



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323363-25

Development

Demolition of existing single storey side extension, construction of new single storey side extension and first floor extension over existing building, alterations to existing elevation, site entrance, new front boundary wall, connection to existing services, proposed development will result in subdivision of site, all associated site works

Location

Liafail, Lower Park, Corbally, Co Limerick

Planning Authority

Limerick City and County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

25164

Applicant(s)

Michael & Edel Clancy.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse permission

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellants	Michale & Edel Clancy.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	25 th September 2025.
Inspector	Ann Bogan

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description.....	4
2.0 Proposed Development.....	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision.....	5
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
6.0 EIA Screening.....	11
7.0 The Appeal	11
8.0 Assessment.....	13
9.0 AA Screening.....	18
10.0 Water Framework Directive.....	19
11.0 Recommendation	19
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	20

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. Site is located in an established residential area in Corbally in the northeastern suburbs of Limerick City. The existing 72sqm, pitched roof, single storey dwelling on site is vacant and in poor condition and is partially covered by extensive vegetation growth. The application site takes in part of the garden of the neighbouring dwelling to the north, which is also in the ownership of the applicant.
- 1.2. The site fronts onto Lower Park Road (shown on some maps as Roseville Gardens), which is not a through road but serves a number of housing estates as well as individual single and two storey houses. There are footpaths along on both of the road, with grass verges in places, and the end of the road has a pedestrian link to the surrounding area.
- 1.3. The gable of the existing cottage is approximately 0.5m from the front boundary wall of the site, while the more recently built single storey houses on either side are set back 16m to 17m from the roadside boundary. There are a number of other historic cottages in the area which either front directly onto the street or have small set-backs.
- 1.4. There is an existing pedestrian entrance on the southern side of the existing dwelling giving access to a narrow, overgrown side passage way, which separates the dwelling from the garden of the neighbouring dwelling to the south.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of:
 - Subdivision of a landholding which currently encompasses the existing derelict dwelling as well as the neighbouring dwelling to the north and its garden. The subject site is stated to be 0.0191 in area.
 - Replacement of existing single storey flat roofed side extension (19.43sqm in area) with a new single storey flat roofed extension (17.1sqm in area), set back further west than the existing extension.
 - Construction of a first floor extension (approximately 58sqm in area) over the main part of the dwelling which currently has a pitched roof. There are some

inconsistencies in the drawings which make it difficult to establish the detail of the proposed extension. The floor plans, sections and elevations (Dwg P-02) show the new extension as flat roofed, with vertical walls, while the existing gable walls are retained and butt up against either end of the flat roof. There also appears to be a small ridge or apex, 220mm high, running east west along what is otherwise a flat roof with vertical sides. The roof plan (Dwg P-01) appears to show a slated pitched roof, which is inconsistent with the rest of the drawings, furthermore it does not show the retention of the gable walls. The proposed finish of the vertical sides of the first-floor extension is unclear.

- Total area of the extended dwelling is stated as 128sqm.
- Proposed elevation changes to existing building include three new windows in the front elevation where previously there were none, additional window and change in location of door in south elevation, and glazed 'french' window in north elevation
- A new vehicular entrance and 1.2m front wall is proposed and new 1.2 m site walls to north and west boundaries and part of south boundary. The proposed 6m wide splay at the entrance is illustrated on the site layout drawing (P-01), however I note the contiguous elevation drawing (P-02) shows a 3m wide entrance, rather than a splayed entrance.
- A new splayed entrance is also shown to serve the adjoining house to north, however this is not within the application boundary and is therefore not part of the application.
- Development will be connected to existing services.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Refuse permission for two reasons

1. Proposed development is considered unacceptable due to its poor design, substandard layout, use of rooflights for upstairs windows and the overdevelopment of the site, which collectively result in a scheme that fails to achieve an appropriate standard of residential amenity. The proposed design

is contrary to the standards outlined in the Limerick County Development Plan (2022-2028)

2. The proposed development would necessitate vehicles reversing onto a public road, which poses an undue risk to public safety and the creation of a traffic hazard. This arrangement is likely to obstruct the free flow of traffic and increase the potential for accidents, particularly in areas with high traffic volumes, or where vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians and cyclists are present. Consequently, the proposal fails to provide a safe and suitable means of access, contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The planning officer considered that the proposed development has not overcome the concerns in previous refusal of permission (24/394) in relation to the poor building design, and that there are still concerns that the vehicular entrance proposed would result in a traffic hazard. Noted non-compliance with planning permission for neighbouring house, 90/455, (in same ownership as subject site) as drawings submitted with that application indicated subject house was to be demolished once permitted dwelling was constructed.
- Refusal of permission recommended. Decision was made in line with recommendation
- Concluded an EIA screening is not required as development is not of a type included under Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regs 2001 (as amended)
- Carried out AA screening examination and concluded the development would not be likely to exercise a significant effect on conservation status of any European Sites and therefore Appropriate Assessment is not necessary

