



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323070-25

Development	Demolition of extensions and garage, and construction of replacement extension and garage with associated development works.
Location	Gorselands, Monterey Road, Greystones, Co. Wicklow, A63 WV65
Planning Authority	Wicklow County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560260
Applicant(s)	Emma & Andrew Harding.
Type of Application	Planning Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission.
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Paul & Muireann Brosnan.
Observer(s)	No Observers.
Date of Site Inspection	29 th of September 2025.
Inspector	Elaine Sullivan

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. Development Plan.....	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	8
5.3. EIA Screening	8
6.0 The Appeal	9
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	9
6.2. Applicant Response	10
6.4. Observations.....	11
7.0 Assessment.....	11
8.0 AA Screening.....	17
9.0 Water Framework Directive	18
10.0 Recommendation	18
11.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	19
12.0 Conditions	19
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site has a stated area of 0.199ha and is located in Greystones, Co. Wicklow. It is positioned at the end of a cul-de-sac, Monterey Road, on the northern side of the town and to the north-east of Greystones Marina. The site currently comprises a large two-storey house with single storey extensions to the north and south. The surrounding area is an established residential area with dwellings in the immediate vicinity being of similar size and plots. There is an existing 2 storey dwelling to the south (Westbank), which is bounded by hedging facing the subject site. To the north is another 2-storey dwelling, (Uisneach), which was built in the garden of the subject site (Gorselands) under PA Ref. 02/7044 and 04/1591.
- 1.2. The site is generally level throughout with a noticeable change in level along the northern site boundary. This results in Uisneach being at a higher level than the subject site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for a part single / part two-storey domestic extension which would comprise the following works,
- the demolition of existing single storey extensions, and existing single storey garage/storage shed to the side and front of the existing house,
 - the construction of a new part single storey, part two storey extension to the front, rear and side of the existing dwelling house,
 - the construction of a new single storey detached garage/storage shed to the side of the existing dwelling house,
 - widening of the existing vehicular entrance gates along with new gates and pier to the front driveway,
 - all with associated alterations to the existing dwelling house, site works and landscaping.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

A decision to grant planning permission for the development was issued by the Planning Authority (PA) subject to 6 planning conditions which are standard in nature.

Condition No. 3 requires that,

(a) The windows to the first floor of the northern elevation shall comprise obscure glazing.

(b) The bathroom window to the first floor of the northern elevation shall be revised so that only the top portion i.e. 10-15% of the overall opening, can be opened, with the remainder being fixed. Prior to the commencement of any development revised details confirming the window type to accord with this requirement shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

(c) All other windows to the first floor along the northern elevation, shall be non-openable.

REASON: In the interests of residential amenity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The decision of the PA was informed by two reports from the Planning Officer. The first report dated the 28th of May 2025 recommended that further information (FI) was requested on three points which are summarised below.

- The PA were concerned that the development could result in real or perceived overlooking of the residential dwelling to the north and its private amenity area and requested that the applicant review the windows on the northern elevation. A landscaping plan was requested to address the potential impacts from overlooking and the removal of boundary vegetation.

- The applicant was requested to address the concerns of the owner and occupier of 'Uisneach' to the north, regarding the positioning of the dwelling on the application drawings.
- A revised site plan showing the levels of the subject lands in relation to the adjoining lands was also requested.

The second report of the PO dated the 26th of June 2025, queried whether overlooking could occur from the bathroom window and whether windows were openable and/or opaque. Planning permission was granted subject to conditions.

3.3. Other Technical Reports

- **Waste Management Section** – Prior to the commencement of development a Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan must be submitted for approval.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Three third party submissions were received by the PA during the public consultation stage.

- A submission from the neighbouring property to the north (Usineach) objected to the development on the basis of a lack of information and incorrect information in the application, and the impact of the development on existing planting and residential amenity.
- A response to this submission was lodged from a family member of the applicant, which sought to clarify some issues raised by the third party and to clarify the extent of the vegetation clearance carried out on the site.
- A further submission was lodged from a neighbour in support of the development. The observer was supportive of the design and architecture and was happy to see the building return to use as a family home.

4.0 Planning History

No planning history for the subject site.

On the adjoining site to the north –

PA Ref. 04/1591 – Planning permission granted for the retention of alterations to two storey dwelling house and garage at Uisneach to the north of the subject site.

