



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323409-25

Development

Construction of a new ground floor extension to front, side and rear, including garage conversion, a first floor extension to side and rear, conversion of existing attic with dormer to rear and roof glazing to front with alterations to existing building to include all site works.

Location

5, Cremore Crescent, Glasnevin,
Dublin 11, D11 E4E9

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council North

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB2180/25

Applicant(s)

Colin and Mary Fogarty

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Kevin O'Connor and Mary Mullett

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

24th October 2025

Inspector

Elaine Power

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Relevant Planning History	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	6
5.3. EIA Screening	6
6.0 The Appeal	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
6.2. Applicant Response	8
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	8
6.4. Observations.....	8
6.5. Further Responses	8
7.0 Assessment.....	8
8.0 Water Framework Directive (Screening).....	16
9.0 AA Screening.....	17
10.0 Recommendation	17
11.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17
12.0 Conditions	17
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at no. 5 Cremore Crescent, Glasnevin, Dublin 11. The surrounding area is suburban in character generally comprising 2-storey semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs. The site is located on the southern side of Cremore Crescent c. 65m from the junction with Cremore Villas and is bound to the rear (south) by the rear gardens of dwellings fronting onto the Old Finglas Road.
- 1.2. The site has a stated area of c. 300sqm and currently accommodates a semi-detached house with a garage to the side and a single extension to the rear of the garage / side of the house. The existing house has a stated floor area of c. 113sqm. There is an existing driveway to the front and private open space to the rear.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the partial demolition of the existing single storey extension and the construction of a single storey extension to the front, side and rear, the conversion of the garage to habitable space, a first floor extension to side and rear and the conversion of existing attic with dormer to rear and roof glazing to front with alterations to existing building to include all ancillary works to accommodate the development.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was granted subject to 9 no. standard conditions. Condition no. 4 requires that the attic space shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with the current Building Regulations.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planners report dated the 16th July 2025 concluded that having regard to the zoning of the site and the provisions of the 2022-2028 City Development Plan, the proposed development is acceptable having regard to the scale and nature of the

development and the associated site context. There are no anticipated impacts on the visual or residential amenities of surrounding properties. The proposed development would therefore not materially contravene the policies and objectives of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, would accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, and it is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted.

3.2.2. *Other Technical Reports*

Drainage Division: Report dated 26th June 2025 raised no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions.

3.3. *Prescribed Bodies*

None

3.4. *Third Party Observations*

Two third party observations were received by the Planning Authority. The concerns raised generally relate to residential and visual amenity and are similar to those outlined in the appeal below. An additional concern regarding works to the shared boundary wall were also raised.

4.0 *Relevant Planning History*

Appeal Site

None

Surrounding Sites

Reg. Ref. 5035/22: Permission was granted in 2023 for the demolition single storey rear room, part of existing rear wall and part of the existing roof and the construction of a single storey extension to the rear of the property, a first floor side extension over the existing garage, alterations to the roof, convert the attic and incorporate rear dormer extension at 15 Cremore Crescent.

Reg. Ref. WEB1102/24: Permission was granted in 2024 for the demolition of existing single storey garage and utility room and the construction of a 2 storey extension to

the side and extend existing hipped roof to new party wall, the provision of a skylight to the front and side roof, the construction of a single storey extension to the rear including roof alterations, the construction of a dormer to the rear and convert the attic space to a habitable room and the widening of the existing vehicular entrance at 26 Cremore Crescent.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

The appeal site is zoned Z1: Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods, with the associated land use objective *to protect, provide and improve residential amenities*.

Appendix 18, Ancillary Residential Accommodation of the Development Plan sets out guidance for residential extensions. Sections 1.1 General Design Principles, 1.3 Extensions to the Side, 1.4 Privacy and Amenity, 1.6 Daylight and Sunlight and 1.7 Appearance and Materials, 4.0 Alterations at Roof Level / Attics / Dormers / additional Floors and 5.0 Attic Conversions / Dormer Windows are considered relevant.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The proposed development is not located within or immediately adjacent to any European Site.

