



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-322961-25

Development	Construction of 2-storey garden room with all associated site works
Location	Loachfail, Outfarm Lane, Carpenterstown, Dublin 15, D15 AX9W
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	FW24A/0452E
Applicant(s)	Endotron Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	
Type of Appeal	First Party against condition
Appellant(s)	Endotron Limited
Observer(s)	Neil and Tehri Delaney
Date of Site Inspection	24 th September 2025
Inspector	Emma Gosnell

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
6.0 EIA Screening.....	8
7.0 Water Framework Directive Screening	8
8.0 The Appeal	9
9.0 Assessment.....	11
10.0 AA Screening.....	14
11.0 Recommendation	15
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	15
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	
Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination	
Appendix 3 – Screening for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is situated in a cul-de-sac off Outfarm Lane, a private estate located in Carpenterstown, Dublin 15 and to the west of the M50.
- 1.2. The site is accessed from the Carpenterstown Road c. 250m to the south. It is adjoined to the north, east and south-west by large, detached 1-2 storey dwellings of varying designs and to the south by out-house/ garage buildings and a yard. The Laverna Way residential estate, which comprises of 2-storey mainly semi-detached units, is located to the west of the site.
- 1.3. The appeal site is c. 0.215ha in area and comprises of a large (c. 399sq.m), red brick, 2-storey dwelling ('Loachfail') set on landscaped grounds. The boundary of the site consists of a solid wall with trees lining same to the north and west.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises of the erection of a detached 2- storey building (c. 356sq.m with max. height of 7.2m) to the rear of the existing dwelling (comprising domestic garage on ground floor level and games room, home gym, home office, home cinema and ancillary spaces for private domestic use at first floor level, and external first floor balcony overlooking the dwelling's rear amenity space), the northward extension of the existing driveway and all ancillary site works.
- 2.2. Further information was submitted on this application and related primarily to the design and layout of the proposed ancillary garden building (which was reduced in scale to 195sq.m and in height to max.6.3m (single storey)).

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission granted on 11/06/2025.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

2 no. planning reports formed the basis of the planning authority's (PA) assessment:

Initial Application Stage

The planner's report of 18/12/2024 found the proposal acceptable in principle but requested Further Information on:

- applicant's land ownership and the status of previously permitted development.
- impact of the proposal on existing trees on the site.
- compliance with SuDS policy.
- potential for the design to give rise to visual intrusion on and overlooking of the private amenity space associated with the property to north and overshadowing of properties to the west.
- compliance with development plan garden room policy in terms of the proposal to provide for a kitchenette and WC toilet facilities at first-floor level.

Further Information Stage

The planner's report of 11/06/2024 found the response generally satisfactory, with the exception of the proposed height of the 1-storey building (maximum height of c. 6.3m) which they considered when combined with its scale and siting had the potential to give rise to visual overbearance on properties to the west, and recommended a grant with conditions – including one to reduce its roof height to 4.3m by condition.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Initial Application Stage

Water Services (04/12/2024) – no objection, subject to compliance with SuDS policy.

Transportation Planning Section (16/12/2024) – no objection to proposal.

Further Information Stage

Parks and Green Infrastructure Division (27/05/2025) – no objection, subject to conditions.

Water Services (04/06/2025) – no objection, subject to conditions.

3.2.3. Conditions

Eight conditions, including the following:

“2. The applicant shall reduce the roof height of the structure to a maximum parapet/ridge height of c.4.3m.

Reason: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development.

3. The proposed garage shall be used solely for use incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house and shall not be sold, rented or leased independently of the house and shall not be used for the carrying on of any trade or business. Reason: In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area”.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No submissions received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Initial Application Stage

Submission received from neighbouring property owner (appeal Observer) raised the following issues:

- Incorrect information in plans.
- Overshadowing and visual intrusion.
- Overlooking.
- Inadequate drainage/ water services information.
- Injures residential amenity.
- Contravention of site zoning.

