



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP 322302-25

#### Development

Changes to planning application approved 3042/24. Changes are the finished floor level of new house to lower by 350mm. The raising of the central element roof height by 700mm from 4.8m approved to 5.5m. The central element of the new dwelling to get wider 700mm at the front & rear. The central element roof profile to change from hipped/partial flat with gable walls on both ends. 2no. proposed flat roof dormers to the rear of the new roof and all ancillary works

#### Location

10 Springdale Road, Dublin 5, D05 PY01

#### Planning Authority

Dublin City Council North

#### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

3045/25

#### Applicants

Stephanie Molloy & Brian Capper

#### Type of Application

Permission

#### Planning Authority Decision

To refuse permission

#### Type of Appeal

First Party

#### Appellants

Stephanie Molloy & Brian Capper

#### Observers

None

#### Date of Site Inspection

26<sup>th</sup> June 2025

#### Inspector

Trevor Rue

## 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 .....	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies .....	5
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. Development Plan.....	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations .....	9
6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment Screening .....	10
7.0 The Appeal .....	10
7.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	10
7.2. Planning Authority Response .....	12
8.0 Assessment .....	12
9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening .....	14
10.0 Recommendation .....	14
11.0 Reasons and Considerations .....	15
12.0 Conditions .....	15
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening .....	18
– Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination.....	19

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The application site is about 6.5 kilometres to the north east of the centre of Dublin. It has a stated area of 735 square metres. It comprises the curtilage of a two-storey dwelling on the northern side of a residential street. At variance with its neighbours, the dwelling has a steeply pitched roof perpendicular to the road. The whole area between the front elevation of the dwelling and the frontage of the site is surfaced in concrete. The rear portion of the site, behind the dwelling, is over 30 metres in length and is covered by rough grass, weeds and rubble.
- 1.2. No. 8 Springdale Road, immediately to the east, is a detached bungalow, while No. 12, immediately to the west, is a two-storey semi-detached house. Two-storey properties on Edenmore Crescent with sizeable back gardens adjoin the site to the north. The eastern, northern and western site boundaries are strongly vegetated.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. It is proposed to construct a new dwelling in the rear portion of the site. It would comprise three elements:
- A single-storey front element in the western part of the site would face southwards towards the existing dwelling and have a pitched roof running on a north/south axis. This element would have a ridge height of 4.8 metres above ground-floor level and would accommodate a lounge and dining area.
  - A single-storey rear element in the eastern part of the site would face northwards towards the adjoining property, 66 Edenmore Crescent and have a hipped roof. This element would have a ridge height of 3.66 metres above ground-floor level and would accommodate two bedrooms.
  - A two-storey central element would take up much of the width of the site. Most of the roof area would be flat and there would be sloping sections to the front and rear. Two flat-roofed dormer windows would be constructed to the rear of the central element but there would be no first-floor windows on the front-facing, southern elevation. This element would have a ridge height above ground-floor level of 5.35 metres. The ground floor would accommodate a hall, kitchen, bathroom, utility room and store, while the first floor would accommodate a

gallery landing, an office and a master bedroom with a vestibule, walk-in wardrobe and *en-suite* facilities.

- 2.2. It is proposed to use black concrete ridge tiles on the flat roof, slates on the pitched and hipped roofs, selected brick on the front and eastern elevations of the front element and sand and cement plastering on the other walls of the dwelling. A total of seven solar panels would be placed on the roofs of the front and central elements. It is stated on the proposed first floor plan that the roof of the rear element could be changed to a green roof if required.
- 2.3. It is proposed that three parking spaces would be provided to the front of No. 10 to serve both the existing and the proposed dwelling. The existing hard surfaces at the rear of the site would be replaced by soft landscaping, lawn, planted beds, permeable paths and self-draining patios. A lawn and play space of 73 square metres and an outdoor dining area of 96 square metres would be provided for the proposed dwelling. A curved boundary wall 1.8 metres high would separate the new property from the existing with pedestrian gates into each.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

