



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323194-25

Development	Retention Planning Permission for retention of log chalet to be used for habitable accommodation for a temporary period of 3 years.
Location	Glen Holme, Landscape Road, Dublin 14, D14X4H3.
Planning Authority	Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D24A/0907/WEB.
Applicant(s)	Edwina Brady.
Type of Application	Permission for Retention.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission for Retention.
Type of Appeal	Third Party.
Appellant(s)	George Brady & Others.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	19 th September, 2025.
Inspector	Aiden O'Neill.

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	8
5.0	Policy Context	9
5.1	Development Plan	9
6.0	EIA Screening	13
7.0	The Appeal	13
8.0	Assessment.....	14
9.0	AA Screening	18
10.0	Water Framework Directive	19
11.0	Recommendation	20
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	20
13.0	Conditions	20
Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening		23
Appendix B: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination		25
Appendix C: Standard AA Screening Determination		28

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1 The proposed development site, 0.041ha in area, is generally rectangular in shape and is generally flat, but drops in level to the north. The site is accessed via a gate from Landscape Road (L-7003). It is identified as Glen Holme, 6b Landscape Road, in the Churchtown area of Dublin 14, and is stated to be located on what would have been a side garden, although at a much higher level, of the existing semi-detached dwelling to the north known as Glen Holme.
- 1.2 The site comprises a log chalet that is in use as a dwelling. The chalet is set back c. 10.190m from the public road and is bounded by a c. 1.5m rendered block wall with piers and access gate, and is positioned to the south of the site, close to the existing c. 1.5m high concrete block wall that forms the southern boundary, and c. 5.45m from the c. 1m-1.5m concrete block wall that forms the northern boundary. There are a small number of disused sheds/outbuildings to the rear, behind the chalet. The chalet is connected to the public water and foul water sewers, with surface water to discharge to ground via a soakpit.
- 1.3 The chalet and curtilage are generally in an unkempt condition. The private open space area is stated to extend to c. 130m². To the north of the site, at a lower level, are 2no. single-storey pitched roof semi-detached dwellings (the closest of which is Glen Holme). To the south, immediately adjoining the proposed development site, is a medium-sized garage building. Further south is the two-storey Glenside pub with thatched roof. To the west are a number of primarily large 2-storey semi-detached dwellings set back from the public road. To the west is a wooded area associated with the Little Dargle, which backs on to Riverside Drive.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The proposed development consists of the retention of an existing log chalet to be used for habitable accommodation for a temporary period of 3 years.
- 2.2 The 2-bedroom single-storey detached log chalet is c. 70.8m² in area, with a pitched roof, c. 3.1m in height to ridge level.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision

The Planning Authority granted permission on 22nd July, 2025 subject to 4no. conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

The Planning Authority attached 4no. conditions of which the following are of note:

2. This permission shall be for a period of three years from the date of this order. The structure shall be removed on the expiration of this period and the site reinstated unless, prior to the end of the period, permission for its retention shall have been granted by the Planning Authority or An Coimisiún Pleanála on appeal.

REASON: In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. The entire dwelling shall be used as a single dwelling unit and shall not be sub-divided in any manner or used as two or more separate habitable units.

REASON: To prevent unauthorised development.

4. The disposal of surface water shall be in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Authority as follows:

a. The surface water runoff generated by the development shall not be discharged to the public sewer but shall be infiltrated locally to a soakaway, as detailed in the application, in accordance with Section 10.2.2.6 Policy Objective EI6: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) of the County Development Plan 2022-2028. The soakaway shall be designed to BRE Digest 365 and shall not have an overflow. The offset distance for infiltration from adjacent buildings or structures will be at the professional judgement of a suitably qualified engineer and shall ensure the proposed system has no impact on neighbouring properties. If a soakaway is not a feasible solution then, prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority a

report signed by a Chartered Engineer showing an infiltration test (with results, photos, etc) and shall propose an alternative SuDS measure.

b. The surface water runoff generated by the development shall not be discharged to the public sewer but shall be discharged locally to the proposed raised rainwater planters as indicated in the application. The proposed raingarden shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the recommendations of the SuDS Manual (CIRIA C753) and best practice guidelines. Any overflow from the rainwater planters shall not connect to the public surface water sewer but shall drain via soakaway as detailed in the drawings.