Further Information Stage

Submission received from neighbouring property owner (appeal Observer) raised the following issues:

- Welcomes redesign.
- Reduction in height is marginal and does not address issues.
- Re-siting and re-orientation required.
- Injures residential amenity.
- Contravention of site zoning.

4.0 Planning History

The appeal site has an extensive planning history which is detailed in the PA's reports. The most recent and relevant applications are detailed below:

Appeal Site

P.A. Ref. FW10B/0040 (PL 06F.237100) – retention permission for 6m high fencing along northern boundary refused on appeal for 1 no. reason: design/ height and siting and impact on amenities (2010).

P.A. Ref. 94A/0884 (06F/095535) – permission granted for dwelling house subject to conditions (1995).

Applicant's Lands to Immediate South

P.A. Ref. FW24A/0256E – permission refused for 2-storey dwelling for 1 no. reason: traffic hazard (2025).

P.A. Ref. FW09A/0104 (PL06F.235288) – permission granted for garage extension, attic conversion and works to entrance gates subject to conditions (2010).

P.A. Ref. FW09A/0177 (PL06F.236008) – permission refused for demolition of existing single storey outbuildings/ stables and provision of 3 no. 2-storey houses for 1 no. reason: overdevelopment (2010).

'Cloonfad' Outfarm Lane

P.A. Ref. F08B/0728 – retention permission granted for single storey detached games room/ garage and shelter storage/ store to the rear of house subject to conditions (2009).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

The following Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines are considered of relevance to the proposed development:

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).

Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2007) - Section 7.3 (Conditions) [cited by the appellant].

5.2. Development Plan

The Fingal Development Plan (FDP) 2023 – 2029 applies.

Zoning

- Section 13.5 (Zoning Objectives, Vision and Use Classes).
- The appeal site is zoned 'RS – Residential' with the objective to 'Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity'.
- Residential (and ancillary) development is permitted in principle under the 'RS' zoning objective.
- Section 13.4 and Objective ZO4 (Ancillary Uses):
Ensure that developments ancillary to the parent use of a site are considered on their merits.

Garden Rooms

Section 14.10 (Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas).

Section 14.10.4 (Garden Rooms): Garden Rooms can provide useful ancillary accommodation such as a playroom, gym, or study/home office for use by occupants of the dwelling house. Such structures should be modest in floor area and scale, relative to the main house and remaining rear garden area. Applicants will be required to demonstrate that neither the design nor the use of the structure would detract from the residential amenities of either the main residence or of adjoining property. External finishes shall be complementary to the main house and any such structure shall not provide residential accommodation and shall not be fitted out in such a manner including by the insertion of a kitchen or toilet facilities. Such structures shall not be let or sold independently from the main dwelling.

Other Development Management Guidance

Section 14.6.6.4 (Overlooking and Overbearance): Development proposals must assess levels of overbearance and potential to cause significant levels of overlooking to neighbouring properties. Issues in relation to excessive overlooking and

overbearance may be addressed through relocation or reduction in building bulk and height. Mitigation measures to ameliorate overbearance should be considered and may include alterations to the bulk and massing of the proposed scheme relative to neighbouring property. Overlooking may also be addressed by appropriate design-led solutions including the sensitive placement of fenestration and balcony treatments.

Objective DMSO71 (Overshadowing of Private Open Space): Ensure private open spaces for all residential unit types are not unduly overshadowed.

Objective GINHO46 (Tree Removal): Ensure adequate justification for tree removal in new developments and open space management and require documentation and recording of the reasons where tree felling is proposed and avoid removal of trees without justification.

Section 3.5.13.1, Policy SPQHP41 (Residential Extensions) and Objective SPQHO45 (Domestic Extensions) [cited by the appellant].

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) – approx. 10km
Royal Canal pNHA (Site Code 002103) – approx. 600m
Liffey Valley pNHA (Site Code 000128) - approx. 800m

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

I have concluded, 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 (refer to form in Appendix 3 for details).

