



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-322733-25

Development

The development will consist of ground floor internal and elevational alterations, first floor internal alterations and extensions to the front, side and rear, a flat roof second floor on top of the existing roof, new second floor to include terrace facing north, new pedestrian entrance location, alterations to the fenestration and all associated works.

Location

Gorse Lodge, Knocknacree Road,
Dalkey, Dublin, A96AK16

Planning Authority

Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County
Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D25A/0258

Applicant(s)

Tina Treanor.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Marcus & Karen Wren.

James & Susan Carter.

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

27th August 2025

Inspector

Jennifer McQuaid

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
5.1. Development Plan.....	8
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	10
5.3. EIA Screening	11
5.4. Water Framework Directive.....	11
6.0 The Appeal	12
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	12
6.2. Applicant Response	13
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	13
6.4. Observations.....	14
6.5. Further Responses	14
7.0 Assessment.....	14
8.0 AA Screening.....	18
9.0 Recommendation.....	19
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	19

11.0	Conditions	19
	Appendix A - Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening	23

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site (0.028ha) is located at Gorse Lodge, Knocknacree Road, Dalkey, Co. Dublin. There is an existing two-storey dwelling on site, with a brick and dash finish to the front elevation, and a render finish to the side and rear elevations. The site is confined with a narrow access via a cul-de-sac which links to a walking route to the Torca Road.
- 1.2. The site is surrounded by a mixture of detached dwelling, with significant variations in building size, scale and design. There's no consistent building line, and the existing dwellings are set at varying distances from the public road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development will consist of:
 - ground floor internal and elevational alterations,
 - first floor internal alterations and extensions to the front, side and rear,
 - a flat roof second floor on top of the existing roof,
 - new second floor to include terrace facing north,
 - new pedestrian entrance location,
 - alterations to the fenestration,
 - all associated works

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Grant subject to 9 conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The principle of development is acceptable.

- The extension will facilitate the continued use of the building as a residential dwelling and will not have a negative impact on the sustainability of the overall building.
- It is considered that the changes at ground floor level are minor and will not have an impact on the amenity of the existing house or adjacent properties. It is not considered that the changes to first floor level would have a significant or negative impact on the amenity of the existing house or adjacent properties. The second-floor extension is not considered to be visually obstructive or overbearing, it is considered that any overshadowing, overbearing will be mitigated by the setback of the extension from the street, and the steep topography will reduce the visual impact to neighbouring properties to the rear of the building. The design and proportions of the extension mean that the visual bulk and massing of the building would be broken up, providing visual and architectural interest without being a dominant feature in the street. Due to the steep slope of the site, any impact to sea views would be minimal and would not be significant.
- The timber screen proposed will protect the amenity of the “White House”, which is the nearest structure to the subject site. It is also noted that, due to the site characteristics and topography of the area, the existing context of the site already has a relatively high level of overlooking and overshadowing between neighbouring buildings.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage: No objection subject to conditions.
- Transportation: No objection subject to conditions.
- Parks and Landscape: No objection.
- Conservation: No objection.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- No reports received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

A total of six third party observations were submitted. The following concerns were raised:

- Traffic and parking on the street.
- Design is out of character
- Overlooking, overshadowing, loss of natural light.
- Overbearing: the structure is too big in scale and height. Reduced privacy.
- Insufficient separation distance to existing dwellings.
- No levels indicated on the drawings.
- Construction will diminish the amenity of the nearby public walkway.
- Environmental sensitivity.
- Devalue property
- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Precedence set.
- Residential amenity diminished.
- Views towards the sea will be blocked.

4.0 Planning History

None.

Adjacent site:

PI Reg. No.: D21B/0321: Permission granted for extension and alterations.

PI Reg. No.: D24B/0518: Permission granted for a single storey garden room and all associated site works.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Dun-Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028

The subject site is zoned “A”, the objective is to seek to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.

Chapter 3 refers to Climate Action

Chapter 4 refers to Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place.

Chapter 12 refers to Development Management

Section 12.2.1 refers to Built Environment

Section 12.3 refers to Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place.

Section 12.3.1 refers to Quality Design

Section 12.3.7 refers to Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas.

Section 12.3.7.1 refers to Extensions to Dwellings.

(ii) Extensions to the Rear:

Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining. The extension should match or complement the main house. First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:

Overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking – along with proximity, height and length along mutual boundaries.

Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability.

Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.

External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.

(iii) Extensions to the side:

Ground floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. However, in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front façade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a "terracing" effect. External finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.

Any planning application submitted in relation to extensions, basements or new first/upper floor level within the envelope of the existing building, shall clearly indicated on all drawings the extent of demolition/wall removal required to facilitate the proposed development and a structural report, prepared by a competent and suitably qualified engineer, may be required to determine the integrity of walls/structures to be retained and outline potential impacts on adjoining properties. This requirement should be ascertained at preplanning stage, Side gable, protruding parapet walls at eaves/gutter level of hip-roofs are not encouraged.

