



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323612-25

Development

Permission for the demolition of an existing single storey dwelling, construction of a new detached two storey dwelling, including modifications to the front boundary wall, the existing pedestrian entrance to be widened to allow for vehicular access with the existing vehicular entrance to be closed, and all associated site works.

Location

Oaklands, 39 Dundanion Road, Beaumont, Cork, T12 HP6P

Planning Authority

Cork City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2543631

Applicant(s)

Ger & Lisa Buckley

Type of Application

Planning Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant permission with 12no. conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)	Patrick O'Driscoll
Observer(s)	Kevin Gallagher
Date of Site Inspection	26 th October 2025
Inspector	Sarah O'Mahony

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Further Information	5
3.2. Decision	6
3.3. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.4. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.5. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	8
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
5.1. Development Plan.....	8
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	9
5.3. EIA Screening	9
6.0 The Appeal	10
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	10
6.2. Applicant Response	10
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	10
6.4. Observations.....	10
6.5. Further Responses	11
7.0 Assessment	11
7.2. Overlooking.....	11
7.3. Design.....	12
7.4. Overshadowing	13

7.5. Plant room noise	14
7.6. Property Devaluation	15
7.7. Construction Impacts	15
8.0 AA Screening.....	15
8.1. Screening.....	15
8.2. Conclusion	16
9.0 WFD Screening	16
9.1. Screening.....	16
9.2. Conclusion	17
10.0 Recommendation	17
11.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17
12.0 Conditions	18
Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination	23
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.094ha site is situated in the southeast suburbs of Cork city, in the Blackrock/Ballinlough area. The immediate and wider area comprises low to medium density, mid-20th century, residential development. The Skehard Road, R582, is situated 500m to the south while the Blackrock Road, R583, is 500m to the north.
- 1.2. There is a detached, single storey 134m² dwelling situated on the site which is accessed from Dundanion Road at the west and which has in-curtilage car parking to the front (west) and private open space to the rear (east). The site forms part of a wider housing estate and is situated at the end of a row of similar single storey dwellings. The dwellings to the south and southeast of the site's open space comprise two and a half storey dwellings of more recent construction situated along Upper Beaumont Drive.
- 1.3. All adjacent land is in residential use.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for development which comprises the following:
 - Demolition of existing 134m² single storey dwelling,
 - Construction of a new detached 245.9m² two storey dwelling on similar footprint on the site,
 - Modifications to the front boundary wall comprising widening the existing pedestrian entrance to allow for vehicular access and removal/closure of the existing vehicular entrance, and
 - And all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Further Information

- 3.1.1. The following further information was sought from the applicant:

- Amend the design to reduce overbearing and detrimental sense of enclosure to habitable rooms in the neighbouring no. 41 Dundanion Road to the north in accordance with Section 11.104 of the City Development Plan.
- Revise the shadow study to fully illustrate impacts to no. 41 Dundanion Road.
- Submit details of the proposed plant room to be situated at the north of the dwelling.

3.1.2. The applicant's response included the following:

- The FFL was lowered by 150mm and the volume of the first floor was also reduced, increasing the separation distance between the proposed dwelling and no. 41 by 600mm to exceed 5m in total. The roof was also redesigned with the ridge level reduced by 400mm.
- The response outlines that a previous proposal permitted a ridge height of 7.675m on the site and this revised proposal is 7.2m.
- References made in a third-party submission to the boundary are out of date and do not account for the current condition of the boundary. The photographs show the boundary from a number of years previously before a new timber fence and hedging was provided. The hedging is now taller than the fence.
- An updated shadow study is provided as prepared by a specialist consultant.
- The plant room will accommodate an air to water heat pump and hot water storage only. A specification sheet for this plant was submitted.

3.2. **Decision**

3.2.1. Cork City Council issued a notification to grant permission on 14th August 2025 subject to 12no. standard conditions.

3.3. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.3.1. Planning Reports

- There are two case planner's reports, one recommending further information and the latter assessing it.

- The Planners report recommendation to grant permission is consistent with the notification of decision which issued.
- Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) issues were screened out.
- It considered the principle of development complies with the zoning objective and that minimum quantitative standards are met. It states that the main impact would be to residential amenity in the neighbouring dwelling to the north but following receipt of further information, it considered such matters to be addressed.
- Reference is made in the report to the proposed vehicular entrance alterations and that 'it is noted that the Council's Urban Roads and Street Design Engineer raises no objection to same.' There is no report on file from the Engineer and it is not referenced in Section 6 of the report regarding 'technical/referral reports' whereas both the Environment Department and Development Contributions Section are noted in that section of the report.
- Additional reports prepared by the Senior Executive Planner agreed with the conclusions of the Area Planner formed in both reports.

