



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP 323776-25

Development

Proposed three storey (three bedroom) detached house and ancillary site works.

Location

27 Hillside, Dalkey, Co. Dublin
A96KP79

Planning Authority

Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D25A/0097/WEB

Applicant(s)

Robert Gardiner & Sinead Tyrrell

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

John & Mary Hanlon

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

15th November 2025

Inspector

Barry Diamond

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History	5
5.0	Policy Context	6
6.0	EIA Screening	8
7.0	The Appeal	8
8.0	Assessment	10
9.0	AA Screening	15
10.0	Water Framework Directive	16
11.0	Recommendation	16
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	16

Appendix 1 – EIA Screening

Appendix 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site comprises the existing dwelling and curtilage of No. 27 Hillside (c.0.05ha) which is located at the junction of Hillside and Barnhill Avenue.
- 1.2. No. 27 Hillside is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof, a render finish to the walls with a brick plinth. The existing dwelling has a ground floor and first floor bay window on the side elevation and a single storey rear annex. A vehicular access exists to the front of the property which accesses onto Hillside.
- 1.3. The site is enclosed to the front of the site along Hillside by a low render wall approximately one metre in height. The wall continues around the corner onto Barnhill Avenue and remains at 1 metre in height until it reaches the front building line of the existing dwelling when it then increases to 2 metres in height. A wall of 1.5 metres in height defines the rear boundary while the gable wall of a single storey annex to the adjoining dwelling (No. 28 Barnhill Avenue) defines the eastern boundary. There is a small single storey ancillary store of in the rear garden area.
- 1.4. The surrounding area is residential and is characterised by similarly designed two storey semi-detached dwellings. Two notable exceptions are a detached dwelling, No.23 Barnhill Avenue which is located 37 metres northwest of the application site and Shamrock Lodge, a single storey dwelling which is set back off the building line of Barnhill Avenue and lies 43 metres west of the application site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises a number of different elements including:
 - i) Demolition of existing bay window to the side of the existing house;
 - ii) Construction of a three storey (three bedroom) detached house to the side garden balcony to rear/south elevation at second floor;
 - iii) Landscape details to include the subdivision of the existing curtilage of No. 27 Hillside;
 - iv) New vehicular access and off-street car parking layout; and
 - v) Ancillary site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.2. On the 10th September 2025 the Planning Authority issued a decision to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

3.2.1. Conditions

4. The subject dwelling shall be set within the existing boundary with the public road and shall not form the boundary wall.

REASON: In the interest of visual amenity and in compliance with Section 12.3.7.1 (iii) of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-20

6. The roof area of the ground floor to the rear shall not be used as a balcony, roof (terrace) garden or similar amenity area.

REASON: In the interests of residential amenity.

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Reports

3.3.2. The Planning Officer comments on the initial scheme that;

- The principle of development is acceptable within the 'A' zoning;
- The room sizes of the dwelling exceed the minimum room sizes;
- The private space to the rear to the dwelling is useful and adequate;
- A contemporary dwelling is acceptable, however, there are concerns with a three storey dwelling, which has a visual bulk greater than the existing dwelling;
- There are concerns with overlooking and overshadowing of neighbouring properties mainly due to the proposed roof terrace;
- There should only be one parking space per dwelling;
- Sustainable Urban Drainage is required in the scheme;

A further information request was made and amended plans were submitted on behalf of the applicant. The Planning Officer comments on the revised scheme that;

- The amended pitch roof and dormer window is less visually obtrusive and would have less impact on residential amenity;
- A single car parking space is now provided;
- SUDs measures are now proposed which will limit the impact on the surface water network;
- The applicant has complied with the further information request;
- EIA screening is not required; and
- The proposal will not significantly impact upon any Natura 2000 site.

3.3.3. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division: no objection subject to conditions.
- Transport Planning Section: Revised plans were requested showing the provision of only 1 No. car parking space per dwelling. No comment was received for the amended scheme.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Éireann– No objection

3.5. Third Party Observations

There were five representations made to the Planning Authority during the processing of the planning application which are attached to the file. I consider that some of the issues raised in their submissions to the Coimisiún correlate with the issues raised, however, the additional issues raised in the observations to the Planning Authority are as follows:

- Proximity of the access to the junction with Hillside and Barnhill Avenue; and
- The development will require scaffolding on the pavement.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 Site

No relevant permission.