The proposed construction of new building structures directly onto the boundary with the public realm (including footpaths/open space/roads etc) is not acceptable and it will be required that the development is set within the existing boundary on site and shall not form the boundary wall. The provision of windows (particularly at first floor level) within the side elevation of extensions adjacent to public open space will be encouraged in order to promote passive surveillance, and to break up the bulk/extent of the side gable as viewed from the public realm.

(iv) Alterations at Roof/Attic Level:

Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles – changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/ "A" frame end of "half-hip" for example – will be assessed against a number of criteria including:

Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.

Existing roof variations on the streetscape.

Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.

Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence.

Dormer extensions to roofs, i.e. to the front, side and rear will be considered with regard to impacts on existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. The design, dimensions, and bulk of any roof proposal relative to the overall size of the dwelling and gardens will be the overriding considerations. Dormer extensions shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries. Dormer extensions should be set down from the existing ridge level so as to not read as a third storey extension at roof level to the rear.

The proposed quality of materials/finishes for dormer extensions will be considered carefully as this can greatly improve their appearance. The level and type of glazing within a dormer extension should have regard to existing window treatments and fenestration of the dwelling. However, regard should also be had to size of fenestration proposed at attic level relative to adjoining residential amenities.

Particular care will be taken in evaluating large, visually dominant dormer window structures, with a balance sought between quality residential amenity and the privacy of adjacent properties. Excessive overlooking of adjacent properties should be avoided.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is not located within a designated site, the nearest are:

- Dalkey Coastal Zone and Killiney Hill pNHA (site code: 001206) is located 230 metres to the south, east and west of the subject site.
- Dalkey Islands SPA (site code: 004172) is located 600metres to the east of the subject site.
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code: 003000) is located 640 metres to the east of the subject site.
- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (site code: 004024) is located 4km northeast of the subject site.
- South Dublin Bay SAC (site code: 000210) is located 4.4km north of the subject site.

5.3. EIA Screening

- 5.3.1. 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.

5.4. Water Framework Directive

The subject site is located in the urban area of Dalkey, Co. Dublin. The site is zoned as "A", the objective is to seek to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities. There are no rivers or streams in close proximity to the subject site. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the appeals submitted.

I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks 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. 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.

- Scale and size of the proposed alterations and extensions to an existing dwelling.
- Location of the subject site on zoned lands in an urban area.
- Lack of connection to water bodies.
- Connection to public water, sewer and public drain.

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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal have been received from the resident to the immediate east of the subject site. The concerns raised are:

- Overlooking, overbearing, overshadowing: The proposal will double the size of the dwelling from 123sqm to 225sqm. The current roof level of the appellant home is 52.12m asl (above sea level), whereas the ground level ridge height of Gorse Lodge is 54.9m asl. the proposed extension will increase the height from 6 metres to 9.2 metres. The level difference from the appellants house to the proposed building will increase to over 14 metres. This is excessive and completely overbearing.

The proposed scale and height will overlook the appellants house and will block significant amounts of natural daylight and sunlight coming into the front & rear garden at various times of the day throughout the year, particularly in the afternoon and evening, given the western orientation of the proposed development. The proposed balcony will have a direct line of sight into a child's bedroom in the rear of Monte Vista. Planting was previously carried out to screen the existing first floor and this has resulted in a loss of light to the room. The proposal is in close proximity to the boundary wall of Monte Vista.

There is a separation distance of 7.85metres from the proposed 1st floor extension to the appellant's dwelling, a separation distance of 16 metres is required as per Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines. The amenity of the appellants home will be injured by the proposal.

- Inadequate Drawings: No site levels included on the drawing or separation distances. The planning application should have been declared "invalid".
- Design: The structure is not in keeping with the existing Victorian architecture and the materials do not reflect the character of the Dalkey area.
- Construction & Access: The road is a public walkway and is a right of way for pedestrians to Killiney Hill. The construction period would cause significant

disruption. Due to the constraints of the site and the narrow access road, it is anticipated that there will be damage to the existing road and stone pillars. White House is a protected structure, and it is located along this access road and the character will be disrupted.

- Appropriate Assessment: There are potential pathways downhill to Dalkey Coastal Zone pNHA, Dalkey Island SAC and Dalkey Islands SPA. An AA screening should be carried out.