5.3. 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. Please refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The third party planning appeal includes a summary of the site context, the planning history, the proposed development and the local policy. The main planning grounds of the third party appeal are summarised below.

Design Approach

- There is no objection to the demolition of the rear extension and the use of the existing attic space for non-habitable purposes.
- The proposed scale of the development is excessive and is not needed to provide a satisfactory standard of internal amenity. The applicant should consider an alternative design and layout for their extension.
- The proposed extensions are disproportionate to the original house.
- The attic has a floor to ceiling height of c. 2.17m and, therefore, is not suitable as habitable space. The rear dormer is excessive for a non-habitable room.
- The dormer would be visually intrusive. A smaller dormer for a non-habitable room is more appropriate.
- The houses to the rear (south) are at a lower level than the houses on Cremore Crescent. The proposed development would have an overbearing impact on these properties.
- The development would be visible and would, therefore, negatively impact on the visual amenities of the Old Finglas Road.
- The proposed development would negatively impact on the residential amenities of the appellants adjoining property with regard to overbearing impact and overshadowing.
- Due to the size of the proposed development and the level changes, it would be visually intrusive when viewed from the appellants adjoining property.

Other Issues

- If permission is granted a condition should be attached that the hours of construction should be reduced given the quiet suburban nature of the site.

6.2. Applicant Response

None

6.3. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority's response requested that the Commission uphold the decision to grant permission and that a condition requiring the payment of a section 48 development contribution be attached.

6.4. Observations

None

6.5. Further Responses

None

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. Having examined the appeal details and all other documentation on file, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design Approach
- Other Issues

7.2. *Principle of Development*

- 7.2.1. The subject site is zoned Z1 with the associated land use objective to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. Residential is a permissible use on lands zoned

Z1. Therefore, the proposed development is considered in accordance with the zoning objective and should be assessed on its merits.

7.3. **Design Approach**

- 7.3.1. The appeal site currently accommodates a semi-detached house with a garage to the side and a single storey extension, to the rear of the garage. The existing house has a stated floor area of c. 113sqm. There is a c. 2sqm blockwork shed located in the rear garden at the site's western boundary with no. 3 Cremore Crescent. The proposed development comprises the partial demolition of the existing single storey rear extension and construction of a new ground floor front, side and rear extension and the conversion of the existing garage to habitable space and a first floor side and rear extension. The proposed extension generally wraps around the side and rear of the existing house in an L-shape. The works also include the construction of a dormer to rear, a roof light to the front and the conversion of attic.
- 7.3.2. The third party raised concerns that the proposed extension would negatively impact on the residential amenities of their adjoining property with regard to overbearing impact and overshadowing.
- 7.3.3. Section 1.0 of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan provides guidance for residential extensions with regard to general design principles, extensions to the rear, extensions to the side, privacy and amenity, daylight and sunlight and appearance and materials. Section 5 of Appendix 18 provides guidance for attic conversions / dormer windows.

Front and Side Extension

- 7.3.4. Section 1.3 of Appendix 18 states that ground floor side extensions will be *evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity and that first floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. However, in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front façade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.*
- 7.3.5. The proposed ground floor side extension sits at the sites western boundary with the appellants property, no. 3 Cremore Crescent. The proposed extension is in a similar

location to the existing garage, side extension and side passageway. It is proposed to incorporate the existing garage and part of the existing side extension into the new 2-storey side extension. The ground floor level would generally comprise a garage / storage area and a utility room and would connect to the proposed single storey kitchen / living / dining room extension to the rear. The ground floor level would project c. 0.9m beyond the front building line and would include 2 no. garage style doors.

