



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-321792-25

<b>Development</b>	Retention for the as built extension to the side of the existing dwelling.
<b>Location</b>	Lissadober, Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Tipperary.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Tipperary County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2498
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Patrick Bourke
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Patrick Bourke.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> of May 2025
<b>Inspector</b>	Caryn Coogan

## Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0 Proposed Development .....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision.....	4
3.1. Decision.....	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies.....	6
3.4. Third Party Observations .....	6
4.0 Planning History .....	6
5.0 Policy Context .....	7
5.1. Development Plan.....	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations .....	7
5.3. EIA Screening.....	8
6.0 The Appeal.....	8
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	8
7.0 Assessment.....	8
8.0 AA Screening .....	15
9.0 Recommendation .....	17
10.0 Reasons and Considerations .....	17
11.0 Conditions.....	18
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The subject site is 0.35Ha. and is located in the townland of Lissadober which is 6.7km northwest of Carrick-on-Suir along the Regional Road R696.
- 1.2. The general area is picturesque rural countryside, especially with views to the east along the R696 (designated scenic route). The site is positioned west of a straight stretch of the Regional Road. There are metal electric gates into the premises, with a concrete and post fence along the roadside boundary, and traffic cones were noted too along the roadside boundary to prevent parking.
- 1.3. The site is triangular in configuration. The main dwellinghouse on the site would appear to be a cruciform single storey house, however, I noted roof lights to the rear and a window on first floor level on the northern elevation. This would suggest there has been an attic conversion carried out to the main dwelling on site.
- 1.4. The subject extension attached to the northern side of the dwelling. It is complete and occupied. The extension would have the appearance of a separate dwelling unit, with a short connection link between the main dwelling and unit. The extension is used as a and has the appearance of a granny flat to the side of the existing dwelling. There is a small patio area along the northern elevation serving the extension.
- 1.5. The entire residential curtilage is accessed from the Regional Road R696.
- 1.6. To the south of the dwelling, there is a detached garden area, which would appear to be an open space area with goalposts on it. This area is screened from the main house with a mature hedgerow. This area has also got a vehicular access onto the R696, however I was unable to establish the purpose of this second entrance within the site boundary.

## **2.0 Development**

- 2.1. The retention of an as built extension to the side of a dwelling house. According to the application form, the existing dwelling on the site is 95sq.m. and the extension

the subject of this appeal is 76.5sq.m. (*However, I would estimate the footprint of the existing dwelling on site is more in the region of 170.sq.m*)

- 2.2. The applicant explained the urgency of development for his mother and a letter from a doctor explaining the need for the extension.
- 2.3. On the 20<sup>th</sup> of June 2023 the planning authority issued detailed further information regarding the proposal would appear to be a self-sufficient unit as opposed to a domestic extension. The further information was responded to on the 26<sup>th</sup> of November 2024, with a sightline drawing, a Site Suitability Report, and new notices.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

On the 9<sup>th</sup> of January 2025 Tipperary Co. Co. issued a Notification to Refuse Permission for Retention for 4No. Reasons:

1. The proposed development has a gross floor area of 76sq.m. and limited integration with the main dwelling is contrary to the requirements of section 4.13 of the development plan relating to the provision for ancillary family living.
2. The proposed development does not provide the 160m sightlines from a 4.5m setback along the Regional Road.
3. Policy 11-9 relates to Flood Risk Assessments, and the site is potentially vulnerable to flooding.
4. There may be a direct hydrological connection from the site to the Lower River Suir SAC, and the proposal may have an adverse impact on the integrity

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

##### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

- The principle is acceptable because there is an existing dwelling on the site.

- The extension is more like a separate dwelling than an extension to the existing dwelling house.
- The applicant has not demonstrated a requirement for ancillary accommodation.
- The structure cannot be integrated into the main dwelling. The applicant must address this issue.
- The applicant needs to provide more information regarding the sewage treatment system, all that was provided was the location of the septic tank.
- Works along the roadside boundary have impeded sightlines, the R696 is a strategic route.
- Further information is required on the AA screening process
- The site is located in an area at risk of fluvial flooding.

