



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323403-25

Development	Retention of extension to balcony, granted under planning reference TP1838096
Location	27 Sundays Well Road, Cork
Planning Authority	Cork City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2543925
Applicant(s)	Rory & Finola O'Brien
Type of Application	Retention Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Declan Fallon
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	8 th October 2025
Inspector	Clare Clancy

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
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
5.1. National Context	6
5.3. Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028	7
5.4. Natural Heritage Designations	10
6.0 EIA Screening	11
7.0 The Appeal	11
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	11
7.2. Applicant Response	12
7.3. Planning Authority Response	13
7.4. Observations	13
8.0 Assessment	13
8.1. Principle of Development	13
8.2. Residential Amenity	14
8.3. Alteration of Ground Levels.....	15
8.4. Built Heritage & Visual Amenities.....	16

8.5. Other Matters	17
9.0 AA Screening.....	18
10.0 Water Framework Directive	19
11.0 Recommendation	19
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	20
13.0 Conditions	20
Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening	22
WFD – Stage 1 Screening.....	24

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located on the Sunday's Well road, the R846 approx. 2 km to the west of Cork city centre. It forms part of Ebenezer Terrance and is the easternmost dwelling at the end of the terrace. Due to the ground levels at the rear of the site which fall sharply to the south, the subject dwelling is split level and is three storey in scale over basement to the rear. The single storey element fronts onto the main road to the north. It is a mid-terrace dwelling bounded to the east and west by a similar type dwelling and is at a lower ground level than the adjoining properties to the east.
- 1.2. The balcony the subject of this application is located on the first floor off the sitting area of the dwelling adjacent to the existing bay window. Above at second floor, there is an existing balcony off the bedroom accommodation. The shared eastern boundary of the site is defined by a stone/block masonry wall with timber fencing (measuring approx. 0.943 m) mounted on top in the location of the existing balcony. The balcony extension is enclosed by timber fencing. A steel/wrought iron railing encloses the remaining area of the balcony and the stairs from the balcony leading to the garden is also made of steel/wrought iron. Timber posts support the balcony at ground floor level.
- 1.3. The site is situated in a prominent and elevated location relative to the surrounding environs and overlooks the River Lee to the south. The surrounding area is generally characterised by existing low density residential development. On street pay and display car parking is located along the R846.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought to retain the extension to the existing balcony which has an approx. gross floor area of 3.6 m².
 - The balcony is located at the first floor and is accessed through the living area of the dwelling.
 - The balcony is fixed to the rear façade of the house and is supported by timber posts at ground level, and is enclosed by timber fencing. There is a stairs off the balcony of steel/wrought iron construction leading to the garden area serving the dwelling.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By Order dated 28th July 2025, Cork City Council decided to grant retention permission subject to 2 no. conditions.

- Condition 2 is a pre-development condition requiring the extended balcony to be finished with steel posts and wrought iron railings to match the adjoining balcony permitted under P.A. Ref. 18/38096 and amended plans to be agreed within 3 months of the grant.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.2. One main planning report dated 24th July 2025 forms the basis of the assessment and recommendation. The following is noted:

- The subject area is small and is a minor increase of the existing balcony area permitted under P.A. Ref. 18/3807.
- Notes the shared third party boundary wall to the east (no. 28) comprising of a masonry wall topped by timber fencing and steel I-beams and railway sleepers.
- No issues arising from overlooking with adjoining properties no. 26 and 28 from the balcony.
- Raises concerns in regard to the material finishes of the balcony which comprises of timber and wrought iron railings and steel posts. Notes the criteria of Objective 8.23 which relates to development in Architectural Conservation Areas with specific reference to criteria (c) and (d) which relate to the use of historic material finishes.
- Recommended permission to be granted subject to a condition that the extended balcony is finished with similar materials to the adjoining balcony.
- The PA concluded that EIA and Appropriate Assessment were not required.

