



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500046-DF

Development	Construction of dwelling with all associated site works
Location	The Grange, Ballyboughal, Fingal, Co. Dublin
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F25A/0678E
Applicant(s)	Naul Road Development Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Naul Road Development Ltd
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	14 th January 2026
Inspector	Emma Gosnell

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	9
6.0 Natural Heritage Designations	13
7.0 EIA Screening.....	13
8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening	14
9.0 The Appeal	14
10.0 Assessment	16
11.0 Recommendation.....	24
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	25
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening and Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination	
Appendix 2 - Appropriate Assessment Screening	
Appendix 3 – Screening for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.03ha, is located on a private laneway and cul-de-sac to the south of Ballyboughal village which, in turn, is located c. 6.5km to the north-west of Swords in Fingal, Co. Dublin.
- 1.2. The laneway is accessed from the R108 regional route (which has a 50km/hr speed limit) which runs in a north-south direction to the east of the appeal site. The site is adjoined by a single storey building to its east and by a 2-storey building, referred to as a 'recreational building' in the application documentation, and gated yard which is in use for storage to its west/ north-west. There is a 2-storey property located to its north. The built form on the laneway, and on the lands to the immediate north, is characterised by large, detached dwellings of varying forms and designs on individual plots which are enclosed by substantial boundaries. There is a bank of undeveloped land on the lane to the east of the appeal site, and the wider area is rural and agricultural in character.
- 1.3. The site, which is generally flat in topography and firm underfoot, is accessed via a wide gated access along its southern boundary and is enclosed by c. 2m high blockwork boundary walls which are topped with further fencing to the north and east. The site is currently in use for the storage of construction materials.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development for which permission is sought comprises of a single storey 1-bed detached dwelling (97sq.m) with a max. height of 6.5m, a timber storage structure, swale, landscaping, site walls, SUDS, connection to existing pumping station and all associated site and ancillary works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission refused on 17/09/2025 for 2 no. reasons as follows:

"1. Having regard to the existing pattern and density of development in the area, the edge of village location of the site, and backland nature of the site and lack of

connectivity to the village, the proposed development would constitute undesirable back land and piecemeal development which would be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development for the village and would be contrary to Objective SPQHO42 - Development of Underutilised Infill, Corner and Backland Sites and Objective SPQHO56 - Rural Villages as set out in the Fingal Development Plan 2023 - 2029. Furthermore, in the absence of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure from the subject lands linking to the village centre and given the poor availability of public transport at this location, the proposed development is largely car dependent and would promote unsustainable transport modes. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The development, as currently proposed, would result in an intensification of use on a shared access road between residential and commercial / agricultural use and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard. Insufficient evidence is submitted to show that adequate sightlines can be achieved at proposed access roadway onto site without impinging on the adjacent properties and it is not clear if the applicant has sufficient interest over necessary lands to over these lands to carry out necessary works in the addition these works are located outside the redline boundary of the subject site. To permit this development in the absence of this information could result in development that would endanger public safety and would be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development of the area. Accordingly, the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area”.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

One planning report (dated 01/09/2025) forms the basis of the PA’s assessment. Points of note in the report include:

- *Principle of Development* – acceptable on basis of site’s ‘RV – rural village’ zoning. No requirement for applicant to demonstrate social or economic ties to area.
- *Siting* – constitutes infill/ backland proposal located outside village core which is not proportionate to the pattern and grain of development on adjoining rural lands. Proposal is premature, piecemeal development contrary to Objectives SPQHO56

(Rural Villages) and SPQHO42 (Underutilised Infill, Corner and Backland Sites).

Refusal Recommended.