The planning authority requested **Further Information** regarding the above issues, upon receipt of the further information the detailed were analysed in the report dated 09/01/2025:

- The proposed ancillary unit is poorly integrated into the main dwelling. The proposal does not satisfy section 4.13 of Volume 3 Appendix 6 of the Tipperary County Development Plan.
- It is unlikely the works to be retained will lead to a significant increase in traffic generated on the site. However, the District Engineer is concerned about the entrance. The boundary treatment has been erected on the sightline visibility triangle.
- A new site suitability report was submitted and proposal to upgrade the existing wastewater treatment system on site. However the fluvial flooding issue was not addressed.
- In the absence of a flood risk assessment, it is not possible to determine if there is a direct hydrological link between the site and the River Glen which is a tributary of the Lower River Suir SAC.
- There has been no flood risk assessment carried out. The applicant claims the site has never flooded.

- A refusal is recommended and 4No. reasons are cited.

### 3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

#### **Engineer Report (13/12/2024)**

- The existing entrance to the dwelling appears to have been modified. There is no record of these works. The works have reduced the sightlines at the entrance.
- The applicant is to submit a revised sightline drawing complying with Section 6.1 and Tables 6.1 of the Tipperary County Development Plan 2022, requiring a 160m sightline in both directions from a 2.4m setback.

### 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

#### 3.3.1 ***National Roads, Tramore House***

The development is remote from the Preferred Transport Solution Corridor currently being developed as part of the N24 Waterford to Cahir project.

### 3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None.

## 4.0 **Planning History**

### 4.1 **Ref: 12/104**

On the site immediately south of the dwelling permission was refused for a dwelling house. I did note this was part of the original site boundaries for the dwelling house on site, and includes what appears to be a new entrance onto the R696. Three reason for refusal, Housing Needs, Road Safety and Flood risk)

### 4.2 **Ref: 07/1490**

Patrick Bourke, current applicant was refused planning permission for a bungalow on the subject site.

### 4.3 **Enforcement File: TUD-23-208**

Development of a dwelling unit

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

The Tipperary County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the relevant development plan. The following policy is relevant:

#### **Policy 5 - 10**

Facilitate the sub-division/extension of existing dwellings for the provision of ancillary accommodation for dependant family relatives, subject to compliance with the Development Management Standards set out in Volume 3.

According to Volume 3 the following standards are relevant:

#### **4.13 Provision for Ancillary Family Accommodation**

Consideration can be given to building ancillary accommodation as an extension to an existing house where it can be shown that such is required for a family member. Proposals for such development will be required to meet the following design requirements:

- a) There shall be direct internal access to the principle dwelling and the structure shall not form a permanent separate self-contained unit from the principal dwelling.
- b) The extension shall be modest in size and shall not provide more than one bedroom (2 bedrooms in exceptional circumstances).
- c) The extension shall not exceed a gross floor area of 50 square metres.
- d) There shall be no subdivision of the garden or entrance.
- e) The design should ensure that the extension forms an integral part of the main dwelling unit capable of integration for single domestic use when no longer required, and shall not be sold or leased separately.

### 5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is located:

5.6km from R. Suir SAC

14.8km from R. Barrow and R. Nore SAC

13.4km from the Comeragh Mountains SAC

### **5.3. EIA Screening**

Having regard to the nature and scale of development for the extension of a family dwelling on an existing residential plot in a rural area, 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. See Appendix 1 & 2.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

- The extension was built for the applicant's elderly mother in 2024. (Appeal submission details the lady's illness however, I do not consider it appropriate to summarise private details in this report. The planning application was accompanied by a letter from her local doctor). The design of the extension is to allow his mother still maintain independent living. His wife has been his mother carer for the past five years.
- The extension is not a separate build, it is wired to the main house and the ESB.
- There is a 160m sightline in both directions at the entrance.
- There have not been any issues with flooding. The applicant has lived there all his life and there has been no record of flooding in the area in the past 100 years.
- It is proposed to install a new sewage treatment and percolation area to serve the dwelling and extension.

