

An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-322990-25

Development

Proposed changes to previously approved Reg. Ref.3800/20, relating to condition 1 and 3, consisting of (i) Alterations to the single storey porch element to dwellings B and C from cantilevered roof structures to supported roof structures (ii) The location of the two rear dwellings (B and C) in relation to the north western site boundary (iii) The parapet height of the side bay windows of dwellings B and C (iv) The retention of clear glass to the south west facing window to dwelling A and all associated ancillary site and landscaping works.

Location

806 Howth Road, Dublin 5, D05 A060

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB1907/25

Applicant(s)

Michael McCawley

Type of Application

Retention Permission

Planning Authority Decision	Grant Retention Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Gearoid Conroy & Others
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	4 th September 2025
Inspector	A Smyth

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description.....	4
2.0	Proposed Development.....	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	5
4.0	Planning History	7
5.0	Policy Context	8
6.0	EIA Screening	10
7.0	The Appeal.....	10
8.0	Assessment.....	11
9.0	AA Screening	16
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	17
11.0	Recommendation	18
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	18
13.0	Conditions	19
 Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening		20

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1 The appeal site on Howth Road, Dublin 5 is a seafront location overlooking North Bull Island and Dublin Bay to its south. Now demolished, the site was formerly a detached dwelling set on level ground with a garden extending northwest at the rear. Construction work is underway for the provision of a detached dwelling (dwelling A) fronting Howth Road, behind which, in the northwest half of the site, is provision of a pair of semi-detached dwellings (dwellings B and C). Boundaries to the southwest, northwest and northeast are defined by concrete block walls, approximately 2 metres in height, some of which have been finished in smooth render. The walls to the northwest and northeast boundaries are interspersed by structural brick piers at every 3 metres approximately. These piers extend approximately 100 mm off the boundary walls into the site. The walls and piers are finished with precast concrete capping.
- 1.2. Howth Road is defined by a mix of detached/semi-detached single and two storey dwellings with associated rear gardens, extending southwest and northeast of the appeal site. Architectural styles vary, the majority of dwellings have traditional pitched roofs, interspersed with a small number of contemporary flat roofed examples. Two modern 5 storey apartment blocks are located approximately 200 metres to the southwest.
- 1.3. Beyond the northwest and northeast boundaries of the appeal site is Island View, a cul de sac of detached and terraced properties, and a block of apartments. These properties are 2 stories in height with traditional pitched roofs. A 2-storey semi-detached dwelling, No. 804 Howth Road and its associated rear garden lie beyond the southwest site boundary wall, currently under construction. No. 808 Howth Road, a 2 storey detached dwelling sits adjacent and northeast of dwelling A.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 Retention permission is sought for changes to a previously granted permission (Reg. Ref.3800/20 and Commission Ref. 310278-21) and include the following:
- i) Single storey porch element to dwellings B and C to be altered from previously approved cantilevered roof structures to supported roof structures.

- ii) Amended location of dwellings B and C from that previously approved in relation to the northwestern site boundary.
- iii) Increased parapet height to the side bay windows of dwellings B and C.
- iv) Retention of clear glass to the southwest facing window of dwelling A.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision

On the 17th June 2025 the decision of the planning authority was to grant retention permission for proposed development subject to two conditions,

- 1. Insofar as the Planning & Development Act 2000 (as amended) and the Regulations made thereunder are concerned the development shall be retained in accordance with the plans, particulars and specifications lodged with the application, save as may be required by the conditions attached hereto. For the avoidance of doubt, this permission shall not be construed as approving any development shown on the plans, particulars and specifications, the nature and extent of which has not been adequately stated in the statutory public notices.

Reason: To comply with permission regulations.

- 2. (a) The terms and conditions of the permission for the original development, which was issued under Reg. Ref. 3800/20 (310278-21 (An Bord Pleanála ref) and WEB2134/23 shall be fully complied with, except where modified by this permission. b) This permission shall cease to have effect on the date of which the Parent Permission Reg. Ref. 3800/20 (310278-21 (An Bord Pleanála ref) expires.

Reason: In the interest of clarity and to ensure the overall development is carried out in accordance with the previous permission.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. The planning authority's report contains the following considerations in relation to the development.

i) The single storey porch element to dwellings B and C to be altered from previously approved cantilevered roof structures to supported roof structures.