- *Residential Standards* – floor areas, internal dimensions and private open space comply with 2007 Quality Housing and 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines.
- *Residential & Visual Amenity* – no potential for negative impact on neighbouring properties or on the character of the area given existing variation in built character.
- *Parking* – 2 no. car parking spaces provided in compliance with 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines and bike parking can be accommodated in-curtillage.
- *Access* – no cycle or pedestrian infrastructure exists to link site to Ballyboughal village. Proposal would give rise to undesirable car dependence. Sightlines to east of site are substandard and Transportation Planning Section do not support further intensification of development on lane without the substandard sightlines on entrance to lane (which give rise to traffic hazard) being addressed. **Refusal Recommended.**
- *Water Services* – wastewater treatment and surface water drainage proposals acceptable (subject to conditions). Site not at flood risk.
- *Landscaping* – no significant trees or hedgerows on site. Existing planting along southern boundary would need to be removed to facilitate proposal. Details of proposed site planting and boundary treatments can be addressed by condition.
- *Part V* – applicant willing to enter into a Part V provision agreement.
- *Noise* – located in Airport Noise Zone D and noise control measures may be required in compliance with Objective DAO11.
- *AA Screening* – site proximity to Rogerstown Estuary SAC and SPA noted but no likelihood of significant effects on European sites on basis of no pathway to same.
- *EIA Screening* – proposal is subthreshold and no EIAR required.

The report concluded by recommending permission be refused as per Section 3.1.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Water Services (12/08/2025) – no objection subject to standard conditions on foul and surface water management and discharge arrangements.

Parks and Green Infrastructure Division (08/11/2025) – no objection to proposal.

Transportation Planning Section (01/09/2025) – proposal not acceptable/ is not supported on basis of car dependence and traffic hazard concerns.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Dublin Airport Authority (28/08/2025) – notes proposal would give rise to an increase of population in Noise Zone D which will militate against the achievement of the airport’s noise abatement objective (when noise mitigation measures are excluded) and the requirement for the applicant to undertake a noise impact assessment. No objection subject to condition requiring the issue of noise and implementation of effective noise mitigation to be addressed prior to the occupation of the development.

3.4. Third Party Observations

No submissions received.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

P.A. Ref. F25A/0154E – application by Naul Road Development Ltd. for a new residential infill development to consist of the provision of 1-bed 1-storey dwelling (119sq.m), timber storage structure, swale, landscaping, site walls, SUDS, connection to existing pumping station and all associated site and other works, refused permission on 16/04/2025 for 2 no. reasons:

“1. The proposed development represents piecemeal development of the applicant’s overall landholding at this location, is not in keeping with the character of the other dwellings recently permitted on the cul-de-sac and significantly breaches the now established building line that is permitted/existing. Furthermore, the development’s proximity to the commercial business to the west, together with the proposed design and layout, boundary treatments, location and orientation of private open space would result in a sub-standard provision of residential amenity for future occupants. The development does not accord with Table 14.4 or Objectives SPQHO56, CSO69 or

Site c. 20m to East

P.A. Ref. F24A/0835E – application by Patrick Gough for 1 no. detached single storey 2-bed dwelling and related works on a site c. 20m to east of the appeal site, granted permission on 11/02/2025 subject to 12 no. conditions, including condition no. 8 which required improvement of sightlines on R108 junction.

Site c. 40m to East

P.A. Ref. F25A/0289E (ABP-322789-25) – application by Naul Road Development Ltd. for 4 no. detached two storey 3-bed dwellings, local alteration to existing boundary walls, landscaping, paving, walls and fences, solar panels, rainwater harvesting tanks with overflow to existing stream (SUDS), connection to existing pumping station and all associated site and other works, refused on appeal on 07/10/2025 for the following reason: “*1. Undesirable intensification of use, piecemeal development of this edge of village site, car dependency and lack of information on proposed pedestrian footpath connecting site to the village core of Ballyboughal and absence of information on the capacity of the road infrastructure to accommodate the addition of the proposed footpath infrastructure*”.

