



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323585-25

Development	Demolition of single storey extensions, construction of single and two storey extensions; attic conversion to habitable use with 2No. rear dormer windows; rooflights, internal alterations, associated works
Location	44 Nutley Park, Donnybrook, Dublin 4
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2445/25
Applicant(s)	Eleanor Chambers + Seamus Griffin
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Ide Woods
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	25 th October 2025
Inspector	Suzanne Kehely

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.4. Other Technical Reports	6
3.5. Drainage Division: No objection subject to conditions:.....	6
3.6. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.7. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context - Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.....	7
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	11
6.0 EIA Screening	11
7.0 Water Framework Directive	11
8.0 The Appeal	12
8.1. Grounds of Appeal	12
8.2. Planning Authority Response	12
8.3. Observations	13
8.4. Further Response	13
9.0 Assessment	13
10.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening	16
11.0 Recommendation	17
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17

Conditions	17
------------------	----

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site of 0.065 hectares as stated is located at the southern end of Donnybrook suburb on the eastern side of Nutley Park - a mature low density residential cul-de-sac type road with restricted egress onto Stillorgan Road. The road is accessed off Nutley Lane opposite RTE grounds.
- 1.2. The site is one of a pair of semi-detached houses (pairing with no. 46 to its northern side) and backs directly onto Elm Park golf course. The site extends to just over 45m in depth and c.14m width in keeping with the plot scale along the road.
- 1.3. The house has substantially retained its original footprint with a modest additional ground level extension to link with the garage and outhouse both of which extend along the party boundary with no. 42 to the south over a length of c.12.8m as detailed in the drawings. No 42 has been extended on its former garage side with a two-storey dormer extension and to the rear with a single storey extension, the depth of which aligns approximately with the line of the outhouse sheds – it is approximately 300mm beyond the shed. The house at No.42 is set back from the boundary by c.900mm.
- 1.4. The rear garden is at a notably lower level than the internal floor level and an expansive patio stepped down from the existing floor level, extends across the rear of the dwelling and has steps down to the garden. The outhouse/shed which extends along the boundary from the rear building façade of the house for a few metres provides screening between nos. 42 and 44. The boundary wall beyond the shed/patio drops in height to what appears to be in the order of 1.5m in height above garden levels but mature planting and growth obscures the wall and provides privacy screening between the neighbouring properties.
- 1.5. There are two notable building styles of predominantly semi-detached house types along the road and many of the house have been extended and modified over the years. The semi-detached character remains a streetscape characteristic of the area.
- 1.6. The garages along the road appear originally detached from the principal dwelling but semi-detached with the garage in the adjacent site.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought for development as follows:

- Demolition of existing single storey extensions, garage and shed which extend 12.8m along the side southern boundary.
- New single storey to the side over the depth of existing ground floor, garage and shed and extending to 13.95m along the side boundary. This is consequent on extending slightly forward of the garage and slightly beyond the line of the shed. The ground floor extension is proposed to extend an additional 5m where it is set back 2.1 m from the southern boundary. A wall screening structure is shown inside the boundary wall along the south boundary on the ground floor plan drawings and this extends 5m to align with the new building line.
- The total depth of the ground floor extension to the rear is 9.65m and this is also stepped back from the northern boundary with no4 by approx. 3-4.35m. The design incorporates windows in all sides.
- New additional first floor extension to the side to be set back by up to 1m from the boundary to the side. The roof is marginally stepped down from existing and a new hip is proposed to the side.
- Attic conversion for habitable use with rooflights and 2 new no. rear dormer structures with metal cladding. These incorporate large square picture windows.
- All other associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. By Order dated 13th August 2024, the Planning Authority issued notification of its decision to grant permission subject to 9 conditions of a standard nature. The detailed requirements of the Drainage division were included and s.48 of

3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.3. Planning Reports: The report of **12th August 2024** the **concerns of the neighbour** regarding clearance, boundary issues and privacy are noted in context of the limitations of the scope of permission in relation to encroachment on private property. The development plan policy for domestic extensions is cited in detail by reference to Appendix 18 of the development plan. Regard is had to the character and pattern of development in the area. A precedent along Nutley Park for similarly styled extensions, rooflights and dormer structures is noted. The side elevation window serving the proposed kitchen is considered to be adequately set back from the party boundary such that privacy treatment to the window is not required. Materials and finishes will be required to harmonise with the existing dwelling. Finally, there it is are no issues arising with residual private open space, separation distances or third party privacy, overbearing impact or overshadowing. . Overall, it is considered that the proposal is in keeping with the standards set out in Appendix 18 of the Development Plan.