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal submission was received on 07/07/2025 relating specifically to Condition No. 2 of the PA decision to grant permission for the development. Condition No. 2 states: *“The applicant shall reduce the roof height of the structure to a maximum parapet/ridge height of c.4.3m”*.

The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

Objection to Condition No. 2

Ground 1 - Basis for Decision

- No basis for the PA’s decision to reduce the height of the garden room (to max. 4.3m) by condition having regard the FI redesign and results of daylight assessment.
- Disagrees with the PA’s view that no major changes have been made to the height, extent or proximity of the proposed structure and they set out the chronology of design changes (height, scale and particulars) made to proposal at FI stage.

Ground 2 - Siting

- The proposal is appropriate in terms of scale, height and general arrangements relative to both the site and the local context.
- Siting of proposal to rear of existing 2-storey dwelling will assist in visually assimilating the proposal into its context.
- The PA failed to consider the site sections (Drawing No. 503 (Revised Site Layout Plan and Site Section/ Contextual Elevations)) or to outline how they considered the relationship between the site/ built context to the south and the proposal.

- The FI proposal is equivalent in height to the existing building to the immediate south and will have the same relationship with the western party boundary and with the properties to the west. This is not acknowledged by the PA who have failed to have regard to the pattern of development directly adjacent to the proposal.
- The prevailing height in the area is 2-storeys and a reduction in ridge height to below 6.3m by condition is arbitrary and consistent with this pattern of development.

Ground 3 – Procedural Issues

- PA have not correctly and/ or objectively assessed the proposal with regard to FDP policy and have misinterpreted and misapplied FDP provisions.
- PA have not properly considered the built context of the proposal.
- PA have failed to provide valid or adequate reasoning for their decision on height.
- Section 7.3 of the Development Management Guidelines require that planning conditions are, inter alia, necessary, relevant and reasonable with adequate reasoning provided for same. Condition No. 2 fails to have regard to these parameters.
- Various examples of case law are cited with respect to conflicting planning decisions regarding equivalent planning scenarios.

Ground 4 – Compliance with Extension Policy

- Proposal is supported by policy guidance set out under Section 3.5.13.1 (Residential Extensions), Policy SPQHP41 (Residential Extensions), and Objective SPQHO45 (Domestic Extensions).
- Residential extension policy does not support the conditioned reduction in height.
- The FI Daylight and Sunlight Assessment demonstrates that the proposal will not give rise to negative impacts on adjoining lands.
- Proposal will reduce shadowing of neighbouring dwellings to the west by removing the existing trees.

Ground 5 – Relationship with Properties to the West

- The existing trees on the western boundary are to be removed as per tree survey.

- The new building will replace these trees and provide for an equivalent level of privacy to neighbouring properties.
- The FI proposal will not give rise to any overlooking of neighbouring properties.

The grounds of appeal are accompanied by a copy of the PA's decision notification.

8.2. Planning Authority Response

The PA, in their response received 24/07/2025, seek that the Commission uphold its decision. In respect to the applicant's FI proposal to reduce the height of the proposed single storey garage to 6.3m (from 7.2m), the PA note that no rationale has been provided for this excessive height and that the blank rear elevation has a poor visual relationship with the private amenity space serving the neighbouring dwellings to the west. In the event that the Commission grant permission for the proposal, the PA seek that, where relevant, conditions relating to the payment of a Section 48 Development Contribution, a bond/ cash security, tree bond and a payment in lieu to compensate for a shortfall in play facilities be applied.

8.3. Observations

Observation received 18/07/2025 from neighbouring property owners (Neil and Tehri Delaney) reiterates their concerns raised at initial application and FI stages. New issues raised are the observer's general support for the PA's attachment of a condition to limit the height of the structure and remaining concerns in respect to the overshadowing impact on their property and neighbouring properties in the Laverna Way estate.

8.4. Further Responses

None received.