REASON: In the interest of public health.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Senior Executive Planner dated 15th January, 2025 notes the following:

- The proposed development is acceptable in principle having regard to the zoning objective NC, subject to compatibility with the overall policies and objectives for the zone.
- In the previous application (PA Reg. Ref. D15A/0682), the applicants (Isobel and Edwina Brady) were named as the owners of the site, including the neighbouring dwelling to the north.
- Planning permission under PA Reg. Ref. D15A/0682 was previously granted for a temporary 5 year period, however the structure was not removed and enforcement proceedings were issued by the Planning Authority (ENF 17024) on 24th May, 2025.
- The applicant has been resident in the chalet for over 9 years. Permission is sought for a further 3 years.
- Uisce Éireann raised concerns about the proposed foul drainage in PA Reg. Ref. D15A/0682 but was satisfied on foot of a response to Further

Information that there will be no additional loading to the foul network as the number of people residing on the property will be the same.

- The proposed dwelling conforms with the minimum standards of the Quality Housing for Sustainable Development 2007. The rear private open space exceeds the standards of the Plan.
- Due to its single-storey nature, there are no overlooking or overshadowing issues.
- The previous planner's report noted that it would be preferable that the subject site would be comprehensively redeveloped in the future, however the temporary use does not prevent this from occurring.
- The temporary accommodation has been in place since 2015. The purpose of the temporary permission is not to extend the life of the structure indefinitely. There are some concerns regarding the impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding streetscape and on amenities of neighbouring residents.
- No changes are proposed to the existing access and parking provision.
- Further Information was sought in relation to drainage issues on 15th January, 2025 and a response was received on 26th June, 2025 providing soakaway details and the management of foul water to the existing combined sewer.
- Permission was recommended subject to conditions, on the basis that the proposed development would not adversely impact the residential amenity of adjacent properties, nor would it detract from the character of the surrounding area.
- The Senior Executive Planner's report is the basis for the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

The Drainage Planning Report dated 12th November, 2024 sought further information on surface water runoff and foul drainage. The report dated 1st July, 2025 on receipt of response to the RFI raised no objection subject to conditions.

The Transportation Planning Report dated 13th November, 2024 raises no objection to the proposed development.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

2no. submissions were received, one from Martin Brady, the other from George Brady, brothers of the applicant.

The submissions cite the same matters, namely that the site is jointly owned by the applicant and her brothers, and is in the process of currently being sold. Any extension to the permission could hinder the sale.

The site was previously subject to 2no. invalid applications, D24B/0349/WEB and D15A/0682/E. The current application seeks to circumvent the more recent invalidation.

ESB wiring is illegally installed. There is also no proper sewerage facilities for the site.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 The proposed development site has been subject to the following planning history:

D24B/0349/WEB: Application for Retention Planning Permission for retention of log chalet to be used for non-habitable storage space only was declared invalid on 13th September, 2024, as the development description did not match the drawings in respect of the use of the structure to be retained.

D15A/0682/E: Application to extend the duration of the permission for the retention of the existing log chalet for a period of 5 years was declared invalid on 15th July, 2021 on the basis that Section 42 cannot be utilised in order to extend the further use of a structure as a dwelling. The applicants in this instance have erroneously applied to extend the duration of the planning permission granted under reg ref D15A/0682.

D15A/0682: Permission granted on 27th May, 2016 by the Planning Authority for the retention of a detached, single storey, 2 bedroom timber chalet for temporary residential use and associated site works at Glen Holme, Landscape Road. Temporary retention permission was sought for a period of 5 years.

Condition No. 2 stated:

The use of the detached single storey 2 bedroom timber chalet for temporary residential use shall cease prior to, on or before 5 years after the date of this permission and the structure shall be completely removed.

REASON: In the interests of proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

D13A/0542 Deemed withdrawn application on 7th October, 2014 for permission for development consisting of the construction of a detached single-storey 2-bedroom bungalow and associated site works.

ENF 17024 A Warning Letter issued to the Owner/Occupier of 'Glenholme, 6b Landscape Road' on 24th May, 2024 for non-compliance with condition no. 2 of PA Ref. No. D15A/0682 in that the temporary residential use of the detached single storey 2 bedroom timber chalet for temporary residential use has not ceased nor has the structure been completely.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028

The subject site is zoned NC In Land Use Zoning Map 1_0 of Volume 4 of the Plan, the objective for which is to protect, provide for and/or improve mixed-use neighbourhood centre.