6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant has submitted a response and stated the following:

- There is a moderate increase in the size and height of the subject dwelling. It is in compliance with the CDP.
- The applicant is willing to provide additional screening on the first and second floor in order to avoid any potential overlooking onto adjacent properties if necessary.
- The dwelling to the east known as South End has no windows on the western elevation. Monte Vista dwelling is looked over 21 metres from the subject dwelling.
- The applicant has carried out a shadow impact assessment and concluded no undue shadowing impact on the existing neighbouring properties.
- The applicant will accept a planning condition to provide a Construction Management Plan.
- Appropriate Assessment, no impact predicted due to the small-scale development and the separation distance and implementation of a Construction Management Plan.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- It is considered that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the Planning Authority, would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

6.4. Observations

- None

6.5. Further Responses

- None

7.0 Assessment

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

- Overlooking, overbearing, overshadowing
- Design
- Other Issues – Construction & Inadequate drawings
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Overlooking, overbearing, overshadowing

7.3. The subject site consists of an existing two storey dwelling on a confined site (0.0288ha) along a narrow cul de sac off Knock-Na-Cree Road. There is a two-storey dwelling to the front (northwest) known as The White House and a single storey dwelling opposite the subject site (east) known as South End and a further dwelling to the east known as Monte Vista. The cul-de-sac rises from Knock-Na-Cree Road, and the subject dwelling is nestled into the topography of the site and bound by a high stone wall.

7.4. The grounds of appeal have stated that the proposal will double the size of the dwelling from 123sqm to 225sqm. The current roof level of the appellant home is 52.12m asl, whereas the ground level ridge height of Gorse Lodge (subject site) is 54.9m asl. the proposed extension will increase the height from 6 metres to 9.2 metres. The level difference from the appellants house to the proposed building will increase to over 14 metres. This is excessive and completely overbearing. The

proposal will overlook the appellants house and will block significant amounts of natural daylight and sunlight. The proposed balcony will have a direct line of sight into a child's bedroom in the rear of Monte Vista. The proposal is in close proximity to the boundary wall of Monte Vista. There is a separation distance of 7.85metres from the proposed 1st floor extension to the appellant's dwelling, a separation distance of 16 metres is required as per Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines.

- 7.5. I note that there is a two-storey dwelling currently on the subject site and the applicant is seeking to increase the size of the dwelling including the height and scale. The ground floor alterations will not increase the footprint; the changes relate to internal changes and conversion of a front entrance to window. The first floor will be significant altered and increase in footprint to the rear of the site; the changes will include expansion the floor area onto the existing terrace with an extension to the southeast and south of the subject dwelling. A second floor will be constructed to include a tv room and bedroom along with a roof terrace to the northern elevation.
- 7.6. I note that concerns were raised in relation to overlooking to the adjacent properties, the subject dwelling is located less than 1 metre from the southern elevation of the existing dwelling (The White House) to the northwest, currently the overall heights are similar, the proposed addition of a 2nd floor will increase the overall height from 6.05metres to 9.2 metres, the proposal will be approximately 1.5 metres higher than the adjacent dwelling to the north, no windows are proposed on the northern elevation, however, a roof terrace is proposed, the applicant is proposing a 1.55 metre high timber screen in order to prevent any overlooking. Given that there are no windows located on the southern elevation of the adjacent property and the proposal for a 1.55-metre-high timber screen, I do not consider that the proposed development will overlook the property to the north.
- 7.7. In regard to the properties to the east, the single storey property (South End) has no windows on the immediate gable to the west. The applicant is proposing obscured/not transparent glazing to avoid overlooking of neighbouring property and in response to the appeal has offered further screening. The appellant raised concerns in relation to the roof terrace overlooking their private amenity space, I note there is a separation distance of over 10 metres from the subject dwelling to the property to the east, although they are not directly opposite, the proposed roof

terrace is directly opposite the private amenity space of the appellants property at a separation distance of over 10 metres. At present, there is a roof terrace at first floor level, the proposed second floor terrace will be located at a higher level, and I do not consider that the proposed terrace will negatively impact the residential amenity space of the property opposite the subject site, and I do not consider that further screening is required. In regard Monte Vista property, this dwelling is located over 21 metres from the subject site and there due to the separation distance, I do not consider overlooking to be an issue.

7.8. In relation to overshadowing, the subject site is located to the south of the existing dwelling to the north, the proposed extension will increase the overall height of the dwelling from 6.05 metres to 9.2 metres, this will mean the subject dwelling will be approximately 1.5 metres higher than the adjacent dwelling. There are no windows on the southern elevation of the adjacent dwelling, therefore, the proposed development will not overshadow the property and impact residential amenity, due to the lack of separation between the two properties, any increased impact will be minimal. In relation to the properties to the east, due to the separation distance and the orientation of the two dwellings along with the lack of windows on the western elevation of the nearest adjacent property, I do not consider that the proposed development will overshadow the adjacent dwelling to the east. In addition, the applicant submitted a shadow analysis as part of the further information response, and it clearly indicates that there will be no undue shadowing impact on the existing neighbouring properties.

