



Inspector's Report

PL-500019-DF

Development

Single-storey extension to side and rear of existing dwelling house to include a self-contained family flat along with associated site works

Location

Flemington Lane, Balbriggan, Co. Dublin, K32 XV04

Planning Authority

Fingal County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

F25A/0643E

Applicant

Derek McEvoy

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

To refuse permission

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant

Derek McEvoy

Observers

None

Date of Site Inspection

5th December 2025

Inspector

Trevor Rue

Table of Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision.....	4
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
6.0 EIA Screening.....	9
7.0 The Appeal	9
8.0 Assessment	11
9.0 AA Screening.....	15
10.0 Water Framework Directive	15
11.0 Recommendation	16
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	16
13.0 Conditions	17
Appendix A: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is about 2.5 kilometres to the north west of Balbriggan and is located on the southern side of a minor road. It has a stated area of 0.128 hectares and comprises the curtilage of a two-storey detached dwelling known as 3 The Brambles, Flemington Lane.
- 1.2. The existing dwelling has a floor area of 150 square metres. It has a pitched roof with two gable ends projecting from its front (northern) elevation. It has dark roof tiles and mainly redbrick walls. It is well screened from the road by thick, tall hedging. There are concrete block walls to the west and south of the dwelling. A recessed gated entrance close to the western site boundary provides access to another dwelling at the rear of the site, 4 The Brambles.
- 1.3. The site is bounded on its eastern side by two dwellings, one behind the other (1 and 2 The Brambles). To the east of those dwellings there is a series of further roadside dwellings, interspersed with gaps, leading towards to town. To the west of the site is an open field. There is a dwelling opposite the site, on the northern side of the road, with open fields behind it.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to construct a single-storey extension to the western side and rear of the existing dwelling. It would be 100 square metres in size, 75 square metres of which would be occupied by a family flat. The flat would accommodate a bedroom with *en suite* facilities, a wardrobe, a gym and a kitchen/dining/living area. The other 25 square metres would accommodate a bedroom and wheelchair-accessible bathroom in the existing dwelling. Access to the flat would be via the dwelling and from the garden to the rear.
- 2.2. The extension would run along the western boundary of the property to meet the southern boundary. The extension would have a maximum height of 5.013 metres and would be about 17 metres in length. It would project by about 10.5 metres from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The width of the extension would range from about 4.3 metres at the front to about 10.5 metres at the back. It would have windows on its northern and eastern elevations and roof lights on its western and southern elevations.

There would be a brick finish to match the existing dwelling to the front and part of the side of the extension and dark grey roof tiles, also to match the dwelling.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. On 8th September 2025, Fingal County Council refused permission for the following reasons:

- 1. On the basis of the information submitted, it has not been demonstrated the intended user of the proposed family flat has a demonstrated need or is dependent on the main occupants of the main dwelling; nor has any evidence been provided to clarify the relationship between these persons. Furthermore, the proposed family flat, while indicated as measuring 75sq.m., is reliant on the provision of an additional 25sq.m. extension to the existing dwelling for access and thus, it is considered the proposed development, in its totality (100sq.m.), exceeds the maximum floor area permissible for a family flat as detailed in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.*
- 2. Given the proposal's proximity to the southern site boundary and that it sits significantly forward of the front building line of the neighbouring dwelling to the south [4 The Brambles], it is considered the proposed development is insensitively designed and would have undue negative impacts on the amenities of adjoining property. The proposed development would therefore contravene Sections 3.5.13.2 and 14.10.3, Policies SPQHP41 and SPQHP42 and Objectives SPQHO45 and SPQHO46 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and thus, would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area; and set an undesirable precedent for other such developments within the County.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. A **planning officer's report** typed on 3rd September 2025 provided the reasoning for the authority's decision. The main points were as follows:

- The applicant has stated that the flat is for his son who cannot afford to purchase or rent his own accommodation. It appears that a permanent housing solution is being proposed. No evidence has been submitted that the son has

a demonstrated need or is dependent on the occupants of the existing dwelling, or to demonstrate the relationship between the occupant of the existing dwelling and the proposed occupant of the family flat.

