



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-322397-25

Development	Renovations and construction of an extension
Location	Balleally Lane, Lusk, Co. Dublin, K45C593A
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F25A/0102E
Applicant(s)	Thomas Farrell
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party v Refusal
Appellant(s)	Thomas Farrell
Observer(s)	None of file
Date of Site Inspection	29/7/25
Inspector	Ronan Murphy

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on the northern side of Balleally Lane (L1180), in the rural townland of Balleally East, north County Dublin, c.2km to the south of Lusk.
- 1.2. The appeal site, with a stated area of 0.120ha, is long and narrow with a frontage of c. 26m to the public road, extending c. 55m to the north, where it narrows to c. 10m. There is a single storey vacant / derelict cottage of c. 59sq.m on the site, setback c. 19m. from the public road.
- 1.3. Existing site boundaries comprise a stone clad concrete block wall of approximately 1.2m high to the front / south, open boundary along the western side comprising mature trees; overgrown vegetation to the north; a concrete block wall of c. 2.5m high extending from the rear of the site to the rear elevation of the cottage; with the remainder of the eastern boundary between the front elevation of the cottage and roadside wall comprising a hedge and partial timber panel fence.
- 1.4. The site is bounded by an agricultural / horticultural related enterprise to the west, fields and polytunnels to the north, and a detached single storey dwelling to the east. To the south of the site, on the opposite side of Balleally Lane, is the former Balleally Landfill, restored and repurposed as a public park (known as Rogerstown Park), interfaced on its south and east sides by the Rogerstown Estuary.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought to renovate and extend a single storey hipped-roof detached two-bedroom dwelling (c. 58m²) to provide a five-bedroom dwelling (total floor area of c. 205m²), to comprise the following works:
 - Renovate the ground floor of the dwelling, including demolition of a rear return, to provide for an extended ground floor that would include 3 bedrooms, bathrooms, kitchen area and separate living room. The proposed ground floor extension would project c. 15.3m from the rear of the existing dwelling and would have a height of c. 2.9m.
 - A first-floor extension to the rear of the dwelling which would include two bedrooms. The first-floor extension would project c. 9.3m from the rear of the dwelling and would have a height of c. 6.3m with a pitched roof.

- Installation of a new on-site tertiary wastewater treatment system and infiltration/treatment area and on-site soakaway

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1 By order dated 7th April 2025 planning permission was refused for the following reason:

1. *By virtue of the proposed loss of integral, rural design features of the existing dwelling, and, the scale and design of the proposed extension, the proposed development would comprise inappropriate development that would fail to reinforce the character, distinctiveness, and sense of place of the 'HA' designated land in which it is located. The proposed development would have an unacceptable detrimental impact on both the character and the setting of the vernacular cottage, and the visual amenity of the surrounding rural area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy GINHP28, Objective GINHO67, Policy HCAP22, Objective DMSO190, Table 14.26, and Section 14.12.13 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, and would therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

There is one area planning report on file which is dated 7th April 2025. The area planners report notes that the subject site is located within HA 'High Amenity Zone' and that the proposed development is associated with an existing dwelling and is considered to be generally acceptable, subject to the consideration of policies and objectives set out in the development plan. The area planners report outlines concern with respect to the impact of the proposed development on the vernacular character of the building. Concerns are also raised that the proposed two storey element would be excessive in its scale and bulk and would create an incongruous relationship with the host dwelling and would appear as a new dwelling. Given these concerns, refusal was recommended.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None of file.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None of file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None on file.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 Appeal Site

Reg. Ref. F98B/0193 – Application for a 100sq.m single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling. Permission granted but not enacted.