4.2 Setting

4.2.1 D19A/1003 & ABP-307379-20 Permission was granted for the demolition of the existing converted former garage attached to the side of the existing house and existing shed to rear, construction of 1no. detached two storey, three bedroom infill dwelling of 135.3m² with single storey element to side and rear, all to side garden of existing house, new vehicular entrance to front to serve existing dwelling, construction of new vehicular access to the rear of the property off existing cul de sac for single car usage for proposed new dwelling and ancillary site works necessary to facilitate the development including SUDS surface water drainage, site works, boundary treatments and landscaping at 121, Hillside, Dalkey, Co. Dublin, A96R599

4.2.2 D18A/1044 & PL06D.226816 Permission was granted for revisions to previously approved dwelling (Reg Ref no. D09A/0275) to include: 1. Omission of approved basement. 2. Revised roof profiles to include reduced roof height. 3. Revised external finishes, window and door design to front, sides and rear. 4. Revised internal floor layout and ancillary works to the side at 57 Mapas Road, Dalkey, Co Dublin.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

The relevant Development Plan is the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. The site is zoned 'A' with the objective to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.

Policy Objective PHP18 (Residential Density) is relevant and states: Increase housing (houses and apartments) supply and promote compact urban growth through the consolidation and re-intensification of infill/brownfield sites having regard to proximity and accessibility considerations, and development management criteria set out in Chapter 12.

Policy Objective PHP19 (Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation) states that it is a policy objective to: “conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF. Densify existing built-up areas in the County through small scale infill development having due regard to the amenities of existing established residential neighbourhoods”.

Policy Objective PHP20 (Protection of Existing Residential Amenity)

Section 12.3.1 (Quality Design)

Section 12.3.3 (Quantitative Standards for All Residential Development)

Section 12.3.4 (Residential Development – General Requirements)

Section 12.3.7 (Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-Up Areas) with particular reference to Section 12.3.7.5 Corner/Side Garden Sites and Section 12.3.7.7 Infill.

Section 12.4.8 (Vehicular Entrances and Hardstanding Areas) requires vehicle entrances and exits to be designed to avoid traffic hazard for pedestrians and passing traffic. In general, for a single residential dwelling, the maximum width of an entrance is 3.5 metres.

Section 12.8.2 (Open Space Categories for Residential Development)

Section 12.8.7 (Private Amenity Space – Quality Standards)

Section 12.8.7.1 (Separation Distances)

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

‘Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities’, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, (2024)

Best Practice Guidelines for Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities 2007.

5.2 Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1 The appeal site is not located on or within proximity to any designated Natura 2000 sites, with the nearest designated sites being the Dalkey Costal Zone and Killiney Hill (pNHA: 001206), located c. 600 metres to the southeast of the site, Dalkey

Islands SPA (SPA: 004172) is located c. 1.32km north east of the site and Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (SAC: 003000) is located c. 1.62km east of the site . The site is to drain to the public sewer and there is no connection to the designated sites which are separated from the application site by intervening development and roadways.

6.0 EIA Screening

Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development, the location of the site within a serviced suburban area, its distance from areas of environmental sensitivity, and the criterion set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination stage (see Appendix 2) and a screening determination is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1 Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1 The third party (No. 23 Barnhill Avenue) grounds of appeal have been submitted by RML Planning and can be summarised as follows:

- The building line is breached along Barnhill Avenue on a prominent site resulting in a seriously negative impact;
- The extensive gable wall of the proposed dwelling along Barnhill Avenue will have a significant visual impact compared to the existing side elevation which addresses Barnhill Avenue with a number of side windows;
- The limited windows on the gable elevation do not provide sufficient surveillance contrary to Section 12.3.7.5 of the Development Plan;
- The proposed boundary wall is unacceptable owing to its height and dominance contrary to Section 12.3.7.5 of the Development Plan;
- Detrimental impact on the amenities of adjoining dwellings;