## **7.0 Assessment**

- 7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, the reports of the Planning Authority, having conducted an inspection of the site, and



having reviewed relevant local policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this First Party appeal can be addressed under the following relevant headings:

- Description of the Development
- Development Plan Policy Context
- Access
- Wastewater Treatment
- Flooding
- Appropriate Assessment (Screening)

## **7.2 Description of the Development**

7.2.1 The submission documents with the planning application contain a number of anomalies, which may have confused the assessment of the case.

- The planning application form states the existing building (dwellinghouse) on the site is 95sq.m., and the floor area of the works to be retained is 76.5sq.m. The existing dwelling is considerably larger in footprint than the subject extension. From my observations on site, and consideration of the planning history files, I calculate the existing dwelling footprint is greater than 175sq.m.
- I was unable to establish the actual grant of planning permission for the subject dwelling on the site. I did find an old history file associated with the applicant and the site planning reference Ref: 07/1490 which was a refusal of planning permission for a bungalow on the subject site. The site layout drawing illustrates the context of the subject site positioned to the north of the existing dwelling.
- According to the submitted floor plans, there is a corridor linking the existing dwelling and the subject extension. The elevation drawings do not match what is on the ground. There is an external door on the western elevation, within the linking corridor which is not illustrated on the submitted drawings. In addition, the door is not included on the elevation drawings or the floor plans.

7.2.2 I consider the issues are not significant material issues because they relate to the rear elevation.

7.2.3 Having regard to the relationship between the existing dwellinghouse and the new addition, plus the use described on the appeal file, as accommodation for the applicant's ill mother, it is my opinion, the subject unit can be described as a separate dwelling unit linked to the main dwelling by a short corridor, as opposed to an extension to the existing dwelling. In my opinion, the applicant should have accurately described the nature and extent of the development for retention, as opposed to stating it is an extension to the existing dwelling. Upon examination of the drawings/ floors plans and the description of use of the unit, I consider the development falls under the category of '**Ancillary Accommodation for a Family Member**', and not a domestic extension.

7.2.4 In addition, the corridor link could easily be removed at a future date, creating an entirely independent living unit. The description of the structure, this has implications for the relevant development plan policies applicable to the development.

### 7.3 Development Plan Policy Context

- 7.3.1 According to **Policy 5 - 10** of the Tipperary County development Plan 2022-2028, it is planning authority policy to '*Facilitate the sub-division/extension of existing dwellings for the provision of ancillary accommodation for dependant family relatives, subject to compliance with the Development Management Standards set out in Volume 3*'. The applicant's mother resides in the subject unit and has been cared for by the applicant's wife. I note the submissions from the family doctor on the planning file. I can confirm also, the applicant's mother was present on the day of my inspection. I would consider the applicant's mother to be dependent as described in the planning application and the case presented on the appeal file to be genuine. Therefore the principle of the development is acceptable under Policy 5-10 as cited above.
- 7.3.2 According to Policy 5-10 of the development plan, the development should meet with the Development Management Standards outlined in Volume 3 of the development plan. I will examine these in greater detail under the following bullet points, as this issue formed the first reason for refusal.

According to **Section 4.13 Volume 3** the following standards are relevant:

- *There shall be direct internal access to the principle dwelling and the structure shall not form a permanent separate self-contained unit from the principal dwelling.*

There is a short corridor link between the existing dwelling and the new ancillary unit.

- *The extension shall be modest in size and shall not provide more than one bedroom (2 bedrooms in exceptional circumstances).*

The unit is modest in scale and does appear to be subsidiary to the main dwelling house in terms of scale and design.

- *The extension shall not exceed a gross floor area of 50 square metres.*

The unit is only one bedroom and is 75sq.m., which is 25sq.m above the maximum floor area prescribed in the development plan. The entire site area is .35ha and the site has the capacity to absorb the development without reducing the visual or residential amenities of the area. The floor area is unusual, with a large angular hallway and ensuite shower room etc. However, the accommodation is Age Friendly and suitable sizing has been applied for adapted living. In my opinion, under the circumstances of this particular case, I consider the 50sq.m. requirement to be unreasonable and rigorous. There should be greater flexibility provided under section 4.13 to take into consideration, site location, site context, site constraints, site facilities and impacts. I consider 75sq.m. creates minimal impact on the subject site and will not create an undesirable precedent if permitted.