9.0 Assessment

This is a first party appeal against a condition of a grant of permission. Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) allows the Commission (so long as it is satisfied that the application does not require an assessment as if it had

been made to it in the first instance) to give the relevant planning authority direction regarding the attachment, amendment or removal of the condition. I am satisfied that the development (the construction of a c. 195sq.m single storey garden room/ garage with a maximum height of c. 6.3m as per the FI proposal) is otherwise in accordance with the Development Plan and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, and I am satisfied that the appeal and observations relate only to condition No. 2, and do not raise any further unrelated issues. Given that I am satisfied that the appeal may be dealt with under Section 139 of the Act, I am going to limit my consideration to the appropriateness of the condition in question. I consider the issues to be:

- Design and Impact on Residential Amenity
- Other

9.1. Design and Impact on Residential Amenity

- 9.1.1. I note the concerns raised by third parties in respect to overshadowing, overlooking and overbearance/ visual intrusion and the response of the PA, who sought to reduce the height of the proposed garden room (from 6.2m at FI stage to a maximum of 4.3m) by condition (No. 2) in order to address concerns in respect to the impact of the proposal on the residential and visual amenities of neighbouring properties.
- 9.1.2. The appellant contends that there is no basis for the PA's decision to reduce the height of their FI garden room (to max. 4.3m) by condition. They consider that it will not give rise to any overlooking or overshadowing of neighbouring properties or impact their internal daylighting on account of its siting and the removal of intervening trees.

Overlooking

- 9.1.3. I am satisfied that the revised single-storey garden room (FI proposal) would not give rise to overlooking of neighbouring properties on account of there being no windows on its north, south or west elevations and no skylights etc. on its roof.

Overshadowing

- 9.1.4. I note that the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment report submitted at FI stage illustrates that the proposal would not give rise to any material change in the sunlighting of the rear gardens of the properties to the immediate north and west and, would have a minimal, negligible impact on the internal daylighting of the properties to

the north. On this basis I am satisfied that the FI proposal is compliant with the BRE Guidelines (2022) and would not negatively impact the sunlighting or daylighting of neighbouring properties.

Overbearance

- 9.1.5. The grounds of appeal note that the height of the proposed garden room (FI proposal) is equivalent to that of the existing building to the immediate south and that it will have the same relationship with the western party boundary/ the properties to the west. For these reasons, the appellant argues that the proposal, in terms of its scale, height and general arrangement, is appropriate to the site and its context and that the conditioned reduction in ridge height is arbitrary and inconsistent with this pattern of development.
- 9.1.6. With regard to the appellant's arguments in respect to the garden room's harmonisation with the structure to the south and replication of its as-built arrangements with the houses to the west, I note that outhouse building to the south was permitted under a previous Development Plan and at a time when the adjoining housing estate to the west may not have been in situ. Notwithstanding, the subject proposal is required to be assessed against the requirements of the current Fingal Development Plan and, whilst visual/ architectural harmonisation with neighbouring structures is a consideration, given the site's 'RS' zoning, it is my view that the impact on neighbouring residential and visual amenity are also very important considerations.
- 9.1.7. Section 14.10.4 (Garden Rooms) requires that such structures are relatively modest in floor area and scale with a design that does not detract from the residential amenities of either the main residence or adjoining properties.
- 9.1.8. It is apparent to me that the PA, in their report of 11/06/2025 assessing the revisions at FI stage, note the proposed reduction in the scale and height of the building to 1-storey (c. 195sq.m with max. height of 6.3m) but consider that, whilst the proposed 900mm reduction in the height of the garden room is in-keeping with the height of the existing outhouse building to south of site, it is still akin to the height of a 2-storey structure which is not justified having regard to its single storey nature.
- 9.1.9. Having regard to the requirements of Section 14.10.4, I would agree with the PA's view that the height of the FI garden room is excessive and does not reflect its transition from a 2-storey to a single storey structure. Having reviewed the information on file, I am also not satisfied that the appellant has provided a justification for the

proposed height of their single storey garden room (which is to be used as domestic garage) and I note that the FI section drawings demonstrate that a significant element of the height of the structure is attributed to its hipped-type roof profile (c. 2.4m).

