



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323040-25

Development	Construction of two dwellings, demolition of shed and associated site works
Location	Lands to Rear of 11 Corduff Cottages, Old Corduff Road, Blanchardstown, Dublin 15
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	FW25A/0178E
Applicant(s)	Thomas Leonard.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First
Appellant(s)	Thomas Leonard
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	13 th of October 2025.
Inspector	Darragh Ryan

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located to the rear of a terrace of single storey houses of early 20th century date on Old Corduff Road, Blanchardstown. Corduff Cottages are located within an established suburban area north-east of the M3 and north-west of the Snugborough Road. The site is located to the rear of Corduff cottages between Old Corduff Road to the east and Edgewood Lawns to the west
- 1.2. The appeal site is located to the rear of Corduff Cottages and is directly behind No. 11 and 12 Corduff Cottages. To the rear of the cottages there is a service road which appears to provide rear access to private green space for the residents of Corduff Cottages. These plots of land, presumably originally intended for garden and/or allotment use have now been utilised to build garages or as garden areas but the majority of the plots are lying fallow. To the south of the appeal site is an amenity green corridor with footpath.
- 1.3. Along the entire access lane running behind the two terraces that comprise Corduff Cottages, none of the plots had been developed for residential purposes. Approximately half the cottages had been extended to the rear and the building line was hard on the laneway itself.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is for the construction of 2 no single storey three-bedroom detached dwellings including off street parking, demolition of existing structures, new boundary treatments, associated landscaping and all other ancillary site development works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. The planning authority issued a Decision to refuse permission for the two reasons:

1. The subject site is zoned RS Residential with the objective to “provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity” within the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029. The proposed development by virtue of its backland location, the loss of private rear amenity spaces serving nos 11 & 12 Corduff Cottages, and the addition of a pedestrian footpath would be seriously injurious to the character of the area and the amenities of existing properties and would depreciate the value of same. As such, the proposed development would contravene Objectives SPQH 042 & DMS 031 and would materially contravene the “RS” Residential zoning objective of the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 and set inappropriate precedent for other similar forms of development. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The access lane fails to provide sufficient visibility to safely accommodate vehicular and pedestrian movements associated with the proposed development, and the existing and future pedestrian movements associated with the access lane. Furthermore, the access lane is seriously deficient, and the proposal does not include any surface upgrade works and would therefore endanger public safety. In this regard, the applicant has not provided sufficient details of ownership of the access lane which would allow an appropriate surface upgrade proposal and control over the access lane to ensure that satisfactory access and traffic arrangements for pedestrians and vehicular traffic there would be conflict between pedestrians and road users at this location. The proposed development would therefore contravene the “RS” Residential zoning objective of the Fingal Development Plan 2023 to 2029 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. There is a single Planning Report on file. The planning report addressed the following:

- Principle of Development considered acceptable.
- Planning History – the associated site has a recent planning history of refusing permission for similar developments. This part of Corduff has a unique and identifiable character in terms of plot layouts and the prevailing pattern of development. In this regard, there is no precedence for backland development to the rear of dwellings along this part of Old Corduff Road. Therefore the proposed development is at odds with the character of the area and is not appropriate.
- Regarding design, overlooking overdominance, overshadowing and overbearing impacts are not considered issues with respect to all aspects of the proposed development.
- The subject site currently serves as the private rear amenity space associated with nos 11 & 12 Corduff Cottages. The proposed development effectively results in the complete loss of their private rear amenity.
- The proposal includes for the addition of a new pedestrian footpath along the shared access from the Old Corduff Road to the rear of Corduff Cottages. The proposed pedestrian footpath is immediately adjacent to the south elevation of no 11 Corduff Cottage. The proposed footpath arrangement will adversely impact the amenities of no 11 Corduff Cottage by way of noise and nuisance and is not appropriate. It is not evident from the submission if the applicant has legal interest in providing the new pedestrian footpath as it is outside the scope of the redline boundary.
- Car parking provision in accordance with Development Plan Standards.
- The proposed development has been setback to provide the access lane road to be upgraded to minimum width that would allow two cars to pass with a buffer strip on either side. There are currently conflict points between pedestrian activity and vehicles accessing the proposed development although vehicles would be travelling slowly in the middle of the lane, visibility

of pedestrians existing near access doors immediately onto the lane would be considered a safety issue.