- 3.1.1. On 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2025, Dublin City Council notified the applicant of its decision to refuse permission, giving the following reason:

*The parent permission 3024/24 / ABP-320287-24 excluded by condition the first floor/dormer level of the approved dwelling on the basis of the unacceptable impact on existing residential amenities. In this instance the proposed first floor, in its form, bulk and massing and the size and position of its windows would be similar in scale and appearance and would have a negative impact on the adjoining properties in terms of overbearing and indirect overlooking and would, therefore cause serious injury to residential amenities, including the use of private amenity space and would be contrary to both the policies and objectives of the current Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

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

#### Planning Report

3.2.1. A planning officer's report dated 31<sup>st</sup> March 2025 provided the reasoning for the authority's decision. The main points were as follows:

- The development is acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of its impacts on the surrounding area and compliance with relevant Development Plan criteria.
- The works proposed are to provide for a two-storey element in the central west-east axis. The flat roof to the proposed first floor would be 550 millimetres higher than the previously specified maximum height of 4.8 metres. The flat roof would present a sizable blank gable to each side boundary. The north/rear and south/front elevations of the house would be less substantial in height than previously approved but the windows to the rear would be wider and closer to the two side boundaries.
- The issues of bulk and mass have not been satisfactorily resolved. Indirect overlooking would remain and arguably would be increased by the window sizes. The circumstances of the site and design have not changed since the previous decision.
- It is proposed that the ground floor of the building would contain two bedrooms, however the ground floor is of sufficient size that the layout could be amended to add a third bedroom if required.
- The planning perspective, reinforced by the Board's previous appeal decision, is that a single-storey bungalow is the maximum quantum of development for the site. In design and impact terms the proposed development is generally unacceptable.

#### Other Technical Reports

3.2.2 The Council's Drainage Division had no objection, subject to standard conditions.

### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. No comment was received from Uisce Éireann or Irish Rail.

## 4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. **2976/17:** On 4<sup>th</sup> December 2017, the Council granted permission to Richard McMullan to demolish a semi-derelict wholesale warehouse unit and construct two semi-detached two-storey-plus-attic four-bedroom houses at the present application site.
- 4.2. **3042/24:** On 15<sup>th</sup> January 2024, the present appellants applied for permission for a detached dormer bungalow in the rear portion of the present application site and for new boundary walls, railings and gates to the front, side and rear of the existing dwelling. The proposed new dwelling comprised single-storey elements to the front and rear and a two-storey central element. The central element was to have a pitched roof on an east-west axis with an apex 7.36 metres above existing ground level.
- 4.3. The planning officer who initially assessed the application considered, given the distances involved, that the proposed building would not create undue or unacceptable overlooking and that it would not overlook the rear of the dwellings to either side other than at an acute angle. This view was not shared by a more senior planner. In response to a request for further information, revised plans were submitted showing a reduction in the height of the single-storey south facing element from 6.1 to 4.8 metres and proposals for planting to the front of the existing dwelling.
- 4.4. On 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2024, Dublin City Council decided to grant permission subject to 11 conditions. Condition 3 read as follows:
- Prior to commencement of development on site the applicant shall submit revised drawings for the written agreement of the Planning Authority which show the following;*
- a) The first floor of the house omitted in its entirety and the roof height of the single storey central element at a maximum height of 4.8m.*
  - b) The entire roof of the infill house shall be hipped.*
  - c) No increase in height of the rear roof shall be permitted unless authorised by a further grant of permission.*
  - d) Ground floor plans of the dwelling incorporating amendments a – c above.*
- Reason:* *To protect the existing residential amenity and ensure no undue negative impacts in terms of overbearing.*
- 4.5. An appeal (**320287-24**) was made to An Bord Pleanála against Condition 3(a) and (b). The inspector considered that the planning authority's Condition 3 was not warranted

and recommended an alternative condition requiring opaque glazing to be fitted in the first-floor window on the southern elevation serving a proposed landing.