3.2.3. The second planning report dated 25th July 2025 endorses the planning officer's report.

3.2.4. Other Technical Reports

- Contributions Report – No development contribution required.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One third party observation was received. The issues raised are largely covered by the grounds of appeal.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

- P.A. Ref. 18/38096 – retention permission granted for the balcony at the rear of the dwelling (10th December 2018).
- E7854 – enforcement case.

Adjoining Site to West

- P.A. Ref. 18/38097 – Split decision (i) retention permission granted for stairs to rear of dwelling (ii) permission refused for extended rear balcony and to rear façade i.e. proposed double doors in lieu of window. The grounds for refusal related to impact on residential amenities and to the architectural heritage of the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Context

5.2. Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011)

The following is relevant:

Section 3.7 Development within Architectural Conservation Areas

- Outlines a list of criteria to be considered in the assessment of a planning application for works within the attendant grounds of a protected structure.

Section 3.10 Criteria for Assessing Proposals within an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).

- Section 3.10.1 Proposal for New Development
 - Notes that where a new building is erected in an ACA, it is preferable to minimise the visual impact of the proposed structure on its setting.
 - The greater the degree of uniformity in the setting, the greater the presumption in favour of a harmonious design.
 - Where there is an existing mixture of styles, a high standard of contemporary design that respects the character of the area should be encouraged.
 - The scale of new structures should be appropriate to the general scale of the area and not its biggest buildings.
 - The palette of materials and typical details for façades and other surfaces should generally reinforce the area's character.

Section 6.8 General Types of Development

➤ Section 6.8.1

Generally, attempts should not be made to disguise new additions or extensions and make them appear to belong to the historic fabric. The architectural style of additions does not necessarily need to imitate historical styles or replicate the detailing of the original building in order to be considered acceptable. However, this should not be seen as a licence for unsympathetic or inappropriate work. Careful consideration of the palette of materials with which the works are to be executed can mediate between a modern design idiom and the historic fabric of the structure. Extensions should complement the original structure in terms of scale, materials and detailed design while reflecting the values of the present time.

5.3. Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028

5.3.1. Volume 1

- The appeal site is zoned ZO 01 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods, forms part of the Sunday's Well ACA which also forms part of a 'Landscape Preservation Zone', however the application site boundaries indicate that it is outside of this designation. It is also located in an area of 'High Landscape Value'.

The main relevant chapters and policies to this development include the following:

➤ Chapter 6

- Landscape Preservations Zones (LPZs)
 - Section 6.19 – Such areas are highly sensitive to development and as such have limited or not development potential.
 - Section 6.20 – The objective for LPZs is to preserve and enhance the landscape character and assets of the sites. There is a presumption against development within LPZs, with development only open for consideration where it achieves the site-specific objectives set out in Tables 6.6-6.10.

In exceptional circumstances, there may be limited scope for development to enable existing occupiers to adapt existing buildings to their evolving requirements, providing that the form or nature of development is compatible with the landscape character of the area. This might include a change of use or minor extensions.

- Table 6.6 Site Specific Landscape Preservation Zone Objectives (NW)

Site Specific Objectives Related to Sunday's Well include the following:

- To create a publicly accessible riverside open space with significant ecological value as part of campus development;
 - To provide an additional public pedestrian bridge to access the development site at the eastern end of the distillery site from the Lee Maltings site;
 - To provide an additional public route along through the centre of the site along the Mill Stream.
- Areas of High Landscape Value (AHLV)

In summary the following is noted:

- Section 6.22 – Areas of High Landscape Value display an intrinsic landscape character and a special amenity value. Development will be appropriate only where it results in a neutral / positive impact on the landscape.
- Section 6.23 – New development in AHLV must respect the character and the primacy and dominance of the landscape. In particular, development on topographical assets such as steep sided slopes, escarpments and ridges is considered to be inappropriate due to the detrimental impact of site and excavation works on the landscape. There will be a presumption against development where it causes significant harm or injury to the intrinsic character of the Area of High Landscape Value.
- Section 6.24 – The AHLV is an additional objective overlaying the land-use zoning objective. Development proposals must comply with the underlying land-use zoning objective. The key areas include the Montenotte / Tivoli Ridge; Shanakiel Ridge / Sunday's Well Ridge; Blackpool Valley; Lough Mahon/ Douglas Estuary; River Lee / Curragheen River.