3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division: No objection subject to standard conditions.
- Environment Waste Management and Control: Two reports on file both of which state no objection subject to standard conditions.
- Development contributions: Report outlining the applicable contributions to be attached to a grant of permission.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Éireann: No response.

3.5. Third Party Observations

- 3.5.1. Two third party submissions were received from Pat O'Driscoll and from Kevin Gallagher and Fiona Hughes-Gallagher. They raised the following matters:

- Overbearing design which would overshadow south facing windows of adjacent dwelling. Shadow study submitted with the application is inaccurate.
- Visual impact.
- Two-storey design is out of character with existing single storey dwellings.
- Clarification required regarding plant room and associated equipment.
- Property devaluation.
- Overlooking.
- Scale of development.
- Construction disruption, noise and nuisance.

4.0 Planning History

- TP 11/34897: Planning permission granted to demolish garage and construct single storey extension to the rear with attic conversion including dormer roof, to rear, 2no. dormer windows to front and roof lights to side elevations with internal alterations and ancillary wite works.
- TP 18/37849: Planning permission granted for alterations to existing dwelling to provide for a two-storey dwelling, in addition to elevation façade alterations and associated site works.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 (referred to hereafter as the CDP). The site is zoned ZO-01 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods which has the following objective:

“To protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses.”

- 5.1.2. Paragraph ZO 1.2 states:

“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.”

- 5.1.3. Development management standards are set out in chapter 11 and I note section 11.12 requires high quality design which takes account of existing context and character while section 11.142 requires the design and layout of residential extensions to have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties as well as the character and form of the existing dwelling. Section 11.139 refers to infill development and similarly requires new development to respect the height and massing of existing residential units and to enhance the character of the area. Paragraph 11.141 clearly sets out support for adapting existing dwellings by stating:

“In order to ensure that existing homes are utilised by occupation Cork City Council supports the retention and adaptation of the existing housing stock to suit the evolving needs of society.”

- 5.1.4. Sections 11.100-11.105 provide guidance on separation, overlooking and overbearance and advise that in established residential developments any significant changes to established context must be considered. Relocation or reduction in building bulk and height may be considered as measures to ameliorate overbearance.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The site is situated 850m north of Cork Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) and Douglas River proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA). It is also situated 6km west of Great Island Channel Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and pNHA and 4km east of Cork Lough pNHA.

5.3. EIA Screening

- 5.3.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The

proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. One appeal is received from Patrick O'Driscoll

- Overlooking concerns from a new first-floor window on the southern elevation of the proposed dwelling which overlooks the adjacent private open space and rear elevation of an existing two-storey dwelling to the south.
- Request made to remove or re-design the window, so it is fitted permanently with obscure glazing and a non-opening fixture below 1.7m from FFL.

6.2. Applicant Response

- None

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- None

6.4. Observations

6.4.1. One observation was received from Kevin Gallagher and Fiona Hughes-Gallagher. It raises the following matters:

- Overshadowing to existing southfacing windows in neighbouring dwelling to the north. The revisions outlined in the further information response do not address the concerns raised. The applicant's reference to a previously permitted ridge level does not clarify that the design in that case included single and two storey elements, with the taller section set back further south from the neighbouring dwelling.
- Overshadowing will impact passive house standard.
- Photographs submitted from 2018 to illustrate the extent of shadow cast by the existing dwelling. Hedging can be removed or trimmed back, as can timber fencing

and therefore its presence as highlighted by the applicant is an irrelevant consideration.

- Proposed building height is out of character with existing single storey dwellings.
- Will noise from the plant room conform to building regulations?
- Property devaluation.
- Construction phase disruption and nuisance.

6.5. Further Responses

None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report/s of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal relates to the following:

- Overlooking
- Design
- Overshadowing
- Plant room noise
- Property devaluation
- Construction impacts

7.2. Overlooking

7.2.1. The appellant requests that the proposed first floor window on the southern elevation is either removed or altered to eliminate overlooking to their property. The window in question is one of two proposed to serve the master bedroom. One window in the bedroom faces west towards the public access road and forms the larger and primary view from that room while the southern window is smaller and secondary.