- 7.3.6. Section 1.1 of Appendix 18 states that *there is general presumption against front extensions that significantly break the building line, unless it can be justified in design terms and demonstrated that such a proposal would have no adverse impact on the character of the area or the visual / residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings.* Given the relatively minor projection from the front building line and the nature and scale of the side extension I am satisfied that it would not negatively impact on the character of the area or the visual amenities of the area and is, therefore, acceptable in this instance.
- 7.3.7. The first floor side extension would accommodate 2 no. bedrooms. It also sits at the boundary with no. 3 Cremore Crescent. The front elevation of the first floor level respects the established front building line. It has a depth of c. 11.2m which extends partially over the proposed single storey rear extension and projects c. 2.8m beyond the existing rear building line. It is proposed that the side extension would have a hipped roof to match the existing and the rear element of the first floor side extension, that projects beyond the existing rear building line, would have a flat roof with a maximum height of c. 6.3m in height.
- 7.3.8. During my site visit it was noted that the house opposite the appeal site, on Cremore Crescent has a similar first floor level extension over an existing garage and Section 4 above outlines that planning permission has been previously granted for similar 2-storey side style extensions on Cremore Crescent.
- 7.3.9. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and to the established pattern of development, I am satisfied that the side extension would integrate into the streetscape and would not negatively impact on the visual amenities of the area and would not impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining property with regard to overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impact.

Rear Extension

- 7.3.10. Section 1.2 of Appendix 18 states that *ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining. The extension should match or complement the main house. First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, 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.*
- 7.3.11. In addition, Section 1.5 of Appendix 18 states that *large single or two-storey rear extensions to semi-detached or terraced dwellings can, if they project too far from the main rear elevation, result in a loss of daylight to neighbouring houses.*
- 7.3.12. The proposed development includes a predominantly single storey rear extension. As noted above, there is a 2-storey element to the side of the original house, which projects c. 2.8m from the rear building line, at the boundary with no. 3 Cremore Crescent. The ground floor extension extends for the entire width (c. 9.5m) of the site. It varies in depth from c. 2.6m at its eastern boundary with no. 7 Cremore Crescent to c. 5m at its western boundary with no. 3 Cremore Crescent. It is noted that no. 3 has an existing single storey rear extension, with a similar ground floor level depth to that proposed. The single storey rear extension would accommodate a new kitchen / living / dining room that would connect to the existing kitchen, living and dining room areas within the existing dwelling. The single storey element of the rear extension would have a flat roof with a maximum height of c. 3.4m.
- 7.3.13. Given the relatively limited size and height (3.4m) of the proposed single storey rear extension and the relatively limited (2.8m) projection of the 2-storey element from the existing rear building line, the relatively limited height (6.3m) of the 2-storey flat roof extension, the existing single storey extension at no. 3 Cremore Crescent and the orientation of the dwellings I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in undue overshadowing of the appellants property or any existing residential dwellings, and a technical assessment of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing performance is not necessary in this instance.

- 7.3.14. With regard to overbearing impact, it is noted that the 2-storey element of the extension would be visible from the rear garden of adjacent properties. However, given the relatively limited height and size of the proposed development I am satisfied that it would not result in an overbearing impact.
- 7.3.15. Section 1.4 of Appendix 18 states that extensions should not result in any significant loss of privacy to the residents of adjoining properties. The proposed rear extension does not incorporate any windows on the side elevations and, therefore, would not result in any undue overlooking of neighbouring properties. The rear elevation of the proposed extension is also located c.32m from the rear elevation of existing dwellings to the south of the appeal site, which front onto the Old Finglas Road. Given the separation distances, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would not result in undue overlooking of the existing dwellings fronting onto the Old Finglas Road.
- 7.3.16. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed rear extension would result in a high quality development which is in accordance with the provisions of Section 1.0 of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan as it would not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling, would not adversely affect existing visual amenities of the area and would not adversely affect residential amenities in terms of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing. It is also noted that the Planning Authority raised no concerns in this regard.
- 7.3.17. The third party raised concerns that the proposed house extension is excessive and disproportionate to the original house. The proposed development results in a single residential dwelling with a stated gross floor area of c. 175sqm (including attic space), on a c. 300sqm site. In excess of c. 115sqm of rear private open space would be retained. I am satisfied that the proposed development is well considered and would not adversely impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling and would not result in overdevelopment of the site.
- 7.3.18. The rear garden of the appeal site is gently sloping and the boundary walls between the appeal site and the adjoining properties at no. 3 and no. 7 Cremore Crescent are staggered in height to correspond to the changing levels. The drawings submitted indicate that the sections of the rear boundary walls would be raised in close proximity to the proposed rear extension, to provide for additional screening. I have no objection