9.1.10. Therefore, in light of the scale and extent of the structure (c. 3.7m – 6.3m in height and c. 21.7m in length and extending almost the full length of the site's western boundary), its proximity/ siting within c.1.17m of the shared western boundary and c. 3.7m of the shared northern boundary (where many intervening, mature trees are proposed for removal) and, the concerns raised by the PA and Observer in respect to overbearance and visual intrusion/ diminution in visual amenity, I consider the attachment of a condition to reduce the overall height (and by implication, scale) of the single storey structure to max. 4.3m to be reasonable having regard to the nature and function of what is proposed. Furthermore, having regard to the c. 3.7m eaves height of the structure, I consider that this allowance will give the appellant enough scope to redesign and provide for a lower roof profile.

9.2. Other

9.2.1. The appellant raises procedural issues with the PA's assessment of their proposal (as detailed in Ground No. 3 under Section 8.1 of this report) and considers that their proposal should be assessed against the Development Plan's domestic/ residential extension policy (set out under Section 3.5.13.1, Policy SPQHP41 and Objective SPQHO45). Having reviewed the description of development applied for (as per the statutory notices), together with the nature and siting of the proposal, which is not physically connected to the main dwelling and therefore does not constitute an extension of same, I am satisfied that the PA were correct to assess the proposal against their garden room policy.

10.0 AA Screening

10.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on European Sites, specifically the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024), South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210), South Dublin Bay and River

Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024), North Bull Island SPA (Site Code 004006), North Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000206) and North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236), in view of these sites' Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of an NIS) is not therefore required.

10.2. This determination is based on:

- The relatively minor nature of the development.
- The location-distance from the nearest European Site and lack of connections.
- Taking into account the appropriate assessment screening undertaken by the PA.

10.3. I conclude that, on the basis of objective information, the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

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

11.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the nature of the condition the subject of the appeal, the Commission is satisfied that the determination by the Commission of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and, based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to ATTACH condition number 2 as follows:

2. The applicant shall reduce the roof height of the structure to a maximum parapet/ridge height of c. 4.3m.

Reason: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed condition fulfils the aim of safeguarding existing visual and residential amenities in line with the appeal site's 'RS – Residential' zoning whilst also ensuring compliance with Section 14.10.4 (Garden Rooms) of the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029.

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.

Emma Gosnell
Planning Inspector
29th September 2025

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-322961-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a detached 2- storey building (c. 356sq.m with max. height of 7.2m) to the rear of the existing dwelling and related works.
Development Address	Loachfail, Outfarm Lane, Carpenterstown, Dublin 15, D15 AX9W
	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.	
☒ 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	
☒ 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)	Part 2, Class 10(b)(iv) - Urban development – 10 hectares (built-up area). Site is 0.215ha ha.

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: _____

Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination

Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive)

I have considered the proposal for the construction of a garden room and all associated ancillary site works at Loachfail, Outfarm Lane, Carpenterstown, Dublin 15 in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located:

- Approx. 10km from South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024)
- Approx. 12km from South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210)
- Approx. 12km from South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024)
- Approx. 13km from North Bull Island SPA (Site Code 004006)
- Approx. 13km from North Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000206)
- Approx. 15km from North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236)

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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:

- Small scale nature of works/ development
- Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections
- Taking into account screening report/ determination by PA

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.

Appendix 3

Screening the need for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination

The appeal site is located at Loachfail, Outfarm Lane, Carpenterstown, Dublin 15.

A tributary of the River Liffey is located c. 360m to the east of the appeal site.

The proposal is for the construction of a garden room and all associated ancillary site – see Section 2.0 of Inspector's Report for further details.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the proposal for permission (described above) on this site at Carpenterstown, Co. Dublin 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 and 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:

- The de-minimus small scale nature and scale of the proposal.
- The location-distance from nearest water bodies and/ or lack of hydrological connections.

Conclusion

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.