➤ Chapter 8 Heritage, Arts and Culture

- Objective 8.23 Development in Architectural Conservation Areas

Development in Architectural Conservation Areas should have regard to the following:

- a) Works that impact negatively upon features within the public realm, such as stone setts, cobbles or other historic paving, railings, street furniture, stone kerbing etc. shall not be generally permitted;
- b) Design and detailing that responds respectfully to the historic environment in a way that contributes new values from our own time. This can be achieved by considering layout, scale, materials and finishes and patterns such as plot divisions in the surrounding area;
- c) Historic materials and methods of construction should be retained and repaired where this is reasonable, e.g. historic windows and doors, original roof coverings, metal rainwater goods should be retained along with original forms and locations of openings etc;

- d) Repairs or the addition of new materials should be appropriate and in keeping with the character of the original structures.

➤ Chapter 11 Placemaking and Managing Development

The following is relevant:

- Adaptation of Existing Homes

Section 11.141 – notes that the design and layout of extensions to houses should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards sunlight, daylight and privacy. The character and form of the existing building should be respected, and external finishes and window types should match the existing.

Section 11.143 – sets out the criteria for extensions to existing dwellings.

➤ Chapter 12 Land Use Zoning Objectives

- Zoning – ZO 01 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods.
- Zoning Objective 1: To protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses.
- ZO 1.2 – notes that development in this zone should generally respect the character and scale of the neighbourhood in which it is situated. Development that does not support the primary objective of this zone will be resisted.

5.3.2. **Volume 3 Built Heritage Objectives**

- Sunday's Well ACA
 - The appeal site is located in Sunday's Well Sub-Area E: South Facing Gardens Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).
 - This ACA relates to the garden areas to the south of the existing dwellings fronting on Sunday's Well road. The lands further to the south are designated as a Landscape Preservation Zone.

5.4. **Natural Heritage Designations**

- SPA: 004030 - Cork Harbour SPA – approx. 4.25 km to the southeast.
- pNHA: 001046 - Douglas River Estuary – approx. 4.25 km to the southeast.

- pNHA: 000094 - Lee Valley – approx. 2.03 km to the west.
- pNHA: 001081 - Cork Lough – approx. 1.14 km to the south.

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. Refer to Form 1 appended to this report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

One third party appeal was received from Declan Fallon whose property adjoins the appeal site to the east. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

Inaccurate Drawings

- The drawings are incorrect. The omission of details may be relevant.
- The ground level at no. 26 was omitted. The site layout plan does not show indicative ground levels.
- Errors are highlighted by the third party on copies of the proposed elevation and site layout plan submitted in support of the appeal.

Conservation & Heritage

- The property is within an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) this includes the curtilage. The development undermines the curtilage and ground level of the properties.
- The report of the Conservation Officer under P.A. Ref. 18/38096 states that the gardens of no.'s 26 and 27 were set out at a distinctively different ground level. The material ground level between 26 and 27 has changed and was referred to in the application.

- The decision was made without a conservation report. Regard should have been given to the conservation report in relation to P.A. Ref. 18/38096. It is unclear if a site inspection was carried out.

Zoning / Impact on Residential Amenities

- The zoning objective for the site is *to protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational, civic uses*. Paragraph ZO 1.1 states that the provision and protection of residential uses and residential amenity is a central objective to the zoning.
- The proposed development undermines the material condition and privacy of the back garden of no. 26 to the east in terms of conservation and practical conservation prospective.
- No reasonable justification is given for the development, based on the needs of the current occupants. There is already a 2 person + balcony directly off a bedroom with ample amenity opportunities.