- This infill development does not respect the height, massing and physical character of the existing residential units contrary to Section 12.3.7.7 of the Development Plan;
- Section 12.3.7.5 of the Development Plan requires that compact detached proposals on corner sites should closely relate to adjacent dwellings;
- This constrained site, the proposed dwelling is taller, has a one sided hipped roof with dominant dormers that are neither characteristic of the existing dwellings or a modern design;
- The three storey element is overbearing and dominant;
- There is no protection plan for the tree outside the site along the road verge;
- The proposed dwelling will have a negative impact on the amenity of the existing dwelling at 27 Hillside, will result in the removal of the playroom window and will be 1.9 metres from the kitchen window on the side gable; and
- The proposal is distinguishable from a dwelling approved at 121 Hillside (Ref's: D19A/1003 & ABP-307379-20) as the building line along Hillside was not broken and was two storey in height.

7.2 Applicant Response

The applicants response was submitted by Ceardean Architects and can be summarised as follows:

- The application was comprehensively assessed by the Planning Authority and fully accords with the Development Plan;
- The building line to the front is only altered by 900mm at ground floor level;
- A condition put forward by the Planning Authority requiring the dwelling to be inset from the boundary wall is acceptable to the applicant;
- Amended plans were deemed acceptable by the Planning Authority and the design compliments the finishes of the adjoining dwellings and has a consistent ridge height;
- There is no loss of views; and

- The applicant is considerate of the impacts of the proposed dwelling on the adjoining dwelling, No. 27 Hillside which is occupied by the applicants' parents.

7.3 Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority consider that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter that would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

7.4 Observations

None

8.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Residential Amenity
- Access
- Other Matters

8.2 Principle of Development

8.2.1 The site is zoned 'A' with the objective 'to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.' The development of additional housing is permissible under this zoning subject to site specific criteria. It should also be noted that the surrounding area is solely residential in character and that the prevailing pattern of development in the immediate vicinity of the application site is dominated by conventional housing constructed circa 1950/1960s'. I consider that the principle of residential development is acceptable in the area.

8.3 Design and layout

8.3.1 The dwelling is to be sited within the side garden of No. 27 Hillside Avenue which is a semi-detached dwelling which also has an aspect onto Barnhill Avenue formed by a two storey bay window. The dwellings along Hillside Avenue are primarily two storey dwellings with hipped roofs running in a parallel line from east to west. A similar design theme is evident along Barnhill Avenue which runs from north to south. The proposed dwelling is a three storey dwelling with a gable roof with box dormers to the front and rear. The dwelling is finished in render with a slate roof covering, standing seam zinc cladding and areas of selected brick with no detail on the colour of the brick finish.

8.3.2 There are no issues raised with the room size standards and I concur with the Planning Authority that these are all to an acceptable standard for a three bedroom dwelling as per the Development Plan and the Guidelines for Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities 2007. In addition, this was not a matter raised by any of the third parties.

8.3.3 Section 12.3.7.5 of the Development Plan 'Corner/Side Garden Sites' states that 'building lines should be followed where appropriate'. In this case the proposed dwelling follows the front and rear building lines along Hillside. The third party raises concern that the proposal will breach the building line along Barnhill Avenue.

8.3.4 It is evident that there is an established set back of 8.7 metres along Barnhill Avenue on the western side and equally a set back of 9.1 metres along the eastern side, however, it is the western side of Barnhill Avenue which provides the most relevant context. There is an established building line along Barnhill Avenue which runs for 350 metres to the south and 150 metres to the north. This established building line is largely uninterrupted and forms a key characteristic of the development pattern and character along Barnhill Avenue.

8.3.5 The proposed dwelling would protrude from the established building along Barnhill Avenue by 7.3 metres at its widest point with no set back failing to respect the established building line and as a result would form an incongruous addition to the street scene, which would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area. I consider that this aspect of the proposed development to be unacceptable.

8.3.6 Section 12.3.7.5 of the Development Plan states that larger corner sites may allow more variation in design, but more compact detached proposals, (emphasis added)

such as the application site (c.0.05ha) should more closely relate to the adjacent dwellings. While the design of the proposed dwelling would have a similar height to the adjoining dwelling, its three storey appearance would not respect the standard two storey character of the other dwellings in the area. The large horizontally dominant windows on the front elevation and variance in the size of window openings, the large box dormers to the front and rear, the mixture of materials including standing seam zinc cladding, large areas of brick on the ground floor and side elevation are all design elements which do not respect and reflect the design of the surrounding development.