- Letters of consent have not been provided to allow improvements to the existing lane, surface and surface water. No proposal has been provided for any upgrade or modification works to the existing laneway.
- The access lane fails to provide sufficient visibility to safely accommodate vehicular and pedestrian movements associated with the proposed development
- The proposed development is inappropriate backland development and is at odds with the character of the area. The loss of the existing private rear amenity spaces and the addition of pedestrian footpath would adversely impact upon residential amenities. The access lane fails to provide sufficient visibility to safely accommodate vehicular and pedestrian movements associated with the proposed development.. The access lane is outside the red line boundary therefore, the applicant has not provided sufficient details of ownership that would allow appropriate control over the access lane to ensure satisfactory access and traffic arrangements can be implemented.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Water Services Department – no objection conditions recommended with respect to control and management of surface water through SUDS methodology.
- Parks and Green Infrastructure – no objection conditions recommended with respect to provision of boundary walls
- Transportation Planning Section recommended additional further information as follows:
 - Letters of consent should be provided to bring the lane up to taking in charge standards and provide the necessary upgrades proposed including road surface, SW and lighting and included in the red line boundary.
 - Where works are required on the property of a third party to meet the requirements for visibility/access the applicant shall

submit written evidence that it has the necessary legal consent/ rights of way etc. to undertake all such works.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Dublin Airport Authority no objection in principle however there is potential negative impact against the achievement of the Noise Abatement Objective (NAO). The NAO measures the number of people (HA) and Highly Sleep Disturbed (HSD) by aircraft noise.
 - By way of further information a Comprehensive Noise Assessment for the development is required that demonstrates how an appropriate level of indoor and outdoor residential amenity can be achieved.
 - By way of condition the applicant/agent should be required to adequately advise prospective purchasers and/or occupiers that the development is located within a Noise zone pertaining to Dublin Airport
 - Post planning compliance the applicant/agent should submit compliance reports verifying the implementation and effectiveness of noise mitigation measures.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- No third party observations were received

4.0 Planning History

4.1.1. Subject Site:

- FW24A/0237E – Refuse permission for the construction of 2 no single storey three bedroom dwellings including off street parking.

The reasons for refusal related to the loss of private amenity space serving the existing dwellings and access laneway is considered substandard to facilitate development.

There are two other refusals for very similar developments on the same landholding for similar refusal reasons.

4.1.2. Adjacent Site

- FW22A/0301/ ABP 315970-23– Refuse permission for the construction of a single storey 2 bed bungalow to the rear of 2 Corduff Cottages.
1. Having regard to the limited area and access arrangements associated with the site and its relationship to adjoining property, it is considered that the proposed development represents inappropriate backland development, would result in a substandard residential unit and would seriously injure the amenities of adjoining residential property. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
 2. It is considered that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the additional traffic turning movements the development would generate on a narrow access lane at a point where sightlines are restricted in both directions.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Development Plan Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 is the statutory plan for the area within which the appeal site is situated and it came into effect on Wednesday 5th April 2023. Set down below are the relevant Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 policies and objectives in relation to this appeal. The appeal site is located within Zoning Objective RS - Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity, where the vision is to ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity.

Policy CSP12 (and Policy SPQHP38) – NPF and RSES - Promote compact growth in line with the NPF and RSES through the inclusion of specific policies and targeted and measurable implementation measures that: - Encourage infill / brownfield development.

3.5.13 Compact Growth, Consolidation and Regeneration - The Council, in line with national and regional planning policies and objectives seeks to promote the regeneration of Fingal's towns and villages by making better use of under-used land and buildings within the existing built-up urban footprint and to drive the delivery of quality housing and increased housing options. This may be achieved in several ways and by projects of varying scale including small residential extensions, subdivision of large gardens to accommodate infill development and where appropriate, backland development opportunities.

Objective SPQHO37 – Residential Consolidation and Sustainable Intensification
Promote residential consolidation and sustainable intensification at appropriate locations, through the consolidation and rejuvenation of infill/brown-field development opportunities in line with the principles of compact growth and consolidation to meet the future housing needs of Fingal.