- While a 75-square-metre family flat is proposed, it can be accessed only via the 25-square-metre extension to the dwelling. The totality of the proposed development therefore does not comply with the 75-square-metre restriction on a family flat.
- Given its siting and design, the proposed extension is not visually harmonious with the existing dwelling. Full elevations of the proposed extension and the existing dwelling have not been provided, nor have full floor plans for the existing dwelling.
- The proposed extension would sit significantly forward, by about 8 metres, of the front building line of the neighbouring dwelling to the rear and south [4 The Brambles]. Given its proximity to the southern boundary, there are concerns that the family flat would have adverse impacts on the visual and residential amenities of that property, including an unnecessary overbearing impact. The submitted plans and particulars lack requisite detail regarding boundary treatments, window locations and separation distances.
- There are also concerns relating to overlooking from No. 4 into roof lights over habitable rooms in the proposed extension. Given the absence of windows in the southern and western elevations and the orientation of the proposed family flat, there are also concerns about access to light into the flat for the majority of the day and in the evening.

3.2.2. The Council's **Water Services Department** had no objection, subject to conditions. One of the recommended conditions was that prior to commencement of construction the developer shall submit an acceptable surface water drainage design and details.

3.2.3. The Council's **Transportation Planning Section** had no objection to the proposed development.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. None were consulted.

3.4. Third Party Submissions

- 3.4.1. None were received.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. **F06A/1477:** On 23rd March 2007, Fingal County Council granted permission to Derek and Sheila McEvoy to construct two detached dormer bungalows to east and south east of the present application site (1 and 2 The Brambles).
- 4.2. **F18A/0511:** On 3rd December 2018, the Council granted permission to Jamie McEvoy and Kevin Doyle for a new dwelling house to the rear and south of the present application site (No. 4).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. Sheet 4 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 indicates that the application site is subject to a RA – Residential Area zoning, whose objective is to provide for new residential communities subject to the provision of the necessary social and physical infrastructure. The vision for this zoning, set out in Section 13.5 of the Plan, is to ensure the provision of high quality new residential environments with good layout and design, with adequate public transport and cycle links and within walking distance of community facilities; and to provide an appropriate mix of house sizes, types and tenures in order to meet household needs and to promote balanced communities.
- 5.1.2. Policy SPQHP41 of the Plan is to support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities. Likewise, Objective SPQHO45 is to encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area.
- 5.1.3. Section 3.5.13.2 of the Development Plan states that family flats are a means of providing additional accommodation with a level of independence for an undefined temporary period of time. Family flats allow for semi-independent accommodation for an immediate family member (dependent on the main occupants of the dwelling).

Policy SPQHP42 is to support the provision of family flats on suitable sites within established residential areas subject to specific design criteria. Objective SPQHO46 is to ensure family flats are for a member of the family with a demonstrated need; when no longer required for the identified family member, are incorporated as part of the main unit on site; do not exceed 75 square metres in floor area; and comply with the design criteria for extensions.

- 5.1.4. Section 14.10.2 of the Plan states that the need for housing to be adaptable to changing family circumstances is recognised and acknowledged and the Council will support applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend as the needs of the household change, subject to specific safeguards. In particular, the design and layout of residential extensions must have regard to and protect the amenities of adjoining properties, particularly in relation to sunlight, daylight and privacy. The design of extensions must also have regard to the character and form of the existing building, its architectural expression, remaining usable rear private open space, external finishes and pattern of fenestration. Additionally, careful consideration should be paid to boundary treatments, tree planting and landscaping.
- 5.1.5. Section 14.10.2.2 of the Plan states that side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, visual harmony and impacts on residential amenity. In certain cases, a set-back of the extension's front facade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall generally match the existing. Section 14.10.2.3 states that ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining to serve the dwelling house. The proposed extension should match or complement the existing dwelling house.
- 5.1.6. Section 14.10.3 of the Plan states that family-flat development may involve the subdivision of a single dwelling, provision of an extension or conversion of a garage attached to the main dwelling, where the use is for a member of the immediate family (for example, an elderly parent). Applications will be assessed in terms of the impact on the integrity of the existing dwelling and neighbouring properties and compliance with the following criteria must be demonstrated:

- A requirement for the family flat must be demonstrated including details of the relationship between the occupant of the main dwelling and the occupant of the family flat.
- When no longer requested for use as a family flat, the accommodation must be capable of being subsumed into the main property.
- Any such extension to the main dwelling shall be subsidiary in scale relative to the main dwelling and shall not exceed an internal floor area of 75 square metres.
- The family flat should not impact adversely on either the residential amenities of the existing property or the residential amenities of the area.
- The entrance to the family flat must be via the main dwelling. Where own-door access is unavoidable, own-door access shall be located to the side or rear.
- No sub-division of the garden is permitted.

