



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322367-25

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Development | Extension to house |
| Location | Leenan, Putland Road, Bray, Co. Wicklow, A98 FH59 |
| Planning Authority | Wicklow County Council |
| Planning Authority Reg. Ref. | 2560122 |
| Applicant(s) | Annette Doyle. |
| Type of Application | Planning Permission. |
| Planning Authority Decision | Refuse Permission. |
| Type of Appeal | First Party |
| Appellant(s) | Annette Doyle. |
| Observer(s) | No Observers. |
| Date of Site Inspection | 25 th of June 2025. |
| Inspector | Elaine Sullivan |

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1.0 Site Location and Description | 3 |
| 2.0 Proposed Development | 3 |
| 3.0 Planning Authority Decision | 3 |
| 3.1. Decision | 3 |
| 3.2. Planning Authority Reports | 4 |
| 3.3. Prescribed Bodies | 4 |
| 3.4. Third Party Observations | 5 |
| 4.0 Planning History..... | 5 |
| 5.0 Policy Context..... | 5 |
| 5.1. Development Plan..... | 5 |
| 5.8. Natural Heritage Designations | 7 |
| 5.9. EIA Screening | 7 |
| 6.0 The Appeal | 8 |
| 6.1. Grounds of Appeal | 8 |
| 6.2. Planning Authority Response..... | 10 |
| 6.3. Observations..... | 10 |
| 7.0 Assessment..... | 10 |
| 8.0 AA Screening..... | 16 |
| 9.0 Recommendation..... | 16 |
| 10.0 Reasons and Considerations..... | 16 |
| 11.0 Conditions | 17 |
| Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening | |

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site has a stated area of 0.0371 hectares and is approximately 1km to the south of Bray town centre. It is a backland site to the rear of a single storey house called Rhoda Cottage. Access to the site is from the side of Rhoda Cottage and is pedestrian access only. The site currently comprises a single storey, 1-bedroom house (Leenaun) in a contemporary style with private amenity space to the front and rear. Rhoda Cottage is one of four similar style houses on Putland Road, which has a mix of architectural styles.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for a first-floor extension of 102sqm over an existing 2-bedroom, single storey dwelling. The first-floor extension would accommodate 3 no. bedrooms and associated facilities and would result in a house with an overall floor area of 204 sqm.
- 2.2. The appeal documentation contains an amended proposal which lowers the height of the eaves by 600mm with a subsequent reduction in the ridge heights from 8.2m to 7.6m and from 7.5m to 6.9m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority (PA) refused permission for the development for the following reason,

Having regard to the proposed development and the prevailing pattern of backland development in the area and the RE Existing Residential zoning objective for the site which is 'To protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas', it is considered that the proposed development would represent haphazard development and would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity by reasons of:

1 a) The design of the proposed extension which is materially at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in this area,

b) The scale and height of proposed first floor extension, resulting in a development that would be visually intrusive and overbearing,

c) The overlooking impact on adjoining houses,

d) Would set an unwanted precedent for development in the area,

The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018, and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planning Officer (PO) dated the 9th of April 2025 informed the decision of the PA and includes the following,

- The PO found the principle of the development to be acceptable but considered the proposed external materials to be unsuitable for the site. They believed that the proposed 'Equitone linea cladding' would be out of context and add to the overbearing nature of the development.
- Regarding the impact on residential amenity, the PO acknowledged the efforts made to reduce overlooking by limiting the number of windows on the upper level. However, they considered that any additional windows at first floor level would be injurious to the residential amenity of adjoining properties and to Rhoda Cottage.
- The overall massing and scale of the proposal was deemed to be unacceptable for the context of the site and its location to the rear of an existing dwelling and on that basis, a refusal of permission was recommended.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- None received.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- No responses received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- None received.

4.0 Planning History

10/630117 – Planning permission granted by the PA in 2011 for the construction of a new 2 bed single storey studio dwelling of 102 sqm to the rear of Rhoda Cottage, an existing dwelling. Both properties would share existing entrance from Putland Road which would be widened from 2.3m to 3.015m.