Objective SPQHO39 – New Infill Development New infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units. Infill development shall retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings.

Objective SPQHO42 – Development of Underutilised Infill, Corner and Backland Sites Encourage and promote the development of underutilised infill, corner and backland sites in existing residential areas subject to the character of the area and environment being protected.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

There are no natural heritage designations located in the vicinity of the site.

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The

proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. This is a first party appeal against the decision of Fingal County Council to refuse permission. The Grounds of Appeal can be summarised as follows:

- 7.1.1. There is no private amenity space associated with nos 11 and 12 Corduff Cottage lost as a result of the proposed development. The proposed greenfield site is in the ownership of the applicant and not the owners of 11 & 12 Corduff Cottage. There is 47m² of private rear amenity space to the rear of 12 Corduff Cottage and 12m² to the rear of number 11 Corduff Cottage – (This was previously the same as number 12, save for an extension to the rear of number 11.) The front garden spaces to both 11 & 12 Corduff Cottages have 70m² of private amenity space.
- 7.1.2. The site is zoned RS residential - Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity, where the vision is to ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity.
- 7.1.3. The proposal is in line with Section 14.10.1 of the Fingal Development Plan for infill sites. The single storey dwellings are not excessive in height at 4.72 sqm and of an appropriate design to assimilate into this urban landscape. The proposal should not be considered out of character of the area. The proposed units are to be located 18.4m to the rear of existing single storey dwellings along Old Corduff Road.
- 7.1.4. The 4.0m laneway that currently runs south to north from the rear of No 1 Corduff Cottages to No 20 Corduff Cottages and has three access points out onto Old Corduff Road at No 1 between Nos 10 & 11 and no 20 Corduff Cottages. It is a communal laneway that currently serves the rear sheds and gardens of the existing dwellings and cars to drive in both directions along its length.
- 7.1.5. The applicant has a legal right of way over this lane way and the associated access points. The access point between No 10 & 11 Corduff Cottages is 6.0m wide and the proximity of the proposed development to this access point would not, conflict traffic or pedestrian movement due to the setback distance of the proposed dwellings,

parking area and open access to the front of the proposed dwellings. There is significant visibility up and down the lane towards the access point between units 10 & 11.

- 7.1.6. The proposal includes for a 8.6m and 8.9m setback of the proposed dwellings from the front boundary to allow for future widening of the laneway in order to improve turning, pedestrian access and fire truck access. A new footpath measuring 2.5m in height and 1 meter in width is proposed. The footpath will enhance pedestrian connectivity and provide a clear delineation between vehicular and pedestrian zones. An auto track analysis has been provided.
- 7.1.7. The provision of the footpath is outside the redline boundary of the development, any footpath provision will be the responsibility of county Council unless specifically conditioned by the PA.
- 7.1.8. The provision of footpath and new access arrangements will be a significant improvement on existing arrangement on site. There will not be a significant increase of pedestrian movements as a result of the proposed development.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority issues a response on 5th of August 2025.

- The planning authority has no further comments to make and seek that the Coimisiun uphold the decision of the planning authority.
- Where the appeal is successful seek that a financial contribution be applied for any shortfall in open space provision
- Inclusion of cash security/bond for residential developments of 2 or more units
- A tree bond or a contribution in respect of shortfall of play facilities are required.

7.3. Observations

There are no third party observations on file.

One observation has been received from Dublin Airport Authority.

- Dublin Airport Authority no objection in principle however there is potential negative impact against the achievement of the Noise Abatement Objective (NAO). The NAO measures the number of people (HA) and Highly Sleep Disturbed (HSD) by aircraft noise.
 - By way of further information a Comprehensive Noise Assessment for the development is required that demonstrates how an appropriate level of indoor and outdoor residential amenity can be achieved.
 - By way of condition the applicant/agent should be required to adequately advise prospective purchasers and/or occupiers that the development is located within a Noise zone pertaining to Dublin Airport
 - Post planning compliance the applicant/agent should submit compliance reports verifying the implementation and effectiveness of noise mitigation measures.