PA Ref. 02/7044 – Planning permission granted for the sub-division of the site at Gorselands and the construction of a two-storey dwelling and detached garage.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 (WCDP)

- 5.1.1. The subject site is within the boundary of the Greystones – Delgany & Kilcoole Local Area Plan 2013-2019 (GDK LAP). This LAP expired in 2019 and the WCDP contains a commitment to prepare a new LAP for Greystones – Delgany and Kilcoole during the lifetime of the plan.
- 5.1.2. Variation No. 2 of the WCDP was adopted and came into effect on the 12th of May 2025. It brought the existing LAPs into the WCDP while new plans were being prepared. Section 5.0 of Variation 2 states that, *‘The existing Local Area Plan will remain in place until that LAP is superseded by a new plan’*.
- 5.1.3. Variation No. 4 was proposed for the WCDP and went on public display in May 2025. The reason for the variation was to make a new local land-use plan (a Local Planning Framework (LPF)) for the towns of Greystones-Delgany and Kilcoole. When adopted, the LPF will be integrated into the Development Plan and will replace the *‘Greystones – Delgany and Kilcoole Local Area Plan 2013-2019’*. At the time of writing, Variation No. 4 has been on public consultation but had not been formally adopted.
- 5.1.4. The following extracts from the WCDP relate to aspects of the subject development but is not an exhaustive list of all relevant policies and objectives contained in the Development Plan.
- 5.1.5. **Zoning** - The subject site is zoned objective ‘RE’– Existing Residential’ in the Greystones-Delgany and Kilcoole Local Area Plan (LAP) 2013-2019, now adopted

into the WCDP. This zoning objective has been retained and carried forward into the Draft GDK LPF.

The 'RE' zoning objective seeks '*To protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas*'.

5.1.6. **Appendix 1 – Development & Design Standards**

3.1.8 – House Extensions – extensions will generally be encouraged, and the following basic principles should be applied to proposals,

- The extension should be sensitive to the existing dwelling and should not adversely distort the scale or mass of the structure,
- The extension shall not provide for new overlooking of the private area of an adjacent residence where no such overlooking previously existed,
- The new extension must not significantly increase overlooking possibilities,
- New extensions should not overshadow adjacent dwellings to the degree that a significant decrease in day or sunlight entering into the house comes about
- While the form, size and appearance of an extension should complement the area, unless the area has an established unique or valuable character worthy of preservation, a flexible approach will be taken to the assessment of alternative design concepts.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

5.2.1. No designations apply to the subject site.

5.3. **EIA Screening**

5.3.1. The proposed development does not come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA, that is, it does not comprise construction works, demolition or intervention in the natural surroundings. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal are summarised below.

- The appellants consider that the proposal represents a material contravention of the RE zoning objective for the site. They believe that the proposed development will have a negative impact on their residential amenity by virtue of the proximity to the shared boundary and the scale of the two-storey extension. It is their view that the proposed massing height and fenestration on the northern elevation could result in overlooking and/or overshadowing and will impede on their enjoyment of their property.
- There is a concern that engineering works required to construct the proposal will impact on the shared boundary planting as a result of damage to established tree roots.
- The appellants list a number of 'mistakes, errors and omissions in the application drawings and documentation, such as lack of contours on the site, incorrect scale on Drawings and incorrect positioning of their property on the contextual drawings. They also take issue with the assessment carried out by the Planning Officer and consider that their submission regarding the validity of the application was not given adequate consideration.
- The grounds of appeal consider that the proposal is out of context with the existing pattern of development which is characterised by detached properties with generous separation distances and soft landscaping.
- It is the view of the appellants that the landscaping plan is inadequate as it does not include the shared boundary to the north, retention of the existing planting on the boundary and the positioning of services.
- The appeal includes proposed options to mitigate the impacts on the existing landscaped areas and the shared boundary (*Diagrammatic Option to Mitigate Impacts on Existing Landscape*).