- 4.6. The Board did not accept the inspector's recommendation. It decided instead to direct the planning authority to attach Condition 3. It based its decision on the following reasons and considerations:

*The Board [considers] that the scale, form and massing of the house in this backland residential setting within the back garden of an existing single dormer design house site, would result in an unacceptable overbearing impact and indirect overlooking on the adjoining properties and onto the host house and would injure the residential amenity currently enjoyed by these properties, including the use of their rear private amenity space. This would be contrary to the provisions of Section 15.13.4 of the Dublin City development Plan 2022-2028 and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

*Nevertheless, the Board was satisfied that this could be adequately addressed by the condition, No. 3, attached by the Planning Authority in this instance, requiring revisions to the design, to form a single storey house response.*

- 4.7. **3042/24Sub01:** On 10<sup>th</sup> January 2025, the present appellants submitted drawings pursuant to Condition 3. The planning officer reported that while the submitted drawings indicated that only the northern portion of the dwelling containing the bedrooms would be hipped while the west-east section and the southern portion would both have gable-ended roofs. The officer's assessment was that submission was not in compliance with Condition 3(b) and therefore could not be considered to be in compliance with Condition 3(d) either. On 27<sup>th</sup> February 2025, the Council informed the present appellants that the details submitted were not satisfactory and were not in compliance with Condition 3.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. Map C of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 shows the application site within Primary Land Use Zoning Category Z1, Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods. The Z1 zoning objective, set out in Section 14.7.1 of the Plan, is to

protect, provide and improve residential amenities. The vision for residential development in the city is one where a wide range of high quality accommodation is available within sustainable communities, where residents are within easy reach of open space and amenities as well as facilities such as shops, education, leisure and community services. The objective is to ensure that adequate public transport, in conjunction with enhanced pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, provides such residential communities good access to employment, the city centre and the key urban villages in order to align with the principles of the 15-minute city. Permissible uses in Z1 areas include residential.

- 5.1.2. A strategic principle set out in Section 1.2 of the Plan is creating a more compact city with a network of sustainable neighbourhoods (aligned with the principle of the 15-minute city) which have a range of facilities and a choice of tenure and house types.
- 5.1.3. Policy SC11 in Chapter 4 of the Development Plan refers to promoting compact growth and sustainable densities through the consolidation and intensification of infill and brownfield lands.
- 5.1.4 Policy QHSN6 in Chapter 5 of the Plan is 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.
- 5.1.5. Section 15.13.4 of the Development Plan deals with backland development, generally defined as development of land that lies to the rear of an existing property or building line. It states that consideration of access and servicing and the interrelationship between overlooking, privacy, aspect and daylight/sunlight are paramount to the success and acceptability of new development in backland conditions.
- 5.1.6. Section 15.13.4 of the Plan goes on to say that applications for backland housing should consider the following:
  - Compliance with relevant residential design standards in relation to unit size, room size, private open space etc.
  - Provision of adequate separation distances to ensure privacy is maintained and overlooking is minimised.



- That safe and secure access for car parking and service and maintenance vehicles is provided.
- The scale, form and massing of the existing properties and interrelationship with the proposed backland development.
- The impacts on either the amenity of the existing properties in terms of daylight, sunlight, visual impact etc. or on the amenity obtained with the unit itself.
- The materials and finishes proposed with regard to existing character of the area.
- A proposed backland dwelling shall be located not less than 15 metres from the rear façade of the existing dwelling, and with a minimum rear garden depth of 7 metres.
- A relaxation in rear garden length may be acceptable [if] sufficient open space [is] provided to serve the proposed dwelling and the applicant can demonstrate that the proposed backland dwelling will not impact negatively on adjoining residential amenity.

## 5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. The application site is not in any Natura 2000 site of European nature conservation importance. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are:

- North Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC), about 1.4 kilometres to the east, designated for tidal mudflats and sandflats, annual vegetation of drift lines, annuals colonising sand and mud, salt meadows, shifting and fixed dunes, dune slacks and petalwort;
- North Bull Island Special Protection Area (SPA), about 1.4 kilometres to the east, designated for various bird species;
- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, about 2.5 kilometres to the south, also designated for various bird species; and
- South Dublin Bay SAC, about 4.7 kilometres to the south, designated for mudflats and sandflats, annual vegetation of drift lines, annuals colonising sand and mud and embryonic shifting dunes.