3.4. **Other Technical Reports**

3.5. Drainage Division: No objection subject to conditions:

- The developer shall comply with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Version 6.0 (available from www.dublincity.ie Forms and Downloads).
- The drainage for the proposed development shall be designed on a completely separate foul and surface water system.
- The development shall incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems in the management of surface water as shown on proposed drawings which includes a proposal to construct a soakaways as part of this development. The design and construction of soakaways must comply with the requirements of BRE Digest 365 and CIRIA C753.
- Any new paving shall be carried out in a sustainable manner so that there is no increase in surface water run-off to the drainage network as per the Dublin City

3.6. **Prescribed Bodies**

No Reports.

3.7. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.7.1. The owner of the adjacent property (appellant) raised concerns about interface of proposal with boundary and sought to ensure
- a 920mm minimum face to face clearance to be kept between boundary wall and proposed side wall of second floor extension, as site plan drawing dimension of 1000mm is open to misinterpretation, following an arbitrary centre line of boundary.
 - boundary wall stability and finished to prevent water ingress.
 - obscure glazing to side elevation ground level the kitchen window.
 - maintaining visual balance and rhythm of the neighbourhood. Queries metal cladding.

Also states that ‘the height of the boundary wall can be reduced from front to rear with the consent of both interested parties.’

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. **The site**

- No recent history.

5.0 **Policy Context - Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028**

- 5.1. **Zoning:** The site is zoned Z1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods with the objective ‘to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.’
- 5.2. **Appendix 18:** provide detail design guidance and considerations for Ancillary Residential Accommodation

5.2.1. **Section 1.1 - General Design Principles:** The design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular, the need for light and privacy. In addition, the form of the existing building should be respected, and the development should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar or contrasting materials and finishes.

- **Applications for extensions to existing residential units should:**

- Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling
- Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight
- Achieve a high quality of design
- Make a positive contribution to the streetscape (front extensions)
- Section 1.2 - Extensions to rear: 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.

- **In determining applications for first floor extensions** the following factors will be considered:-

- Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries
- Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability
- Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries
- External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.

5.2.2. **Section 1.3 - Extensions to side:** 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.

- **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 extensions 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.

5.2.3. **Section 1.4 - Privacy and Amenity:** Extensions should not result in any significant loss of privacy to the residents of adjoining properties. Generally, windows overlooking adjoining properties (such as in a side wall) should be avoided. Where essential, the size of such windows should be kept as small as possible and consideration should be given to the use of high-level windows and- or the use of obscure glazing where the window serves a bathroom or landing. Bedrooms in general should not be lit by obscure glazed windows as a means to prevent undue overlooking of adjacent properties. There will be a general presumption against the development of rear balconies and roof terraces. However, in inner urban areas, where there are limited opportunities for ground floor amenity provision, innovative design solutions for private amenity space will be considered on a case-by-case basis where it can be demonstrated that provision of same would not have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenities of adjacent properties. It is important to make sure that any extension does not unacceptably affect the amenities of neighbouring properties. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight. It is advisable to discuss proposals with neighbours prior to submitting a planning application

5.2.4. **Section 1.6 - Daylight and Sunlight:** 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. Furthermore, depending on orientation, such extensions can have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight received by adjoining properties. On the other hand, it is also recognised that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable. Consideration should be given to the proportion of extensions, height and design of roofs as well as taking account of the position of windows including rooms they serve to adjacent or adjoining dwellings.