Precedent

- The proposed development will establish precedent which would not be in keeping with the visual appearance of the terrace.
- The proposed development is not in keeping with other buildings in the terrace.
- The decision transfers to the property and not to individuals involved opening the possibly of all balconies to be used simultaneously with alternative tenants.

7.2. Applicant Response

The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The applicant's who are in their 80s have difficulty with steps down to the garden. The balcony was extended by approx. 3.75 m to accommodate 2 no. chairs so that they could sit outside in the fresh air.
- The extension does not encroach on the privacy of the property no. 26 to the east.

Photos of the existing balcony are submitted in support of the response.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

None.

7.4. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development
- Residential Amenity
- Alteration of Ground Levels
- Built Heritage & Visual Amenities
- Other Matters

8.1. Principle of Development

- 8.1.1. The site is zoned ZO 01 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods the objective for which is 'to protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses'. Having regard to the zoning objective of the site I consider that the overall principle of the proposed development is acceptable subject to the amenities of surrounding properties being protected and the scale, character and design of the development respecting the character of the area. These matters will be considered below.

8.2. Residential Amenity

- 8.2.1. The existing balcony structure on the south facing elevation of the existing dwelling and is an extension to that already permitted balcony under P.A. Ref. 18/38096. In this regard it is extended to the east and provides for additional floor area around the bay window up to the eastern boundary of the site. It is 1.210 m in depth and 3.0 m in length thus resulting in a marginal floor area increase. The existing bay window and the balcony at second floor level appear to be later additions as I noted at time of site inspection that adjoining properties to the west did not have similar additions.
- 8.2.2. The appellant's property adjoins the appeal site to the east (no. 26) and the extension abuts the existing boundary wall. At the location of the balcony, the shared boundary wall is defined by a masonry wall with timber fencing mounted on top. It is backed by trees and hedgerow on the appellant's side. The balcony extension is well screened from the neighbouring property to the east and does not give rise to overlooking of this adjoining property either to the east or directly to the rear back garden private amenity space of this dwelling. As it is adequately screened by the existing boundary, on that basis I am satisfied that that no undue overlooking occurs.
- 8.2.3. In relation to the adjoining property to the west, I note that the layout of the house design is similar to the appeal site. The dwellings within the terrace are characterised by single storey terrace dwellings at street level, and 3 storey at the rear with 2 storeys set above basement level. As a result, there is access to the private amenity spaces available from the first floor level which serves as the living area within the dwellings, as well as from basement level. In the case of the adjoining property to the west, the living area would also appear to be at first floor level and access to the garden area is via an existing door between the living spaces which is enclosed by a balcony with steps off the balcony to the garden area. Having regard to the foregoing, while there is already a certain amount of overlooking occurring which is inevitable due to the design of these dwellings, and having regard to the fact that a balcony was already permitted on the appeal site, I do not consider that the extension to the permitted balcony would give rise to undue overlooking of this adjoining property.
- 8.2.4. In terms of noise and nuisances, due to the limited floor area and to the purpose of the balcony which is for residents to sit out in, I do not consider that the use of the balcony would give rise to excessive or undue noise disturbances. Having regard to

the foregoing and the location of the balcony which is extended to the east, I am satisfied that it will not unduly impact on the existing residential amenities or privacy of adjoining properties in terms of overlooking or general noise disturbances and therefore is in accordance with the zoning objective for the site.