Objective PHP19 of the Plan seeks to:

- Conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting

improvements and adaptation of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF.

- Density existing built-up areas in the County through small scale infill development having due regard to the amenities of existing established residential neighbourhood

In relation to infill development, section 12.3.7.7 of Chapter 12 of the Plan states that:

- In accordance with Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock - Adaptation, infill development will be encouraged within the County. 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.

In relation to corner/side garden sites, section 12.3.7.5 of Chapter 12 states as follows:

- Corner site development refers to sub-division of an existing house curtilage and/or an appropriately zoned brownfield site, to provide an additional dwelling(s) in existing built-up areas. In these cases, the Planning Authority will have regard to the following parameters (Refer also to section 12.3.7.7):
 - Size, design, layout, relationship with existing dwelling and immediately adjacent properties.
 - Impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents.
 - Accommodation standards for occupiers.
 - Development Plan standards for existing and proposed dwellings.
 - Building lines followed, where appropriate.
 - Car parking for existing and proposed dwellings provided on site.
 - Side/gable and rear access/maintenance space.
 - Adequate usable private open space for existing and proposed dwellings provided.
 - Level of visual harmony, including external finishes and colours.

- Larger corner sites may allow more variation in design, but more compact detached proposals should more closely relate to adjacent dwellings.
- A modern design response may, however, be deemed more appropriate in certain areas where it may not be appropriate to match the existing design. M Side gable walls as side boundaries facing corners in estate roads are not considered acceptable and should be avoided.
- Appropriate boundary treatments should be provided both around the site and between the existing and proposed dwellings. Existing boundary treatments should be retained/ reinstated where possible.
- Use of first floor/apex windows on gables close to boundaries overlooking footpaths, roads and open spaces for visual amenity and passive.

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

The National Planning Framework (NPF) First Revision, April 2025 sets out a strategy to accommodate around 950,000 additional people in Ireland between 2022 and 2040, focused on compact and sustainable growth. The NPF supports the better management of Dublin's growth to ensure that more of it can be accommodated within and close to the city and in the metropolitan area.

The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024, also aim to promote sustainable and compact urban growth, focused on increased residential density, and greater flexibility in design standards.

The Guidelines on Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities 2007 set out the quantitative and qualitative standards for typical dwellings.

Section 7.5 of the Development Management Guidelines 2007 addresses temporary permissions, stating that:

In deciding whether a temporary permission, which can apply to a particular structure or use, is appropriate, three main factors should be taken into account.

- First, the grant of a temporary permission will rarely be justified where an applicant wishes to carry out development of a permanent nature that conforms with the provisions of the development plan.
- Secondly, it is undesirable to impose a condition involving the removal or demolition of a structure that is clearly intended to be permanent.
- Lastly, it must be remembered that the material considerations to which regard must be had in dealing with applications are not limited or made different by a decision to make the permission a temporary one.

Thus, the reason for a temporary permission can never be that a time limit is necessary because of the adverse effect of the development on the amenities of the area. If the amenities will certainly be affected by the development they can only be safeguarded by ensuring that it does not take place.

The Guidelines further state that a second temporary permission should not normally be granted for that particular reason for it should have become clear by the expiration of the first permission whether permanent permission or a refusal is the right answer. In other circumstances, an application for a second temporary permission may be quite genuine and should be dealt with on its merits. For example, where a temporary permission has been granted for a structure which is inherently impermanent, an application for a permission for a further limited period could reasonably be made if the structure has been well maintained and there has been no other change in circumstances relating to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area concerned.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The proposed development site is c. 4.71km to the south-west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) and the South Dublin Bay pNHA (Site Code: 000210).

See Appendix 2.

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1 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 Grounds of Appeal

A Third Party appeal by George Brady and Martin Brady raises the following grounds of appeal.

- The appellants are co-owners of the proposed development site with the applicant.
- There is no consent provided from the legal co-owners of the site.
- The log cabin was built without prior permission, and this is not the first attempt to secure permission. Repeated applications are an abuse of the planning system and legitimise unauthorised development and delay lawful resolution of a co-ownership dispute.
- The presence of the log cabin and the applicant's exclusive occupation of the land have blocked the agreed sale and development of the site for over seven years. Retention permission would further entrench this obstruction.