- 8.3.7 I am of the view that the application site represents a small corner plot of the type referred to in Section 12.3.7.5 and is on a prominent site due to its position beyond the building line of Barnhill Avenue, where the proposed design would reflect poorly with the character and design of the dwellings in the surrounding area.
- 8.3.8 The appearance of the gable wall was raised as a design concern by the third party and was stated as being extensive and fails to address Barnhill Avenue and does not offer sufficient surveillance of the open space areas. While this point has some merit, I consider that many of the dwellings which are gable on to Barnhill Avenue tend to have blank gable walls with limited fenestration. The proposed dwelling has a number of window openings and provides some visual interest and surveillance onto Barnhill Avenue. I also note that a similar design of gable elevation at a corner site was considered acceptable at 57 Mapas Road, Dalkey, Co Dublin. (Ref: D18A/1044 & PL06D.226816).
- 8.3.9 I note that the third party states that a dwelling approved at 121 Hillside (Ref's: D19A/1003 & ABP-307379-20) does not set a precedent for similar developments as the building line along Hillside was not broken. I note within the Inspectors report that the proposed dwelling was a two storey dwelling and that there was a stepped building line along the cul-de-sac which runs to the side of that site. These circumstances are not shared with the subject application site.
- 8.3.10 The applicants supporting statement which was submitted to the Planning Authority refers to a precedent at 57 Mapas Road, Dalkey, Co Dublin. (Ref: D18A/1044 & PL06D.226816). This dwelling has a two storey appearance and does not breach any significant building line along Mapas Road. I do not consider that this previous approval sets a precedent in the area.

8.4 Residential Amenity

8.4.1 The impact on residential amenity was raised as an issue by third parties and was initially a concern raised by the Planning Authority, however, this was indicated as being acceptable following the submission of an amended design.

8.4.2 Section 12.3.5.2 of the Development Plan refers to “A minimum clearance distance of circa 22 metres, in general, is required, between opposing windows” and also provides that “In certain instances, depending on orientation and location in built-up areas, reduced separation distances may be acceptable”.

8.4.3 It is important to note that SPPR 1 - Separation Distances - Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) states that a minimum of 16 metres separation distance should generally be achieved, however, if there are no opposing windows serving habitable rooms and where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme then a reduction is permissible. In addition, there shall be no specified minimum separation distance at ground level or to the front of houses.

8.4.4 There are separation distances in excess of 22 metres between the side and front elevations of the proposed dwelling to the neighbouring properties with no back-to-back relationships which is in accordance with Section 12.3.5.2 of the Development Plan.

8.4.5 The rear elevation would allow some views towards the front and side elevation of No. 22 Barnhill Avenue at a distance of 16 metres, however, these would not constitute views between opposing windows. The views would be at an oblique angle and would not provide any significant loss of amenity. In addition, an existing tree to the rear boundary of the application site obscures views towards a window in the side gable of No. 22 Barnhill Avenue.

8.4.6 While the proposed separation distances are not strictly in accordance with the separation distances in the Development Plan (Section 12.3.5.2) and SPPR 1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), refer to the separation distances between opposing windows and therefore the proposal complies with the requirements of the Development Plan and the Compact Settlement Guideline. I am of the view that the separation distances are acceptable given the proposed design and no significant loss of privacy or overlooking will arise from the proposed development.

8.4.7 A condition was imposed (Condition 6) by the Planning Authority that the flat roof on the first floor rear elevation should not be used as a balcony/amenity area in the interests of residential amenity. I consider that this condition would be necessary as the elevated height would give views to the rear garden areas along Hillside. In addition, this form of elevated amenity area would be highly visible from Barnhill Avenue and is a feature which would be uncharacteristic of the area.

8.4.8 The third party states that the Planning Authority had failed to assess the impact of the proposed development in the existing dwelling at No. 27 Hillside. The proposed dwelling is constructed approximately 1.9 metres from the side elevation of No. 27 Hillside which is the existing dwelling on the plot to be subdivided. Section 12.3.1.1 Design Criteria of the Development Plan requires an assessment of daylight standards between buildings which was provided for the initial submission, however, it does not address the impact on the side elevation of No. 27 Hillside.