21/525 – Planning permission granted by the PA in 2021 for works to Rhoda Cottage to the front of the site, to comprise a ground floor extension of 2.2 sqm and a first-floor extension of 52 sqm including attic conversion with alterations to the elevations and fenestration.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.2. The Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028, (WCDP) is the operative development plan for the site.
- 5.3. Bray is identified as a Level 1 – Metropolitan Key Town in the County Wicklow Settlement Strategy.
- 5.4. The subject site is zoned objective '*RE – Existing Residential*' in the boundary of the Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan (LAP) 2018-2024, which has now expired. The objective of the RE zoning is '*To protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas*', and the accompanying description is, '*To provide for house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity.*'
- 5.5. The WCDP commits to preparing a new LAP for Bray Municipal District (including Enniskerry and Kilmacanogue) in the period 2022-2025. Work commenced on the review of the Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018 - 2024 and the preparation of the new plan in 2024. A pre-draft public consultation ran from 20th of

November 2024 until 18th of December 2024, with submissions invited. Section 3.5 of the WCDP states that *‘As part of the LAP adoption process, the land use zoning and key development objectives maps for the LAP settlements / areas are integrated into Volume 2 of the CDP by way of variation.’*

5.6. **Chapter 3 - Settlement Strategy** - Objectives include,

CPO 4.2 - To secure compact growth through the delivery of at least 30% of all new homes within the built-up footprint of existing settlements by prioritising development on infill, brownfield and regeneration sites and redeveloping underutilised land in preference to greenfield sites.

CPO 4.3 - Increase the density in existing settlements through a range of measures including bringing vacant properties back into use, reusing existing buildings, infill development schemes, brownfield regeneration, increased building height where appropriate, encouraging living over the shop and securing higher densities for new development.

CPO 4.8 - To prepare new local plans for the following areas during the lifetime of this development plan: Bray Municipal District, Wicklow-Rathnew, Arklow, Greystones-Delgany and Kilcoole, Blessington.

5.7. **Chapter 6 – Housing** – Objectives include,

CPO 6.21 - In areas zoned ‘Existing Residential’ house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity will normally be permitted (other than on lands permitted or designated as open space, see CPO 6.25 below). While new developments shall have regard to the protection of the residential and architectural amenities of houses in the immediate environs, alternative and contemporary designs shall be encouraged (including alternative materials, heights and building forms), to provide for visual diversity.

CPO 6.22 - In existing residential areas, small scale infill development shall generally be at a density that respects the established character of the area in which it is located, subject to the protection of the residential amenity of adjoining properties. However, on large sites or in areas where previously unserved, low-density housing becomes served by mains water services, consideration will be given to

densities above the prevailing density, subject to adherence to normal siting and design criteria.

Relevant Appendices - Appendix 1: Development and Design Standards.

Section 3.1.8 – House Extensions - The construction of extensions to existing houses will be encouraged generally as it usually provides a less resource intensive method of expanding living space than building a new structure. The basic principles to be applied include the following,

- The use of sensitive design,
- No overlooking of adjacent private areas,
- No increased overlooking of adjoining areas,
- No significant loss of daylight or sunlight to adjoining areas,
- The form size and appearance of the extension should complement the area.

5.8. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.8.1. The site is not within a Natural Heritage Area (NHA) and is not within a proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA). The closest pNHA is Bray Head which is c. 0.6km to the south-east of the site.

5.9. EIA Screening

- 5.9.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal include the following,

- The applicant states that the existing house is backland development but is not haphazard as it was granted planning permission in 2011 and is fully authorised.
- As the pattern of development was established through the previous grant of permission the pertinent issues are whether the extension will affect the 'vista' from Putland Road and whether it will overshadow or overlook existing neighbours. Drawings were submitted with the appeal to demonstrate that the impact on the streetscape and on the neighbouring properties.
- The applicant engaged with the neighbours on both sides to address concerns about overlooking and overshadowing. An 'over-shadowing' diagram has also been prepared and showed that with the pitched roof profile, existing planting and 2m boundary fence, there would be little or no variation in the shadows cast, apart from the month of December when the sun is low in the sky.
- To avoid overlooking the extension was designed with windows carefully positioned to avoid direct overlooking of the properties to the east and west. Windows on the southern and northern elevations serve non-habitable rooms, apart from one bedroom window on the southern elevation where views are blocked by a projection at first floor level.
- There are two dormer windows on the eastern elevation, facing west. These windows would be 7m from the boundary with the adjoining property which has a 2m boundary. The combination of the set-back distance and the boundary treatment would prevent overlooking of the adjoining private space to the rear.
- The north-facing window to the en-suite bathroom is over 30m to the rear elevation of the house in the Seacrest estate. Windows on the southern elevation of the extension would be over 19m from the facing elevation of

Rhoda Cottage. The applicant is satisfied that the lower level of the property at Leenaun and the 2m high boundary between both properties would prevent overlooking. Reference is made to the Compact Settlements Guidelines which allows a 16m separation distance between opposing windows at first floor level.

