



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-322019-25

<b>Development</b>	<i>Construction of new detached 1.5 storey dwelling to rear of existing dwelling and all associated site works</i>		
<b>Location</b>	<i>180 Whitehall Road, Terenure, Dublin 12 D12F2K4</i>		
<b>Planning Authority Ref.</b>	<i>SD24A/0273W</i>		
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	<i>Gerry and Mary Rylands</i>		
<b>Type of Application</b>	<i>Permission</i>	<b>PA Decision</b>	<i>Refuse Permission</i>
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	<i>First</i>	<b>Appellant</b>	<i>Gerry and Mary Rylands</i>
<b>Observer(s)</b>	<i>None</i>		
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	<i>11<sup>th</sup> April 2025</i>	<b>Inspector</b>	<i>Andrew Hersey</i>

### 1. Site Location/ and Description.

The site is located in a suburban residential area in Terenure in South Dublin. The site comprises of a semi-detached single storey dwelling with 2 storey extension to the rear. To the rear there is long garden which stretches back as far as the River Poodle. Flood alleviation works including for works directly adjacent to the rear of the site are currently being undertaken in the River Poodle to prevent future flooding of lands in the vicinity of the river.

There is a detached residential unit in the rear garden to the south west, 182a Whitehall Road. To the north east there are detached sheds in the rear garden.

Access to the site is via an open ungated access into a long and narrow front garden. There is also a side passage which connects to the rear garden

**2. Proposed development.** The proposed development comprises of permission to :

- Construct a new 1.5 storey dormer dwelling in the rear garden of the existing dwelling and adjacent to No. 182a Whitehall Road.
- Construction of a shared vehicular entrance between the subject site, No.180 and the adjacent residence to the east, No 178 Whitehall Road which is to serve the rear gardens of both properties.
- There is a legal agreement on file between the applicants and the owners of No 178 Whitehall with respect to the shared entrance and a right of way through the said shared entrance has been agreed between both parties subject to planning permission being in place.
- The stated floorspace associated with the proposal is a stated 178sq.m. and the site area is 0.192ha.

**3. PA's Decision** Permission was refused for the following reason:

*The subject site is located within a flood risk area designated as Flood Zone A and Flood Zone B, which is at risk of flooding. Based on the information submitted, which contains a number of discrepancies and the absence of a completed/operational flood alleviation scheme, the Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed development has overcome the previous reason for refusal and would not be at risk from flooding or would not give rise to flooding at other locations. Having regard to the provisions of the 2022-2028 South Dublin County Development Plan's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and SDCC Water Services Department expert guidance, and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, the proposed dwelling cannot be favourably considered by the Planning Authority. As such, it is*

*recommended that permission be refused for the proposed infill dwelling and associated works.*

**3.1 Submissions:** There is one submission on file which raises the following;

- Loss of privacy and overlooking, and loss of light to neighbouring homes
- A decrease in property values
- Not align with the character of neighbourhood as the building would be out of context with architectural style and scale of existing homes in area,
- OPW working on new flood defences for area.

**3.2 Internal Reports.**

- Roads Report (received 12<sup>th</sup> February 2025) – no objection
- Environmental Health Office (16<sup>th</sup> January 2025) - no objection
- Water Services (31<sup>st</sup> January 2025) - recommends refusal on basis of non-compliance with 5.2.1 part 3 of the South Dublin County Development Plan *Strategic Flood Risk Assessment* which states that *‘highly vulnerable developments should not be permitted in Flood Zone A or Flood Zone B’* and *‘Existing open spaces in Flood Zone A and B should be retained to maintain floor storage areas’*
- Planners Report (dated 2025) raises concerns with respect to:
  - That issues with respect to the principle of a dwelling at this location, traffic safety and issues with respect to design have been accepted by the Planning Authority
  - Discrepancies in the existing and proposed site levels
  - Lack of clarity as to whether the proposed development addresses the previous reason for refusal
  - That the Flood Alleviation Scheme is not yet in place.
  - That regard is had to the report from the Water Services Department who recommends permission be refused.

