



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322696-25

Development	Demolition of a recently constructed timber shed and construct a pavilion ancillary to main dwelling house which is a protected structure
Location	Springdale, Ennis Road, Limerick
Planning Authority	Limerick City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560223
Applicant(s)	Martin Ryan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Martin Ryan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	15 th August 2025
Inspector	Clare Clancy

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. National Context	7
5.4. Limerick City and County Development Plan 2022-2028.....	9
5.5. Natural Heritage Designations	11
6.0 EIA Screening.....	12
7.0 The Appeal	12
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	12
7.2. Planning Authority Response.....	14
7.3. Observations.....	14
8.0 Assessment.....	14
8.1. Principle of Development	14
8.2. Design & Height.....	15
8.3. Impact on Protected Structure	17
8.4. Impact on ACA & Visual Amenities	18
9.0 AA Screening.....	18

10.0	Water Framework Directive	19
11.0	Recommendation	20
12.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	20
	Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening	22
	Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination	24
	WFD – Stage 1 Screening.....	26

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site comprises of a 0.23 ha site with a well maintained existing two storey period style c. 1910 dwelling which is a protected structure, and a large garden to the rear. There is an existing garage to the west of the dwelling and a garden shed structure to the rear, both positioned along the western boundary of the site. The roadside boundary is defined by a 1.8 m high stone wall backed by mature hedging. The northern and western boundaries are defined by a high boundary wall with security fencing mounted on top and is backed by mature trees and hedging.
- 1.2. The appeal site fronts onto the Ennis Road (R857). There is a laneway running along the western boundary of the site providing pedestrian access from Lansdowne Gardens to the Ennis Road. Shelbourne AFC sports grounds adjoins the north eastern corner of the site, and University Maternity Hospital Limerick is located approx. 150 m to the east. Limerick city centre is located approx. 750 m to the east.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought to demolish a timber shed, and to construct a pavilion to the rear of the existing dwelling which is a Protected Structure. The proposed new structure will provide for office, artist, and gym space and 2 no. w.c.'s. The proposed development comprises of the following:
 - State site area 0.23 ha.
 - Gross floor space of the structure to be demolished 14 m², max roof height 3.8 m.
 - Gross floor area of the proposed development is 94.105 m². The stated net floor area approx. 78 m², max roof height 6.791 m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By Order dated 13th May 2025 Limerick City and County Council decided to refuse permission for the following reason:

The development, by reason of its design, height and scale would be considerably at variance with the general character of the area; would constitute an unduly prominent and obtrusive feature on the Ennis Road and part of Lower Shelbourne Road ACA; and would accordingly detract to an undue degree, from the protected structure RPS 3433 and ACA. The extent of the works would be contrary to Objective EH O50 Work to Protected structures and Objective EH O53 Architectural Conservation Areas of the Limerick Development Plan (2022-2028) and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

One planning report forms the basis of the assessment and recommendation. The following is noted:

- The principle of the proposed development is acceptable subject to planning considerations and Objectives EH O50 and EH O53 being satisfied.
- Notes the report of the Conservation Officer who recommended further information (FI) in regard to a revised design to address height and scale and material finishes to respond to the site context and existing heritage character. It was concluded that the scale of the works required to address the concerns raised, would be too significant to address by way of FI or by conditions.
- The proposal would be visible from the Ennis road, Lansdowne Gardens and the laneway bounding the site to the west.
- Notes that the existing dwelling is an important feature within the Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).
- No justification is provided for the provision of 2 no. toilets within the proposed structure given the proximity to the existing dwelling and further notes which could be removed by condition in the event of a grant.
- The proposed development was considered contrary to Objectives EH O50 and EH O53.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Architectural Conservation Officer
- An assessment of the history and significance of the existing building is required including information on any additional historic fabric on site.
- The height and scale is inappropriate within the historic setting.
- The material finishes are inappropriate to the setting and character and should be revised to incorporate materials that are visually cohesive with the existing historic fabric.
- A revised design and material finishes is recommended to respond sensitively to the established portions and architectural style of the existing dwelling.
- Any new interventions should not dominate the or detract from the historical setting.
- Recommends a revised design to be carried out by a conservation architect.

Recommended FI to address the following:

- i. Revised design required to address the appropriate height, scale and material finishes.
- ii. The submission of an Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment (AHIA) to include a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) to appraise the character of the setting of the protected structure, and the wider ACA.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Éireann – Existing connections. No objection subject to conditions.