- 7.2.2. In this context, it is evident that the southern window is additional and does not form the only means of natural light for the room. I consider the requested alterations of providing opaque glazing would address all concerns of overlooking while still maintaining a high degree of natural light and internal residential amenity for the proposed occupants.
- 7.2.3. I therefore recommend the insertion of a condition requiring the first-floor window on the southern elevation to be permanently finished with opaque glazing and that any openable section is situated a minimum of 1.7m above the first-floor finished floor level.
- 7.2.4. Having interrogated the floorplan and elevation drawings as well as the site layout plan, I note that the remainder of the first-floor windows serving habitable rooms are situated on the front or rear elevations which all benefit from appropriate separation distances. One window is proposed on the northern elevation however it will serve a bathroom and does not have any directly opposing first floor windows.

7.3. Design

- 7.3.1. The proposed two-storey dwelling is designed with a hipped roof and flat central area with a total ridge level of 28.150mOD which is marginally above the 27.3mOD level on the neighbouring single storey to the north and marginally below the 29.77mOD level of the two storey dwelling to the south. In this regard, the proposed design acts as a transition between both structures and in my view, appropriately responds to the built form in the area.
- 7.3.2. I note the Observer's point suggesting the form of a two-storey structure would be out of character with the existing single storey dwellings on Dundanion Road. However, having regard to the extent of intervisibility between the site and the remainder of the single storey dwellings on Dundanion Road, as well as the intervisibility between the site and the existing two storey dwellings to the south and southwest on Upper Beaumont Drive, I consider the principle of providing a two-storey structure on this site is acceptable.
- 7.3.3. I also consider there is a sufficient two storey separation distance and transition in scale between the proposed dwelling and the existing single storey dwelling to the north to successfully integrate the proposed dwelling into the streetscape without any

negative visual impacts. It would be 0.8m taller than the adjacent single storey dwellings which is not significant in my opinion. It would have a larger bulk and massing than the existing Dundanion Road dwellings, but I do not consider this differential would detract from the visual amenity or character of the area. I consider it has adequately responded to the built context of the area in terms of scale and height.

7.3.4. In terms of the detailed design, I consider the layout, fenestration and massing are all acceptable as are the proposed materials and finishes. I do not consider the design would result in a negative visual impact when viewed from neighbouring property. In this regard, I note the commentary regarding the permanence of timber fencing and hedging, however I ultimately consider that the design, layout, fenestration and materiality of the proposed northern elevation would not negatively impact the visual amenity of the adjoining property to the north.

7.3.5. In conclusion, I consider the proposed design is acceptable for the site and would comply with the zoning objective and development management requirements for the area.

7.4. Overshadowing

7.4.1. The third-party observation raises concerns about overshadowing as the subject site is situated to the south of the observer's property which has 2no. south facing windows serving kitchen and living spaces.

7.4.2. The proposed dwelling would be situated on approximately the same footprint as the existing structure but would actually increase the separation distances by an additional 1.8m to a total of 6.7 and 6.8m from the dwelling to the north. Further, the revised proposal would be only 1.15m taller than the current dwelling on site which by itself is not a significant change in my view.

7.4.3. I consider the likely singular aspect of the proposed development which could impact the degree of light and sunlight entering the windows in question is from the increased bulk and massing of the development above ground floor.

7.4.1. 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice', also known as the BRE Guidelines, is a non-statutory guidance document which sets out methodologies and assessment techniques to quantify daylight, sunlight and

overshadowing. The applicant submitted a shadow study which concludes that the proposed development meets the recommended standards of the BRE Guidelines.

- 7.4.2. I note the observer does not accept this conclusion, however having regard to the shadow study, application drawings and the overall extent of change likely to be experienced at the adjoining property, I agree with the conclusions drawn and consider the proposed development is not likely to result in any significant impact to adjoining residential amenity. Analysis of the December forecasted shadow, when the sun is lowest in the sky, demonstrates a minimal change from existing to proposed scenarios.
- 7.4.3. A minor change is likely to occur in terms of the quantity of daylight and sunlight entering the windows in question however in my view this change is acceptable, particularly in light of the urban nature and overall medium to low density of the area and is not a sufficient ground for refusing permission as it would not significantly impact existing residential amenity.

7.5. Plant room noise

- 7.5.1. The floor layout plans suggest that a plant room would be provided on the northern side of the building which would form part of the footprint of the dwelling and be recessed within the overall building line, however it would only be accessed from an external door.
- 7.5.2. The observation questions if noise emissions would adhere to building regulations however this is outside the remit of planning legislation. The specification sheet provided by the applicant indicates that the proposed plant and machinery is all standard domestic equipment which is unlikely to generate significant noise.
- 7.5.3. I also consider that the location of the equipment in a plant room situated within the footprint of the existing building and benefiting from standard insulation and joinery etc which forms the overall structure and fabric of the building, will further reduce any potential noise emissions. I am therefore satisfied that the equipment will not impact adjoining residential amenity.