to the increased height of the rear boundary walls. However, it is noted that a third party submission made to the Planning Authority stating that no permission was given to alter the boundary wall. While this is noted, it is my opinion that this is a matter that falls outside of the planning code and having regard to the provisions of Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act it should be noted that a person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission to carry out any development.

Materials

- 7.3.19. Section 1.3 and Section 1.7 of Appendix 18 state that external finishes shall complement the existing building. The information provided on the drawings indicate that the front elevation of the ground floor side extension would be finished in brick and the first floor level would be finished in render, to match the existing dwelling. The side and rear elevation would be predominantly finished in render with a brick element at ground floor level. I am satisfied that the external materials would harmonise with the existing house and have no concerns in this regard.

Dormer Extension

- 7.3.20. The works also include the construction of a dormer extension to the rear, a roof light to the front and the conversion of attic. Concerns are raised by the third party that the rear dormer is excessive and would be visually intrusive. The third party also notes that the houses to the rear (south) that front onto the Old Finglas Road are at a lower level than the houses on Cremore Crescent. The proposed development would have an overbearing impact on these properties, and it would be visible from the Old Finglas Road.
- 7.3.21. Section 5 of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan provides guidance for attic conversions / dormer windows and notes that *the conversion of attic spaces is common practice in many residential homes*. Table 18.1 includes a number of criteria when assessing a dormer window. The following are considered relevant: be visually subordinate; relate to the shape, size position and design of existing doors and windows; be set back from the eaves; and sit below the ridgeline of the roof; complimentary materials and comply with building regulations.
- 7.3.22. It is proposed to provide a new hipped roof over the side extension. This would extend the width of the existing roof to a maximum width of c. 9.3m. The proposed dormer is

c. 3.8m in width. It is located c. 0.8m from the site's boundary with no. 7 Cremore Crescent and c. 4.8m from the site's boundary with no. 3 Cremore Crescent. The dormer is set down c. 0.3m from the ridge of the roof and set back c. 0.6m from the eaves. Given the overall width and shape of the roof, a significant portion of the roof would be visible following the dormer extension. In my opinion the proposed dormer would be subordinate to the roof and, therefore, would not be excessive in this instance.

7.3.23. The proposed dormer extension includes 2 no. windows, c. 1.2m in width each. I have no objection to the size and position of the windows and considered them proportionate to the proposed dormer extension and to the proposed and existing windows and doors on the rear elevation of the house. The dormer would be finished in a metal cladding. In my opinion this is a high-quality contemporary material, and I have no objection in this regard.

7.3.24. It is acknowledged that the rear dormer extension would be visible from the rear garden of the appellants property. However, having regard to the nature and scale of the dormer I am satisfied that it would not result in any undue overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impact.

7.3.25. The third party raised specific concerns regarding the impact of the proposed extension on properties to the rear of the appeal site, fronting onto the Old Finglas Road. The rear elevation of the dormer is located c. 17m from the sites rear boundary and c. 35m from the rear elevation of the existing houses fronting onto the Old Finglas Road. The third party raised concerns that due to the level differences between the appeal site and the adjacent houses fronting onto the Old Finglas Road that the rear dormer extension in combination with the proposed extension would result in undue overlooking and have an overbearing impact. During my site visit it was noted that the appeal site gently slopes in a north-south direction and that there is a minor level difference between the appeal site and the houses to the rear (south). It is acknowledged that the rear dormer and the taller element of the 2-storey extension is likely to be visible from these properties. However, given the separation distance, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in any undue overlooking or an overbearing impact on the existing dwellings fronting onto the Old Finglas Road.