The application was referred to the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage however no response was received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

- P.A. Ref. 20/1052 – Retention permission granted for raft foundations and permission granted for extension to the rear and side of the existing dwelling (09th December 2020).

To the West

- P.A. Ref. 25/60357 – Permission granted for a single storey rear extension and shed to the rear (14th August 2025).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Context

5.2. National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH)

The existing dwelling is recorded as a building of interest on the NIAH:

- Springdale House Reg. No. 21512055.
- Rating: Regional.
- Categorise of Special Interest: Architectural, Artistic.

5.3. Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011)

The guidelines provide guidance to planning authorities in assessing applications involving Protected Structures. The appeal site is located within an Architectural Conservation Area and adjoins a protected structure. The following is relevant:

Section 3.7 Development within Architectural Conservation Areas

- Outlines a list of criteria to be considered in the assessment of a planning application for works within the attendant grounds of a protected structure.

Section 3.10 Criteria for Assessing Proposals within an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).

➤ Section 3.10.1 Proposal for New Development

- Notes that where a new building is erected in an ACA, it is preferable to minimise the visual impact of the proposed structure on its setting.
- The greater the degree of uniformity in the setting, the greater the presumption in favour of a harmonious design.

- Where there is an existing mixture of styles, a high standard of contemporary design that respects the character of the area should be encouraged.
- The scale of new structures should be appropriate to the general scale of the area and not its biggest buildings.
- The palette of materials and typical details for façades and other surfaces should generally reinforce the area's character.

Section 6.8 General Types of Development

➤ Section 6.8.1

Generally, attempts should not be made to disguise new additions or extensions and make them appear to belong to the historic fabric. The architectural style of additions does not necessarily need to imitate historical styles or replicate the detailing of the original building in order to be considered acceptable. However, this should not be seen as a licence for unsympathetic or inappropriate work. Careful consideration of the palette of materials with which the works are to be executed can mediate between a modern design idiom and the historic fabric of the structure. Extensions should complement the original structure in terms of scale, materials and detailed design while reflecting the values of the present time.

Section 13.5 Development within the Curtilage of a Protect Structure

➤ Section 13.5.1

- Proposals for new development within the curtilage of a protected structure should be carefully scrutinised by the planning authority, as inappropriate development will be detrimental to the character of the structure.
- Where a formal relationship exists between a protected structure and its ancillary buildings or features, new construction which interrupts that relationship should rarely be permitted.
- The relationship between the protected structure and the street should not be damaged. New works should not adversely impact on views of the principal elevations of the protected structure.

- Where a large house or an institutional building has a garden which contributes to the character of the protected structure, subdivision of the garden, particularly by permanent subdividers, may be inappropriate.
- Proposals are often made which combine works to a protected structure, often to allow a new use be made of it, with new development within its curtilage or attendant grounds.

5.4. Limerick City and County Development Plan 2022-2028

The relevant policy and objectives of the current development plan include the following:

- **Volume 3 Architectural Conservation Areas & Record of Protected Structures**
 - The appeal site is located in ACA 6: Ennis Rd. & Lower Shelbourne Rd.
 - The appeal site is on the Record of Protected Structures (RPS 3433)
- **Chapter 6 Environment, Heritage, Landscape and Green Infrastructure**
 - Built Heritage

The following policies and objectives are relevant:

Policy EH P5 Protection of the Built Environment

It is a policy of the Council to promote high standards for conserving and restoring the built environment and promote its value in improving living standards and its benefits to the economy.

Objective EH O50 Work to Protected Structures

It is an objective of the Council to:

- a) Protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.
- b) Ensure that any development proposals to Protected Structures, their curtilage and setting, shall have regard to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities published by the Department of the Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.

- c) Ensure that all works are carried out under the supervision of a qualified professional with specialised conservation expertise.
- d) Ensure that any development, modification, alteration, or extension affecting a Protected Structure and/ or its setting, is sensitively sited and designed and is appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, layout and materials.
- e) Ensure that the form and structural integrity of the Protected Structure is retained in any redevelopment and that the relationship between the Protected Structure and any complex of adjoining buildings, designed landscape features, or views and vistas from within the grounds of the structure are respected.
- f) Respect the special interest of the interior, including its plan form, hierarchy of spaces, architectural detail, fixtures and fittings and materials.
- g) Support the re-introduction of traditional features on protected structures where there is evidence that such features (e.g. window styles, finishes etc.) previously existed.
- h) Ensure that new and adapted uses are compatible with the character and special interest of the Protected Structure.
- i) Protect the curtilage of Protected Structures and to refuse planning permission for inappropriate development within the curtilage and attendant grounds, that would adversely impact on the special character of the Protected Structure.
- j) Protect and retain important elements of built heritage including historic gardens, stone walls, entrance gates and piers and any other associated curtilage features.
- k) Ensure historic landscapes and gardens associated with Protected Structures are protected from inappropriate development.