P.A. Ref. F24A/0651E (ABP-320990-24) – application Naul Road Development Ltd. for 4 no. detached dwellings, related infrastructure and site works, refused permission on appeal on 13/02/2025 for 1 no. reason relating suburban design, intensification of use and absence of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure linking site to village.

P.A. Ref. F23A/0374 (ABP-318005-23) – application by Naul Road Development Ltd. for construction of 2 no. houses and all associated site works, granted on appeal on 19/06/2023 subject to 10. no conditions incl. condition no. 3(b) requiring completion of R108 junction upgrade.

P.A. Ref. F22A/0403 (ABP-314914-22) – application by Naul Road Developments Ltd. for construction of a house and all associated site works, granted on appeal on 25/07/2023 subject to 10 no. conditions.

Full Extent of Development Lands to East

P.A. Ref. F22A/0071 – application by Naul Road Development for 3 no. detached 2-storey 4-bed dwellings and related works, refused permission on 11/04/2022 for 3 no.

reasons relating to: 1. Traffic hazard, 2. Unsustainable car dependency, 3. Flood risk from neighbouring stream.

Junction of Laneway with R108

P.A. Ref. F22A/0239 – application by Naul Road Development Ltd. for alterations to the existing site entrance and piers (R108 junction) to allow for increased sightlines, the relocation of a ESB pole, landscaping and all associated site and other works, granted permission on 10/08/2022 subject to 3 no. conditions.

4.3. **Other Adjacent Sites**

Site to North-East

P.A. Ref. F24A/0907E – application by Key More Estates Ltd. for proposed single storey dwelling, storage structure, site walls, relocation of entrance gates granted under planning with Reg. Ref. No. F23A/0493, changes to landscaping, widening of the existing driveway to 5.5m wide, mini roundabout, SUDS (rainwater butts & permeable surfaces), connection to existing services and all associated site and other works, granted on 02/04/2025 subject to 16 no. conditions.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **National Policy**

Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (NPF) (2025): NPO 24: housing in rural areas under urban influence; NPO 25: reverse rural declines; NPO 26: proportionate rural growth; NPO 28: siting and design criteria for rural housing; NPO 45: increase density in settlements.

Climate Action Plan (2024 & 2025) and National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2023-2030 – Outcome 2A protection of existing designated areas & protected species.

The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2024) - set out policy and guidance in relation to the planning and development of urban and rural settlements, with a focus on sustainable residential development and the creation of compact settlements – SPPR3 (parking) and Table 3.8 (Accessibility).

Our Rural Future: Rural Development Policy 2021-2025.

Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes and Sustaining Communities (2007) - Table 5.1: Space provision and room sizes for typical dwellings.

5.2. Regional Policy

Eastern & Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy 2019-2031 (RSES) – Rural Areas:

- RPO 4.80: provision of single houses in rural areas under strong urban influence based on consideration of demonstrable economic or social need.
- RPO 4.81: siting and design criteria for rural housing.

5.3. Development Plan

The Fingal Development Plan (FDP) 2023 – 2029 applies.

Zoning

The site zoning designation is 'RV - Rural Village' with the objective to 'Protect and promote the character of the Rural Village and promote a vibrant community in accordance with an approved land use plan, and the availability of physical and community infrastructure'.

The vision for 'RV' lands is to 'Protect and promote established villages within the rural landscape where people can settle and have access to community services, including remote work hubs. The villages are areas within the rural landscape where housing needs can be satisfied with minimal harm to the countryside and surrounding environment. The villages will serve their rural catchment, provide local services and smaller scale rural enterprises. Levels of growth will be managed through approved land use plans to ensure that a critical mass for local services is encouraged without providing for growth beyond local need and unsustainable commuting patterns'.

Rural Villages

Ballyboughal/ Ballyboghill falls within 'Town and Villages' category under the FDP with objective to prepare a Masterplan for same (LAP expired in May 2022).

Sections 3.5.15 (Housing in Rural Fingal) and 3.5.15.1 (Rural Villages) - The Rural Settlement Strategy is not applicable to Rural Villages and settlement is open to all.