- 5.2.5. **Section 1.7 - Appearance and Materials:** The extension should not dominate the existing building and should normally be of an overall scale and size to harmonise with the existing house and adjoining buildings the appearance of the existing structure should be the reference point for any consideration of change that may be proposed. The materials used should complement those used on the existing building features such as windows and doors on the new extension should relate to those on the original building in terms of proportion and use of materials.
- 5.2.6. **Section 4.0 Alterations at Roof Level- Attics- Dormers- Additional Floors:** The roofline of a building is one of its most dominant features and it is important that any proposal to change the shape, pitch or cladding of a roof is carefully considered. Alterations at roof level can include the conversion of an attic space and inclusion of dormer windows or the provision of an additional storey modifying the roof profile entirely. The following criteria will be considered in assessing alterations at roof level:
- Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
 - Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
 - Distance- contrast- visibility of proposed roof end.
 - Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence.
- 5.2.7. **Section 5.0 Attic Conversions - Dormer Windows:** The conversion of attic spaces is common practice in many residential homes. The use of an attic space for human habitation must be compliant with all of the relevant design standards, as well as building and fire regulations. Dormer windows, where proposed should complement the existing roof profile and be sympathetic to the overall design of the dwelling. The use of roof lights to serve attic bedrooms will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Where it is proposed to extend the ridge height to accommodate an increased floor to ceiling height, the design should avoid an overly dominant roof structure. The proposed scale of the roof should retain similar proportions to the building where possible. Dormer windows may be provided to the front, side or rear of a dwelling.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. The subject site is c.1.2 km from South Dublin Bay SAC (site code 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (site code 004024.) It also the same distance from South Dublin Bay proposed NHA (site code 000210).

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. 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 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 Water Framework Directive

- 7.1. The site is an urban serviced site. There is no watercourse on site. There is combined sewer that traverses part of a corner of the adjacent garden and is well removed from any of the proposed demolition or works area. The proposed works are modest in scale and incorporate SuDS and no drainage issues arise in Drainage Division report. Given the location removed from any significant waterbody and within the curtilage of the dwelling there is no likely pathway due to the nature and limited scale of the development at this location and good construction practice.
- 7.2. Having assessed the proposed development and 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 and having further considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I consider that the proposal can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 7.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- the scale and nature of the domestic extension works in an urban serviced area

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.

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

8.1.1. The neighbour in the dwelling to the north has lodged an appeal and the grounds are similar to the issues raised in the objection to the planning authority. The key objections are:

- Overlooking given that the appellant understood the intention of the applicant to orient windows away, yet this has not been done to the appellant's satisfaction. The proposed ground floor south facing window in the kitchen is main concern given its large size, orientation onto the boundary and potential for directly overlooking the rear of the appellant property. This would cause loss of privacy and serious injury to residential amenity. Reduction in size, 'muffling' or screening along the boundary are not accepted as a means to mitigate impact. Omission of glazing is sought.
- Overlooking from master bedroom first floor window near boundary.
- Overall extent of extension along joint boundary, and encroachment of property.
- Numbers 9 and 34 Nutley Park as cited examples of extension are not relevant as they have no side windows.

8.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority has no additional comments to that raised in its planning report and requests that its decision be upheld with particular reference to attachment of the s.48 contribution condition.

8.3. Observations

None

8.4. Further Response

- The applicants have made considerable efforts to engage with neighbours and take on board their concerns as part of the design process.
- No discussion was had concerning the kitchen window so no assurance given. The PA report is cited in respect of its setback and relationship with boundary

9.0 Assessment

9.1. Issues

- 9.1.1. This appeal is against a decision to grant permission for a domestic extension. Having regard to the submissions on file and the site and its environs as inspected, I consider the key issues relate in general terms overall **scale and integration** and in more precise terms to overriding issue is **overlooking and impact on amenity of no.42**. There are also other matters raised.