- *There shall be no subdivision of the garden or entrance.*

The development is in compliance.

- *The design should ensure that the extension forms an integral part of the main dwelling unit capable of integration for single domestic use when no longer required and shall not be sold or leased separately.*

The unit currently is attached to the main dwelling. However, it cannot be sold off separately because it utilises the same entrance and infrastructure as the main dwelling.

7.3.3 The first reason for refusal states the proposal does not meet with the requirements of Section 4.13 of the development plan because it exceeds the permitted floor area and provides limited integration with the main dwelling. The structure is an ancillary family unit and there is a corridor linking both units would satisfy the nature and use of the use. In addition, I consider there should be concessions regarding the arbitrary floor area to allow for age friendly accommodation and accessibility, which would require larger rooms than standard living accommodation. I consider the reason for refusal to be unduly unreasonable in this instance and should be dismissed by the Board.

#### **7.4 Access**

7.4.1 The second reason for refusal in the planning authority's decision relates to the vehicular access to the development. The reason for refusal states the modified entrance onto the Regional Road R696 does not provide the required sightlines in accordance with the requirements of the county development plan. This requirement is a 160metre sightline in both directions within a 4.5m setback.

7.4.2 I note from the Planning Report on file, a street view photograph taken in 2019 of the roadside boundary was illustrated and it stated it would appear modifications were carried out to the entrance and the roadside boundary. However, there is no planning reference regarding the permitted entrance. In addition, the subject application and associated public notices (original notices and subsequent notices following the submission of further information) did not make reference to retention of the as-built entrance.

7.4.3 I refer to a Warning Letter issued to the applicant from the planning authority on 9<sup>th</sup> of February 2024. The reference TUD-23-208 refers to the following alleged unauthorised developments:

(i) The construction of a dwelling

(ii) the placing of a mobile home on lands and the occupation and use of same as a dwelling and resulting in a material change of use

(iii) water and wastewater infrastructure associated with (i) and (11)

(iv) material widening of an entrance onto public road R-696.

The subject structure of this appeal resembles a separate dwelling unit within the curtilage of the existing dwellinghouse, therefore I can assume this current planning application/ appeal relates to part (i) of the notice. I did not observe a mobile home on the site during my inspection, perhaps it has been removed from the site. The wastewater treatment is addressed in the next portion of this report. The planning application does not include the material widening of the entrance, it was excluded from the description and submission documents. In my opinion, the planning authority and the applicant should address this outstanding issue in a separate application/ declaration.

7.4.3 In my opinion, the access to the dwelling relates to the original planning permission associated with the dwelling. Any retention of a material alteration of the access or roadside boundary treatment would need to be dealt with under a separate planning application or a declaration, as it was not applied for under this current application. The applicant was requested by way of further information to address the modified entrance. The comments in the Districts Engineers report dated 13/12/2024 are noted regarding lack of sightlines, in particular the new boundary treatment now interferes with the sightline triangle to the north. It should be noted the Planning Report also acknowledged the subject ancillary family unit would NOT result in a significant intensification of use of the existing entrance.

7.4.4 In my opinion, a speed limit of 80kmph applies on the R696 at this point. The development does not represent an increase in traffic on the site. There is no access for a car to the ancillary unit within the current site layout. Therefore, I am not satisfied that the access issue is relevant to the development as presented in the planning application. Given that the route is a designated Scenic Route in the county development plan, I would question the sensitivity and appropriateness of the specification (timber rail fence and concrete post) in terms of visual impact. However, I do not consider the issue of the modified entrance can be included in the assessment of the case, it should be dealt with separately in terms of compliance with the permitted dwelling/ access on the site. Furthermore, the subject site includes a second entrance at the southern extremity of the roadside boundary. I

was unable to establish the purpose of the second access which includes a gravel road and leads into a green area/ open space associated with the dwellinghouse. In order to avoid any ambiguity or irregularities, I would suggest a planning condition to attached, excluding any issues arising from the access, so that these can be addressed independently to the current application.