Policy SPQHP45 – Rural Housing: Provide viable options for the rural community through the promotion of appropriate sustainable growth of the rural villages and clusters, balanced by carefully controlled residential development in the countryside.

Objective CSO68 – Rural Villages, Policies CSP43 – Viable Options for the Rural Community and SPQHP51 and SPQH52 – Growth and Protection of Rural Villages.

Objective SPQHO56 – Rural Villages: Facilitate appropriate development within Rural Villages subject to compliance with the following:

- i. The scale of new residential development shall be in proportion to the pattern and grain of the existing settlement and shall be located within the defined development boundary.
- ii. Encourage and promote compact growth within Rural Villages including infill, brownfield development together with redevelopment of derelict/underutilised properties.
- iii. All development shall enhance the existing village character and create or strengthen a sense of identity and distinctiveness for the settlement.
- iv. New commercial development should be centrally located within the village and contribute positively to the streetscape and public realm.
- v. Encourage new community and social facilities in conjunction with residential development.

Objective CSO69 – Scale of New Housing Developments in Towns and Villages: Ensure that the scale of new housing developments within Towns and Villages both individually and cumulatively, shall generally be in proportion to the pattern and grain of existing development.

Objective CSO72 – Compact, Organic and Sequential Development of Towns and Villages: The scale of new residential schemes within Towns and Villages shall be in proportion to the pattern and grain of existing development with a focus on delivering compact growth and providing for the organic and sequential development of the settlement. Infill and brownfield development shall have regard to the existing town or village character and create or strengthen a sense of identity and distinctiveness for the settlement.

Infill Development

Sections 3.5.13 and 14.5, Policy SPQHP38 and Objective SPQHO37 (Compact Growth and Consolidation).

Sections 14.10 (Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas) and 14.10.1 (Corner/Infill Development).

Table 14.4 (Infill Development) and Objectives DMSO31 and SPQHO39 – New/ Infill Development: New infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units. Infill development shall retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings.

Objective SPQHO42 – Development of Underutilised Infill, Corner and Backland Sites Encourage and promote the development of underutilised infill, corner and backland sites in existing residential areas subject to the character of the area and environment being protected.

Housing Design Guidance

Sections 14.12.1 (Design Criteria for Rural Villages and Rural Clusters).

Section 14.8 (Housing Development Standards), Objective DMSO19 (Housing Quality Standards) and Objective DDMSO27 (Min. Private Open Space).

Other

Section 14.18 (Green Infrastructure and Natural Heritage).

Objectives SPQHO69 – Vehicular Entrances and SPQHO90 - Entrances and Front Boundary Treatment.

Objective CMO47 – Road Safety and Rural Roads: Prioritise safety on rural roads and junctions, while having regard to the protection of biodiversity, Green Infrastructure and rural character present in roadside trees, hedgerows and banks.

Policy CMP7 (Policy CMP7 – Pedestrian and Cycling Network) and Objective CSO52 – Safe and Convenient Road, Pedestrian and Cycle System.

Objectives SPQHO91 - Retention Hedgerows, DMSO125 – Management of Trees and Hedgerows and DMSO126 – Protection of Trees and Hedgerows during Development.

Section 11.9.2 (Noise), Table 8.1 and Objectives DAO11 – Requirement: Noise Insulation and DMSO105 – Development within Airport Noise Zones.

Table 14.19: Car Parking Standards – Zone 2: 1 no. is ‘Norm’ for 1-beds.

Objective CIOSO5 – Residential Developments and Community Facilities.

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located within or adjoining any designated site.