- Considered acceptable as it is not a significant departure from what was previously approved under application 3800/20. There is no increase in proposed width of the porches to those originally approved.
- The porches do not oversail either side boundary.
- The porch to dwelling B is supported by a block wall. The porch to dwelling C is supported by 5 no. columns positioned against the northeastern side boundary wall. These columns are load bearing, the boundary wall is not used for this purpose.
- Any potential impact to the structural integrity of shared boundary walls is a non-planning matter that would be dealt with under separate codes including relevant Building Regulations and Civil Law.

ii) Amended location of the two rear dwellings, dwellings B and C, from that previously approved in relation to the northwestern site boundary.

- Dwellings B and C are c.2m closer to the rear boundary than what was approved under application 3800/20. This is considered acceptable.
- Dwelling B now has a rear garden area of c.54sq.m and dwelling C a rear garden area of c.45sq.m. Both dwellings achieve the minimum standard of 40 sqm private open space for properties of this type, as per Section 5.3.2 Private Open Space for Houses of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).
- Separation distances and any potential for loss of privacy is typically considered where there is an impact on the rear of neighbouring properties. It should be noted that the rear of proposed dwellings B and C face the front elevation of the opposing property, No. 12 Island View and as such there are no concerns regarding overlooking.

iii) The parapet height of the side bay windows of dwellings B and C.

- The modifications made to the bay windows, and general fenestration of dwellings B and C are considered acceptable. The changes are relatively immaterial when compared to those previously approved and are considered unlikely to give rise to a perception of undue overlooking of adjoining properties.

iv) Retention of clear glass to the southwest facing window to dwelling A

- This was conditioned to have opaque glazing as previously approved under applications 3800/20 and 310278-21.
- The change to clear glazing is considered acceptable as this window serves the landing area and staircase, not a habitable room and there are no concerns regarding overlooking and potential loss of privacy of any adjoining residential properties.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Dublin City Council Drainage Division: Report dated 26th May 2025, no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Referred to Irish Water on the 20th May 2025. No response received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Observations were submitted to the planning application from the third-party appellant, Gearoid Conroy, Island View, Kilbarrick Road, Dublin 5 and Sinead Conroy, Director, Raya Investments Limited of 2 Bath Place, Blackrock, Co Dublin. Those observations form the basis of this third-party appeal, as listed in Paragraph 7.1 below.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. Planning Authority Ref. 3800/20: 806 Howth Road, Dublin. Demolition of existing two storey dwelling, attached garage and sheds to the rear; Construction of 1 no. detached three storey 4-bedroom dwelling (House Type A); construction of 2 no.

semi-detached two storey 3-bedroom dwellings (House Types B&C) to the rear of site; Relocation and remodelling of the existing vehicular entrance off Howth Road; and other works as part of the development. **7th June 2022, Grant permission** on third party appeal, ABP Ref. 310278-21. Of the conditions stipulated by the Commission the following three are particularly relevant to this appeal.

Condition 3. All first-floor window opens on the north-east and south-west facing elevations to all houses shall be permanently fitted with obscure glazing.

Condition 4. The flat roofs of the dwellings shall be accessed for fire escape and maintenance purposes only, save for the second-floor terrace to House A.

Condition 8. No part of the development, including fascia board, gutters, drainpipes or other rainwater goods shall overhang or encroach onto the neighbouring property.

- 4.1.2 Planning Authority Ref. WEB2134/23: 806 Howth Road, Dublin. Proposed changes to dwelling A of previously approved Reg Ref: 3800/20, consisting of proposed changes to external glazing to rear on ground floor and change of room use from bedroom to gym. Proposed addition of a balcony on first floor to the front of the dwelling and associated facade amendments. Proposed increase in size of master bedroom and alteration of glazing and balcony at second floor level. **5th April 2024, Grant permission.**

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

Within the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2022-2028 the following strategies and policies are applicable.

Chapter 15 – Development Standards

15.2.4 Interest in Property – An applicant who is not the legal owner of the land or structure in question must submit a letter of consent from the owner in order to make the planning application.

15.11.3 Private Open Space – A minimum standard of 10 sqm of private open space per bedspace will normally be applied. A single bedroom represents one

bedspace and a double bedroom represents two bedspaces. Generally, up to 60-70 sqm of rear garden area is considered sufficient for houses in the city.

15.11.4 Separation Distances (Houses) – refers to adequate separation distance at the rear of dwellings. Careful positioning and detailed design of opposing windows can prevent overlooking with shorter back-to-back distances and windows serving halls and landings which do not require the same degree of privacy as habitable rooms.