## **7.5 Wastewater Treatment**

7.5.1 Given the additional loading associated with the ancillary unit, the applicant has proposed in further information submission dated 26<sup>th</sup> of November 2024, a new wastewater treatment system south of the existing dwelling and a new soil polishing filter, with a design criteria outlined in the Site Suitability report. I would consider this enhancement of the existing treatment system to be justified under the circumstances, as the development for retention presents increased loading on the existing sewage treatment system, albeit a single bedroom ancillary unit.

7.5.2 A Site Suitability report was prepared and details of the secondary sewage treatment system where submitted. I am satisfied this improvement to the existing sewage treatment system on site is warranted in this instance and complies with the EPA Guidelines.

## **7.6 Flooding**

7.6.1 The planning authority refused the development due to an absence of a flood risk assessment associated with the site. The particular concern related to the upgrading of the sewage treatment on site. I note from the mapping there is a watercourse west of the site, but not adjoining, called River Glenbrook. The watercourse is a minor tributary of the Lingaun River which is within the Ruir Suir catchment. The subject site is marginally located adjacent to or within an area designed with Low Probability of Fluvial flooding.

7.6.2 Having regard to the fact the development is an ancillary to the primary use of the site, and that the sewage treatment system is an upgrading of an existing system on site, I consider a Flood Risk Assessment is not required in this instance. The watercourse is a minor stream. It is located 100m from the proposed treatment system. The probability of flooding occurring in the area is low, 1:1000 year. The new treatment system will improve the quality of the effluent been discharge into the groundwater. Therefore, I consider the risk of pollution to be minor, because the

proposal is not introducing a new system, it is replacing and improving an existing system.

- 7.6.3 I do note from planning histories associated with the immediate vicinity of the site, that the flooding issue was a reason for refusal prohibiting new development in the area alongside traffic and local needs issues. However, as this is an extension and improvement to an existing development, I do not believe a Flood Risk Assessment is required given the minor nature of the development.

## **8.0 AA Screening**

- 8.1. The subject site has a stated area of 0.35 ha and contains an existing dwelling house. The subject development is proposed retention of a single bedroom ancillary family unit for a dependent family member. Under the proposal the existing sewage treatment system on site will be upgraded to include a new secondary treatment system and polishing filter area.
- 8.2. The site does not adjoin any European sites, and there are no direct links associated with the site to any European sites. The River Suir SAC (Site Code 002137) is located 4km north (River Linguan) of the site and 8km south of the site. There is a watercourse 78metres west of the subject site which is within the River Suir SAC catchment.
- 8.3. I note from the planning authority's report that it was indicated the site is located within an area that is at risk of flooding, therefore further information was requested in order to complete the AA screening. Following receipt of the further information, the planning authority concluded that in the absence of a Flood Risk Assessment, it was not possible to determine if there was a direct hydrological link between the subject site and the River Glenbrook, a watercourse within the catchment area of the Lower River Suir SAC.
- 8.4. Upon examination of the EPA river maps and the OPW Flood Map, I note the site is partially within a low fluvial flood risk area. The development is existing. The issue of concern for the planning authority is the replacement and upgrading of an existing sewage treatment system with a secondary sewage treatment plant and polishing filter south of the existing main dwelling on the site.

8.5. I consider the enhancement of the existing sewage treatment system on site to be a mitigation measure against any potential impact that may arise on site flooding. The risk of fluvial flooding is very low, according to the mapping 1:000 year fluvial flooding episode. In addition, the watercourse is over 100metres from the replacement treatment system, and it is not a significant watercourse, more like a stream. Therefore, the likely of a material impact or a significant impact on the water quality of the R. Glenbrook, in the unlikely and rare event of flooding, as a result of the development, is unlikely to occur. In addition, should such a flooding event occur, the proposed sewage treatment system under this current application, would reduce the pollution risk.

8.6. **Likely significant effects on the European sites in view of the conservation objectives**

8.7. The operation of the development will not result in impacts that could affect the conservation objectives of the SACs due to separation distance and lack of meaningful ecological/ hydrological connections. There will be no changes in ecological status of the European sites due to development.