Objective EH O53 Architectural Conservation Areas

It is an objective of the Council to:

- a) Protect the character and special interest of an area, which has been designated as an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) as set out in Volume 3.

- b) Ensure that all development proposals within an ACA be appropriate to the character of the area having regard to the Character briefs for each area.
- c) Ensure that any new development or alteration of a building within an ACA or immediately adjoining an ACA, is appropriate in terms of the proposed design, including scale, height, mass, density, building lines and materials.
- d) Seek a high quality, sensitive design for any new development(s) that are complementary and/or sympathetic to their context and scale, whilst simultaneously encouraging contemporary design which is in harmony with the area. Direction can also be taken from using traditional forms that are then expressed in a contemporary manner, rather than a replica of a historic building style.
- e) Seek the retention of all features that contribute to the character of an ACA, including boundary walls, railings, soft landscaping, traditional paving and street furniture.
- f) Seek to safeguard the Georgian heritage of Limerick.

➤ **Chapter 12 Land Use Zoning Strategy**

- Land Use Zoning

The appeal site is zoned 'Existing Residential'.

Objective: To provide for residential development, protect and improve existing residential amenity.

Purpose: This zone is intended primarily for established housing areas. Existing residential amenity will be protected while allowing appropriate infill development. The quality of the zone will be enhanced with associated open space, community uses and where an acceptable standard of amenity can be maintained, a limited range of other uses that support the overall residential function of the area, such as schools, creches, doctors surgeries, playing fields etc.

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

- SAC: 002165 - Lower River Shannon SAC – approx. 378 m to the southeast.

- SPA: 004077 - River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries SPA – approx. 525 m to the south.
- pNHA: 000435 - Inner Shannon Estuary - South Shore – Approx. 1.043 m to the southwest.
- pNHA: 002048 - Fergus Estuary And Inner Shannon, North Shore – approx. 378 m to the southeast.
- pNHA: 002001 - Knockalisheen Marsh – approx. 1.27 km to the north.

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 appended to this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- The proposed design of the pavilion was informed by the design and material finishes of the existing dwelling.
- Stone surround is used to define the three bay front elevation.
- The proposed tower allows for natural light to enter the building, and in particular the artist studio space and is compatible with the style of the existing dwelling. It does not detract or undermine the existing dwelling as it is substantially lower and at distance from the existing dwelling.
- Material finishes include natural slate, bespoke joinery timber windows.
- The proposed development uses a very similar palette of materials to surrounding buildings and to the existing dwelling.

- It is setback over 60 m from the front boundary and well behind both the frontage of the existing dwelling and frontages of others houses in the area.
- It is not excessive in terms of height, having regard to the existing dwelling and adjoining dwellings.
- In terms of impacts on the existing dwelling, the proposed structure will be well setback from the front line of the dwelling and is well below the height of the dwelling.
- The proportions and main elements i.e. window opes are consistent with the dwelling.
- The planner's report and the conservation officer's report fail to outline in detail the nature of the objections of the planning authority. The height and scale is stated as being inappropriate which is unclear given that the height of the proposed structure which is substantially lower than of the existing dwelling.
- There is no requirement that the design is required to be carried out by an accredited conservation architect.
- It is unclear why the PA considered the proposed material finishes to be inappropriate.
- The Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities supports proposals that extend protected structures to ensure that they remain viable.
- In terms of design, it is important not to produce pastiche. The use of modern stone clad surround at the front is appropriate to set the construction on the pavilion within its time and date. Section 6.8.3 of the guidelines notes that attempts should not be made to disguise new additions or extension to make them appear to belong to the historic fabric.
- No objections were raised by third parties.

Alternative Approaches

- Two alternative proposals are provided. Option B presents with a lantern style rooflight over the central pavilion bay and is similar to a recently constructed pavilion used in the French embassy. Option C presents as an A-frame roof

with flat rooflights over the centre bay, is simpler and significantly reduces the height of the proposed pavilion.