There is a well-documented shortage of housing in the area, and the proposed development presents a valuable opportunity to deliver much-needed housing in accordance with planning policy.

- The applicant has commissioned soakage and sewerage works, and these have not been independently assessed.
- The previous permission required conditions to landscape the site which has not been carried out. The site is overgrown and unmanaged, and the applicant has failed to maintain the property.
- The proposed development is at odds with good planning practice. Granting permission would set a poor precedent.
- A refusal of permission is requested.
- Photos taken from November 2024 are enclosed with the appeal.

7.2. Applicant Response

N/A

7.3. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority's response dated 1st August, 2025 states that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

7.4. Observations

None.

7.5. Further Responses

None.

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. Having examined all the application and appeal documentation on file, and having regard to relevant policy, I consider that in addition to main issues which require consideration in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal, the substantive issue of a further temporary permission requires consideration.

8.2 The main appeal issues are as follows:

- Legal status of the applicant to make the application.
- Planning policy matters
- Drainage matters
- Other matters

In addition I will consider the issue of a further temporary permission in the context of the Development Management Guidelines 2007.

8.3 Legal status of the applicant.

8.3.1 The appellants have stated that are co-owners of the proposed development site with the applicant, and that the applicant does not have their consent to make the application.

8.3.2 The applicant has indicated on the application form that she is the owner.

8.3.3 The Planning Authority has stated that in the previous application (PA Reg. Ref. D15A/0682), the then applicants (Isobel and Edwina Brady) were named as the owners of the neighbouring dwelling to the north. That application was validated as being in compliance with Article 22 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended.

8.3.4 The current application has also been validly accepted on the basis that the applicant is stated to be the owner, and therefore in compliance with Article 22 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended.

8.3.5 In this context, in terms of the legal interest, I am satisfied that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence of her legal intent to make an application. Any further legal dispute is considered a civil matter and is outside the scope of the 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, 2000, as amended.

8.4 Planning policy matters

8.4.1 The appellants contend that the site of the proposed development can respond to current planning policy requirements for much needed housing.

8.4.2 The proposed development is located in an area zoned for neighbourhood centre uses, NC In Land Use Zoning Map 1_0 of Volume 4 of the Plan, the objective for which is to protect, provide for and/or improve mixed-use neighbourhood centre.

8.4.3 In this context, in planning policy terms, the proposed development site is, in principle, suitable for more intensive development to contribute to the delivery of compact growth in Dublin as envisaged in the NPF First Revision 2025, and the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024.

8.4.4 However, in planning terms, the granting of permission for the further retention of the existing log chalet as a residential use will not prejudice or undermine the future redevelopment of the site in line with the provisions of the NPF First Revision and the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024.

8.4.5 Having regard to sections 12.3.7.5 and 12.3.7.7 and objective PHP19 of the Plan in relation to corner site development/infill development, the proposed development to be retained respects the height and massing of the existing residences to the north and retains the physical character of the area without impact on the amenities of existing residences. The proposed development also follows the existing building line, and the accommodation standards, including private open space, as noted by the Planning Authority, are aligned with the Guidelines on Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities 2007, and also the standards of the Plan.

8.5 Drainage matters

8.5.1 The appellants state that there are drainage matters that are unresolved on site.

8.5.2 In this respect, I note the concerns raised in the Drainage Planning Report, and the RFI on drainage issues (surface water and foul water). I also note the recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to conditions, in the Drainage Planning Report on foot of the response to the RFI. I recommend the attachment of a drainage condition in the event that the Commission is minded to grant planning permission.

8.6 Other

8.6.1 Planning History matters

8.6.1.1 The appellants reference examples of previous applications that were declared invalid as an indication of the applicant's abuse of the planning system.

8.6.1.2 However, the applications were invalidated for technical reasons having regard to the provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended.

8.6.2 Non-compliance with landscaping conditions

8.6.2.1 The appellants argue that the proposed development site has not been landscaped as required by condition, and that the site is overgrown and unmanaged, and the applicant has failed to maintain the property. As noted above, the existing chalet and curtilage is in an unkempt condition and does require management and maintenance. However, I do not consider that a refusal of permission on this ground is warranted. I recommend the attachment of a landscaping condition, including a condition requiring a bond to secure the satisfactory landscaping of the site, in the event that the Commission is minded to grant planning permission.