9.2. Scale and integration

- 9.2.1. The proposed development constitutes a significant increase in the floor area of the original dwelling on site. The extended house as it stands has a stated floor area of 196 sq.m. while the external dimensions on the drawings amount to a gross area of 216 sq.m. It is proposed to demolish about 49 sqm at ground level and replace with a larger ground floor extension of c130sq.m while also introducing a new first floor extension to the side with a gross floor area of 49 sq.m.
- 9.2.2. In addition to the proposed attic level this will increase the habitable floor area considerably with larger rooms and ancillary space. As viewed from the street, the main difference is the addition of a first-floor level to the side. I note however the extension to side at this floor is only 3.8m in width as viewed from the street. This is subordinate to the original width of the principal house at 9.3m. The scaling and order of windows is in keeping with that of the original house. Of particular note is the stepping down of the roof ridge and recessed stepping of the first-floor building line.

These elements combine to mark the additional space as visually subordinate. In terms of spacing between dwellings and a potential terracing effect, the ground floor extends to the boundary which is consistent with the building lines established by the garage layout, while the first floor is stepped back from the side boundary. (Drawings indicate a set back off the face of the wall at 1m which gives a 1.8m spacing between dwellings at first floor.) The secondary entrance at ground level reads as a side passage. I consider this arrangement visually prevents a terracing effect. Accordingly in terms of streetscape elevation, the proposed development is I consider, in keeping with the semi-detached character and rhythm that prevails in the streetscape. I note that many houses have been modified and in addition to the original design variance along the road that the spacing and generous plot width and mature sylvan setting allow for degree of individual design approaches to extending the properties. In this case I am satisfied that the proposal meets with the overall design guidance of Appendix 18 in terms of maintaining the character and visual amenities and that diminution or injury of such amenity does not constitute grounds for refusal.

9.3. Overlooking and Impact on no.42

- 9.3.1. The proposed ground floor level extension will marginally increase in depth where it abuts the boundary with no.42 to the south. It will for example extend 13.95m where presently the ground floor structure extends 12.8m. Part of this increase is consequent on a marginal stepping forward of the building line beyond the existing garage facade to align with the original house façade. The shed and garage will be replaced by ancillary utility type accommodation along the boundary and through which access from the front garden to rear garden can be accommodated. It will I consider have little imperceptible difference. The issue of boundary encroachment is a civil matter. Permission under the Planning Acts does not confer property rights.
- 9.3.2. A critical issue for the appellant relates to the south facing window in the extension. While the appellant questions the need for this window having regard to the other expansive windows and rooflights, I consider a south facing window to be an appropriate addition to habitable space in terms of aspect and solar gain. In terms of impact on no.42, I note the kitchen extension extends beyond the line of the existing patio and beyond the neighbour's 4m deep extension by almost 5m. While this part of the extension is shown as being setback 2.1 metres from the side boundary with

no.42, I note that the site levels and relatively low garden level at this point could give rise to overlooking if the lower wall height was maintained and in the absence of planting. I note that the applicant intends to provide screening and that some screening is shown in the ground floor plan. However, in the section AA drawings a boundary screen is proposed along the boundary and steps down beyond the patio. There is perhaps some disparity between the drawings, but I am satisfied that the applicant clearly intends to screen the boundary. I further note that the extension to the rear is stepped down from the original part of the house where floor levels are being retained. A 1.8m screen as measured from the finished floor level of the new kitchen area at this stepped down level would maintain screening and is a normal approach to boundary facing windows. I further note that the design has been arranged so that there are no patio doors to this southern patio, instead the living area opens onto the larger northern patio. In my judgement, the design through use of levels and setbacks has adequately responded to the rear garden terrain and boundaries in terms of protecting privacy and assimilating the extension. Having regard to this design approach, I consider direct overlooking from the kitchen can be sufficiently mitigated through screening, precise details of which can be submitted for agreement with the planning authority to allow for some negotiation between the parties. In this regard I note comments of the appellant to the planning authority which refer to a stepping down of the boundary by agreement. In the letter of observation, the appellant states 'the height of the boundary wall can be reduced from front to rear with the consent of both interested parties.'