8.0 **Assessment**

- 8.1. Having examined all the application and appeal documentation on file, and having regard to relevant local and national policy and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise.

The main issues, therefore, are as follows:

- Principle of development.
- Impact on residential amenity/ Private Residential Amenity
- Traffic hazard/ Laneway.
- Material Contravention
- AA Screening.

8.2. Principle of Development

- 8.2.1. The appeal site is located on lands zoned RS – “Residential” under the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029. The zoning objective seeks “to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity.” The overall vision for RS

lands is to ensure that new development within established residential areas has minimal impact on, and ideally enhances, existing residential amenity.

- 8.2.2. In this context, the planning authority accepted in principle that the provision of two residential dwellings at this location could be appropriate, subject to the proposal's consistency with the wider policies and objectives for RS-zoned lands as outlined in the Development Plan.
- 8.2.3. In accordance with Section 14.10.1 of the Development Plan, the proposed development qualifies as infill development. Objective DMS031 supports the delivery of suitable infill schemes, provided that the design respects the established character, height, and massing of surrounding residential properties.
- 8.2.4. The proposal comprises the construction of 2 no. single-storey, three-bedroom detached dwellings, each with a maximum ridge height of 4.7 metres and finished with hipped roof profiles. Both dwellings are identical in internal layout and external design. The houses are proposed to be located to the western side of the existing shared laneway, approximately 8.5 metres set back from it. This laneway lies to the rear of Corduff Cottages and has traditionally served as access for residents, currently functioning as a mix of vehicular access, domestic garages, and informal parking or amenity space.
- 8.2.5. Having regard to the RS zoning objective and the relevant policy framework, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with the Development Plan and is acceptable in principle. Furthermore, the proposal is consistent with national and regional planning policies which promote the efficient use of zoned lands and encourage infill and backland residential development within established urban areas.
- 8.2.6. Accordingly, I consider the proposed development to be acceptable in principle

8.3. Loss of Residential Amenity/ and loss of Private Residential Amenity

- 8.3.1. The planning authority's principal reason for refusal relates to the perceived loss of private rear amenity space serving Nos. 11 and 12 Corduff Cottages. It was considered that the proposed dwellings, accessed via the existing rear laneway, together with the introduction of a pedestrian footpath, would detract from the established residential character and injure the amenities of adjoining properties. The planning authority further stated that the development would contravene

Objectives SPQH042 and DMS031, thereby materially contravening the RS – Residential zoning objective of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029.

- 8.3.2. In the appeal submission, the applicant clarifies that the subject lands are within their ownership and control and form part of a separate folio from the adjoining dwellings at Nos. 11 and 12 Corduff Cottages. It is further stated that these adjoining cottages each retain their own defined private rear gardens within their property boundaries. Accordingly, it is argued that no loss of private amenity space would arise from the proposed development.
- 8.3.3. Each of the two proposed single-storey dwellings is to be provided with a private open space area of 80 sq.m, which exceeds the minimum standards set out under SPPR 2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).
- 8.3.4. Having reviewed the submitted documentation, I am satisfied that the subject lands were previously separated from Nos. 11 and 12 Corduff Cottages and that there is no existing entitlement or right of use of these lands by adjoining property owners. Consequently, the proposed development would not result in a direct loss of private residential amenity to the occupants of Nos. 11 or 12 Corduff Cottages. Notwithstanding the above, I note that the rear laneway currently functions as an access route for the residents of Corduff Cottages, providing entry to garages and informal areas used for private car parking and domestic storage. During my site inspection, several vehicles were observed parked either within the laneway or immediately adjoining it.
- 8.3.5. The proposed development would occupy the private green spaces to the rear of Corduff Cottages. The granting of permission in this instance could set a precedent for similar infill-type proposals on adjacent plots. Such incremental or piecemeal development would likely result in the progressive loss of informal parking and storage spaces currently serving existing residents.
- 8.3.6. In my view, while the principle of infill residential development on RS-zoned lands is supported in policy terms, any redevelopment in this area should be informed by a coordinated or masterplan approach. Such an approach would ensure that existing parking arrangements, storage needs, and potential upgrades or widening of the

laneway to safely accommodate both vehicular and pedestrian movements are properly addressed.