6.2. Applicant Response

A response was received from the applicant on the 21st of August 2025 and includes the following,

- The applicant notes that the separation distance from the two-storey extension to the site boundary with Uisneach measures 3.8m at one end, and 3.9m at the other end. There is also a substantial level difference between both properties with the subject site at a lower grade than the adjoining property.
- Shadow models submitted with the application shown that there would be no impacts on adjoining property in terms of shadow cast and as there are no windows to habitable rooms facing Uisneach. As such the applicant states that there would be no issue with overlooking.
- The applicant refutes the assertion that surrounding development is characterised by clear separation between detached properties and cites the property at 'Westbank' to the south as an example (**PA Ref. 21/117**). Furthermore, they state that the emerging pattern of development in recent years is to subdivide large sites to provide a greater intensity of development.
- The response states that the (almost) 4m setback to the shared boundary is more than adequate to protect all existing planting along the boundary. Thus, there would be no impact on biodiversity or wildlife.
- Regarding the validity of the application, the applicant notes that the details were checked and validated by the PA and levels were indicated on plans and sections. There is no legal requirement to submit a detailed topographical survey for a domestic extension and computer generated images are based on an accurate representation of the difference in levels between the two sites.
- The applicant acknowledges that there was a mistake on the scale of the Existing Site Plan Layout. However, the scale shown on the Proposed Site Plan Layout was correct. They note that the contextual elevations show three houses in context, Westbank, Gorselands and Uisneach and that positions and levels of the three houses relevant to each other are correct. As the

houses are located at the end of a cul-de-sac, some distortion occurs from widening the aperture to show all houses in context. There is no attempt to mislead, and all houses are accurately reflected and dimensioned on the site layout plan drawings.

- In response to the appellants claim that the landscaping plan was inadequate, the applicant states that routine maintenance works to the gardens at Gorselands removed some low-level vegetation. A complete landscaping plan for the entirety of the site was unnecessary and what was proposed in response to the FI request was to supplement planting along the shared boundary with Uisneach. Five new trees are proposed along the boundary to supplement the existing planting.
- With regard to overshadowing the applicant states that there is a 1.8m level difference between the sites and there is also a 1.8m high boundary fence along the higher level. This means that an object at the Gorselands side would need to be in excess of 3.6m tall to cast a shadow on the Uisneach side. An object 4m away from the boundary would need to be 7.5m tall (depending on the angle of the sun) to cast a shadow. As the eaves level of the new two storey block is approximately 5.2m, there will be no impacts in terms of shadow casting on existing planting on the Uisneach part of the boundary.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- No response on file.

6.4. Observations

- None received.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development
- Technical Details
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Other Issues

7.2. Principle of Development

- 7.2.1. The subject site is in the settlement of Greystones and is zoned objective RE – Existing Residential, which seeks, *‘To protect, provide for and improve residential amenities of adjoining properties and areas while allowing for infill residential development that reflects the established character of the area in which it is located.’* The principle of the development which is for a domestic extension to an existing dwelling is acceptable within the zoning for the site and will be assessed on its merits against the policies and objectives of the WCDP.
- 7.2.2. The grounds of appeal include a heading which refers to ‘Material Contravention of Planning Zoning Objective RE and Guidelines’. The appeal is not specific as to how or why the proposal may materially contravene the zoning objective or what guidelines the heading refers to. In the absence of specific details, an assumption is made that the appellants consider the development contravenes the RE objective by virtue of its potential to adversely impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property to the north (Uisneach) through overshadowing, overlooking and amenity. The impact of the proposal on existing development will be assessed in full below. However, as noted above, the subject proposal for an extension to an existing house is in accordance with the zoning objective for the site and as such, I am satisfied that no issue regarding material contravention of the zoning objective arises.

7.3. Technical Details

- 7.3.1. The appellants submit that the application details are insufficient. They state that the drawings did not contain sufficient details to accurately demonstrate the sloping conditions of the site and the context of the neighbouring houses. They note that a

topographical survey was not included and that the drawings did not show contours. The appellants highlighted a discrepancy in the annotated scale on the Existing Site Plan drawing and believe that the shadow survey was not accurate as it assumed a completely flat site. Concerns were also raised that the contextual elevations did not provide an accurate demonstration of the location of neighbouring houses.