ABP-319872-24 / Reg. Ref. F24A/0269-Application for the renovation and extension of the existing derelict cottage to provide (1) for a 1.5 storey 5-bedroom dwelling (2) Landscaping and Boundary treatments (3) to provide sewerage system and percolation area to EPA standards and all associated works to facilitate the development. Permission refused. This decision was subject to a first party appeal to An Bord Pleanála who upheld the decision of the Planning Authority for the following reason:

- 1. The subject site is located in an area zoned 'HA' - High Amenity, for which the objective is "to protect and enhance high amenity areas," as set out in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, comprising alterations and extensions to a single-storey vernacular dwelling, it is considered that by reason of the design of the extensions, in terms of height, scale, bulk and fenestration detail, the proposed development would have a significant and negative impact on the character and setting of the existing dwelling and visual amenity of the rural area, would therefore be contrary to Policy GINHP28, Objective GINHO67, Policy HCAP22, Objective DMSO190 and Section 14.12.13 of the Fingal Development Plan*

2023-2029; and by reason of the design of the rear extension, in terms of height, scale and bulk, the proposed development would have a significant and negative overbearing impact on the adjoining dwelling 'Le Verna' to the east; and would therefore be contrary to Policy SPQHP41 and Objective SPQHO45 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029; and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The design of the development currently being considered has been altered to reduce the overall floor area from 370m² to 205m². This has been achieved by reducing the area of the proposed first floor extension by c.102m².

4.2 Precedents

4.2.1 The first party appeal includes a number of permissions which were granted for similar developments. These include the following:

F98B/0193-Stone Cottage, Balleally Lane. Application for a proposed 100 m² extension to a 62 m². existing dwelling. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

F10B/0299-Autum Leaves, Rogerstown Lane. Application for New single storey extension to side & rear of existing dwelling, with re-location of hall door and new porch to front of proposed. Application to include internal alterations. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

F15B/0274-Rose Cottage, Rogerstown Lane. Application for Extend the existing single storey extension to rear of existing cottage and raise the proposed roof to form dormer accommodation and also to remove and relocate the existing shed to facilitate proposed redevelopment on site to the rear of the existing extended cottage. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* is the operative plan for the area. The proposed development site is located within a rural area which is zoned HA 'High Amenity' with the associated land use objective to 'protect and enhance high amenity areas.' The vision for the HA zone is to 'protect these highly sensitive and scenic

locations from inappropriate development and reinforce their character, distinctiveness, and sense of place. In recognition of the amenity potential of these areas opportunities to increase public access will be explored.

5.1.2 In addition to this, the site is located within an 'Estuary Type' landscape, classified as being 'Highly Sensitive' as set out in Fingal's Landscape Character Assessment.

5.1.3 The following policies and objectives are pertinent:

SPQHP41 which seeks to support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

SPQHO45 which seeks to support dwelling extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

Policy SPQHP48 which seeks to encourage the re-use and re-habitation of existing housing stock in rural areas in preference to new build and actively promote the protection of rural buildings.

Objective SPQHO52 which encourages the re-use and adaptation of the existing rural residential building stock and other building types.

Policy GINHP28 which seeks to protect High Amenity areas from inappropriate development and reinforce their character, distinctiveness, and sense of place.

Objective GINHO67 which seeks to ensure that development reflects and reinforces the distinctiveness and sense of place of High Amenity areas, including the retention of important features or characteristics.

Policy HCAP22 which seeks the retention, appreciation and appropriate revitalisation of the historic and vernacular building stock, and 20th century-built heritage of Fingal in both the urban and rural areas of the County by deterring the replacement buildings.

Objective DMSO190 which outlines that where development is proposed for a site that contains a vernacular or historic building, 20th Century building of merit and/or structures that contribute to the distinctive character of the rural or urban areas of Fingal then the scheme should have regard to the direction in Table 14.26.

Table 14.26 which relates to the direction on Development of Vernacular Buildings or Other Built Heritage Assets.

Section 14.12.13 (development management standards) relates to extensions of rural dwellings and states that extensions of a reasonable or modest size may be acceptable, subject to the proposed extension respecting the character, scale, and proportions of the existing dwelling, and subject to the availability of necessary services and protection of the visual amenities of the area.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1 The subject site is not within or immediately adjacent to any Natura 2000 or designated sites. The Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code: 000208), Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004015) and Rogerstown Estuary pNHA (Site Code: 000208) are located 215m to the north. The Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code: 000205), Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004025), and Malahide Estuary pNHA (Site Code: 000205) are located 3.6km to the south.

5.2.4 The site is located within the Rogerstown Estuary Ecological Buffer Zone, as identified under the Fingal Development Plan, designated to protect the ecological integrity of nationally and internationally designated sites.