The nearest European sites in close proximity to the appeal site are as follows:

- Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code 000208) - approx. 5km
- Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code 004015) - approx. 6km
- Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004205) – approx. 6km
- Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000025) - approx. 6.5km
- North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236) – approx. 11.5km
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 003000) - approx. 13km

The site is also proximate to the following Natural Heritage Areas and proposed Natural Heritage Areas:

- Rogerstown Estuary pNHA (Site Code 000208) – approx. 5km.
- Malahide Estuary pNHA (Site Code 000205) – approx. 6km.

7.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendix 1 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.

8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

I have concluded, 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 (refer to form in Appendix 3 for details).

9.0 The Appeal

9.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal submission was received (10/10/2025) and seeks to address the PA's reasons for refusal. The grounds of appeal (GOA) can be summarised as follows:

General

- Planning history of appeal site and adjoining lands is outlined with relevant reasons for refusal and rationale underpinning grants of permission highlighted.
- Proposal responds to and overcomes P.A. Ref. F25A/0154E refusal reasons.
- PA has raised new infill policy compliance issues in respect of current proposal not previously raised.
- National, regional and FDP policy supports infill proposal.
- No third party submissions and proposal meets all residential/ amenity standards.
- Proposal does not constitute unsustainable one-off housing.
- Appellant willing to accept a condition requiring contribution for open space.
- PA decision to refuse current proposal inconsistent with decision on F24A/0907E which was determined to be infill development consistent with SPQHO56.
- Transportation Department stance on current proposal (recommend refusal) is inconsistent with their decision on F25A/0154E (no objection to proposal).

- Appellant willing to provide new 1.8m wide footpath along west side of public road (as also proposed under F25A/0289E (then currently under appeal under 322789-25)) which can be conditioned. (Note: this was subsequently refused on appeal)

Response to Refusal Reason No. 1

- Site is at edge of Ballyboughal village but still comes within boundary/ RV zoning and there is no policy basis for precluding development of this site for housing.
- Site location not visually sensitive or visible from public roadway.
- Use of vacant and infill site proximate to existing and permitted dwellings is not piecemeal development.
- PA's stance on proposal is contrary to that of F24A/0907E and F22A/0239.
- Citing of 'overdevelopment' in refusal reasoning is contradicted by PA assessment which states that the house would meet all required residential standards and would not have a negative impact on neighbouring dwellings.
- PA's concerns re: 'suburban house design' have no basis in policy. Proposed design is in-keeping with varied character of permitted & existing housing on lane.
- Pattern and density of development in village varies significantly – no conflict.
- Proposal is capable of being serviced, would not prejudice public health.

Response to Refusal Reason No. 2

- PA's issues with access and connectivity – which were not raised under previous application - can be overcome through the provision of a new footpath.
- Conditional ABP grant under F22A/0239 requires delivery of revised R108 junction and a similar condition could be attached in this instance.
- Proposal for 1 no. dwelling does not give rise to significant intensification that would give rise to a traffic hazard.

The GOA are accompanied by a copy of the PA's decision notification.

9.2. **Planning Authority Response**

Response (dated 23/10/2025) states that the PA have no comments to make in respect of the appeal and seeks that the Commission uphold decision to refuse permission. In the event that their decision is overturned by the Commission, the PA seek that, where relevant, conditions relating to the payment of a financial contribution and/ or special development contribution under FCC's Section 48 Development Contribution Scheme be applied and that a tree bond also be sought where required.

9.3. **Observations**

None received.

9.4. **Further Responses**

None received.

10.0 **Assessment**

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/ regional/ national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Pattern of Development
- Design and Layout
- Access
- Other Matters

10.1. **Principle of Development**

- 10.1.1. Permission is sought for the construction of a dwelling with all associated site works. Residential development is permitted in principle under the site's 'RV – Rural Village' zoning which seeks to 'Protect and promote the character of the Rural Village and promote a vibrant community in accordance with an approved land use plan, and the availability of physical and community infrastructure'. Section 3.5.15.1 (Rural Villages)

states that the Rural Settlement Strategy is not applicable to the Rural Villages and that settlement is open to all, without the need to demonstrate a local or rural-generated housing need. In light of the foregoing, I consider the proposal to be acceptable in principle, subject to the further detailed considerations outlined below.