- The appeal notes that Rhoda cottage is owned by the applicant and occupied by the applicant's daughter.
- To address the concerns of the PO regarding the height of the proposal, the applicant has submitted revised drawings which reduce the eaves level from 1.6m to 1m with a subsequent reduction in the ridge height from 8.2m to 7.6m. The applicant states that, due to the separation distance between properties, the lower eaves level and raking away at the ridge point / roof profile, orientation and configuration, the sunlight to adjoining properties will be unaffected.
- Reference is made to the provisions of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 as they relate to the subject development. The applicant is satisfied that the development would be in accordance with the development standards in relation to private open space (80 sqm rear garden), plot ratio (0.55) and site coverage (31%).
- The applicant disagrees the opinion of the PO that the proposal would set an unwelcome precedent for development in the area and has included references to several permitted developments in the area that would represent 'backland' development.
- The applicant states that the external finishes and materials were chosen to help merge the development into the backdrop vista. The existing house is a combination of Anthracite coloured fibre-cement panels to the western wing and cedar timber cladding, in its raw state, on the eastern wing, which would blend into the background. However, should the Coimisiún agree with the opinion of the PO, the applicant would welcome a condition to modify the finishes of the house.

- A letter from the applicant outlining the need for the extension which is a result of rising house prices was submitted with the appeal. The applicant also notes that no observations were submitted from the neighbours on either side.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- No comments received.

6.3. Observations

- No observations received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, inspected the site and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal relate directly to the reasons for refusal and can be assessed under the following headings:

- Principle of Development
- Residential Amenity
- Design & Visual Impact

7.2. Principle of Development

7.2.1. The proposed development is for a first-floor extension to a single storey house on a site which is zoned objective '*RE – Existing Residential*'. The objective of the RE zoning is '*To protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas*', and the accompanying description is, '*To provide for house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity.*'

7.2.2. The house was granted permission in 2011 under PA Ref. **10/630117**. On this basis, I am satisfied that the principle of the development has been established on the site

and the proposal is acceptable subject to the policies and objectives of the WCDP. Development plan policies CPO 6.21 and CPO 6.22 are of particular relevance to the subject appeal. CPO 6.21 states that 'In areas zoned 'Existing Residential' house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development...' will normally be permissible subject to appropriate design and encourages the use of contemporary architecture. CPO 6.22 states that small infill development should be at appropriate density that respects the established character of the area, and the protection of the residential amenity of adjoining properties. Both objectives support infill development and extensions to existing properties whilst reinforcing the importance of existing residential amenity for adjoining properties.

- 7.2.3. The applicant provided several examples of 'backland' development in the area as part of the appeal. However, I am satisfied that the principle of the development has been established on the site and is acceptable, and that the relevant planning issues relate to the potential impact of the proposal on existing residential amenity in terms of loss of privacy, loss of daylight and/or sunlight and visual amenity. These issues will be addressed in the following sections.

7.3. Design & Visual Impact

- 7.3.1. The first reason for refusal relates to the design of the proposal which the PA contend is materially at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in the area. The report of the PO stated that the proposed development would be unacceptable from a visual amenity perspective, that the proposed finishes would be unsuitable and that the ridge height would be visible from the street which would result in a development that would be visually intrusive and overbearing.
- 7.3.2. The proposed development would provide an additional floor above a single storey 1-bedroom house to provide a 3-bedroom house. The existing house is designed in two linear volumes connected by a hallway. This design approach would be followed through at first floor level with a pitched roof profile above each section and connected by a hallway with a lower pitched roof at a right angle to the main roof profiles. External finishes proposed for the elevations are 'Equitone' Linea cladding / ribbed fibre-cement cladding in Anthracite colour.