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines (where relevant)

National Planning Framework First Revision

National Policy Objective 22 - In urban areas, planning and related standards will be based on performance criteria that seek to achieve well-designed high-quality outcomes in order to achieve targeted growth.

Performance-Based Design Standards are defined on Page 60 of the NPF as a goal-oriented design approach which involves developing standards to achieve a particular outcome rather than applying rigid quantitative standards in all cases (for example, mandatory separation distances).

Detailed guidance and standards in support of NPO22 are set out in the following document.

Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage – Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024

SPPR 1 - Separation Distances

When considering a planning application for residential development it is a specific planning policy requirement that a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, above ground floor level shall be maintained.

There shall be no specified minimum separation distance at ground level or to the front of houses in statutory development plans and planning applications shall be determined on a case-by-case basis to prevent undue loss of privacy.

SPPR 2 - Minimum Private Open Space Standards for Houses

It is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that proposals for new houses meet the following minimum private open space standards:

1 bed house 20 sq.m

2 bed house 30 sq.m

3 bed house 40 sq.m

4 bed house 50 sq.m

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

Special Area of Conservation (SAC): North Dublin Bay; Special Protection Area (SPA): North Bull Island and Proposed Natural Heritage Areas (pNHA): North Dublin Bay lie approximately 30 metres southeast of the appeal site.

6.0 EIA Screening

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).

7.0 The Appeal

7.1 Grounds of Appeal

On the 9th July 2025, a third-party appeal was received from Mr Gearoid Conroy. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The appeal specifically relates to dwellings B and C.
- Dwellings B and C encroach onto the boundary wall with Island View Court with a general lack of separation distance from their side boundaries, particularly to the northeast section of the appeal site.
- Dwellings B and C are closer to the boundary with No. 12 Island View than what was agreed under the granted permission, Reg Ref. 3800/20.
- Overlooking from dwellings B and C, being closer to No. 12 Island View than approved under the granted permission, Reg Ref. 3800/20.

- Overlooking from dwelling C into first floor apartments in Island View Court to the northeast.

7.2. Applicant Response

None received.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

None received.

7.4. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

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

- Encroachment on Third Party Property.
- Impact on Neighbouring Residential Amenity.
- Other Matters

Third party property

8.2. Dwellings B and C have a 'single storey porch element' to their side elevations, being open ended with a roof above that extends out from the main structure at first floor level. These were originally approved with cantilevered roofs however, this proposal now seeks the roofs to be supported by a block wall to the side of dwelling B and by 5 metal columns to the side of dwelling C. The third-party applicant contends the metal support columns to dwelling C have been cut into the boundary wall and that the roof element oversails that wall.

8.2.1 During my site inspection I observed both the supporting wall (dwelling B) and the supporting columns (dwelling C). Visually, both appear to be inside the development site. Specifically, in relation to the supporting columns, these are not

cut into but sit adjacent to the northeast boundary wall. I note that one of the wall caps, in so far as it itself overhangs the boundary wall into the appeal site, has been cut to allow a column to be placed adjacent to the wall. Regarding the first-floor roof structure above, I do not consider it over sails the boundary wall, sitting flush and inside the wall capping. I did observe the roof does overhang the capping stone atop each of the block pillars, which themselves extend approximately 100mm from the wall into the development site.

8.2.2 Having examined the drawings submitted with the application, I note the width of the roof element to each porch on dwellings B and C correspond to the width shown on the previously approved drawings and I agree with the planning authority's contention that there is no change in the width of the roof. Other than one wall cap having been cut and the porch roof overhanging only part way to the extended brick piers, I did not see any evidence that the boundary wall has been used to attach and support the porch element of dwelling C as contended by the third party.

8.2.3 In addition to my observations, I note the first party states on their application form that they are the owner of all lands within the defined red line of the site and that no other legal owner of the land or structure has been identified through submission of any letter of consent, as would be the requirement under Section 15.2.4 – Interest in Property, of the DC Development Plan 2022-2028.

8.2.4 This appeal submission did include a copy of a solicitor's letter sent to the first party on the 23rd April 2024 regarding the third party's position as to their ownership of the wall.

8.2.5 There is a disparity between the parties in terms of the extent of legal interest however, this is considered a Civil matter and is outside the scope of this planning appeal. In any case, this is a matter to be resolved between the parties, having regard to the provisions of s.34(13) of the 2000 Planning and Development Act (as amended).