Drawing proposals were submitted with the appeal in regard to proposed Option B and C.

7.2. **Planning Authority Response**

Response received from the PA noting that no further comments to make outside of the assessment of the planning application.

7.3. **Observations**

None.

8.0 **Assessment**

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local, regional and national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design & Height
- Impact on Protected Structure
- Impact on ACA & Visual Amenities

8.1. **Principle of Development**

- 8.1.1. Having regard to the establishment residential use of the property and to the zoning objective for the site, I consider that the proposed development would be acceptable in principle. Policy EH P5 and objective EHO 50 of the development plan aims to ensure that existing built heritage and the special interest of protected structures and their attendant grounds are protected. In this regard, further assessment will be required in relation visual amenity and impacts on built heritage.

8.1.2. In the appeal details, I note that the applicant has submitted alternative design options which aim to address the concerns of the planning authority (PA). I am satisfied that it does not introduce any significant new issues for third parties and I note that the PA in its response to the first party appeal has not indicated any objection to the amended options. I am therefore satisfied that the alternative options can be considered by the Commission.

8.2. Design & Height

8.2.1. In terms of the proposal to demolish the existing timber garden shed, I note that this is a typical timber garden shed structure set on a hardstanding area to the rear (north) of the existing garage. It does not contribute towards the special interest or to the character of the existing dwelling on the site which is the protected structure, therefore I have no objection to its removal.

8.2.2. The proposed pavilion structure will be located at the rear of the existing garage on the site and will be set back from the public road by approx. 59.8 m. This existing garage is set back from the rear building line of the dwelling and approx. 47.5 m from the public road. The height is not indicated on the plans or drawings submitted however based on measurements taken from the site layout plan, the gross floor area is approx. 67 m² and the height is estimated to be c. 4.5 m.

8.2.3. The PA have raised concern in regard to the design, height and scale of the proposed structure and the material finishes, in particular, the height and scale which were not appropriate to the historic context setting. Issues regarding proportion and architectural style were also raised.

8.2.4. In terms of the overall footprint, it will have a gross floor area of 94.32 m² and will extend to the rear of the garden abutting the western boundary of the site. I note that the front elevation (east) will not extend beyond the footprint of the existing garage. There will be a separation distance of approx. 2.13 m between the pavilion and the northern boundary line of the existing garage.

8.2.5. The development as proposed will have a max roof height of 6.791 m with the proposed tower adding approx. an additional 1.825 m. Without the tower element, the structure would stand at approx. 4.96 m above ground level. I would agree with the PA that the overall height should be reduced and the removal of the tower would

achieve this which would result in lessening the visual impact on the setting of the protected structure and on surrounding visual amenities in the context of the site.

- 8.2.6. The eastern elevation of the proposed structure is designed such that it is balanced and symmetrical in proportion with 3 no. bays, each facilitating the 3 no. proposed internal spaces. The proposed fenestration is also balanced and retains vertical emphasis which is characteristic of the fenestration serving the existing dwelling. Therefore I do not agree with the PA on this point, and I consider that the design does assimilate with the existing dwelling in terms of fenestration proportions.
- 8.2.7. The pallet of material finishes comprises of natural roof slate, concrete clad to encase the 2 no. bay window projections and the front door entrance, timber or timber effect windows, cast iron rain water goods, and a select red brick finish to match the existing dwelling. For the tower mounted on the roof top, material finishes will include decorative timber panels and glazing.
- 8.2.8. The PA considered that the proposed material finishes were inappropriate to the context of the sites historical architecture context. The material finishes of the main dwelling comprise of pebble dash render to first floor, black slates, timber surrounds, red brick, and pvc rainwater goods. The windows and doors appear to be timber. The newer ground floor extension to the side and rear of the dwelling comprises of cladded roof, pvc windows and doors, red brick, render finish, and pvc rain water goods.
- 8.2.9. In my opinion the material finishes of the proposed structure broadly reflect that of the original and newer fabric of the existing dwelling. However, while the concrete clad surrounds would not be a feature of the original fabric of the dwelling, I consider that flexibility with regard to material finishes can be considered in some instances where their use is not over dominant. In this case, I am satisfied that the proposed clad surrounds would not unduly impact on the visual amenities of the existing dwelling. The proposals for rainwater goods are not indicated but I am satisfied that this could be addressed by a suitable condition. Should the Commission be minded to grant permission, I recommend the inclusion of a condition with regard to agreeing material finishes with the PA including rainwater goods.