- 7.3.2. I have reviewed the plans and particulars of the application and the FI response, and I am satisfied that they contain sufficient information to describe the context of the site and its relationship with the adjoining sites. I note to the Commission that the PA considered the application to be complete for the purposes of validation and did not consider that a topographical survey or drawing showing contours was required for the site. Levels for the subject site and the adjoining site are shown on *Drawing A02/1 – Proposed Site Layout Plan and Garage Details*, which was submitted under further information. Whilst there is a change of levels between the subject site and the adjoining site, the scale and location of the urban site and the proposal for a domestic extension, would not warrant a topographical survey.
- 7.3.3. With regard to the contextual elevation shown on *Drawing AB2/0 – Existing Site Plan and Existing & Proposed Context Elevations*, the contextual survey includes three houses which are all positioned at the end of a cul-de-sac. As the houses are offset from each other and at the end of a cul-de-sac, some distortion occurs from widening (and flattening) the aperture to show all houses in context. The levels shown on the contextual elevation correspond with the Proposed Site Layout and I am satisfied that the elevation is an accurate portrayal of the relationship between the buildings.
- 7.3.4. It is the view of the appellants that the application should have included a Design Statement and that it should have been assessed against *Section 1.1 of Appendix 1, ‘Key Principles of Good Design’*. It is at the discretion of the PA to request a Design Statement for development of a smaller scale. In this instance, they did not consider it to be necessary, and I would agree. The scale of the proposal for a domestic extension does not warrant a detailed design statement. Furthermore, it is clear that Section 1.1 of Appendix 1 relates to larger scale development proposals and that the correct guidance for domestic extensions is contained in *Section 3.1.8 of Appendix 1 – House Extensions*.

- 7.3.5. As noted previously, I am satisfied that the application contains sufficient information to make an informed decision on the planning application.

7.4. Impact on Residential Amenity

- 7.4.1. The crux of the appeal relates on the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of the neighbouring property to the north, Uisneach, in terms of overlooking, overshadowing and impact on the attendant private amenity space.

Overlooking

- 7.4.2. The issue of overlooking was addressed by the PA who requested further information regarding the fenestration on the northern elevation. In response, the applicant reduced the size of the window to the stairs and clarified that all windows on this elevation would be to non-habitable rooms and would have obscured glazing. I have reviewed the drawings and visited the site and I am satisfied that the proposed development will not result in loss of amenity for the property to the north from overlooking.
- 7.4.3. As noted previously, the site to the north, Uisneach, is at a level approximately 1.7m above the subject site. The southern elevation of Uisneach is c. 9.2m from the shared site boundary and there are bedroom windows at first floor level on its southern elevation. Given the change in levels and the orientation of the house, the residents at Uisneach would experience more open views across the subject site than the proposed development. The two-storey element of the extension to Gorselands would be c. 3.7m from the site boundary with the adjoining property, which would result in a separation distance of c. 13m between the elevations of both houses. Drawing No. A02/1 – ‘Proposed Site Plan and Garage Details’, shows that as the properties are offset from each other, only the south-western corner of Uisneach would directly face the north-eastern corner of the extension. However, the views from the circular windows at Uisneach would be more expansive than those from a standard window opening. The first-floor window to the stairs of the extension would be approximately 4m from the north-eastern corner of the extension, which would mean that its position in the elevation would not directly face onto the house to the north.

7.4.4. Section 3.1.3 of Appendix 1 relates to development standards for privacy in housing developments. The text states that, *'A separation of 22m will normally be required above ground level between opposing windows serving private living areas (particularly bedrooms and living rooms). However, this rule shall be applied flexibly:... Windows serving halls and landings do not require the same degree of privacy as say balconies and living rooms;*

7.4.5. SPPR 1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines states that, *development plans shall not include an objective in respect of minimum separation distances that exceed 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units or apartment units above ground floor level... Separation distances below 16 metres may be considered acceptable in circumstances 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.*

7.4.6. The first-floor windows on the proposed extension do not serve habitable rooms and as such the minimum separation distance as per SPPR 1 does not apply. However, I note that the separation distance between the northern elevation of the proposed extension would be 13m from the southern elevation and window of the property to the north. Notwithstanding the separation distance between the properties, the level difference will also play a part in deflecting views between properties. Furthermore, the position of the stairs window in the elevation is not directly facing the house to the north. On the occasion of the site inspection the site boundary comprised timber fencing with hedging on the northern side and some mature evergreen pittosporum / kohuha trees on the southern side. The applicant has stated that it is proposed to infill the gaps between existing planting with five new trees of native Irish species.

I am satisfied that the windows on the northern elevation of the proposed extension will not result in overlooking of the property to the north and the attendant open space, by virtue of the change in levels between the site, the existing and proposed boundary treatment, the position of the windows which are not directly facing the neighbouring property and the nature of the windows which serve non-habitable spaces and rooms in the extension. I note that the applicant has stated that the windows at first floor level on the northern elevation would be fitted with obscured glazing. I would question whether this is necessary in consideration of the

foregoing. As this portion of the development would be north facing the provision of adequate natural light to the stairs would be a consideration. However, I note that this solution was presented by the applicant in response to the request for further information. Condition No. 3 of the decision of the PA restricts the window openings on the northern elevation. Given the physical separation distances between the properties, the level differences between the sites and the existing and proposed planting along the boundary, I consider this condition to be unnecessary. Should the Commission grant permission, I recommend that it is omitted from the decision.