7.6. Property Devaluation

- 7.6.1. I note the concerns raised in the grounds of appeal in respect of the devaluation of neighbouring property. However, having regard to the assessment and conclusion set out above, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the value of property in the vicinity.

7.7. Construction Impacts

- 7.7.1. Having regard to the scale and nature of the proposed development, I consider it highly unlikely that any significant disruption or nuisance would be caused by the construction phase due to the modest scale of the proposal and likely short, and ultimately temporary timeline. I recommend the preparation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented to reduce impacts to existing residential amenity.
- 7.7.2. Lastly for the purpose of completeness, while I note the appeal and observation did not make reference to the proposed vehicular alterations, I have assessed these and consider the revised layout to be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and would not detract from the amenity or character of the area.

8.0 AA Screening

8.1. Screening

- 8.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 8.1.2. The site is situated 850m north of Cork Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) and 6km west of Great Island Channel Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
- 8.1.3. The proposed development seeks to demolish an existing dwelling and construct a new dwelling on a similar footprint on the site.
- 8.1.4. 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.

8.1.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The urban infill nature and modest scale of the works,
- The location of the site removed from any waterbodies and lack of any hydrological connectivity,
- Existing connection to public water services and
- Taking into account the screening report/determination by Cork City Council.

8.2. Conclusion

8.2.1. 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.

8.2.2. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 WFD Screening

9.1. Screening

9.1.1. The subject site is located 600m south of the Atlantic Pond and 650m south of the River Lee. The Douglas Estuary is situated 850 south of the site.

9.1.2. The proposed development seeks to demolish an existing dwelling and construct a new dwelling on a similar footprint on the site.

9.1.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

9.1.4. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

9.1.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The urban infill nature and modest scale of the works.
- The location of the site removed from any waterbodies and lack of any hydrological connectivity.
- Existing connection to public water services.

9.2. **Conclusion**

9.2.1. 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.

10.0 **Recommendation**

10.1.1. I recommend that planning permission is granted in accordance with the conditions set out below.

11.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the location of the existing residential site within the existing built up area of Cork city on zoned and serviced lands, the provisions of Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, the established pattern of residential 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 appropriate in terms of design and layout, would not result in the creation of a traffic hazard, and would not seriously injure the amenities of neighbouring properties in 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 18th day of July 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 first floor window on the southern elevation shall be permanently finished with opaque glazing and any openable section shall be situated a minimum of 1.7m above the first floor finished floor level. Reason: In the interest of upholding adjoining residential amenity.
3.	(a) All foul sewage and soiled water shall be discharged to the public foul sewer. (b) Only clean, uncontaminated storm water shall be discharged to the surface water drainage system [or soakpits] and no surface water shall enter the public road. Reason: In the interest of public health.
4.	Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

	Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.
5.	Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0800 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1600 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority. Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.
6.	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 Coimisiún 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.

Sarah O'Mahony
Planning Inspector

28th October 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	323612
Proposed Development Summary	Demolish existing dwelling and construct new dwelling, alterations to vehicular entrance and all associated site development works.
Development Address	Oaklands, 39 Dundanion Road, Beaumont, Cork, T12 HP6P.
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)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	☐ 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)?	
☐ 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
☐ 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?	
☐ 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.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☒ 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)	Class 10 (b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units. Class 10 (b)(iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere Class 14 Works of Demolition Works of demolition carried out in order to facilitate a project listed in Part 1 or Part 2 of this Schedule where such works would be likely to have significant effects on the environment, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7

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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The urban site is serviced and its size is not exceptional in the context of the prevailing plot size in the area. A short-term construction phase would be required and the development would not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance due to its scale. The development, by virtue of its type and nature, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. Its operation presents no significant risks to human health. The size and scale of the proposed development is not significantly or exceptionally different to the existing dwellings.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	The development is situated in an urban area adjacent to and in close proximity to existing residential properties which is not exceptional in the context of surrounding development. It is not likely to have any cumulative impacts or significant cumulative impacts with other existing or permitted projects. The development is removed from designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative	Having regard to the nature of the proposed development and works constituting development within an existing built up area, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant

effects and opportunities for mitigation).	effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____