5.3. EIA Screening

5.3.1 Refer to Form 1 Appendix 1. The proposed development comprises alterations and extensions of an existing dwelling. These works do not fall into a class of use under Schedule 5 of the Regulations and, therefore, I do not consider that EIA or Preliminary Examination for EIA is required in this instance.

5.4 Water Framework Directive

5.4.1 The purpose of the EU Water Framework Directive is an initiative aimed at improving water quality throughout the European Union. The Directive was adopted in 2000 and requires governments to take a new approach to managing all their waters; rivers, canals, lakes, reservoirs, groundwater, protected areas (including wetlands and other water dependent ecosystems), estuaries (transitional) and coastal waters.

5.4.2 An Coimisiún Pleanála and other statutory authorities cannot grant development consent where a proposed development would give rise to a reduction in water quality.

5.4.3 I note that the existing waterbodies in the vicinity of the site are located within the Palmerstown_010 river waterbody. In proximity to the appeal site, this waterbody is classified as poor ecological status. In addition to this, the Palmerstown_010 river waterbody flows into the Rogerstown Estuary which is a transitional waterbody (IE_EA_050_0100). This waterbody is classified as poor ecological status. This is illustrated on the EPA mapping (<https://gis.epa.ie/EPAMaps/agriculture>).

5.4.4 I have assessed the proposed dwelling and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

5.4.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale and nature of the development; and
- The adequate treatment of wastewater with the site.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 A First Party appeal has been submitted by Bell Associates on behalf of the applicant against the Planning Authority's decision to refuse permission. The grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- The design of the proposed development takes the concerns of the planner in the previous application into account.
- The design of the proposed development minimises the impact of the extension. The extension would have minimal visibility from the public road.
- The 'HA' zone is appreciated; however, the site is directly opposite from the former municipal waste facility to the south and a dwelling house to the east, a farm unit to the west and open fields to the north.

- The site is in a remote area on a quiet rural road within a hollow below surrounding land and is relatively well screened from public view having regard to screening provided by mature trees and the set back from the public road.
- Other rear dormer extensions are noted, including at Rose Cottage, Stone Cottage, Autum Leaves, and a house on Rogerstown Lane.

6.1.2 The first party appeal includes a letter dated 30th April 2025 from the owner of the adjoining property supporting the proposed development.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

- Letter dated 26th May 2025 which states that the Planning Authority has no further comment to make and requests the An Coimisiún Pleanála uphold the decision of the Planning Authority. However, if the appeal is successful then provision should be made for conditions relating to development contributions, bonds / tree bonds as appropriate.

6.3. **Observations**

6.3.1 None on file.

6.4. **Further Responses**

6.4.1 None on file.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the appeal details and all other documentation on file, including the first party appeal and observation, the reports of the local authority and inspected the site, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Scale
- Residential Amenity
- Wastewater Management

- Flooding
- Appropriate Assessment.

7.1 Principle of Development

7.1.1 The appeal site is within the High Amenity Zone with the associated land use objective '*Protect and enhance high amenity areas.*' Residential is permitted in principle in the HA zone and therefore, I am satisfied that the proposed uses are in accordance with the sites zoning objective and that the proposed development is acceptable in principle.

7.2 Design and Scale

7.2.1 A first party appeal has been received against the decision of Fingal County Council to refuse planning permission for an extension to a dwelling for a single reason relating to the scale and overall design of the proposed extension which would have an unacceptable detrimental impact on both the character and the setting of the vernacular cottage, and the visual amenity of the surrounding rural area.

7.2.2 The planning authority note that the existing cottage is not a protected structure or within an Architectural Area. However, the cottage is a c.20th century cottage and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. The area planner states that the proposed two storey element to the rear of the cottage is excessive in terms of mass, bulk and scale and that hipped roof profile creates an awkward relationship with the existing roof profile of the host dwelling.

7.2.3 The first party appeal states that the concerns of the planner under the previous refusal were taken into consideration in the design of the development currently being considered and the design minimises the impact of the extension. It is further state that the proposed extension would have minimal visibility from the public road and that the appeal site is within a remote rural area on a quiet rural road.