Amended Proposals

- 8.2.10. The grounds of appeal argue that the proposed design of the structure does not detract from the existing protected structure and that careful consideration was given to

producing a design that respects the existing dwelling, in terms of the architectural design treatment, scale, portions and material finishes. In response to the concerns raised by the PA, the applicant has included 2 no. amended designs with the appeal.

8.2.11. In the case of Option B, it is proposed to reduce the height of the tower and expand it along the ridge of the roof incorporating 7 smaller window opes. Option C proposes to remove the tower entirely and to provide roof lights integrated on the roof. The drawings do not indicate any other amendments to structural changes or material finishes and the footprint appears to remain the same.

8.2.12. Overall, I consider that due regard has been given to the architectural character of the existing protected structure on the site and that amended proposal Option C would constitute a reduction in the height of the proposed structure and an improvement to the overall external appearance of the proposed structure.

8.3. Impact on Protected Structure

8.3.1. As well as being designated a protected structure, the existing dwelling and attendant grounds is afforded regional protected status, as it is listed as a building of interest on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage. I note that the council's Conservation Architect had recommended an Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment to be undertaken, however I note that a description and an external appraisal of Springdale House is available on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage website¹.

8.3.2. In considering the potential impacts on the setting of the existing protected structure and its character, it is important to note that the existing dwelling has undergone a substantial extension to the rear, and that there are 2 no. garages/outbuildings on the site (excluding the timber shed proposed to be removed). In my opinion the impact is confined to the rear of the existing dwelling rather than at the front of the house. The site is generous in area and is well landscaped. In this regard, the front and lateral rear boundaries of the site are defined by mature trees and hedging which lends itself to enclosing the site from view from public areas.

8.3.3. Notwithstanding I note the concerns of the PA in regard to the scale of the proposed development, having regard to the existing development already carried out on the

¹ <https://www.buildingsofireland.ie/buildings-search/building/21512055/springdale-ennis-road-limerick-municipal-borough-limerick-co-limerick>

site. The proposed development is significant in scale for a third ancillary domestic structure to the adjoining dwelling. The footprint extends to a depth of 15.95 m and is greater than the depth of the original footprint of the existing dwelling. Taken together with the existing ancillary domestic structures, and the extension carried out to the rear of the existing dwelling, I have concerns that the scale of the proposal is excessive and that cumulatively with the existing ancillary adjoining structures, that the proposed development would adversely impact on the character and setting of the existing dwelling and would therefore be at variance with Objective EH O50 of the development plan. For this reason I recommend that permission is refused.

8.4. Impact on ACA & Visual Amenities

- 8.4.1. The appeal site forms part of the Ennis Road, Lower Shelbourn Road ACA. The rear of the site backs on to Lansdowne Gardens. There is a pedestrian link from the Ennis road to Lansdowne Gardens bounding the appeal site to the west. There are mature trees and hedging along the western and northern boundary of the site and there is security fencing mounted on the boundary walls of the site. I noted at time of site inspection that in general, views of the rear of the site are not available from the Ennis Road due to the enclosed nature of the site and the existing mature landscaping. Similarly when viewed from Lansdowne Gardens to the north, the site is enclosed by a high boundary wall with mature trees on the inside.
- 8.4.2. Subject to the reduction in the overall height of the structure as discussed in Section 8.2 above, and having regard to the location of the proposed structure which will be positioned at the rear of the existing garage along with the setback distance from the adjoining public road to the south, and to the enclosed nature of the site as a result of mature landscaping, I am satisfied that the proposed development will not unduly impact on the character of the ACA, or on the visual amenities of the surrounding area. The proposed development would be consistent with Objective EH O53 of the development plan.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

- 9.1.2. The appeal site is located in Limerick city in an established residential area and within its development boundary. The site is zoned 'Existing Residential'. The proposed development comprises the construction of an ancillary domestic structure within the curtilage of an existing dwelling.
- 9.1.3. The closest European site, relative to the appeal site is SAC: 002165 - Lower River Shannon SAC – approx. 378 m to the southwest and SPA: 004077 - River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries SPA – 525 m to the south.
- 9.1.4. The PA considered that there was no requirement for appropriate assessment, the project was screened out due to the lack of ecological or hydrological connection between the development site and any European site.
- 9.1.5. 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 nature, scale and location of the development.
 - The availability of public wastewater piped infrastructure.
 - The absence of any hydrological connection to any European site.
 - To the location of the project and separation distance to any European Sites.
 - To the conclusion of the PA.