8.3. Alteration of Ground Levels

- 8.3.1. The appellant raises that the ground level of his property is not indicated on the drawings submitted with the application, and that there is a material alteration to the ground levels between the two properties. In this regard, reference is made to the Conservation Report provided for P.A. Ref. 18/38096 in the context of property no.'s 24-26 Sunday's Well Road whereby the appellant states that the gardens between no. 26 and no. 27 were set out at a distinctly different ground level, and the issue that arises is that the material ground level between the two properties has changed and is not referred to in the application. Inaccuracies in the drawings are also highlighted by the appellant.
- 8.3.2. On the matter of inaccuracies on the drawings provided, to clarify, I have carried out a site inspection and I am satisfied that the existing balcony layout broadly reflects that as indicated on the site layout plan drawings with the application.
- 8.3.3. In relation to the ground levels, the extension to the balcony extends by approx. 1.21 m from the bay window at first floor level. It is supported by timber posts beneath which are set on what appears to be a make shift timber decking plinth. I note that there is an existing access door between the living area and the study which has direct access to the garden via the steps and path, and that directly adjacent to this door, the balcony which was the subject of P.A. Ref. 18/38096 was extended. The basement level also contains 2 doors which lead to the garden area. The change in the existing ground levels within the garden area are notable as the site falls to the south. I noted that steps provide access to the lower part of the garden area which is indicative of the sloping gradient within the site. Having regard to the foregoing, while I note that the ground level of the appellant's property is not indicated on the plans and elevations submitted with the application, I do not consider that the subject extension has materially altered the ground levels within the appeal site such that it would impact on

the ground levels of the neighbouring site. The balcony extension sits at the same level of the adjoining balcony, stairs and bay window.

8.4. Built Heritage & Visual Amenities

- 8.4.1. The appeal site is located within an ACA. However I note that it is not a protected structure and it is not list as a building of interest in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH).
- 8.4.2. I note that the assessment of the PA did not raise any concerns in regard to any impacts on the built heritage of the immediate area. The only concern that arose related to the material finishes of the extended balcony which is of timber decking like construction. The PA included a condition requiring the extension to be finished with materials similar to the adjoining balcony and stairs which are of steel / wrought iron construction. In terms of impact on visual amenities, the PA did not refer to same in the assessment.
- 8.4.3. The design of the existing structure is not, in my opinion, as such that it would have a significant negative impact on the overall character of the existing dwelling and its curtilage. The southern elevation has a balcony at second floor level and a bay window on the first floor, which the balcony extension generally ties in with. I note condition 2 included by the PA in the decision to grant retention requiring the balcony to be finished with steel posts and wrought iron as opposed to timber to tie in with the existing balcony. I would agree with the PA, that the balcony should be finished similarly as its current appearance is at odds with the overall setting of the balcony. Therefore in the event of a grant I recommend that the Commission includes such a condition and this would be consistent with Section 3.10.1 and Section 6.8.1 of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011).
- 8.4.4. In terms of the character of the ACA and the impacts on same, I note the Sunday's Well ACA is made up of six distinct Sub-Areas and that the appeal site is in Sub-Area E. This area is characterised by south facing gardens associated with the row of dwellings 27-31 fronting onto Sunday's Well road. I note that they do not adjoin the lands further to the south which are the subject of a Landscape Preservation Zone however, the area is noted to be located in an area designated as 'High Landscape Value'.

8.4.5. The balcony structure is located to the rear of the terrace and its visibility from the south is largely confined to views from the public realms to the south of the River Lee. I consider that the structure is of a minor scale when viewed in the context of the existing dwelling and the overall terrace. It would have a relatively limited visual impact on the ACA when viewed from the public realm, and given the separation distances, I am satisfied that it would not seriously detract from the visual amenity of the surrounding area. Accordingly, I have no objection in this regard and therefore consider that the development is generally acceptable in the context of Objective 8.23 which relates to development in ACAs, and to Section 6.22 and Section 6.23 of the development plan which sets out the policies and objectives for development in Areas of High Landscape Value.