- 8.3.7. Having regard to the foregoing, I consider that while the proposal may be acceptable in principle, it represents a piecemeal and uncoordinated approach to backland development within this established residential area. Granting permission in this instance would set a precedent for further similar developments that fail to adequately consider the existing pattern of car parking, storage, and access arrangements serving Corduff Cottages.
- 8.3.8. Objectives SPQH042 and DMS031 of the Fingal Development Plan seek to promote infill development only where it respects the established character of the area. In my opinion, the potential erosion of existing rear access, parking, and storage functions would, over time, significantly alter the character of the Corduff Cottages enclave and displace on-street parking onto Corduff Road, to the detriment of residential amenity and public safety.
- 8.3.9. Accordingly, I concur with the planning authority that a grant of permission in this instance would be contrary to the provisions of Objectives SPQH042 and DMS031, would fail to protect the established residential character of the area, and should therefore be refused permission.

8.4. Traffic Hazard/ Laneway

- 8.4.1. The second reason for refusal issued by the planning authority relates to deficiencies in the existing access laneway. It was considered that the laneway fails to provide sufficient visibility to safely accommodate vehicular and pedestrian movements associated with both the proposed development and existing users. Furthermore, the lane is of poor quality, and the proposal does not include any surface upgrade works.
- 8.4.2. The planning authority concluded that the proposal would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, given the inadequate condition of the laneway, the absence of any upgrade works, and the applicant's failure to demonstrate ownership or control over the laneway to facilitate necessary improvements. It was therefore determined that the proposed development would contravene the "RS" Residential zoning objective of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029.

- 8.4.3. The submitted site layout plan indicates the proposed dwellings set back from the existing laneway, with the front boundary removed to improve sightlines. This design would also facilitate localised widening of the laneway at the development frontage, thereby improving access and egress movements. An Autotrack analysis was provided to demonstrate that adequate turning movements could be achieved for emergency and service vehicles. The applicant also stated that works to upgrade the laneway and provide a pedestrian footpath are located outside the red line boundary of the application site and therefore cannot be implemented by the applicant unless specifically required by condition.
- 8.4.4. I note that the Transportation Section of Fingal County Council raised no objection to the proposal in principle, subject to the applicant submitting letters of consent from the relevant landowners to enable the upgrading of the laneway to a standard suitable for taking in charge.
- 8.4.5. The laneway currently serves as an access route to the rear of Corduff Cottages and connects to Corduff Road at three separate locations adjacent to no 1, between Nos. 10 & 11, and adjacent to No. 20 Corduff Cottage. Based on my inspection, I consider that adequate sightlines exist at the junctions with Corduff Road. Within the laneway itself, the sightlines can be improved through the removal or reduction of front boundaries, and the proposed setback at the development frontage would assist in achieving this. I therefore do not consider the issue of visibility within the laneway to be, in itself, a substantive reason for refusal.
- 8.4.6. However, the laneway remains narrow, measuring approximately 2.7 metres in width, and is currently of poor surface condition. The applicant's proposed localised widening at the frontage of the two dwellings would not resolve the broader deficiencies of the laneway nor address access and movement issues along its full extent. Moreover, no details have been provided regarding surface upgrade works or drainage improvements to ensure the laneway is suitable for additional residential traffic. The lack of comprehensive proposals for these necessary works, together with the absence of clear ownership or control over the laneway, limits the applicant's ability to ensure its long-term functionality and safety.
- 8.4.7. While I am satisfied that visibility and access at the junctions with Corduff Road are acceptable, the proposal represents a piecemeal approach to development along this

laneway. The limited widening proposed at the application site would not address the overall substandard condition or restricted width of the laneway, nor would it provide for consistent or safe access in the context of potential future infill development in this area. Accordingly, I consider that the proposal fails to adopt a coordinated or masterplan approach to development of backland sites along Corduff Cottages. In this regard, it would be contrary to Objectives SPQH042 and DMS031 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029, which seek to ensure that infill development occurs in a manner that respects the existing character of the area and provides for safe and sustainable access arrangements.