Impact on Neighbouring Residential Amenity

- 8.3. Dwellings B and C, circa 2 metres closer to the northwestern site boundary than previously approved, raises concern for the third party with regard to overlooking into bedrooms of their property.
- 8.3.1 The DC Development Plan 2022-2028, Chapter 15 – Development Standards, Section 15.11.4 Separation Distances (Houses), refers only to separation distances in situations where there is back-to-back housing, not where one dwelling backs onto the front of another as is the case in this appeal.
- 8.3.2 However, the NPF, which the DC Development Plan is required to be consistent, requires use of Performance-Based Design Standards as *‘a goal orientated design approach which involve developing standards to achieve a particular outcome rather than applying rigid quantitative standards in all cases (for example mandatory separation distances)’*. The NPF requires planning authorities to consider detailed guidance and standards contained in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines 2024.
- 8.3.3 Section 5.3.1 of the 2024 Guidelines for Planning Authorities contains a specific planning policy requirement, SPPR 1, that requires a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses only. Further the Guidelines indicate that there shall be no specified minimum separation distance at ground level or to the front of houses.
- 8.3.4 The previously approved separation distance between windows of dwellings B and C and the front of the applicant’s dwelling is indicated on the submitted plans to have been approximately 27.9 metres. The plans indicate the repositioning of dwellings B and C reduces that separation distance to approximately 26.2 metres. As dwellings B and C have been constructed, I consider the revised separation distance to accurately reflect the situation on the ground.
- 8.3.5 I am of the opinion that the revised separation distance does not vary significantly from what was deemed acceptable under the previous approval, and in any case is well in excess of the 2024 Guidelines minimum required 16 metre separation distance to be applied for back-to-back housing. The planning authority has no concerns regarding overlooking, which I concur with. I therefore do not consider,

as suggested by the third party, the need to impose retrospectively the provision of opaque glazing or other form of screen to the first-floor windows at the rear of dwellings B and C.

8.3.6 The third party has concerns regarding raising the height of the first-floor side bay windows, tenuously linking this to overlooking into the habitable rooms of Island View Apartments. The increased height to the first-floor bays is equal to, and no higher than, the approved height of the roof of dwellings B and C, which I consider acceptable. Regarding the issue of overlooking, I observed 3 windows at first floor level on the east elevation of dwelling C. These windows, in bedroom 2, the bathroom and on the landing at the top of the stairs, are all fitted with obscure glazing and cannot be seen through. Narrow pop out windows on the north west and south east sides of the bays have been fitted with clear glazing, as allowed for in the granted permission 3800/20 and, now that dwellings B and C have been constructed, I observed these are positioned such that there is no undue overlooking to either the adjacent apartments and their grounds, or other properties in the vicinity of the appeal site.

8.3.7 On the matter of the garden sizes to dwellings B and C, due to their repositioning within the appeal site, the site layout plans indicate open space provision to be approximately 44 sqm (dwelling B) and 52 sqm (dwelling C). Section 15.11.3 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 requires open space to be provided at a rate of 10 sqm for each bedspace within a dwelling, double bedrooms account for two bedspaces. On plan, dwellings B and C contain 3 double bedrooms, therefore requiring a minimum of 60 sqm of open space per dwelling. As the proposed garden sizes fall below 60 sqm it could be considered the proposed development is contrary to the development plan however, regard must also be had to published Ministerial Guidance.

8.3.8 Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, published in 2024 is such ministerial guidance. Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) requires the Planning Authority and the Commission to have regard to that guidance, and to apply any specific planning policy requirements (SPPRs) within it in the performance of their functions. SPPR 2 - Minimum Private Open Space Standards for Houses, requires

proposals for new houses to meet minimum private open space standards which, in the case of these 3-bedroom dwellings is 40 sqm per dwelling. Application of SPPR 2 supersedes the requirements set out in Section 15.11.3 of the development plan and I note and concur, that the planning authority made its determination on that basis. The proposed garden sizes to dwellings B and C are considered appropriate.

8.3.9 Although not raised by the third party, I am required to consider the retention of clear glazing to the southwest side elevation of dwelling A. Condition 3 of the granted permission 3800/20 required this window to be fitted with obscured glazing in the interest of residential amenity.

8.3.10 Observed during my site visit, this window extends at first floor from floor to ceiling with a pitched clear glazed roof above. It serves to provide light to a first-floor bridge landing which is away from the window by a 2-metre-wide void, allowing natural light to penetrate to the ground floor entrance hall. From the landing window views to the southwest across the rear of neighbouring properties occur, specifically the adjacent No. 804 Howth Road, approximately 10 metres away. A separation distance of less than 16 metres may be considered acceptable within SPPR1 of the guidelines for Planning Authorities where there are no opposing windows serving habitable rooms and where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme to prevent undue overlooking of habitable rooms and private amenity spaces.