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Engineers report:

- Roads: Description is at odds with layout plan. Site plan shows 2 proposed entrances and not alterations. Proposed layout will not allow for 2 entrances and turning areas. Roads Section not in favour of 2 entrances which would result in vehicles reversing onto a main road endangering vehicles and pedestrians. Recommend requesting applicant to examine a shared access and ensure there is a turning area within the sites.

Surface Water: Submit drawings and supporting information to show compliance with Limerick City and County Councils Surface Water and SUDs specification for approval; submit details of disposal of roof and surface water; include a SUDs Pod/Planter and submit details for approval.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

Observation received from owner of neighbouring property to south:

- Queries legal interest of applicant to build on or up to shared boundary line and replacement of boundary walls
- States no consent given to construct or maintain proposed property or remove landscaping that will restrict natural light to it
- Concerns re proposed design: Increased height of roof will cause overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing of their house; appears to be additional windows on ground floor, higher roof requires shared gable wall height to be increased
- Non compliance with permission 90/455 which required existing house to be demolished on completion of new dwelling

4.0 Planning History

PI ref 24/394: permission refused to Michael and Edel Clancy for demolition of existing single storey side extension and first floor extension over existing building, alterations to existing elevations, site entrance, new front boundary wall, connection to existing public services and all associated site works on 04/12/2024, to create a dwelling of 156sqm, for two reasons:

Reason 1 is similar to reason 1 of decision on current application and related to poor design and layout and over development of the site, which fails to result to achieve an appropriate standard of residential amenity and also refers to the absence of any private outdoor amenity space.

Reason 2 refers to risk to public safety and creation of traffic hazard due to necessity for vehicles to reverse onto public road and has the same wording as reason 2 of decision on current application.

PI Ref 90/455 Michael Clancy granted permission for construction of dormer dwelling, subject to conditions.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Limerick County Development Plan 2022-2028

Vol 1 Chapter 11 Development Management Standards

Section 11.3.7 Private Open Space

11.3.7 Private Open Space

The following is required as a minimum for new housing developments (excluding apartments and sheltered housing):

Front garden: Minimum length of 6m. where ground floor dwellings have little or no front gardens a 'defensible space' must be created behind the public footpath, such as a planting strip. Variation in building lines will be permitted where there is overall coherence to the design.

Rear Garden: Minimum 11m (22m back-to back) garden depth will apply in order to protect privacy, sunlight and avoid undue overlooking. Reductions will be considered in the case of single storey developments and/or innovative schemes where it can be demonstrated that adequate levels of privacy, natural lighting and sunlight can be achieved. All dwellings should have the minimum rear garden area as follows:

Table DM 3: Rear Garden Areas

House Type	Minimum rear garden area (sqm.)
1-2 bedroom	48
3-5 bedroom	60-75
Inner urban/infill dwellings/mews	25

*Narrow strips of incidental open space to the side of houses should not be included in private open space calculations.

The above may be relaxed in exceptional circumstances such as:

- Where the development is within 10-minute walking distance of a public park or other amenity such as river bank/canal bank walkway/cycleway;
- The need to protect the established pattern of historic plot sizes of medieval streets;
- In respect of an innovative layout proposed in the development,

Whilst the above standards may be deviated from in instances of sheltered housing/ accommodation and infill or backland development, the design should not compromise amenity of the residents. Any deviation from the above standards shall be accompanied by a written statement justifying the deviation and shall include mitigation/compensatory design features to ensure amenity is not compromised.

Section 11.4.4 Extensions to Dwellings

11.4.4.1.2 Rear/Side Extensions

Ground floor rear/side extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining. First floor rear/side extensions will be considered on their merits and will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions, the following will be considered:

- Degree of overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking - along with proximity, height and length along mutual boundaries;
- Size and usability of the remaining rear private open space;
- Degree of setback from mutual side boundaries. No part of the extension shall encroach or overhang adjoining third party properties.

Any planning application submitted in relation to extensions, basements or new first/upper floor level within the envelope of the existing building, shall clearly indicate on all drawings the extent of demolition/ wall removal required to facilitate the proposed development. In addition, a structural report, prepared by a competent and suitably qualified engineer, may be required to determine the integrity of walls/structures to be retained and outline potential impacts on adjoining properties. This requirement should be ascertained at preplanning stage.