For these reasons, I consider the proposed development to be piecemeal in nature, lacking a holistic approach to access design and laneway improvement, and therefore recommend that planning permission be refused.

8.5. Material Contravention

- 8.5.1. I note that the Planning Authority's reason for refusal states that the proposed development would be contrary to Objectives SPQH042 and DMS031 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029 in relation to infill development and, therefore, that the proposal would materially contravene the RS – Residential zoning objective of the same Plan. Objectives SPQH042 and DMS031 seek to promote infill development only where it respects and complements the established character of the area. The Planning Authority considered that the proposed development would negatively impact this established character and would therefore materially contravene the RS zoning objective — the vision of which is to ensure that new development within established residential areas has minimal impact on, and ideally enhances, existing residential amenity.
- 8.5.2. Having regard to the above, I consider that the development of these lands is, in fact, consistent with the underlying zoning objective for the area. It is also consistent with wider national policy, notably National Policy Objective 3b of the National Planning Framework, which seeks to facilitate at least 50% of all new residential development within the built-up areas of existing cities and towns. This objective specifically promotes development on brownfield and infill sites, with a target that 40% of new housing be delivered on such lands. In my view, the subject site clearly presents an opportunity to contribute towards this strategic goal.

- 8.5.3. While I acknowledge that the current proposal may be somewhat piecemeal and would benefit from a more comprehensive, masterplan-led approach to ensure the protection and integration of existing residential amenity and character, I do not consider the proposed development to represent a material contravention of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029.

I am satisfied that the proposal is acceptable in principle and generally compatible with the RS Residential zoning objective. In my opinion, the development as proposed is not, in the normal understanding of planning practice, of sufficient specificity or significance to justify the use of the term “materially contravene.” Accordingly, the Commission should not consider itself constrained by the provisions of Section 37(2) of the Planning and Development Act in this instance.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. AA Screening

- 9.1.1. I have considered the subject development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). The subject development is not located or adjacent to any European sites.

- 9.1.2. The subject development comprises the development of 4 no. houses on an infill plot. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment as there is no conceivable risk to any European site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The scale and nature of the development;
- The distance to the nearest European site and the lack of direct connections; and,
- Taking into account the screening determination of the Planning Authority.

- 9.2. 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 a retrospective Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) is not required.

9.3. **Water Framework Directive**

I have assessed the proposed development for the construction of 2 residential units 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 a surface water

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The best practice standard measures that will be employed to prevent groundwater and surface water pollution from the site.

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.

10.0 **Recommendation**

I recommend that planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

11.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

1. In the absence of a masterplan approach for the proposed development, that allows for comprehensive development of this back land site, the Coimisiun cannot be satisfied that the proposed development would not have an undue impact on the existing residential amenity of residents of Corduff Cottages. Furthermore, the precedent by which a grant of permission would create an opportunity for further piecemeal development at this location that would not provide for existing car parking or existing storage arrangements for residents of Corduff Cottages. As such, the proposed development would contravene Objectives SPQH 042 & DMS 031 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 and set inappropriate precedent for other similar forms of development. The

proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

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.

Darragh Ryan

Planning Inspector

21st October 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	323040-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 2 dwellings
Development Address	Lands to Rear of 11 Corduff Cottages, Old Corduff Road, Blanchardstown, Dublin 15
	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. Class 10 (b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units - The proposed development is subthreshold as it relates to the construction of 4 no. dwellings.
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)	Class 10 (b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units - The proposed development is subthreshold as it relates to the construction of 4 no. dwellings.

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 ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	323040-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 2 dwellings
Development Address	Lands to Rear of 11 Corduff Cottages, Old Corduff Road, Blanchardstown, Dublin 15
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The proposal comprises the development of 2 no. house on zoned lands The size of the development would not be described as exceptional in the context of the existing environment. The proposal will not produce significant waste, emissions or pollutants. By virtue of its development type, it does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	The proposed development is locate on greenfield area of a residential estate on zoned lands. There are no significant environmental sensitivities in the vicinity – potential impacts on the SACs is addressed under Appropriate Assessment (Screening).
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development (i.e. 2 no. dwellings on zoned lands), there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA

There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)