8.3.11 The subject window serves circulation space in dwelling A, not habitable rooms, as defined in Appendix A, Glossary of Terms of the guidelines and, its position relative to No. 804, does not allow views into opposing windows of the property. The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 at Section 15.11.4 Separation Distances (Houses) advises that windows serving halls and landings do not require the same degree of privacy as habitable rooms. Whilst there are views from the window over the rear garden of No. 804 the most private amenity area immediately adjacent to the back of that dwelling does benefit from screening provided by its own outbuildings. I note no observations have been made on this matter to either the planning application or this appeal.

8.3.12 I therefore consider clear glazing in this instance is acceptable to the requirements of both the guidelines for planning authorities and the planning authority's development plan and that undue overlooking would not occur.

Other Matters

8.4. Concern was raised that further alterations to the rear of dwellings B and C could occur, such as a balcony overlooking the third party's property. In this regard I note that the original granted permission includes a condition (No. 4) restricting access to the flat roofs of the dwellings for fire escape and maintenance purposes only, save for the second-floor terrace to House A. Any use in contravention of this condition would be a matter for the planning authority.

8.4.1 Procedural matters on the timing of the placement of Site Notice 2 relating to this proposed development were raised. In terms of procedural matters and the alleged irregularities in terms of the nature and timing of the erection of the site notice, I note that both matters 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.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. I have considered the alterations proposed to the three dwellings previously granted permission in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

9.2. The subject site is located approximately 30 metres northwest of the North Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and North Bull Island Special Protection Area (SPA).

9.3. The proposed development comprises the repositioning of 2 dwellings (dwellings B and C) with minor external structural alterations and the provision of a clear glazing unit to the side elevation of 1 dwelling (dwelling A).

9.4. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

- 9.5. 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 European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small-scale nature of the proposed works.
 - The previous consideration and subsequent approval for this scheme in relation to the nearest European site and lack of connections.
 - The Appropriate Assessment contained within the authority's planning report.
- 9.6. I conclude that 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.
- 9.7. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The subject site is located on Howth Road, Dublin5, approximately 30 metres northwest of North Dublin Bay shoreline.
- 10.2. The proposed development comprises of amendments to a previously granted scheme for 3 dwellings to include the repositioning of 2 dwellings (dwellings B and C) with minor external structural alterations and the provision of a clear glazing unit to the side elevation of 1 dwelling (dwelling A).
- 10.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.4. I have assessed the development 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. 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.

10.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows [insert as relevant]:

- The nature of works being small in scale.
- The lack of hydrological connections. The scheme as approved is in a serviced urban area and requires connection to existing wastewater networks.

Conclusion

10.6. 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

- 11.1. I consider that the third-party grounds of appeal are not sustained and the Planning Authority's reasons for granting this retention application are upheld.
- 11.2. I therefore recommend that permission be granted for the development having regard to the reasons, considerations and conditions set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. Having regard to the pattern of existing development in the area, the site's location and the scale of development relative to its surrounding residential area, it is considered to be a form of development that would not, subject to compliance with conditions set out below, contravene the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2022-2028 or the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage – Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024, and would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions


1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application and received by the planning authority on the 24th day of April 2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Apart from any departures specifically authorised by this permission, the development shall comply with the conditions of the parent permission [Register Reference 3800/20, 310278-21 (An Bord Pleanála ref) and WEB2134/23] unless the conditions set out hereunder specify otherwise. This permission shall expire on the same date as the parent permission.

Reason: In the interest of clarity and to ensure that the overall development is carried out in accordance with the previous permissions.

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.



Adam Smyth
Planning Inspector

15th September 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACB-322990-25
Proposed Development Summary	Proposed changes to previously approved Reg. Ref.3800/20 to include alterations to the single storey porch element to dwellings B and C from cantilevered roof structures to supported roof structures; location of the two rear dwellings (B and C) in relation to the north western site boundary; parapet height of the side bay windows of dwellings B and C; and, retention of clear glass to the south west facing window to dwelling A.
Development Address	806 Howth Road, Dublin 5, D05 A060
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 <u>Part 1</u>, 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.	State the Class here
<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 <u>Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)</u> 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 development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> 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
<input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

ASingh

Date: _____

15/9/25