8.8. **In combination effects**

8.9. The development will not result in any effects that could contribute to an additive effect with other developments in the area. No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.

8.10. **Overall Conclusion – Screening Determination**

8.11. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on any European Site and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment Stage 2 is not required.

The determination is based on:

- Having regard to the absence of any direct hydrological connection from the subject site to any European Site.



- Having regard to the distance of the site from the European Sites regarding any other potential ecological pathways and the low fluvial flooding risk associated with the subject site
- Having regard to the screening report and determination of the planning authority.
- Having regard to the issue of the proposal does not lead to any additional loading on the onsite sewage treatment system, yet the development includes the proposed enhancement and upgrading to a secondary sewage treatment system and polishing filter.

## 9.0 Recommendation

I recommend the planning authority's decision to refuse the retention of the development be overturned by the Board and the Board grant planning permission for retention of the development based on the following Reasons and Considerations.

## 10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to Policy Objective 5-10 and Section 4.13, which relate to ancillary accommodation for dependent family members, of the Tipperary County Development Plan 2022-2028, and having regard to the limited scale and form of the development proposed to be retained, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, there would be no loss of visual or residential amenity, and the development would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and public health. The development as proposed would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 11.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be retained, carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, and the further information received on the 24<sup>th</sup> of November 2024 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 prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

**Reason:** in the interest of clarity

2. This grant of permission relates only to the ancillary accommodation for dependent family member. This does not include the access arrangements or roadside boundary treatment associated with the primary dwelling on the subject site.

**Reason:** in the interest of clarity

3. (a) The wastewater treatment system hereby permitted shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations included within the site characterisation report submitted as further information on 26<sup>th</sup> of November 2024 and shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled "Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent  $\leq$  10) " – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.  
  
(b) Treated effluent from the septic tank/ wastewater treatment system shall be discharged to a percolation area/ polishing filter which shall be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled "Code of

Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent  $\leq 10$ )” – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.

(c) Within six months of this decision, the developer shall submit a report to the planning authority from a suitably qualified person (with professional indemnity insurance) certifying that the wastewater treatment system and associated works is constructed and operating in accordance with the standards set out in the Environmental Protection Agency document referred to above.

**Reason:** In the interest of public health and to prevent water pollution.

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.

---

Caryn Coogan  
Planning Inspector

08 May 2025

# Form 1

## EIA Pre-Screening

<b>An Bord Pleanála</b> <b>Case Reference</b>	321792-25		
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Retention of an as-built extension to dwelling house		
<b>Development Address</b>	Lissadober, Carrick-On-Suir, Co. Tipperary		
<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)?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>		Part 2, Class 10(b)(i).	Proceed to Q3.
<b>No</b>			No further action required
<b>3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
<b>No</b>	X	Threshold: Construction of more than 500 dwelling units and urban development which would involve	Proceed to Q4

		an area greater than 20 hectares outside of a builtup area	
<b>4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>	X	Ancillary one bedroom unit within an existing residential curtilage in a rural area.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

<b>5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?</b>		
<b>No</b>	X	<b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q4)</b>
		<b>Screening Determination required</b>

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Form 2

### EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>An Bord Pleanála Case Reference</b>	<b>ABP-321792-25</b>
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	RETENTION of as built extension to side of dwelling
<b>Development Address</b>	Lissadober, Carrick-on-Suir
<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b></p>	
<p><b>Characteristics of proposed development</b></p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	Small one bedroom residential unit for a dependent family member which includes the upgrading of the existing septic tank treatment system on site to a secondary treatment system with polishing filter
<p><b>Location of development</b></p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	The rural location is removed from any sensitive designated sites or cultural interests. No loss of hedgerow / trees is proposed.

<b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b> (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).		The impacts will be contained within the site with any water based run-off contained on site and wastewater treated on site.
<b>Conclusion</b>		
<b>Likelihood of Significant Effects</b>	<b>Conclusion in respect of EIA</b>	<b>Yes or No</b>
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.	<b>YES</b>
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.	

**Inspector:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DP/ADP:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)