I consider that the proposed development, individually or in-combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to have a significant effect on any European designated site(s). As appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The appeal site is located in Limerick city in an established residential area and within its development boundary. The site is zoned 'Existing Residential'. The River Shannon lies approx. 400 to the east.

The nearest water body relative to the appeal site is the North Ballycannon_010 IE_SH_25N170970 which is reported at 'good' status. The nearest ground water body is Limerick City Northwest IE_SH_G_140 and is at Good Status.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the proposed 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 in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.

10.2. 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.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and scale of the development which is located in an urban area in Limerick city, the zoning objective for the site and the availability of pipe water and wastewater services.
- The location-distance from the nearest water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission is refused for the following reason and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Taken together with existing development already carried out to the existing dwelling and within its curtilage, it is considered that the proposed development by reason of its overall scale and height, and the cumulative impact associated with both the existing and proposed development within the attendant grounds, would be out of scale and character with its surrounding historical context, would negatively impact the special character and appearance of the existing

dwelling which is listed as a Protected Structure (RPS 3433) in the current development plan, and would not be in accordance with Objective EH O50 of the Limerick City and County Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development would, therefore be, contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Clare Clancy
Planning Inspector

02nd October 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322696-25
Proposed Development Summary	Permission to demolish a timber shed, and to construct a pavilion to the rear of the existing dwelling which is a Protected Structure
Development Address	Springdale, Ennis Road, Limerick
	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input 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 checked="" 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>Class 10(b)(iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere.</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>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP-322696-25
Proposed Development Summary	Permission to demolish a timber shed, and to construct a pavilion to the rear of the existing dwelling which is a Protected Structure
Development Address	Springdale, Ennis Road, Limerick
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
<p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>The proposed development relates to the demolition of an existing shed and the construction of a pavilion to accommodate office, artist and gym space. The site has a stated area 0.23 ha.</p> <p>The proposed development will have a gross floor area of proposed structure 78 m², max roof height 6.791 m.</p> <p>The site is located to the rear of an existing dwelling and the site is located in an urban context and is connect to existing public services. The proposed development in this urban location will not result in any significant waste or pollutant.</p> <p>It is not considered that any significant cumulative environmental impacts will result when considered in accumulation with existing developments. Minor demolition works are required to remove a small garden shed, and there are no identified risks of accidents or disasters, nor is there an obvious risk to human health that result from the proposed development. The proposed development will not give rise to the production of significant waste, emissions or pollutants.</p>
<p>Location of development</p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic,</p>	<p>The appeal site is located in the city urban area. The nearest sensitive environmental receptor is the River Shannon which lies approx. 400 m to the east which is also a designated European Site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC: 002165 - Lower River Shannon SAC – approx. 378 m to the southwest • SPA: 004077 - River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries SPA – 525 m to the south. <p>There will be no significant effects on water bodies or Biodiversity.</p> <p>The site contains a protected structure to which no works are proposed. The site is afforded regional protection as it listed on the National Inventory of</p>

cultural or archaeological significance).	Architectural Heritage.
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, the potential for effects and significant effects would relate to construction stage and surface water runoff at operational stage.</p> <p>During construction phase, noise dust and vibration emissions are likely. However any impacts would be local and temporary in nature and the implementation of standard construction practice measures would satisfactorily mitigate potential impacts.</p> <p>No significant impacts on the surrounding road network are considered likely at operational stage. At operational stage surface water runoff would be discharged to the public foul sewer.</p>
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

WFD – Stage 1 Screening

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Comisiún Pleanála ref. no.	ABP-322696-25	Townland, address	Permission to demolish a timber shed, and to construct a pavilion to the rear of the existing dwelling which is a Protected Structure
Description of project	Springdale, Ennis Road, Limerick		
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,	The site is located in Limerick city urban on zoned lands. The River Shannon is located c. 400 m to the east of the appeal site. There are existing piped infrastructure services to which it is proposed to be connected the new development.		
Proposed surface water details	Surface water will be discharged to the public sewer.		
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	The proposed development will be serviced by piped public water mains. Uisce Éireann raised no objection to the proposed development subject to standard conditions.		
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	The proposed development will be serviced by piped public wastewater connection. No objection was raised by Uisce Éireann regarding connection to same.		
Others?	Not applicable		