5.2.2. Table 10-2 of the Development Plan lists two other sites of international nature conservation importance in Dublin Bay, namely North Bull Island Ramsar Wetland

Site; and Sandymount Strand / Tolka Estuary Ramsar Wetland Site. It also lists North Bull Island National Special Amenity Area and North Bull Island National Nature Reserve.

- 5.2.3. The application site is not in or near any Natural Heritage Area (NHA). There are five proposed NHAs in the area served by Dublin City Council – North Dublin Bay; South Dublin Bay; Dolphins, Dublin Docks near Pigeon House Harbour; Grand Canal; and Royal Canal.

## **6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment Screening**

- 6.1. The proposed development is not within any prescribed class set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, or in Part V of the Roads Regulations 1994. No mandatory requirement for environmental impact assessment therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Please refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 to this report.

## **7.0 The Appeal**

### **7.1. Grounds of Appeal**

- 7.1.1. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:
- The appellants are a newly married couple who have been given an opportunity to build a home on land to the rear of a parent's house. The proposed dwelling would make efficient use of a backland site in suburban Dublin. It would consolidate residential development within an existing built-up area within close range of various amenities. It is near to Raheny Village where there are supermarkets, shops and restaurants. It is also near to primary and secondary schools, St. Anne's Park, Dollymount Beach and excellent public transport. There is a train station only 200 metres from the site, which one of the appellants uses to get to work. The other appellant would be able to use the proposed office space in the dwelling for business purposes.
  - The proposed development would be consistent with the zoning and relevant policies and objectives of the current Development Plan. It would accord with the prevailing height in the area, which is two to three storeys. The site is

surrounded by 10-metre-high trees in neighbouring properties to the south, east and west.

- It is proposed to reduce the finished-floor level of the dwelling by 350 millimetres. The flat roof of the central element would have a maximum height of 5.15 metres, only 350 millimetres higher than the 4.8 metres specified in Condition 3 of the previous permission.
- The development has been designed to avoid being overbearing. The boundary walls with 8 and 12 Springdale Road are 2 metres and 2.7 metres high respectively. The proposed dwelling would sit 3.15 metres above the boundary wall with No. 8 and 2.45 metres above the boundary wall with No 12. The existing dwelling, No. 10, is 6.68 metres high and the proposed dwelling would be 1.53 metres lower. It would be 500 millimetres lower than No. 8 and 3.13 metres lower than No. 12.
- The proposed dwelling has been designed to provide adequate natural light to all habitable rooms while protecting the private amenity of adjoining sites by placing bedroom windows to the rear of the building. There would be no first-floor windows to the south, east or west. There would therefore be no undue overlooking from the proposed dwelling towards the back of the adjoining dwellings. The dormer windows on the rear, northern elevation would be 29.87 metres from the rear elevation of 64 Edenmore Crescent, well in excess of the 15-metre requirement in the Development Plan.
- A precedent has already been set by permissions granted for two-storey dwellings in rear gardens with roof heights higher than what the appellants are proposing. Seven application reference numbers were cited. While some of these garden sites may have been larger than the appellants' site, many of the approved developments featured considerably smaller separation distances.
- Particular attention is drawn to a recent permission granted by Fingal County Council for construction of a four-bedroom two-storey dwelling incorporating a double garage to the rear of the existing house at 8 Windmill Lands, Swords, Co. Dublin (**F25A/0018e**). If Raheny were one in the Fingal area, the appellants' application would have been approved. A postcode should not determine how applications are dealt with.

## **7.2. Planning Authority Response**

### **7.2.1. None**

## **8.0 Assessment**

### **8.1. Nature of the Application**

- 8.1.1. The proposed development is described on the application form as “changes to planning application approved 3042/24”. However, examination of the application as a whole indicates that it in fact seeks an entirely new permission, alternative to that previously granted. The application is accompanied by a comprehensive set of drawings covering the whole site. Should it be approved, there would be two mutually exclusive permissions, either of which the appellants could implement as they chose. I am satisfied that this is not an application to modify the previous permission.