5.2. **Development Contribution Scheme**

5.2.1. Section 9 of Fingal County Council's Development Contribution Scheme 2021-2025 set the level of contribution for residential development at €98.21 per square metre. Section 11 of the Scheme states that the first 40 square metres of domestic extensions will be exempted from the requirement to pay development contributions. This exemption is cumulative and limited to 40 square metres in total per dwelling.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

5.3.1. The application site is not within any Natura 2000 European site of nature conservation importance. The nearest Natura 2000 sites to the site are:

- Boyne Coast and Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC), about 9.5 kilometres to the north of the site, designated for estuaries, mudflats and sandflats, annual vegetation of drift lines, annuals colonising mud and sand, salt meadows, shifting dunes and fixed coastal dunes;
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, roughly 10 kilometres to the east of the site, designated for harbour porpoise;

- Rogerstown Estuary SAC, about 14 kilometres to the south east of the site, designated for estuaries, mudflats and sandflats, annuals colonising mud and sand, salt meadows, shifting dunes and fixed coastal dunes;
- Boyne Estuary Special Protection Area for birds (SPA), about 12 kilometres to the north of the site;
- River Nanny Estuary and Shore SPA, about 4 kilometres to the north of the site;
- North-west Irish Sea SPA, roughly 1.8 kilometres to the east of the site;
- Rockabill SPA, about 10.5 kilometres to the east of the site;
- Skerries Islands SPA, about 9 kilometres to the south east of the site; and
- Rogerstown Estuary SPA, about 14 kilometres to the south east of the site.

5.3.2. The application site is not in any Natural Heritage Area (NHA). The only NHA in Fingal is Skerries Islands, which is also a SPA. There are 17 proposed NHAs in Fingal, which are identified on Green Infrastructure Map 2 (Sheet 15) of the Development Plan. The nearest of these areas to the application site are Knock Lake and Bog of the Ring.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment 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 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- Both refusal reasons could have been readily resolved through a request for additional information.
- The proposed family flat is intended for the applicant's adult son, Raymond McEvoy, who wishes to reside near his parents while maintaining a degree of

independent living. A copy of his birth certificate confirming this relationship was provided. He was born in 1994.

- Although Raymond works as a graphic designer, the ever-increasing cost and unavailability of property to buy or rent has made it impossible for him on his income to be in a position, currently or in the foreseeable future, to move out of the family home while trying to save for a deposit. The proposed family flat would provide him with his own temporary accommodation, with privacy to work, live and socialise with friends and avoid the limitations an adult child and his partner would have living directly with his parents.
- This attempt to facilitate intergenerational living by extending and adapting the existing dwelling to accommodate the current and future needs of all occupants in the current housing crisis should be facilitated and applauded. During a time when the media is reporting proposals by the Government to introduce new planning exemptions to allow homeowners to subdivide existing dwellings into self-contained living units without obtaining planning permission, it is extraordinary that this application has been refused.
- The proposed 75-square-metre family flat would be accessed directly by a sliding door from the rear garden. The rear garden can be accessed by walking round the eastern side of the main dwelling. The family flat would not be reliant on the 25-square-metre extension for access and it is unreasonable to take the floor area of the proposed family flat to be 100 square metres. The proposed ground floor plan distinguishes the family flat (shown in yellow) from the extension to the existing dwelling (shown in blue).
- The family flat can be incorporated into the main dwelling when Raymond no longer needs it. It complies with design criteria for extensions and is subservient to the dwelling.
- There is no objective or policy in the Development Plan that prohibits an ordinary extension to a dwelling being constructed at the same time as a family flat. That is a common-sense approach. The proposed extension would facilitate an internal link to the family flat, which is a Development Plan requirement, but would not be part of the flat's functional area.

- The dwelling to the south [No. 4] is occupied by family members Kevin and Jamie Doyle, who have submitted a letter saying that they do not feel the extension would have any undue negative impacts on the amenities and enjoyment of their property. Neither they nor their neighbours [at No. 3] currently overlook each other nor would they do so upon completion of the proposed works. The northern gable of No. 4 faces the southern elevation of the applicant's dwelling [No. 3]. That gable has only one window, which is obscured by a tall boundary wall. As a condition of planning permission (F18A/0511), this window was fitted with obscure glass.
- The proposed family flat would be single-storey with a modest footprint. It would respect building lines to the extent possible on this constrained site and avoid any overlooking or overbearing impact. The ground floor of No. 4 would be 1.5 metres above that of the family flat, which would minimise the impact of the proposed extension on that property.
- A condition could be attached to any grant of permission requiring the proposed roof lights on the south-facing roof slope to be omitted. The bedroom would have a window for daylight and fire escape and would not be reliant on the roof light. The other rooms would be non-habitable and could operate without natural daylight. An occupancy condition could also be attached.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