**3.3 External Consultees**

- Uisce Eireann (1<sup>st</sup> February 2025) - no objection

#### **4. Planning History**

- S24A/0059 for the same development refused permission by South Dublin County Council on issues relating to Flood Risk. This was appealed to the Board by the first party. The Board refused permission on issues relating to Flood Risk. In this respect the Boards reason for refusal states the following:  
*‘Having regard to the location of the site within Flood Zone A and B in the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Section 5.21, Development Plan IE 4 Objective 1 Flood Risk, and The Planning System and Flood Risk Management (November 2009) Section 528, as revised by Circular 2/14 Flooding Issues, requiring developments to demonstrate that flood risk to a development can be adequately managed and will not cause unacceptable adverse impact elsewhere. it is considered that the applicant has failed to satisfactorily address the mitigation required by not incorporating a finished floor level of 53.37 metres Ordnance Datum in the design to ensure that the flood risk to the proposed development has been mitigated and managed to an acceptable level of risk. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area’*

#### **5. National/Regional/Local Planning Policy**

##### **5.1 The South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028**

- The site is zoned ‘objective, ‘RES’ under the 2022-2028 South Dublin County Development Plan (CDP), which seeks ‘To protect and improve residential amenity’
- Section 12.6.8 Development on Infill Sites
- Section 12.6.8 Backland Development
- Policy GI3: Sustainable Water Management
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
- Policy IE4 Flood Risk Objective 1

*To require site specific flood risk assessments to be undertaken for all new developments within the County in accordance with The Planning System Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities*

*(2009) and the requirements of DECLG Circular P12 / 2014 and the EU Floods Directive and Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring and the policies and objectives of this chapter.*

## **5.2 Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements (SRDCS)**

### **5.3 Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (The FRM Guidelines) (2009), Technical Appendices (2009)**

**and Circular PL 2/2014:** Is a systematic framework for the consideration of flood risk in the planning system, adopting a risk-based sequential approach. The Justification Test for development management is set out in Box 5.1. Circular PL2/2014 Flooding Issues provides clarification on the use of flood mapping in assessing planning applications, and revised Section 5.28 for the assessment of minor proposals including infill.

## **5.2 Natural Heritage Designations**

The nearest designated site is;

- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) is located 8.3km to the east
- South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) is located 8.3km to the east

## **6. The Appeal**

**6.1** A First Party appeal was lodged by Gerry and Mary Rylands on the 6<sup>th</sup> March 2025.

The appeal in summary raises the following issues;

- That flood alleviation measures are currently being undertaken by the OPW in the River Poodle to the rear of the proposed development site.
- That the only issue the council has with respect to the proposed development relates to flooding and the proposal is premature until flood alleviation works are complete.
- That it is the consulting engineers view that major alleviation works have already been completed upstream at Tymon Park and as such permission

could be granted subject to a condition restricting dwelling occupation until the remedial works are completed.

- Flood Relief works in the form of a retaining wall to the rear of No 180 and its neighbours have commenced and are to be completed in 2025.
- The appellant refers to ABP319421-24 as precedent.
- That there is a report from the councils project engineer on file (copy attached to appeal) that states that the works at Tymon Park North are 100% completed and that defence walls are currently being installed at 168-186 Whitehall Road.
- That the FFL of the house is 53.37m which includes for a freeboard of 500mm
- That there is a Flood Impact Assessment on the file which states that the proposal will exceed 0.1% AEP Flood Event by 500mm

**6.2 P.A. Response** South Dublin County Council responded to this appeal by letter dated the 12<sup>th</sup> March 2025. The following issues were raised;

- That the council confirms its decision
- That the issues raised in the appeal are covered in the Chief Executives Order

## **7. EIA Screening**

See completed Form 1 & 2 on file. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required

## **8. AA Screening**

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 8.3km to the east of South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) 8.3km to the east of South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210)