Overshadowing -

- 7.4.7. Appellants also raised a concern that their property to the north would experience overshadowing as a result of the two-storey extension. Shadow diagrams showing the existing and proposed properties in relation to the adjoining property to the north were prepared for the application. The drawings show that there will be no additional impact on the adjoining site for the majority of the year. However, some additional overshadowing may occur to the outdoor area to the west of Uisneach during the winter months when the sun is lowest in the sky. This is shown on the diagrams for the '21st December – 12.00HRS' and for the '21st December 15.00HRS'.
- 7.4.8. The grounds of appeal were also concerned that the shadow diagrams were prepared without having regard to the level changes between sites, which would result in inaccurate results. The applicant has confirmed that the site levels were included as part of the model and that the results are accurate.
- 7.4.9. I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in any undue overshadowing of adjoining properties to the north or south and that the results of the diagrams shown are accurate. Although the subject site is to the south of Uisneach, the change in levels and the position of the proposed extension, (offset from the existing property) would mitigate any direct overshadowing. As such the minimal additional overshadowing during the winter months would not result in any undue negative impact on the amenity of the adjoining property to the north.

7.5. Other Issues

- 7.5.1. The grounds of appeal argue that the proposed extension is out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area which is characterised by large separation distances between properties and to boundaries. I would agree that the

existing cul-de-sac is characterised by large, detached properties, some of which have heavily planted boundaries. However, there is a mix of architectural styles and dwelling types and there are no special designations or conservation objectives which relate to the area. I consider the contemporary extension to be an acceptable design response to a large site at the end of a cul-de-sac in an urban area.

7.5.2. Whilst the appellants considered the landscaping plan to be inadequate, I note that the site is in an urban area and is not within a sensitive landscape area and does not have any specific objectives to preserve or restore landscape. As such, a landscaping plan would not normally be required for a domestic extension. The applicant has proposed to provide screening along the northern boundary by planting an additional five trees to infill gaps in the existing planting, which I consider to be a reasonable response.

7.5.3. Concerns were also raised by the appellants regarding the impact of the proposal on their boundary planting which has been in place for several years. The boundary planting visible from the subject site is mature hedging with some semi-mature specimen trees. I note to the Commission that damage to third party property is a civil issue and is not dealt with through the Planning Acts. As such it is not for the Commission to consider as part of this appeal. However, the applicant's response submits that a 4m separation distance is sufficient to prevent any damage to the root systems of existing planting. From my observations of the boundary treatment on site and from the photographs submitted by third parties during the public consultation stage, I am satisfied that a separation distance of 4m would be sufficient to prevent any damage to the root systems of the hedging and/or the specimen trees.

8.0 AA Screening

8.1. 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 any European site(s) in view of the conservation objectives of the sites and is therefore

excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required. This determination is based on:

- The small-scale nature of the works proposed.
- The lack of connections to any European sites.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

- 9.1. The subject site is located in the settlement of Greystones and is connected to the public water and wastewater services. The proposed development comprises an extension to a domestic dwelling. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.2. I have assessed the subject proposal 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.
- 9.3. The reason for this conclusion is based on the small-scale nature of the development and its location in an urban settlement.
- 9.4. 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 is granted for the development.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development for a first-floor extension to a house in an area zoned '*RE – Existing Residential*', the objective of which is '*To protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas*', it is considered that by virtue of the design, location and context, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or property in the vicinity, and would not be detrimental to the quality of the public realm. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the policies and objectives of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 and with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on the 8th day of April 2025, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted to the planning authority on the 13th day of June 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>

3.	<p>The site development work and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the adjoining street(s) are kept clear of debris, soil and other material.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of orderly development and to ensure that the adjoining roadways are kept in a clean and safe condition.</p>
4.	<p>Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
5.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>

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.

Elaine Sullivan
Senior Planning Inspector

13th of October 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323070-25
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of existing single storey extensions and the construction of a part-single / part two-storey extension to a domestic dwelling.
Development Address	Gorselands, Monterey Road, Greystones, Co. Wicklow.
	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 type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed	

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

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____