7.2.4 The appeal currently being considered is a second application for renovations and extension of the existing derelict cottage on the appeal site. The previous application which was refused planning permission (ABP-319872-24- see planning history above) had an internal floor area of 307m² and included a storey and a half style extension to the rear of the dwelling which had a depth of 13.3m and a maximum height of c. 7.76m with a pitched roof.

- 7.2.5 The proposed development currently being considered has a total floor area of 205m² and includes a first-floor element which would project c. 9.3m from the rear of the existing dwelling and would have a maximum height of c. 6.3m and would have a hipped roof profile.
- 7.2.6 While I note that the mass and bulk of the proposed extension is reduced from that which was previously refused, the design of the development as lodged does not fully address the reasons for refusal in the previous application. The design of the proposed extension to the rear, particularly the hipped design of the roof of the two-storey element is still prominent and does not have due regard to the host dwelling.
- 7.2.7 Notwithstanding this, I am of the opinion that, there is some potential for this site to be developed in a manner which would be consistent with the policies and objectives of the *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* and the pattern of existing and permitted development in the area.
- 7.2.8 In coming to the above conclusion, I have considered the location of the appeal site within the HA-High Amenity Zone and the vernacular design of the current building on site. With respect to the High Amenity zoning of the land, having been on site it is my opinion that the immediate area surrounding the site is not particularly sensitive. My opinion is based on the number of dwellings and horticulture buildings (glass / hot houses) in proximity to the appeal site and in the surrounding area along Balleally Lane. In addition to this, the *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* provides clear support for the retention and reuse of existing dilapidated vernacular buildings and dwelling extensions of appropriate scale.
- 7.2.9 I note the concerns of the Planning Authority that the proposed extension would appear to comprise a new dwelling and that the loss of the porch and chimney stacks would erode the design quality of the original cottage.
- 7.2.10 In my opinion, a balance must be reached between retaining the design of the original building and bringing the building back into use in a manner which is consistent with modern housing standards and energy efficiency requirements. In this respect, the existing dwelling has a modest floor area of c. 58m², this area is marginally larger than the minimum floor area of a one-bedroom apartment as set out in the Planning Design Standards for Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2025. Given this, in my opinion, the dwelling in its current layout would not be suitable to accommodate a

family. The proposed layout, allows the building to return to family accommodation which is up to modern standards. The reality is that the element of new build will significantly larger than the current dwelling.

7.2.11 I note the concerns of the Planning Authority with respect to the impact of the removal of the existing chimney stacks on the appearance of the dwelling. I consider that the removal of these chimneys represents a reasonable balance between bringing the building up to modern day living and energy efficiency standards to ensure its continued use while maintaining the architectural integrity of the building. The removal of the chimneys would allow the dwelling to achieve an acceptable BER rating which is essential for the lowering of emissions from residential development such as that proposed.

Conclusion

7.2.12 While the current design of the proposed extension to the rear, particularly the hipped design of the roof of the two-storey element is prominent and does not have due regard to the host dwelling, I am of the opinion that these matters could be dealt with by way of condition which alters the design of the first-floor element of the proposed development to have a maximum height of 5 metres and a flat roof finish. These design alterations would, in my opinion, reduce the impact of the proposed extension and protect the visual amenities of the area.

7.2 Residential Amenity

7.1.1. The *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* supports dwelling extensions subject to the protection of residential amenities.

7.2.5 There is a dwelling to the east of the appeal site. The proposed extension would be set back c. 3.2m from the eastern boundary of the land. In terms of overlooking, it is noted that there is a window within the east facing elevation at first floor level. However, this window would face towards the western elevation of the neighbouring dwelling which is blank and therefore there is no potential for overlooking from this window.

7.2.6 Having regard to the set back of the proposed extension from the eastern boundary of the land and the orientation of the site, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would not have any undue impacts on the residential amenity of the dwelling to the

east. I note that the area planner did not have any concerns with respect to the impact of the proposed extension on the residential amenity of the dwelling to the east.