The proposed development comprises of the construction of a new house. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, and its location in a suburban area, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The relatively small scale nature of the works proposed
- The extensive distances to the nearest Natura 2000 sites (8.3km)
- The indirect hydrological connection from the site to these sites and the fact that the proposed house is located over 50 metres from the hydrological connection (River Poddle) I note in this respect that the Poddle outfalls to the River Liffey at Custom House Quay which is not an Natura 200 site but the Liffey outfalls to Dublin Bay which is a Natura 2000 site.
- Having regard to the screening report/determination carried out by the Planning Authority

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required

## **9.0 Assessment**

### **9.1 Introduction**

9.1.1 I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file and I have inspected the site and have had regard to relevant local development plan policies and guidance.

9.1.2 I am satisfied the substantive issues arising from the grounds of this third party appeal relate to the following matters

- Principle of Development/Development Plan Policy
- Flood Risk
- Residential Amenity Impacts
- Access and Parking
- Design & Conservation

## **9.2 Principle of Development/Development Plan Policy**

9.2.1 The site and the building subject to this appeal is located on lands zoned as 'RES' in the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 (hereunder referred to as the SDCDP), the objective of which is *'To protect and improve residential amenity'*. Residential Use is a category of development which is considered to be 'Permitted in Principle' on such zoned lands as per the SDCDP.

9.2.2 Section 12.6.8 of the SDCDP sets out criteria to be applied for applications for residential dwellings on Infill Sites and Backland Development Sites. The proposal can be classified as an Infill and Backland Development site in this context. I am of the opinion, and having regard to the case planners report on file with respect to this issue, that the proposal generally complies with this section of the statutory development plan.

9.2.3 I further note that the stated site area is 0.192ha which is a large site in a suburban context. The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements (SRDCS) would recommend under Table 3.1 that; *'It is a policy and objective of these Guidelines that residential densities in the range 40 dph to 80 dph (net) shall generally be applied at suburban and urban extension locations in Dublin and Cork'*. At the lower rate of 40dph the proposed site could therefore potentially accommodate 8 dwelling units. While this level of development cannot be accommodated due to the narrow shape of the site and due to the restricted access, I am of the opinion that on the basis of the fact that there are houses in the rear gardens of adjacent houses and the low density context of the area and having regard to the density provisions in the SRCDS



that a house can be accommodated on site subject to the residential amenities of the adjacent properties being protected.

- 9.2.4 Having regard to the foregoing I therefore consider that the proposed development can in principle be accommodated on site and would not be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

### 9.3 Flood Risk

- 9.3.1 The appeal site is located adjacent to the River Poddle and within the fluvial Flood Zone A and B per County Development Plan SFRA Flood Mapping. Residential dwellings are classified as Highly Vulnerable Development within the Flood Risk Management (FRM) Guidelines and are not considered appropriate within Flood Zone A and B.

- 9.3.2 The FRM Guidelines, recognises the need for growth within urban settlements and as per Table 3.2, sets out that the Justification Test (Box 5.1) is required to be met for Highly Vulnerable Development within Flood Zone A and/or Flood Zone B. Section 5.28 as amended by Circular 2/14 states that applications for minor development including small scale infill, “are unlikely to raise significant flooding issues...the sequential approach cannot be used to locate them in lower-risk areas and the Justification Test will not apply.” Section 5.28 further states “However, a commensurate assessment of the risks of flooding should accompany such applications to demonstrate that they would not have adverse impacts or impede access to a watercourse, floodplain or flood protection and management facilities. These proposals should follow best practice in the management of health and safety for users and residents of the proposal” On this basis the guidelines do accept that a risk assessments can be carried out for small scale infill developments on lands designated Flood Zone A & B. The proposal in question would fit into the category of a small scale infill development and therefore this section of the guidelines can be applied.

- 9.3.3 The Planning Report from the Water Services Department of SDCC refers to Section 5.2.1 Part 3 of the SDCC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. It is noted that this part specifically states that *‘Development in Flood Zone A should consist of water*

*compatible development only* and that *'Highly Vulnerable Development shall not be permitted in Flood Zone A or B'* Residential Development is considered highly vulnerable.