7.3.26. With regard to the concerns that the rear dormer and extension would be visible from the Old Finglas Road it is my opinion the rear dormer may be partially visible from the Old Finglas Road, from views between the existing semi-detached dwellings that front onto the Old Finglas Road, however, given the nature and scale of the proposed development and the c. 70m separation distance from the rear dormer extension to the Old Finglas Road I am satisfied that it would have a negligible impact on the visual amenities of the area.

7.3.27. Overall, having regard to the separation distances between the proposed dormer and directly opposing dwellings and the overall width of the site, the width of the proposed roof and the dimensions of the dormer, it is my opinion that the proposed dormer extension would be in accordance with the provisions of the Section 5 of Appendix 18 of the development plan would not be overbearing when viewed from the rear gardens of adjoining properties and would not result in any undue overlooking.

Rooflight

7.3.28. It is also proposed to provide a roof light on the front roof profile. The rooflight is c. 0.6m in width by 0.5m in length. Given the relatively limited size and the positioning of the roof light I am satisfied that it would not adversely impact the visual amenities of the area.

Attic Conversion

7.3.29. The proposed development also includes the conversion of the converted attic space. The third party has raised concerns regarding the intended use of the attic. The attic area has a floor to ceiling height of 2.171m. The Planning Authority noted the floor to ceiling height and Condition no 4 of the grant of permission states that the attic space shall not be used as a habitable space, unless it complies with the relevant Building Regulations. It is my recommendation that a similar condition be attached to any grant of permission.

7.4. *Other Issues*

7.4.1. Condition no. 9 of the grant of permission sets the hours of construction work to between 7am – 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am to 2pm on Saturday. The third party considers that given the residential nature of the surrounding area that building works

should not begin until 9am and should end by 12pm on a Saturday. While the concerns of the third party are noted, these are standard construction hours and given the relatively short term duration of the construction phase I am satisfied that it would not unduly impact on the residential amenity.

8.0 Water Framework Directive (Screening)

- 8.1. The subject site is located the suburban area of Dublin. There are no watercourses within the appeal site. The nearest water body is the River Tolka (TOLKA_050), located c. 300m south of the appeal site. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 8.2. 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 and 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.
- 8.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows
- The small scale and nature of the development
 - Location-distance from nearest water bodies
 - Lack of hydrological connections
- 8.4. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

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 any European sites in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required. This determination is based on:

- The small scale and nature of the scheme,
- The urban location of the site,
- The separation distance from nearest European site, and
- The lack of a direct or indirect pathway to any designated site.

10.0 Recommendation

It is recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the sites residential zoning objective, the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan, 2022 -2028, the existing pattern of development in the area, and the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be acceptable and would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 28th day of May 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity

3. The attic space shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with relevant Building Regulations.

Reason: To ensure an adequate standard of development.

4. No part of the flat roof shall be used as a balcony, terrace or private amenity area.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

5. All external finishes shall harmonise with the existing finishes on the house in respect of materials and colour.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity

7. Drainage arrangements, including the disposal and attenuation of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

8. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Elaine Power

Senior Planning Inspector

28th October 2025

Appendix 1:

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323409-25
Proposed Development Summary	Partial demolition of the existing single storey extension and the construction of a new ground floor extension to front, side and rear, including garage conversion, a first floor extension to side and rear, conversion of existing attic with dormer to rear and roof glazing to front
Development Address	No. 5 Cremore Crescent, Glasnevin, Dublin 11
	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.	
<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,	

<p>Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><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>	

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____