7.2.1. The planning authority referred to the planner's report and had no further comments. It requested the Commission to uphold its decision. If the appeal is successful, provision should be made for a financial contribution and/or any special development contributions required in accordance with the Council's Development Contribution Scheme. A condition should also be included where a tree bond is required.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Issues

8.1.1. Having inspected the site and considered in detail the documentation on file for this first-party appeal, it seems to me that the main planning issues are:

- whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle;
- whether its layout and design are satisfactory; and
- its effect on residential amenity.

8.2. Acceptability in Principle

8.2.1. The application proposes an extension to the side of the existing dwelling as well as a family flat behind the proposed extension. The physical extent of each of these developments is carefully delineated on the proposed ground floor plan. While the family flat would have an internal access via the side extension, it would not include the side extension. The side extension would have a floor area of 25 square metres and the family flat would have a floor area of 75 square metres.

8.2.2. Policy SPQHP41 and Objective SPQHO45 of the Fingal County Development Plan support and encourage extensions to dwellings subject to the protection of the environment and residential and visual amenities. The proposed side extension is therefore acceptable in principle.

8.2.3. Sections 3.5.13.2 and 14.10.3 of the Development Plan, taken together, define a family flat as semi-independent accommodation for an immediate family member, for example an elderly parent, who is dependent on the main occupants of the dwelling. A requirement for a family flat must be demonstrated including details of the relationship between the occupant of the main dwelling and that of the family flat.

8.2.4. The intended occupant of the family flat proposed in this application is the appellant's son, Raymond McEvoy, whose birth certificate has been submitted to confirm the immediate family relationship. I see no good reason to doubt this evidence.

8.2.5. The acceptability in principle of the proposed family flat therefore hinges on whether a requirement for such a unit has been demonstrated. It may be inferred from the evidence submitted that Raymond is currently living in the family home. It is not explicitly claimed in the grounds of appeal that he is dependent on the main occupants of the existing dwelling. There is, for example, no suggestion of a health-based dependency. It is stated that Raymond wishes to reside near his parents and that the planning application is an attempt to facilitate intergenerational living. The proposed family flat would provide him (and, it seems, his partner) with a degree of privacy on a temporary basis, while he tries to save for a deposit to buy a permanent home.

8.2.6. The appellant's case centres on the unaffordability of alternative accommodation for his son as a result of the current national housing shortage. No details have been provided about the extent and duration of Raymond's attempts to buy or rent properties and the reasons why any such attempts were unsuccessful. The fact that Raymond's parents are willing to help him out does not in itself amount to evidence of his dependency on them. I conclude that the totality of the evidence submitted is insufficient to demonstrate that he has a requirement for a family flat and that the proposed family flat does not meet a key test for acceptability in principle.

8.3. Layout and Design

8.3.1. In the course of my site inspection, I noticed that the south-western portion of the appeal site, into which the proposed family flat would extend, is occupied by a green metal shed with a pitched roof. I also noticed two large grey sheds and associated hard-standing areas to the front of the existing dwelling, behind the roadside hedge. None of these structures is shown on the submitted drawings.

8.3.2. In my opinion, while it would have been good practice to submit a plan illustrating the upper floor of the existing dwelling, such a plan is not necessary to describe the works to which the application relates. The submitted drawings show the proposed western and southern elevations only to the extent that they would not be concealed by the existing boundary walls, which would remain in place. However, no essential information is missing as the proposed ground floor plan shows no openings on those elevations below roof level. It would have been helpful had separation distances between the proposed development and the adjacent dwelling been marked on the contiguous elevations but it is possible to scale them off.

8.3.3. Other deficiencies in the submitted drawings are of greater significance. The ground floor plan shows three skylights in the south-facing roof plane whereas the southern elevation shows two. The eastern elevation of the proposed family flat is incomplete. Should the Commission decide to grant permission, it would be necessary to require revised plans to be submitted prior to the commencement of development.

8.3.4. I consider that the side extension and family flat, taken together, would be visually harmonious with the existing dwelling. The front façade of the extension would be appropriately set back from that of the existing dwelling. Finishes would match. The

family flat would be subsidiary in scale relative to the main dwelling. The internal floor area of the family flat would not exceed 75 square metres. There would be an entrance to the family flat via the main dwelling and own-door access would be located to the rear and side. No sub-division of the garden is proposed and adequate usable private rear open space would be retained. When no longer required for use as a family flat, the accommodation would be capable of being subsumed into the main dwelling. Subject to the submission of accurate drawings, I find the layout and design of the proposed development to be acceptable.