8.6.3 Temporary permission

8.6.3.1 The Planning Authority has granted temporary permission for a further three years. This is in addition to the previously permitted 5-year temporary permission, D15A/0682, granted on 27th May, 2016.

8.6.3.2 It is noted that the applicant has lived in the chalet for 9 years.

8.6.3.3 Having regards to the provisions of the Development Management Guidelines 2007 in relation to temporary permissions, I note that the Planning Authority, in granting permission, considered that the proposed development would not adversely impact the residential amenity of adjacent properties, and would not detract from the character of the surrounding area.

8.6.3.4 In addition, I note that it is further stated that the dwelling to be retained conforms with the minimum standards of the Quality Housing for Sustainable Development 2007, and that the private open space exceeds the standards of the Plan.

8.6.3.5 It is also noted that there are no overlooking or overshadowing issues.

- 8.3.6.6 Water and foul water issues have been addressed to the satisfaction of Uisce Éireann, while a soakaway is proposed to be installed, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority, subject to condition.
- 8.3.6.7 As noted above, a temporary permission will not preclude the future development of the site in line with planning policy.
- 8.3.6.8 I also note that there is no justification presented in the Senior Executive Planner's report on why a further temporary permission is imposed by condition.
- 8.3.6.9 The Guidelines, however, also state that an application for a second temporary permission may be quite genuine and should be dealt with on its merits. For example, it is stated, where a temporary permission has been granted for a structure which is inherently impermanent, an application for a permission for a further limited period could reasonably be made if the structure has been well maintained and there has been no other change in circumstances relating to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area concerned.
- 8.3.6.10 In this context, and notwithstanding its unkempt state, the cabin has been home to the applicant for 9 years. However, it cannot be described as a permanent home in the context of its status as a log chalet.
- 8.3.6.11 Therefore, I would be inclined to agree with the Planning Authority that a further temporary permission should apply for a further three years, in the event that the Commission is minded to grant permission.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. 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 the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024) and the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) or any other European site, in view of the sites Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on:

- The modest scale of the works and the nature of the development
- Location - distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.
- Taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1 The subject site is located in an established suburban area of Churchtown. The nearest relevant water body is the Dodder, code IE_EA_09D010900, c.0.047km to the north-west, the status of which is 'At Risk'.

10.2 The proposed development comprises the Retention Planning Permission for retention of log chalet to be used for habitable accommodation for a temporary period of 3 year at Glen Holme, Landscape Road, Dublin 14, D14X4H3.

10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal. I have assessed the proposed development of the Retention Planning Permission for retention of log chalet to be used for habitable accommodation for a temporary period of 3 year at Glen Holme, Landscape Road, Dublin 14, D14X4H3, 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.

10.4 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and scale of the development proposed which includes a connection to public services.
- Distance from the nearest relevant water bodies, and the lack of hydrological connections.

10.5 Conclusion

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend the Commission grant permission for the reasons and considerations set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1 Having regard to the provisions of the Guidelines on Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities 2007, Section 7.5 of the Development Management Guidelines 2007, and sections 12.3.7.5 and 12.3.7.7 and objective PHP19 of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, it is considered that, subject to conditions set out below, the proposed development will not detract from the amenities of the area, and is in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended on 26th 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 and the development shall be retained, carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
----	---

2.	<p>This permission shall be for a period of three years from the date of this order. The structure shall be removed on the expiration of this period and the site reinstated unless, prior to the end of the period, permission for its retention shall have been granted by the Planning Authority or An Coimisiún Pleanála on appeal.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</p>
3.	<p>The entire dwelling shall be used as a respective single dwelling unit and shall not be sub-divided in any manner or used as two or more separate habitable units.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
4.	<p>The attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
6.	<p>A comprehensive boundary treatment and landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority within three months of the date of this permission. The boundary treatment and landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed scheme and shall be completed within the first planting season.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
7.	<p>The developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company or such other security as may be accepted in writing by the planning authority, to secure the satisfactory landscaping of the site, coupled with an agreement empowering the planning authority to apply such security, or part thereof, to such landscaping. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority</p>

	<p>and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interest of visual and residential amenity.</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.