11.4.4.1.3 Alterations at Roof/Attic Level

Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles (changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/'A' frame end or 'half-hip' for example) and additional dormer windows will be assessed having regard to the following:

- The character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures;
- Established streetscape character and roof profiles;
- Dormer extensions to roofs, i.e. to the front, side and rear, will be considered with regard to impacts on existing character and form and the privacy of adjacent properties.

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

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024,

SPPR 2 Minimum Private Open Space Standards for Houses.

Section 5.3.2 Private Open Space for Houses

“Well-designed private open space forms an integral part of houses and is essential for health and wellbeing. The minimum private open space standard in development plans often reflects the traditional suburban separation standard and width of a dwelling. A more graduated and flexible approach that supports the development of compact housing and takes account of the value of well-designed private and semi-private open space should be applied.”

SPPR 2 - Minimum Private Open Space Standards for Houses

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

1 bed house 20 sqm.

2 bed house 30 sqm

3 bed house 40 sqm

4 bed + house 50 sqm

..... For building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size or urban infill schemes on smaller sites (e.g. sites of up to 0.25ha) the private open space standard may be relaxed in part or whole, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality and proximity to public open space. In all cases, the obligation will be on the project proposer to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the planning authority or An Bord Pleanála that residents will enjoy a high standard of amenity”.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

Lower Shannon SAC (002165) is 260m from site

River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries SPA is 2.3km from site.

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. See Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- Site is very compact and challenging to develop and site area cannot be increased to south, east or west as land not in applicant's ownership
- Applicant increased the site area from 0.0137ha to 0.191ha (by incorporating land from their garden to the north), and reduced area of proposed

development from 156sqm to 128sqm, to address refusal reasons relating to overdevelopment of previous application (24/394)

- Moving site boundary north results in much safer entrance, which mirrors existing site entrance in the area
- Extended boundary also addressed Council's concerns re lack of outside amenity space
- Applicant intends to redevelop the cottage, but without approval for proposals to make it habitable it will remain derelict
- Site is in area zoned existing residential where extension to existing dwelling is deemed acceptable
- With regard to Limerick Development Plan guidance on assessing extensions including size, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of useable space remaining, proposed side extension is smaller and lower in height than existing extension
- Re proposed first floor extension, current height of cottage is 5.3m while proposed extension is 5.080m
- First floor extension involves construction of a dormer style continuous roof, spanning length of cottage
- First floor windows on wall elevation of dormer roof are set back from boundaries to ensure little overlooking into neighbouring dwelling
- Frosted glass is used in south elevation in first floor windows serving bathroom and landing
- Contrary to reference in reason for refusal, proposed first floor windows are traditional windows and not rooflights; rooflights were never proposed or shown on drawings
- Proposed first floor extension would ensure the overall character of the cottage is maintained
- All windows are placed to ensure they are not directly overlooking any neighbouring dwelling

- As outlined above applicants have done all in their power to address issues raised by Limerick City and County Council over two applications.

7.2. **Applicant Response**

- N/A

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

- Planning Authority stated it had no further comments to make outside the assessment in the planner's report

7.4. **Observations**

- None

7.5. **Further Responses**

7.5.1. None

8.0 **Assessment**

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

- Suitability of building design
- Outdoor amenity space
- Access and traffic safety

8.2. **Suitability of Building Design**

8.2.1. The application seeks to renovate and extend an existing cottage, which is acceptable in principle in an area 'existing residential'.

8.2.2. The development involves construction of a new side extension, replacing the existing extension and the construction of a first floor extension. As indicated in section 2.2 above, there are inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations, particularly in relation to the first floor extension. The appeal submission refers to it

as a 'dormer style continuous roof, spanning the length of the cottage' and confirms that rooflights are not proposed, contrary to the reference in the reason for refusal.