- 9.3.3. The other overlooking source relates to the first-floor windows in the master bedroom which overlook the back garden but also wrap around the corner to face the northern boundary with no.46. These provide oblique views into the garden of no.42 and while they are I agree quite expansive, the impact is greater on 46 although this neighbour has made no submissions. The set back from the north is however 7.5m and at a point where there is a mature boundary. There are no opposing windows. I consider the plot width and scale of elevation can absorb the extent of glazing and no undue overlooking will arise. The extensive glazing also helps to assimilate the large dormers which border on being quite dominant relative to the original window scale.
- 9.3.4. On balance I concur with the opinion of the planning authority that having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the pattern of development in

the area that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding area.

- 9.3.5. I recommend that the standard conditions be generally applied. In respect of drainage issues, I note the combined sewer in the area and in the interest of clarity on the requirements for SuDS, I consider it helpful to attach the detailed wording as specified by the planning authority in this regard.

10.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 10.1.1. I have considered the development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in a serviced urban area approximately 1.2km from South Dublin Bay SAC (site code 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (site code 004024). The development description is contained in Section 2 of this report. I note no AA issues arose in the Planning Authority screening assessment. There were no drainage ditches evident within or proximity to the appeal site. I am satisfied that there is no apparent surface water link between the appeal site, and any European site close to the site.
- 10.2. 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 European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The relatively modest scale of the proposed residential development, which would connect to the public piped water services,
 - The separation distance from the nearest European site and the lack of direct hydrological or ecological connectivity to any Natura 2000 site.
- 10.3. The AA screening exercise conducted by the Planning Authority which concluded that either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, there would be no likely significant effects on any European sites.
- 10.4. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, the proposed development would not have a 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 (Stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) is not required.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be granted for the proposed development based on the following reasons and considerations and subject to the following conditions

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the established pattern of development in the area, and the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not give rise to significant overlooking of neighbouring dwellings, would not have a negative impact on the character of the area or the visual or residential amenities of property in the area, and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Conditions

1.	The proposed development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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 proposed development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. Reason: in the interest of clarity
2.	Screening to a height of 1.8m above the finished floor level of the proposed lower kitchen level shall be provided along the boundary with no.42 for the depth of the extension and patio steps, unless otherwise agreed with the

	<p>planning authority. Details shall be submitted for the written of the planning authority prior to commencement of development on site.</p> <p>Reason: in the interest of residential amenity.</p>
3.	<p>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 or public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: in order to safeguard the amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
4.	<p>The glazing to all bathroom and en-suite windows shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.</p>
5.	<p>Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The developer shall comply with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Version 6.0 (available from www.dublincity.ie Forms and Downloads). ii. The drainage for the proposed development shall be designed on a completely separate foul and surface water system. iii. The development shall incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems in the management of surface water as shown on proposed drawings which includes a proposal to construct a soakaways as part of this development. The design and construction of soakaways must comply with the requirements of BRE Digest 365 and CIRIA C753. iv. Any new paving shall be carried out in a sustainable manner so that there is no increase in surface water run-off to the drainage network as per the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

	Reason: in the interest of public health.
6.	<p>Site development and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner to ensure that the adjoining street is kept clear of debris, soil, and other material.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the adjoining road is kept in a clean and safe condition, in the interest of orderly development.</p>
7.	<p>External finishes shall be as indicated on the submitted drawings unless otherwise agreed with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: in the interests of visual and residential amenities.</p>
8.	<p>The entire premises shall be used as a single dwelling unit and shall not be subdivided by way of sale or letting or otherwise.</p> <p>Reason: in the interest of residential amenity.</p>
9.	<p>The developer shall pay to the Planning Authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the Planning Authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the Planning Authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission</p>

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

Suzanne Kehely
Senior Planning Inspector

28th October 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	323585-25
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of single storey extensions, construction of single and two storey extensions; attic conversion to habitable use with 2No. rear dormer windows; rooflights, internal alterations, associated works
Development Address	44 Nutley Park, Donnybrook, Dublin 4
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 development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	

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

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"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____