9.3.4 It is clear therefore that Development Plan Policy does not allow vulnerable development which includes for residential development on Flood Zones A or B but at the same time the FRM Guidance suggests that small scale infill developments on appropriately zoned lands in urban areas can be considered.

9.3.5 The Planning Report from the Water Services Department of SDCC also states that the flood alleviation works to the River Poddle are not yet complete but that once complete the works will provide protection to these properties from 1% AEP

9.3.6 A report from the Project Resident Engineer of the River Poddle Flood Alleviation Scheme of SDCC dated 27<sup>th</sup> February 2025 has been included with the appeal. It is noted that this report was not referred to the planning department and I note that the report is not specific to the planning application. It is not clear as to where the report was sourced by the appellant. The report states:

- That the River Poddle Flood Alleviation Scheme commenced in April 2024 and is a 3 year project. The report states that the status of the project is that flood defences in Tymon Park North and South are completed and
- Flood defences are underway and 7% complete in Whitehall and Wainscroft.
- That flood defences are currently being installed along the rear of 168 – 186 Whitehall Road (which includes for the proposed development site)
- That the project is scheduled to be fully completed by September 2025 and when completed that the project will provide protection to these properties from 1% AEP.

9.3.7 I noted from the site visit that works had been carried out on the River Poddle to the rear of the site. It is not clear if these works were completed

9.3.8 It is noted that the application includes for a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which has been compiled in accordance with the FRM Guidelines. The report in summary

recommends that the proposed development, with its incorporated mitigation measures and suggested planning conditions, meets the requirements of the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines, the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028, and SDCC SFRA requirements.

9.3.9 The report further states that *the primary flood protection measure is the FAS (Flood Alleviation Scheme) itself, which will protect the site up to the 1% AEP flood event, including allowances for culvert blockage and freeboard'*

9.3.10 It is noted that a 500mm freeboard over the 1% AEP Flood Event levels is proposed which is stated as being 52.87mOD. The FFL is therefore proposed at 53.37mOD.

9.3.11 The submitted FRA has demonstrated that the levels of flood risk for the development are low and that flood risk to and from the development will be mitigated. Furthermore, no adverse impacts on the River Poddle, the flood plain or on the River Poddle Flood Alleviation Scheme were identified in the FRA.

9.3.12 I note that protection will be afforded to the appeal site when the Poddle River Flood Alleviation Scheme is completed, which is expected to be this September.

9.3.13 I have examined the previous application on the site (ABP319916-24) note that the only reason for refusal related to the fact that the FFL of 53.37, as advised as in the FRA was not proposed on the drawings.

9.3.14 I note that the drawings submitted under this appeal shows for a FFL of 53.37m in Drawing No. 501, though it is further noted that the FFL is not cited on the site layout plan Drawing No. 500. This will raise the existing ground levels where the house is to be located by approximately 1.0 metres. I note the case planners comments with respect to the inconsistencies in the plans submitted. Furthermore it is not clear from the drawings that the proposals include for the raising of land levels

9.3.15 The case planner notes the survey drawings submitted with the application prepared by GEO 3D solutions. These drawings show for a ground level of 52.52m where the proposed house is to be located and a FFL of 52.67 of the house located to the west i.e. this house is marginally higher than site levels. The proposed drawings specifically Drawing 501 Section BB shows for the proposed house to be lower than the adjacent

existing house even though the proposed house has a FFL of 53.37m which should be higher not lower than the adjacent house. With respect to the same I have concerns with respect to accuracies of the drawings submitted specifically the section drawings showing the proposed house in the context of the adjacent dwelling at 181 a Whitehall Road.