- 7.3.3. The additional wall plate height at first floor level would be 1m with the roof slope starting from this point and extending to an overall height of 7.6m.
- 7.3.4. In response to the decision of the PA, the applicant submitted revised drawings which reduced the eaves level, and subsequent ridge height of the proposal by 600mm. This would result in a ridge height of 7.6m instead of 8.2m for the western volume, which would be c. 400mm above the ridge height of Rhoda Cottage to the front of the site. The western section of the extension would be the only portion of the house visible from the street. The ridge height of the eastern section of the building is lower and would be 6.9m.
- 7.3.5. The design of the extension is contemporary in nature. CPO 6.1 of the WCDP supports the use of contemporary designs for domestic extensions to provide for visual diversity. However, the report of the PO found the proposed finishes to be out of context for the site and thought that a concrete render in light or white colours would be more acceptable. In their appeal, the applicant states that, whilst they consider the material to be appropriate for the site, they are willing to alter the proposed finishes should the Coimisiún consider it appropriate.
- 7.3.6. I disagree with the opinion of the PO regarding the external finishes. The contemporary materials proposed are appropriate for the modern design approach and the anthracite colour proposed would help to blend the house into the background rather than increase its prominence. The contrast of darker colours with trees and planting allows the greenery to take visual precedence which helps to absorb the built form into the background. In my opinion a lighter colour would increase the visibility of the extension when viewed from the road and would be at odds with the contemporary design. I note that the development would be c. 50m from the public footpath and that the level of the site is lower than the public road. Given the existing topography and the surrounding built form, the roof profile of the western wing would only be visible through a small opening on Putland Road. I am satisfied that the contemporary design and finishes would not result in an adverse visual impact when viewed from Putland Road and that it would not have a negative visual impact on the streetscape.
- 7.3.7. The PO raised a concern that the proposal would have an overbearing impact on adjoining properties by virtue of its scale, height and external finishes. The houses

to the west and east of the subject site have rear gardens that are more than 40m in length. As previously noted, the massing of the building would be broken into two separate volumes, each with a pitched roof profile with the eastern roof ridge at a height of 6.9m and the western roof ridge at 7.6m in height. Whilst the additional floor would be noticeable from the adjoining properties, the separate roof volumes and height would reduce the massing and visual impact. The site is surrounded by trees and planting which would also soften the appearance of the built form, and the use of dark colours and materials would also help the extension to blend into the background.

- 7.3.8. I note the separation distances between the properties which would range from 25m to the property to the east, 28m to the west and 30m to the houses to the north and I consider the separation distance to be sufficient to prevent an overbearing impact from the additional structure.
- 7.3.9. Overall, I consider the proposal to be acceptable within the context of the site. The original house was permitted in 2011, and the proposed development would maximise the potential of the site to provide an additional 'family' home in the urban area. I have visited the site and reviewed the details of the development, and I am satisfied that the contemporary design of the development would reduce the overall impact of the additional floor and would not result in any undue negative impact on existing residential amenity in terms of loss of privacy, loss of sunlight or daylight, overshadowing or negative visual impact.

7.4. Residential Amenity

Overlooking

- 7.4.1. The backland site is bounded by trees and planting on all sides. To the east the adjoining property (Baymount) has a row of mature trees along their boundary which are taller than the proposed extension. Apart from a bathroom window, which would be fitted with obscured glazing, there are no windows on this elevation and direct overlooking of the property to the east would not be an issue. A first-floor window is proposed on the southern elevation, which would face towards the rear of existing houses on Putland Road. However, the eastern wing of the building projects forward

of this elevation and would block any sightlines from the house to the rear elevation of Baymount.

7.4.2. To the west, the adjoining property (Doomore) also has mature trees and planting along its boundary. Two west-facing dormer windows at first-floor level are proposed in the extension. These windows would be approximately 7m from the site boundary, and the applicant is of the opinion that the separation distance, mature planting and 2m high boundary would be sufficient to prevent direct overlooking of the adjoining property. Having visited the site, I would agree with the applicant. The boundary of the adjoining property to the west is heavily planted with mature trees which would block any views towards the rear garden. The subject site also has mature planting which would obstruct any sightlines towards the private open space to the west. Should the planting be removed later, I am satisfied that the 7m separation distance to the site boundary, the positioning of the windows facing west, and the 2m site boundary would be sufficient to obstruct direct sightlines from the first-floor window to the rear garden of the adjoining property to the west.