Aiden O'Neill

Aiden O'Neill
Planning Inspector

29th September, 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323194-25
Proposed Development Summary	Retention Planning Permission for retention of log chalet to be used for habitable accommodation for a temporary period of 3 years.
Development Address	Glen Holme, Landscape Road, Dublin 14, D14X4H3.
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)	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 40%;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </div> <div>Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.</div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 20px;"> <div style="width: 40%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> <div>No, No further action required.</div> </div>
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.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q 1v	

1. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, 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 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	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)	Part 2, Class 10(b)(i) [Residential] where the mandatory threshold is 500 dwelling units Part 2, Class 10(b)(iv) [Urban Development] where the mandatory thresholds are 2ha, 10ha or 20ha depending on location.
2. 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"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Ad. onull

Inspector: _____

Date: 29th September, 2025

Appendix B: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ACP-323194-25
Proposed Development Summary	Retention Planning Permission for retention of log chalet to be used for habitable accommodation for a temporary period of 3 years.
Development Address	Glen Holme, Landscape Road, Dublin 14, D14X4H3.
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	The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, does not require demolition works, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development	The proposed development is situated in an established suburban primarily residential area. The site is not located within, or immediately adjoining, any protected areas. The development would be located in a serviced urban area and would not have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location. There is no hydrological connection present such as would give rise to significant impact on nearby water courses (whether linked to any European site or other sensitive receptors). The site is not considered to be an environmentally sensitive site
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and

	spatial extent of effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act. There are no significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects.
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.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Ad onull

29th September, 2025

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix C: Standard AA Screening Determination
Test for likely significant effects

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	Retention Planning Permission for retention of log chalet to be used for habitable accommodation for a temporary period of 3 years at Glen Holme, Landscape Road, Dublin 14, D14X4H3.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	The proposed development site is 0.041ha in area and is located c. 4.71km to the south-west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), and the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210). The proposed development involves the retention of a log chalet which is use as habitable accommodation. There are no construction works proposed and no significant emissions are expected.
Screening report	N
Natura Impact Statement	N
Relevant submissions	None
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model	

[List European sites within zone of influence of project in Table and refer to approach taken in the AA Screening Report as relevant- there is no requirement to include long list of irrelevant sites.

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³ Y/N
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024)	14no. species https://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/spa/004024	c. 4.71km to the south-west	No direct connection, possible indirect	Y
South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210)	4no. habitats https://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/sac/000210	c. 4.71km to the south-west	No direct connection, possible indirect	Y

¹ Summary description / cross reference to NPWS website is acceptable at this stage in the report

² Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species

³if no connections: N

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites [From the AA Screening Report or the Inspector's own assessment if no Screening Report submitted, complete the following table where European sites need further consideration taking the following into account:

- Identify potential direct or indirect impacts (if any) arising from the project alone that could have an effect on the European Site(s) taking into account the size and scale of the proposed development and all relevant stages of the project (See Appendix 9 in Advice note 1A).
- Are there any design or standard practice measures proposed that would reduce the risk of impacts to surface water, wastewater etc. that would be implemented regardless of proximity to a European Site?
- Identify possible significant effects on the European sites in view of the conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other plans and projects)

AA Screening matrix		
Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 1: South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024) Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046] Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130] Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) [A137] Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141] Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143] Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144] Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149] Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157]	Direct: None Indirect: Negative impacts (temporary) on surface water/water quality due to construction related emissions including increased sedimentation and construction related pollution.	N/A Negative affect on habitat quality

Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162] Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179] Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) [A192] Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193] Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]		
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site* No	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 2: South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]	Direct: None Indirect: Negative impacts (temporary) on surface water/water quality due to construction related emissions including increased sedimentation and construction related pollution.	N/A Undermine conservation objectives related to water quality

Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]		
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
Further Commentary / discussion (only where necessary): N/A		
Step 4: Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site		
I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on the The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project. No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.		
Screening Determination Finding of no likely significant effects 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 the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), and the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) in view of the conservation objectives of this/these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required. This determination is based on:		

- The modest scale of the works and the nature of the development
- Location - distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.
- Taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority.

Ad. O'Neill

29th September, 2025

Inspector: _____

Date: _____