### **8.2. Issues**

- 8.2.1. Having inspected the site and considered in detail the documentation on file for this First Party appeal, it seems to me that the main planning issues are:
- the acceptability in principle of the proposed development at this location; and
  - its effects on the residential amenity of adjoining properties.

### **8.3. Acceptability in Principle**

- 8.3.1. The Dublin City Development Plan states that residential development is permissible in the Z1 zoned area where the application site is located. The Plan favours sustainable intensification of land use, including backland development, in neighbourhoods such as Raheny which have a range of facilities, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation. Planning permission is already in place for a hipped-roofed single-storey dwelling with a maximum height of 4.8 metres in the rear portion of the site. I agree with the planning officer that the development now proposed is acceptable in principle but that its compliance with relevant Development Plan criteria and its impacts on the surrounding area need to be assessed.

### **8.4. Residential Amenity**

- 8.4.1. The front element of the dwelling now proposed would be located about 12 metres from the rear façade of the existing dwelling, less than the 15-metre standard specified

in the Development Plan. However, having regard to the family relationship of the intended occupants and the extent to which provision is made for shared areas within the site, I do not consider this sub-standard distance to be critical in this instance. The layout provides for a rear garden depth of about 9 metres in the north-western part of the site and I find that acceptable.

- 8.4.2. No concerns have been raised regarding unit size, room size, private open space or car parking. In my opinion, the proposed parking area to the front of the existing house needs to be softened by planting, as provided for in the extant permission. In the event of a new permission being granted, this could be secured by a condition.
- 8.4.3. Every planning application site has unique characteristics. Assessments of impacts on the surrounding area call for site-specific judgements. I consider that comparisons with permissions granted on other sites, whether in Dublin City or elsewhere, are of little assistance in assessing the off-site effects of the proposed development.
- 8.4.4. The dwelling design does not involve any west-, south- or east-facing windows at first-floor level. Two north-facing dormer windows are proposed in the central element, to be located about 7.5 to 9.5 metres from the rear site boundary. The nearest dwellings on Edenmore Crescent to the north have back gardens with a depth of about 20 metres and I am satisfied that the proposed separation distances are more than adequate to ensure that privacy would be maintained and overlooking minimised.. There are tall trees, many of them evergreen, on the northern, eastern and western boundaries of the application site. It seems to me that the potential for indirect overlooking of the back gardens of Nos. 8 and 12 is negligible. In my opinion, it would not be justifiable to withhold planning permission on grounds of overlooking.
- 8.4.5. Front and back elements similar in size and position to those currently proposed have already been approved. I infer from the evidence that the concerns about overbearance relate to the height and massing of the central element of the proposed dwelling. Where dimensions shown on and measurable from submitted drawings differ from dimensions given in the grounds of appeal, I have preferred the former.
- 8.4.6. The back garden of the existing two-storey house at 12 Springdale Road is about 37 metres long. The nearest part of the central element would be situated about 22 metres back from the house. The central element would extend back for a further 5 metres, running parallel to the boundary wall. The distance between the central

element and the boundary wall would be 1.2 metres. Its flat roof would be 5.5 metres above existing ground level and about 3.05 metres higher than the top of the wall. The existing tall boundary vegetation would significantly lessen the sense of awareness that the occupants of No. 12 would have of the presence of the proposed structure and largely alleviate its impact on that adjoining property.

8.4.7. The back garden of the existing detached bungalow at 8 Springdale Road is about 36 metres long. The nearest part of the central element would be situated over 23 metres back from the bungalow. The central element would extend back for a further 5 metres. The distance between the central element and the boundary wall would be 1.227 metres. Its flat roof would be 5.5 metres above existing ground level and about 3.5 metres higher than the top of the wall. The existing tall boundary evergreen vegetation would significantly lessen the sense of awareness that the occupants of No. 8 would have of the presence of the proposed structure and largely alleviate its impact on that adjoining property. I consider that it would not be justifiable to withhold permission on grounds of overbearance.