8.4.9 In order to facilitate the proposed dwelling, the playroom window on the side elevation of No. 27 Hillside is to be closed up, however, the playroom still benefits from a window on the front elevation of the existing dwelling which would allow sufficient daylight for the room. The ground floor kitchen window on the side elevation of No. 27 Hillside will remain and will have a limited separation of only 1.9 metres from the proposed three storey dwelling. The kitchen of No. 27 does not benefit from any other additional windows although it would gain some diffused light through a double door opening leading into the dining room which has a window opening. I am of the opinion that given that this property is owned by the applicant matter the could be resolved through internal reconfiguration of the rooms and would not warrant a reason for refusal.

8.5 **Access**

8.5.1 Concerns were raised by third parties during the processing of the planning application by the Planning Authority with the position of the access close to the junction of Hillside and Barnhill Avenue. There is a vehicular entrance already in existence serving No. 27 Hillside and it is capable of parking more than one vehicle. The site layout was amended during the processing of the application to limit the proposed development to one parking space at the request of the Planning Authority.

8.5.2 I note that while there was no response to the amended site layout from the Transport Section, the Planning Authority were satisfied with the access and parking

arrangement. The proposed access does not exceed 3 metres in width and is separated from the in-curtilage parking of No. 27 by a boundary wall. I am of the opinion, that the entrance arrangement does not differ significantly from the existing arrangement, it would not increase any risk to road safety and would not affect the visibility at the junction. I consider that there will be no additional impact on the local road network in terms of traffic generation, traffic safety, or pedestrian/vehicle conflict.

8.6 Other Matters

8.6.1 A concern was raised about the lack of a protection plan for the tree located on the grass verge along Barnhill Avenue outside the application site. I do not have any evidence that the tree will be at risk during construction, however, should scaffolding be needed to be erected along the footpath, the applicant would require a license from the County Council and would need to comply with the terms of that license. I do not consider that a reason for refusal would be justified on this aspect.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1 I have considered the development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at 27 Hillside, Dalkey, Co. Dublin, no relevant designated sites are close by.

9.2 The proposed development comprises the construction of a three storey (three bedroom) detached house. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal. 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.

9.3 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and nature of the development; and
- Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.
- The screening decision of the Planning Authority.

9.4 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1 The subject site is located at 27 Hillside Dalkey Co. Dublin which is 1.13km from the nearest known watercourse.
- 10.2 The proposed development comprises the construction of a three storey (three bedroom) detached house. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.3 I have assessed the proposed construction of a three storey (three bedroom) detached house and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks to protect and where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status) and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 10.4 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
 - Small scale and nature of the development
 - Distance from nearest water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.
- 10.5 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 costal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

That planning permission be refused for the reasons and considerations set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposed development would be contrary to Section 12.3.7.5 of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 as the development of this corner site for a dwelling, when taken in conjunction with existing pattern of

development in the urban area, does not respect the established building line along Barnhill Avenue and the design does not closely relate to the design of the adjacent dwellings. The proposed development would therefore detract from the character and visual appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposed development is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Barry Diamond
Planning Inspector

26th November 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP 323776-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a three storey (three bedroom) detached house.
Development Address	27 Hillside Dalkey Co. Dublin A96KP79.
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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) 	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in <u>Part 1</u> . EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	Class 10(b) (i) [Residential] mandatory threshold is 500 dwelling units. Class 10(b)(iv) [Urban Development] where the mandatory thresholds are 2ha, 10ha or 20ha depending on location.
<input 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 <u>Part 2</u>, 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 type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>Threshold = 500 dwelling units. Proposed development = 1 dwelling unit.</p>

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ACP 323776-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a three storey (three bedroom) detached house.
Development Address	27 Hillside Dalkey Co Dublin A96KP79
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).	This urban site is serviced and forms part of the curtilage of an adjacent dwelling which is not exceptional in the context of the surrounding area and development. 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, 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.
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 to the side of an existing dwelling and the scale of the single unit proposal is not considered 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.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	

<p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	<p>EIA is not required.</p> <p>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.</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____