9.3.16 I note that the appeal submitted has not addressed this inconsistency.

9.3.17 Having regard to the same and having regard to

- The fact that the Flood Alleviation Scheme is not as yet complete
- Having regard to the report from Water Services which recommend that the proposed development is refused on the basis that the site does not have, at present the benefit of the flood relief scheme, and the 1%AEP which is would provide.
- That the site is still designated Flood Zone A & B which as per development plan policy precludes vulnerable development which includes for residential development.

It is considered that the proposed development is premature pending the completion of the Flood Alleviation Scheme and that details with respect to the proposed FFL when compared to levels of adjacent properties is unclear.

## **9.4 Residential Amenity Impacts**

9.4.1 The proposed development is located 45 metres to the south of the existing house on site No 180 Whitehall Road and is located 3.605 metres from the adjacent house to the west No 182a Whitehall Road. It is also located 900mm from the eastern party boundary.

9.4.2 The proposed house is a dormer dwelling with a height of 6.8 metres. There is a first floor window facing north east which will overlook the rear garden of the adjacent property. This window serves a bedroom, in which there are two other windows, a dormer facing south and a rooflight facing north. In the case where the Board are minded to granting the proposed development it is recommended that this window is

either omitted or be top hung and restricted with opaque glass. There are no windows on the gable facing west towards No 182a Whitehall Road. Subject to the amendments to the first floor window on the north east elevation being imposed by way of condition I do not consider that there will be any overlooking issues as a consequence of the proposed development.

- 9.4.3 With respect to overshadowing, there is some confusion with respect to the same as there are inconsistencies in the drawings as detailed under 9.3.15 above which shows the FFL of the proposed development below that of No 182a which is not correct.
- 9.4.4 There is potential for shadow cast on the adjacent property to the west from easterly sunlight though it is noted that there is likely already a shadow cast as a consequence of existing trees on the boundaries of the adjacent property to the east.
- 9.4.5 With respect to the property to the east there is potential for shadowing to the garden of this property when the sun is in the south and the west. It is unlikely to impact upon the house however and considering the potential level of shadowing and the large size of the garden associated with the adjacent house to the east, it is considered that the impact upon the residential amenities of the property would be negligible.
- 9.4.6 I note that a boundary in the form of a fence is to be constructed 8 metres to the north of the proposed house and along the proposed driveway. This will subdivide the proposed house from the existing in the rear of the property. As stated previously there is 45 metres between the front elevation of the proposed house and the rear elevation of the existing house on site No 180 Whitehall Road – the said distance therefore exceeds the threshold for overlooking between first floor windows which the SRCDS recommends at minimum of 16 metres (Policy SPPR1 of the same)
- 9.4.6 Subject to amendments to the first floor window on the north east elevation, I do not consider that there will be impacts to the residential amenities of adjacent properties.

## **9.5 Access and Parking**

- 9.5.1 Access is to be to the side of the existing property on site between No 180 and No 181 Whitehall Road. The vehicular access is to serve the rear gardens of the two properties.
- 9.5.2 I note a clear access of 5.1 metres between the two properties. Access to the proposed house is to be via a driveway along the fence boundary of the north eastern boundary of the rear of the site and parking is to be in front of the proposed house.
- 9.5.3 Access from the public road is to be along the existing driveway which serves No 180 and parking for No 180 is proposed to be located in the north western corner of the site near the roadside. A hedge between No 180 and No 178 is to remain. It is not clear from the drawings submitted if there are to be amendments made to the existing entrance or the roadside boundary. It would also appear that there is to be no amendments made to the front garden of the property to section it off from the driveway which is now to serve the proposed house.
- 9.5.3 However, I note that there is no objection from the Roads Department of SDCC on this matter and the case planner has accepted the same
- 9.5.4 With respect to the above, I consider aspects with respect to access and parking are acceptable subject to, in the event that the Board are mindful to grant permission for the said development that details with respect amendments to the roadside boundary and front garden of No 180 are agreed with the Planning Authority by way of planning condition

## **9.6 Design & Conservation**

- 9.6.1 The proposed development site is located within an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) as designated in the SDCDP.
- 9.6.2 The application has been supported by an Architectural Impact Statement prepared by an accredited Grade 3 Conservation Architect
- 9.6.3 The report notes the distinctive historical fabric of No 180 Whitehall Road and that of the adjacent houses all of which form a crescent of houses at this location.