- 8.2.3. Drawing P-02 indicates that the existing pitched roof is replaced by a flat roofed, vertically sided extension, built over the footprint of the original ground floor (with, seemingly, a largely decorative 22mm high ridge running along the centre of the otherwise flat roof). The windows are vertical rather than rooflights, and are not set back. It is presented as a two storey flat roofed structure. I would not describe the proposed extension as a 'dormer style roof'.
- 8.2.4. The gable walls are shown as retained and butt awkwardly into the flat roofed structure behind them, and appear to largely act as a fascia to the boxlike structure behind. The design is attempting to retain existing features of the building, while at the same time creating a full second storey in area. However, the result is a confusing, somewhat incoherent and poor quality design, with the resultant building having a bulky and overbearing appearance, whose design and roof character is out of character with the existing building and other historic and more recent structures in the area.
- 8.2.5. There is a lack of consistency between drawings P-02 and P-01, with the latter representing the new extension as having what appears to be a pitched slated roof. The specification also refers to a slated roof. However, a slated roof by definition has to be sloping to function and as outlined above, the plans and sections in P-02 show the roof as flat. For the purposes of assessment, I am assuming the roof plan shown in P-01 is a representational error.
- 8.2.6. I note there is further inconsistency in the floor to ceiling heights shown in the cross sections, which suggest that the floor to ceiling height is below 2.4m for most of the first floor space. Among other inconsistencies, the first floor side wall construction is shown on the floor plan as a cavity block wall, but is not represented as such in the cross section. The outline specification states the outer walls are to have a render finish, however it's unclear what finish is represented by the red lines shown on the elevation drawings of the first floor extension.
- 8.2.7. The proposed structure does not appear to overhang the adjoining property to the south, although I note that no details of roof drainage are provided.
- 8.2.8. South facing windows at first floor level are shown as frosted glass to prevent overlooking of neighbouring property. Proposed changes to the three ground floor

windows and door in the south elevation results in four windows and a relocated door. They are 1m from the side boundary and face into the neighbouring front garden. However, most windows are pre-existing and extensive planting in the neighbouring garden acts as a screen so they are unlikely to significantly impact on the neighbour's residential amenity. However, the dense planting limits daylight to the ground floor of the subject structure, impacting on quality of amenity of occupants.

- 8.2.9. I agree with the Planning Authority planner's report, that the deficiencies in the documentation provided with the application militate against a full and accurate assessment of the application and raise concerns about the quality and indeed feasibility of the design.
- 8.2.10. I acknowledge the desirability of the refurbishment of this derelict structure and the compact nature of the site and note that the floor area of the proposed development has been reduced from the previous application (24/294) and the site area increased. However, I believe that the concerns raised in the previous application relating to the poor quality of the design remain, that the proposed design would not comply with the Limerick City and County Development Plan guidance for extensions and roof/attic changes (Section 11.4.4) and that the proposal represents overdevelopment of this confined site.
- 8.2.11. I note the planning authority assertion that the proposal is non-compliant with the permission for the existing house to the north as the drawings indicated the indicated the subject dwelling was to be demolished on completion of the new dwelling. I believe this issue could be overcome if the design, access and other issues relating to refurbishment of the subject dwelling were resolved, subject to revised boundaries of the existing dwelling to north being satisfactory from a residential amenity, perspective for both dwellings.

8.3. Outdoor Private Amenity Space

- 8.3.1. The site area has been increased from the previous application, which had no outdoor open area, apart from the narrow side passage and a covered car port. Most of the additional space is taken up by the recessed vehicular entrance and driveway/parking area. There is no rear garden as such, but a small area of around 15sqm located beyond the parking space could be considered usable private

amenity space, although not immediately accessible from the living areas. There is also a small open area adjacent to the public road and house entrance, however it is in full public view and could not be considered as providing a high quality of amenity.

- 8.3.2. Limerick City and County Development Plan has a private open space requirement of 60-75sqm for a new three bed dwelling, while SPPR 2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024 requires a minimum of 40sqm for three bed dwellings. The private open space provided in this case is well below each of these standards.
- 8.3.3. Both of these policy documents allow deviation from the standards in certain circumstances. The Development Plan allows a reduction where a public park is within 10 minutes walk, and allows a reduction to 25sqm in inner urban areas/infill sites/mews. This is not an inner-urban location or infill site. It involves the refurbishment and substantial expansion of an existing dwelling rather than a new dwelling. It is arguable that it would be unreasonable to strictly apply the requirements for a new dwelling. The Guidelines allow deviations in private open space provision in the case of refurbishment of an existing dwelling.
- 8.3.4. I note that deviations from the private open space standards are allowed where “the design does not compromise the amenity of the residents” (Development Plan) and “subject to design quality and availability of public open space” (the Guidelines). The Guidelines also state: “In all cases, the obligation will be on the project proposer to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the planning authority or An Bord Pleanála that residents will enjoy a high standard of amenity”.
- 8.3.5. Quality as well as quantity of private open space provision is clearly an important consideration, regardless of whether it is a new dwelling or expansion and refurbishment of an existing dwelling. In this case, I am not satisfied that the application demonstrates the provision of a high standard of amenity for residents of a three bed dwelling, and I believe the reduction in quantity of open space is not compensated for by the provision of a lesser quantity of high quality private open space and/or the availability of nearby suitable public open space.