7.9. I note the concerns in relation to overbearance, at the proposed development is currently directly adjacent to the property to the northwest and the overall height will be increased by approximately 1.5 metres above the current roof line height of the adjacent property, I do not consider that there will be an overbearance impact on the adjacent property. In relation to the properties to the east, there is a separation distance of over 10 metres between the two closest properties and as there are no windows on the western elevation of the existing dwelling with the front elevation facing north west, and taking into account the overall ridge height of the adjacent properties in the area, I do not consider that the proposed development will have an overbearance impact on the residential amenity of the property to the east. Monte Vista property is located over 21 metres from the subject site and due to the

separation distance, I do not consider that the proposed development will cause a negative overbearance impact on this property.

- 7.10. Having regard to the location of the proposed development within a residential site of a two-storey dwelling, taking into account the nature of the site, the confines and the proximity of the adjacent property to the northwest and the current separation distance to the properties to the east, I do not consider that overbearance, overshadowing or overlooking will be an issue.

7.11. Design

- 7.12. The two-storey dwelling on site, is a modern design and includes a mixture of finishes including stone, timber and plaster with a flat roof. The proposed design will reflect the current design and retain the flat roof.

- 7.13. The grounds of appeal outline that the structure is not in keeping with the existing Victorian architecture and the materials do not reflect the character of the Dalkey area.

- 7.14. I note that the current dwelling on site, is a modern flat roof design and the proposed design is in keeping with the current design on site. The material includes colour render finish, granite capping, brushed aluminium capping, selected timber cladding and stone. The generally area is made up of a mixture of house designs and types, the older style houses resemble Victorian architecture and some with modern extensions, while the newer dwellings are modern style. I consider the proposed extension and alterations to the subject site are considered acceptable and in keeping with the surrounding area.

- 7.15. Having considered the proposed design and the surrounding area, I do not consider that the proposed development will negatively impact the visual amenity of the area or effect the character of the area.

7.16. Other issues – Construction & Inadequate Drawings.

- 7.17. In terms of terms of the drawing submitted and the alleged omissions of site levels and separation distances. I note that the drawings were considered acceptable by the Planning Authority. I am satisfied that this did not prevent the concerned party from making representations. The above assessment represents my de novo consideration of all planning issues material to the proposed development.

7.18. In regard to potential disruption caused during construction in particular in relation to construction traffic. I note that the Planning Authority attached condition no. 5 which states that the applicant shall prevent any mud, dirt, debris or building material being carried onto or placed on the public road or adjoining property as a result of the site construction works and repair any damage to the public road arising from carrying out the works. Storage of construction materials is not permitted on the public road/footway unless agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. In addition, I note the applicant is willing to accept a condition requiring a Construction Management Plan, there in the event of a grant of permission, a similar condition shall be applied.

8.0 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 site is not located within a designated site; the nearest European sites are: Dalkey Islands SPA (site code: 004172) is located 600metres to the east of the subject site and Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code: 003000) is located 640 metres to the east of the subject site.

The proposed development comprises extension and alterations to an existing dwelling with connection to public sewer, water and public drainage. I note the grounds of appeal raised concerns in relation to potential pathways downhill to Dalkey Coastal Zone pNHA, Dalkey Island SAC and Dalkey Islands SPA.

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:

- Scale and size of the proposed extension and alterations to an existing dwelling.
- Distance to the nearest European site Dalkey Islands SPA (site code: 004172) is located 600metres to the east of the subject site and Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code: 003000) is located 640 metres to the east of the subject site.

- Services connection to public water, public sewer and public drain.
- The lack of pathway connections to the SPA/SAC.

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

- 9.1. I recommend that planning permission should be granted, subject to the conditions as set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1. Having regard to the grounds of appeal, the nature and scale of the proposed development, the existing residential use on site, the residential land use zoning as per Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the proposed development will not negatively impact the residential amenity of the adjacent properties or visual impact the character of the area and would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 01st 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed extension shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

3. The existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity.

4. The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

5. The applicant shall prevent any mud, dirt, debris or building material being carried onto or placed on the public road or adjoining property as a result of the site construction works and repair any damage to the public road arising from carrying out the works. Storage of construction materials is not permitted on the public road/footway unless agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area and in the interests of road safety.

6. Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.

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 Coimisiún 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.

Jennifer McQuaid
Planning Inspector

2nd September 2025

Appendix A - Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322733-25
Proposed Development Summary	The development will consist of ground floor internal and elevational alterations, first floor internal alterations and extensions to the front, side and rear, a flat roof second floor on top of the existing roof, new second floor to include terrace facing north, new pedestrian entrance location, alterations to the fenestration and all associated works.
Development Address	Gorse Lodge, Knocknacree Road, Dalkey, Dublin, A96AK16
	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)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. ☐ 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)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ 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?	
☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2,	

Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold

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)?	
Yes ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____