- 9.6.4 These houses, I consider contribute to the ACA the protection of which is enshrined in the SDCDP under Policy NCBH23 and Policy NCBH20
- 9.6.5 The report in summary states that the proposed house will not be visible from Whitehall Road and in this context the proposed development will not impact upon the ACA. The report further states that *The proposed shared driveway between no 178 and 180 will not involve the loss of any historic boundary/railing.*
- 9.6.6 Having regard to the above and having regard to the fact that the proposed development will not be visible in the context of the existing house on site I consider that the proposed development will not impact upon the ACA.
- 9.6.7 With respect to the proposed house, the same comprises of a dormer dwelling 6.8 metres in height with a 10.4 x 10.9 metre floorplan. The external detailing comprises of timber, render and steel clad detailing. With respect to the same, I do not consider that the proposed house will impact upon the visual amenities of the area and is therefore deemed acceptable.

## **10. Recommendation**

- 10.1 I recommend that permission be refused for the following reason:
- 1. The subject site is located within a flood risk area designated as Flood Zone A and Flood Zone B, and is therefore at risk of flooding pending the completion of the River Poddle Flood Alleviation Scheme. Based on the information submitted, which contains a number of discrepancies in the drawings submitted with respect to existing floor levels, the Board is not satisfied that the proposed development would not be at risk from flooding or would not give rise to flooding at other locations. Having regard to the foregoing and having regard to the provisions of the 2022-2028 South Dublin County Development Plan's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment with respect to the restrictive policies for residential development in areas designated Flood Zone A and Flood Zone B, it is considered that the proposed development would not accord with statutory development plans Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, would be premature pending the completion of*

*the River Poddle Flood Alleviation Scheme and would therefore 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.

---

Name: Andrew Hersey

Planning Inspector

Date: 4<sup>th</sup> June 2025



# Form 1

## EIA Pre-Screening

<b>An Bord Pleanála Case Reference</b>	ABP322019-25		
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	<i>Construction of new detached 1.5 storey dwelling to rear of existing dwelling and all associated site works</i>		
<b>Development Address</b>	180 Whitehall Road, Terenure, Dublin 12 D12F2K4		
<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>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>	Tick/or leave blank	Class 10 (b) (i) Part 2 Housing Projects	√
<b>No</b>	Tick or leave blank		
<b>3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>		500 houses	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
<b>No</b>		√	Proceed to Q4
<b>4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?</b>			

Yes		The relevant threshold under Class 10 (b) (i) Part 2 Housing Projects is 500 houses, 1 house is proposed and is there considered to be a sub threshold development	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)
-----	--	--	---

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	√	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)
Yes		Screening Determination required

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

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

## Form 2

### EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference Number	ABP- 322019-25
Proposed Development Summary	<i>Construction of new detached 1.5 storey dwelling to rear of existing dwelling and all associated site works</i>
Development Address	180 Whitehall Road, Terenure Dublin 12
<p>The Board carried out a preliminary examination [ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended] of at least the nature, size or location of the proposed development, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</p> <p>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>	
Characteristics of proposed development	<i>The proposed development comprises of permission for a dwelling and associated site works,</i>
Location of Proposed Development	<i>The development is situated in an suburban area in Dublin 12 where services are present.</i>

	<i>There are no sensitive environmental receptors on site or in the vicinity of the same.</i>	
<b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b>	<i>The site is located in an area which is at risk of flooding and within an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats, and the peripheral location of the house from any buildings associated with the ACA, the likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.</i>	
<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.	Yes
<del>There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</del>	<del>Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.</del>	No
<del>There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</del>	<del>EIAR required.</del>	No

Inspector: Andrew Hersey

Date: 04/06/2025

DP/ADP: \_\_\_\_\_  
(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

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