8.4. **Access and traffic safety**

- 8.4.1. The application plan drawing (P-01) shows a new splayed vehicular entrance and one on-site parking space. (Note the contiguous elevation illustration in drawing P-02

does not show the splayed entrance, rather it appears to reflect the entrance proposed in the previous application. It is assumed this is an error). Creation of the new entrance requires the removal of the existing entrance serving the dwelling to the north and the drawings show a second new entrance to serve this adjoining dwelling. However as noted earlier, this is outside the site boundary and therefore not part of the application.

- 8.4.2. I note the Planning Authority Roads Dept report refers to an inconsistency between the description of the proposal as 'alterations', and the proposal shown on drawings which is for a new entrance and not alterations. However, my reading of the description is that the alterations mentioned are not intended to refer to the site entrance but to alterations to elevations of existing dwelling.
- 8.4.3. The main concern in the Planning Authority Roads Dept. report is that there is insufficient space for a vehicle to turn within the subject site, which would result in vehicles reversing out of the driveway onto what is described as a main road, which could result in collisions or pedestrians being struck by vehicles. The report also states it is not in favour of the proposal to have two entrances without space for turning and recommends the applicant examine a shared access and ensure a suitable turning area within the sites.
- 8.4.4. In the event, further information was not sought and the Limerick County Council reason for refusal No 2 states that as the proposed development would necessitate vehicles reversing onto a public road, which would pose undue risk to public safety and create a traffic hazard.
- 8.4.5. I note that reversing out of onsite parking spaces onto the public road is common within housing estates and in older residential roads in the vicinity and elsewhere. The Planning Authority presumably holds the view that the levels of traffic on Lower Park Road are such as to increase the risk of traffic hazard over that within a housing estate, although I am not sure that it is accurate to term it a 'main road'.
- 8.4.6. This section of Lower Park Road is not a through road, however there are three housing estates accessed off it, beyond the subject site, and there are also a number greenfield sites zoned for new residential development. It therefore has a higher level of traffic than a road within an estate and traffic levels will further increase as zoned lands are developed. There is a pedestrian link to nearby areas at the end of the road and I noted at the time of the site inspection that there was a significant

amount of pedestrian traffic, mainly school children, using the link and passing along the road.

- 8.4.7. I accept therefore that allowing the entrance with the likelihood of a second entrance adjacent, in the absence of turning areas, would not be good practice and would increase the risk of traffic accidents and injury to vulnerable road users such as pedestrians.
- 8.4.8. I note that Limerick City and County Development Plan parking policy allows a relaxation in parking requirements in part or whole for refurbishment schemes. The absence of onsite parking in this location in this suburban location would however be likely to result in parking on the relatively wide recently constructed footpaths as is the case in examples observed on the street.
- 8.4.9. If the Commission were minded to grant permission based on the proposed layout, a condition requiring the reduction in height of the front boundary wall to allow for adequate sight lines at the entrance would be recommended.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is 260m from the Lower Shannon SAC and 2.3km from the River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries SAC. The proposed development comprises extension of an existing dwelling and creating a new entrance in the Corbally area of Limerick city.
- 9.2. No nature conservation issues were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of works i.e. small scale and nature of the development
 - Location and-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections
- 9.4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The subject site is located at Corbally, Limerick City and the nearest waterbody is the River Shannon (Lower)_060, which is 520m from the site and its water quality status is moderate.
- 10.2. The proposed development consists of demolition of a side extension to an existing dwelling, construction of a new side extension, a first floor extension over existing building, alterations to elevations, new entrance, connection to existing services.
- 10.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.4. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 10.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small scale and nature of the development
 - The distance from nearest water bodies and lack of hydrological connections
- 10.6. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. Refusal of permission is recommended.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposed development, by reason of its poor design and bulky appearance, is out of character with the existing building and other residential development in the vicinity and would have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the area. Furthermore, it lacks suitable outside amenity space, constitutes overdevelopment of the site and would result in an unsatisfactory standard of residential amenity for occupants. The scheme is not in accordance with the standards outlined in Section 11.4.4 of the Limerick City and County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. It is considered that the proposed development, which would necessitate vehicles reversing onto a public road, would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard. This arrangement is likely to interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on the road and endanger vulnerable road users such as pedestrians. Therefore, the proposal fails to provide a safe and suitable means of access, contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

Ann Bogan
Planning Inspector

18th October 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP- 323363
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of side extension, construct new side extension and first floor extension over existing building and new entrance
Development Address	Liafail, Lower Park, Corbally, Limerick
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of	

<p>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>No X</p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: Ann Bogan

Date: 18/10/25