8.4. Residential Amenity

- 8.4.1. During my site inspection, I saw a pedestrian gate in the wall separating the application site from the neighbouring property to the south, 4 The Brambles. This is consistent with the evidence that there is a family relationship between the respective occupants.
- 8.4.2. The southern, rear elevation of the proposed family flat would be about 2.4 metres from the northern, side elevation of No. 4. It would have an eaves height of about 3.1 metres and a ridge height of just over 5 metres. The family flat would come close to the side of the neighbouring dwelling and would be significantly forward of its front elevation. However, due to its single-storey design, the intervening boundary wall, the perpendicular relationship with No. 4 and the fact that No. 4 sits on higher ground, the family flat would not in my judgement have an unduly overbearing effect.
- 8.4.3. The proposed ground floor plan shows that the family flat would be served by seven roof lights, a north-facing window and an east-facing window. The dormer window in the front elevation of No. 4 would be at right angles to the rear of the family flat. The only window in the side elevation of No. 4 facing the application site is at ground-floor level. Views from that window into the site are, and would continue to be, impeded by the boundary wall. In my opinion, concerns about overlooking from No. 4 into roof lights in the proposed extension are not well founded.

8.5. Conclusion

- 8.5.1. I am satisfied that the proposed side extension is consistent with Policy SPQHP41 and Objective SPQHO45 of the Development Plan and is unobjectionable. While the proposed family flat is capable of meeting most of the criteria set out in Section 14.10.3

of the Plan, it has not been demonstrated that the appellant has a requirement for a family flat. As this criterion is of fundamental importance, it seems to me that planning permission should not be granted for that element of the proposal. I have concluded therefore that a split decision is appropriate.

- 8.5.2. It seems to me that the proposed 25-square-metre side extension qualifies for an exemption under the Council's Development Contribution Scheme. The planning authority has not explained why a special development contribution or a tree bond is required in connection with the side extension.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 9.1. Having considered the nature, location and small scale of the proposed development, the nature of the foreseeable emissions therefrom, the availability of public piped services to accommodate the foul effluent arising therefrom, the distance from the nearest European site and the absence of any known hydrological link between the application site and any European site, I am content on the basis of objective information that the development is not likely to have a significant effect on any European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. I therefore conclude that the carrying out of an appropriate assessment under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The application site is located about 700 metres from a tributary of Clonard Brook, which flows into the Irish Sea. The proposed development comprises an extension to a dwelling to include a self-contained family flat. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.2. I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no

conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

- 10.3. The reasons for this conclusion are the nature and small scale of the works, the distance from the nearest water bodies and the lack of known hydrological connections.
- 10.4. I conclude on the basis of objective information that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend to the Commission that planning permission be granted for the proposed side extension, subject to the conditions set out below.
- 11.2. I recommend that planning permission be refused for the proposed family flat.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. Side Extension

- 12.1.1. Having regard to the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029 and in particular to the RA zoning objective, Policy SPQHP41 and Objective SPQHO45 thereof, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed side extension would be visually harmonious with the existing dwelling, would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenity of the area, and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.2. Family Flat

- 12.2.1. Section 3.5.13.2 of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029 states that family flats are a means of providing additional accommodation with a level of independence for an undefined temporary period of time. Objective SPQHO46 of the Development Plan further seeks to ensure that family flats are for a member of the family with a

demonstrated need. Having regard to the information accompanying the planning application and appeal, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed occupier is dependent on the main occupants of the existing dwelling. The proposed family flat would therefore not be in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Development Plan and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The 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 development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed development shall be amended by the omission of the proposed family flat shown coloured yellow on the proposed ground floor plan submitted with the application. Revised drawings, including a new floor plan and full elevations for the proposed side extension, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: It has not been demonstrated that the appellant has a requirement for a family flat</p>
3.	<p>Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit proposals for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interest of sustainable drainage.</p>

4.	Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes of the proposed side extension shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.
----	---

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.



TREVOR A RUE

Planning Inspector

11th December 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500019-DF
Proposed Development Summary	<i>Extension to dwelling to include a self-contained family flat</i>
Development Address	<i>Flemington Lane, Balbriggan, Co. Dublin, K32 XV04</i>
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.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<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.
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)?	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: Trevor A. Lane

Date: 11th December 2025