8.5. Other Matters

Inaccuracies on Drawings

8.5.1. Concerns are raised in relation to inaccuracies on drawings submitted with the planning application, in particular the omission of the ground level at no. 26 to the east, which is purported to be omitted in the subject application. The appellant considers this to be a material issue as the ground level between no. 26 and 27 has changed and was not referred to in the application. In this regard, the report of the Conservation Officer P.A. Ref. 18/38096 relating to the appeal site, indicated that the gardens between no. 26 and 27 were set out at a distinctly different ground level. I acknowledge the matter raised, however having reviewed the drawings and carried out a site inspection of the appeal site, I am satisfied that the information submitted with the planning application is sufficient for a full assessment of the appeal to be carried out. Furthermore I am satisfied that the grounds levels relating to the appeal site have not been altered as result of the subject development.

Precedent

8.5.2. The appellant has raised that the proposed development will establish precedent for similar type proposals which would not be in keeping with the visual appearance of the terrace. I have considered the matter of visual impact in Section 8.4 above and I have noted that the appeal site while located within an ACA, is not a protected structure and is not listed as a building of interest in the NIAH. The development has been assessed

on its own merits, and I would note that all appeal cases are assessed and determined on their own merits, having regard to the sensitivity of the receiving environment and the specifics of the proposed development.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.1.2. The appeal site is located in a suburban area of Cork city centre approx. 1.25 km to the west. The closest European sites relative to the appeal site lie approximately as follows:
- SPA: 004030 - Cork Harbour SPA – approx. 4.25 km to the southeast.
- 9.1.3. The subject application relates to the retention of an extension to an existing balcony.
- 9.1.4. The planning authority considered that the proposed development should not exercise a significant effect on the conservation status of any European designated site, and Appropriate Assessment was not necessary.
- 9.1.5. 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:
- The nature, scale and location of the development.
 - The intervening land uses between the subject site and the European site.
 - The distance between the appeal site and European sites and the absence of hydrological or other ecological pathways to any European site.
- 9.1.6. 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

- 10.1.1. The subject site is located within an existing residential area in the suburban area of Cork city. The nearest waterbody is the Lee River LEE (CORK)_090 (IE_SW_19L030800) and the nearest surface water body is the
- 10.1.2. The subject development comprises the retention of an extension to an exiting balcony.
- 10.1.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.1.4. I have assessed the subject 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.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works i.e. the small scale nature of the development
- Lack of hydrological connection.

10.1.5. 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

I recommend that retention permission is granted.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the zoning objective for the site 'ZO 01 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' the objective for which is 'to protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses', the planning policies and objectives of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 in particular the stated policies and objectives set out in Section 6.20 relating to sites located in designated Landscape Preservation Zones, Section 6.23 which relates to sites located in an area of High Landscape Value, and having regard to the sites location within a designated Architectural Conservation Area, to the nature, limited scale and siting of the existing balcony extension, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the retention of the proposed development would not impact negatively on the character and setting of the Architectural Conservation Area, would not unduly impact on the residential amenities of adjoining properties, and would not unduly impact on the visual amenities of the area. The retention of the balcony extension is, therefore, in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be retained in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as received by the planning authority on the 03rd 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>The timber finishing to the extended balcony shall be replaced with steel posts and wrought iron railings to match the adjoining permitted balcony.</p>

	<p>Within three months of the date of this Order, revised plans and elevations incorporating the above amendments shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for written agreement. In default of agreement, the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the protection of 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.

Clare Clancy
Planning Inspector

20th October 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP 323403-25
Proposed Development Summary	Retention permission for extension to balcony granted under P.A. Ref. 18/38096
Development Address	27 Sunday's Well Road, Cork City
	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 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 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 proposed road	

<p>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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

WFD – Stage 1 Screening

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.	ACP 323403-25	Townland, address	27 Sunday's Well Road, Cork City
Description of project		Retention permission for extension to balcony granted under P.A. Ref. 18/38096	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		The site is located within an urban area service by piped public services. The development the subject of retention refers to the extension to an existing balcony the nature of which is private amenity space. It is limited in size.	
Proposed surface water details		Existing. No issue arises.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Existing. No issues arise.	
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		Existing. The proposed development will not impact on same.	
Others?		Not applicable	