7.3 Wastewater Management

7.4.1 The proposal would be served by a Hydrocare on site wastewater treatment system and percolation area. I refer the Coimisiún to the Site Characterisation Form which was submitted to the Local Authority. Surface water is identified as a potential target risk and that the site has a high-water table. The Site Characterisation Form shows that the percolation tests carried out on site suggests that the soils and subsoils inherent on the site are suitable for a secondary treatment system and infiltration area.

7.4.2 The form shows that soil is a Surface Water Gleys, Ground Water Gleys with Irish Sea Till derived from Lower Palaeozoic sandstones and shales subsurface. No bedrock or groundwater were encountered in the trial holes. The percolation tests yielded a sub-surface T value of 22.89, this would comply with the standards set out in Table 6.4 of the EPA Code of Practice: Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) 2021.

7.4.3 The site Characteristics Form details that minimum separation distances will be met and exceeded in all instances.

7.4.4 Having reviewed the Geological Survey Ireland's GIS Mapping, I note that the proposed wastewater treatment system has been sited over a Poor Aquifer - Bedrock which is Generally Unproductive except for Local Zones with a recourse protection categorisation of R1. Having regard to the soil depth and the secondary treatment, as shown in the Site Characterisation Form, I am satisfied that the effluent will be suitably treated before reaching the aquifer.

7.4.5 Therefore, I am satisfied that wastewater treatment would comply with the EPA Code of Practice: Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) 2021.

7.5 Flooding

7.6.1 I have consulted the flood mapping system (www.floodinfo.ie) and I note that the flood maps for this area of Fingal are currently under review (Map review Number MR018)

7.6.2 However, it would appear that the site was within Flood Zone C in previous iterations of the Flood Maps. I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in the increase of flood risk either within the site itself or the surrounding area.

8 AA Screening

8.1 I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The proposed development is located within a rural area of Fingal and comprises of the renovation and extension of a single storey hipped-roof detached two-bedroom dwelling to provide a five-bedroom dwelling and wastewater treatment facility.

8.2 The subject site is not located within or adjacent to a European Site. The nearest designated sites are the Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code: 000208), Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004015) and Rogerstown Estuary pNHA (Site Code: 000208) are located 215m to the south. In addition to this, the site is located within the Rogerstown Estuary Ecological Buffer Zone, as identified under the Fingal Development Plan, designated to protect the ecological integrity of nationally and internationally designated sites.

8.3 The proposed development is located in a rural area and comprises the renovation and extension of an existing dwelling, and installation of a new tertiary wastewater treatment system.

8.4 Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, and having regard to the AA Screening carried out by the Planning Authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site.

8.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Domestic nature of the development
- The distance from European Sites, absence of ecological pathways to any European Site, and the intervening land to the south comprising a former landfill, rehabilitated for use as a public park.

- 8.6 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.
- 8.7 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9 Recommendation

- 9.1 I recommend that planning permission be granted.

10 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1 Having regard to the policy and objectives as set out in the *Fingal County Development Plan 2023 – 2029* in respect of residential development within the High Amenity Zone, the nature, scale and design of the proposed development, to the pattern of existing and permitted development in the area it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would respect the existing visual character of the area and would be acceptable in terms of public health. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11. Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application dated 11 February 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:

(a) The maximum height of the extension to the rear of the host dwelling development shall not exceed 5m.

(b) The roof of the extension to the rear of the host dwelling shall be altered from a pitched roof to a flat roof.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of protecting the visual and the residential amenity of the properties of the area.

3. The proposed wastewater drainage system shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled "Code of Practice – Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)" – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

4. All surface water generated within the site boundaries shall be collected and disposed of within the curtilage of the site. No surface water from roofs, paved areas or otherwise shall discharge onto the public road or adjoining properties.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and to prevent pollution.

5. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development. All

existing over ground cables shall be relocated underground as part of the site development works.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

6. 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.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

7. 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.

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.

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.

Ronan Murphy

Ronan Murphy

Planning Inspector

31 July 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322397-25
Proposed Development Summary	Renovations and construction of an extension
Development Address	Balleally Lane, Lusk, Co. Dublin, K45C593A
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project.' Proceed to Q2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p> <p><i>[Delete if not relevant]</i></p>
<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p> <p><i>[Delete if not relevant]</i></p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____