8.4.8. The application site is largely shielded from view by boundary vegetation which is under the control of adjoining owners. In my judgement, the proposed height of 5.5 metres represents a reasonable compromise between the 4.8 metres that has already been accepted and the 7.36 metres that was rejected by the planning authority and An Bord Pleanála. It seems to me that in the specific context of this application site, the extra 0.7 metres is not of such significance as to warrant refusing planning permission. My overall conclusion is that the proposed development is consistent with the Z1 zoning objective to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.

## **9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening**

9.1. Having considered the nature, location and modest scale of the proposed development, the nature of the receiving environment as a built-up urban area, the nature of the foreseeable emissions therefrom, the availability of public piped services to accommodate the foul effluent arising therefrom, the distance from the nearest European site and the absence of any known hydrological link between the application site and any European site, I am content on the basis of objective information that the development is not likely to have a significant effect on any European site, either alone

or in combination with other plans or projects. I therefore conclude that the carrying out of an appropriate assessment under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

## 10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend to the Commission that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out below.

## 11.0 Reasons and Considerations

11.1. Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, including the Z1 zoning that pertains to the application site; to the extant planning permission for a dwelling on the site; to the physical characteristics of the site and adjoining sites, including the height and nature of boundary vegetation; and to the height, massing and fenestration of the dwelling now proposed, it is concluded that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking or overbearance and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 12.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity.</p>
----	--

2.	<p>Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit proposals for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To prevent flooding and in the interest of sustainable drainage.</p>
3.	<p>a) The driveway entrance shall be 4.0 metres in width and shall not have outward opening gates, unless the planning authority agrees in writing to footpath and kerb amendments for a reduced entrance.</p> <p>b) All costs incurred by Dublin City Council, including any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development, shall be at the expense of the developer.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of pedestrian and traffic safety.</p>
4.	<p>Proposals for planting to the front of the existing house shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The agreed planting shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the new dwelling.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of visual amenity and ecology.</p>
5.	<p>Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction and demolition waste.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of public safety and amenity.</p>
6.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under Section 48 of the Planning and Development</p>



	<p>Act 2000. The contribution shall be paid prior to the commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to the Board to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000 that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under Section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>
--	---

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.




---

**TREVOR A RUE**

Planning Inspector

4<sup>th</sup> July 2025

## Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	322302-25		
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of a dwelling		
<b>Development Address</b>	10 Springdale Road, Dublin 5		
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (For the purposes of the Directive, "project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes; - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)		Yes	✓
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>			
No	✓		Proceed to Q3.
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994?</b>			
Yes	✓	2001 Regulations, Schedule 5, Part 2, Class 10(b)(i)	Proceed to Q4.
<b>4. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?</b>			
No	✓		Proceed to Q5.
<b>5. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?</b>			
Yes	✓	<i>Threshold: More than 500 dwelling units</i> <i>Size of development: One dwelling unit</i>	Preliminary examination required (Form 2).
<b>6. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?</b>			
No	✓	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4).	

Trevor A Rue

**TREVOR A RUE**

Planning Inspector

4<sup>th</sup> July 2025

## Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	322302-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	<i>Construction of a dwelling</i>
<b>Development Address</b>	<i>10 Springdale Road, Dublin 5</i>
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's report attached herewith.</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Proposed Development</b> (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)	<i>The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, does not require demolition works or the use of substantial natural resources. It does not give rise to a significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster and is not vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.</i>
<b>Location of Development</b> (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)	<i>The application site is removed from sensitive natural habitats, centres of population and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the Dublin City Development Plan.</i>
<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)	<i>Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats and features, 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 Planning and Development Act 2000.</i>

Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
<i>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</i>	<i>EIA is not required.</i>




---

**TREVOR A RUE**

Planning Inspector

4<sup>th</sup> July 2025