7.4.3. Two first-floor windows are proposed on the southern elevation, one to a bedroom and the other would service the hallway. In their assessment, the PO considered that these windows would be injurious to the amenity of Rhoda Cottage through overlooking. There would be a separation distance of c. 19.4m between opposing first floor windows at Rhoda Cottage and Leenaun, the subject property. The boundary between both properties has been landscaped and planted with trees and plants that provide privacy to each house. Section 3.1.3 of the WCDP states that *‘A separation of 22m will normally be required above ground level between opposing windows serving private living areas (particularly bedrooms and living rooms). However, this rule shall be applied flexibly...’*. The plan also states that windows serving halls and landings do not require the same level of privacy. SPPR 1 of the Sustainable and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities states that development plans *‘shall not include an objective in respect of minimum separation distances that exceed 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units or apartment units above ground floor level.’* Having visited the site, I am satisfied that sufficient consideration has been given to protecting the privacy of both houses through careful design and landscaping. I am also satisfied that the proposed separation distance between first

floor windows in both properties is sufficient to prevent loss of privacy through overlooking and that it is in accordance with SPPR 1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines.

- 7.4.4. The site backs on to the rear gardens of No's 38 and 39 Seacrest. The northern elevation of the extension would have an obscured bathroom window and a window lighting the hallway facing towards the houses on Seacrest. A separation distance of c. 30m would be provided between the opposing elevations, which is sufficient to prevent overlooking.
- 7.4.5. Having visited the site, I am satisfied that the design of the proposal and the surrounding site context would prevent significant adverse impacts on existing residential amenity through overlooking of adjoining property. I note that the applicant engaged with the neighbours to the east and west and that no observations were lodged from either party during the public consultation period.

Overshadowing / Loss of sunlight

- 7.4.6. Given the north-south orientation of the existing property, the potential for overshadowing from the first-floor extension would be most pertinent for the property to the east as the increased height could block the evening light from the west to the adjoining property to the east. Three shadow analysis diagrams were submitted by the applicant to demonstrate the impact of the proposal on the adjoining property in March, June and December on any given year. The drawings show that the additional shadows cast from the extension to the east would be minimal.
- 7.4.7. Overshadowing would not be an issue for Rhoda Cottage as it is positioned to the north of the subject property and the separation distances between the properties at Seacrest would be sufficient to prevent undue overshadowing of these dwellings and their attendant open space.
- 7.4.8. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed design and fragmented built form would not result in significant overshadowing or loss of light to adjoining properties and that the existing residential amenity would not be negatively affected in this matter.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the proposed development for a domestic extension in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in a backland site in a suburb of Bray, Co. Wicklow and is approximately 0.6km overland from the nearest European Sites which is Bray Head Special Area of Conservation (Site Code 000714).
- 8.2. The proposed development comprises a first-floor extension to an existing single storey house in an urban area. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 8.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small-scale nature of the development and the nature of the works proposed.
 - The location of the site and its distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.
- 8.4. I conclude, 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 Recommendation

I recommend that planning permission is granted for the development.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature of the proposed development for a first-floor extension to a house in an area zoned '*RE – Existing Residential*', the objective of which is '*To protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas*', it is

considered that by virtue of the design, location and context, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or property in the vicinity, and would not be detrimental to the quality of the public realm. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the policies and objectives of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 and with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

| | |
|----|---|
| 1. | <p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on the 25th day of February 2025, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted to An Coimisiún Pleanála on the 24th day of April 2025, 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>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p> |
| 2. | <p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p> |
| 3. | <p>The site development work and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the adjoining street(s) are kept clear of debris, soil and other material.</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>Reason: In the interests of orderly development and to ensure that the adjoining roadways are kept in a clean and safe condition.</p> |
| 4. | <p>Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p> |
| 5. | <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 Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</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.

Elaine Sullivan,
Senior Planning Inspector

27th of June 2025

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

| | | | |
|--|--|------------|--|
| An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference | ABP-322367-25 | | |
| Proposed Development Summary | First floor extension to existing house. | | |
| Development Address | Putland Road, Bray, Co. Wicklow | | |
| 1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings) | | Yes | Tick if relevant and proceed to Q2. |
| | | | Tick if relevant. No further action required |
| 2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)? | | | |
| Yes | | | Proceed to Q3. |
| No | X | | Tick if relevant. No further action required |
| 3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class? | | | |
| Yes | | | EIA Mandatory EIAR required |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| No | | | Proceed to Q4 |
| 4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]? | | | |
| Yes | | | Preliminary examination required (Form 2) |

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____