10.2. **Pattern of Development**

- 10.2.1. Objective SPQHO56 encourages and promotes compact growth within Rural Villages including infill, brownfield development together with redevelopment of derelict/underutilised properties – with this sentiment being reiterated by Objectives SPQHO42 and CSO72. The appellant contends that their infill proposal is supported by national to local policy. I consider that the proposal, which is to be developed on an a zoned, gap site between existing properties on a private laneway which is serviced by public potable and foul water mains, is compliant in principle with planning and development policy which encourages consolidation and compact growth in order to make efficient use of zoned and serviced land.
- 10.2.2. Refusal reason no. 1 refers to the proposal constituting ‘piecemeal’ development that is out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the village and refers to contravention of SPQHO56 - Rural Villages on the basis of its edge of village, backland location, lack of connectivity to Ballyboughal village, and departure from the pattern of development on adjoining lands. I note that similar concerns gave rise to refusal reason No. 1 under P.A. Ref. F25A/0154E (which also cited non-compliance with Objectives CSO69 and CSO72 and Table 14.4).
- 10.2.3. I note that Objective SPQHO56 (Rural Villages), seeks that new residential development be located within the defined development boundary, that its scale is proportionate to the pattern and grain of the existing settlement (also required by Objectives CSO69 and CSO72), and that it enhances the existing village character, identity and distinctiveness. Similarly, Objective SPQHO42 support for the development of underutilised infill residential sites is conditional on the character of the area and environment being protected.
- 10.2.4. Having considered the existing and permitted pattern of residential development (with extant permissions for 4 no. dwellings) on the laneway, I consider the proposal to

provide for a further dwelling at this location, which comes within the defined development boundary of Ballyboughal Rural Village, to be acceptable in principle.

10.2.5. However, I would have concerns that the c. 0.03ha scale and configuration of the appeal site and the nature and form of development proposed are not proportionate to the overall pattern and grain of residential development within the wider village, which is typically characterised by comparatively larger detached and semi-detached dwellings on large plots. In this regard, I also note that the appeal site is of a much smaller scale and more constrained than the appellant's development sites to the east (which are comparatively larger and have much greater plot depths). In this respect, it is not clear as to why the L-shaped portion of lands to the immediate north and east of the appeal site, which are also in the appellant's ownership, were not included as part of the application lands.

10.2.6. In light of the foregoing issues, I am of the view that the appeal site presents as a constrained, left-over portion of land and, for this reason, I consider that the proposal constitutes ad-hoc piecemeal development which is not appropriate to its edge of village location and which is not in-keeping with the pattern and grain of existing and permitted development in the settlement of Ballyboughal.

10.3. **Design and Layout**

10.3.1. The GOA seek to draw the Commission's attention to the fact that the PA have raised infill policy compliance issues not previously raised. In this regard, I note that the PA's refusal reason no. 1 refers to the proposal's contravention of Objective SPQHO42 - Development of Underutilised Infill, Corner and Backland Sites.

10.3.2. In this respect, I am satisfied that the proposal, which is not a corner site or in a backland location, constitutes infill development. Having reviewed the proposal against the parameters of Table 14.4 (Infill Development), which seek to provide a high-quality design response; to avoid overlooking, overbearance and overshadowing; to respect the character of area; and, to positively contribute to/ animate the streetscape, I am satisfied that the proposal is compliant with same. I have reached this conclusion on the basis of the proposal meeting the room sizing and dimension standards set out in the 2007 Housing Guidelines and exceeding the FDP minimum private open space standard of 60sq.m (71sq.m provided) for houses of 3-beds or

less, and on account of its design (internal layout, orientation, single storey height, enclosure and front elevation addressing the lane) not giving rise to negative impacts on neighbouring residential or visual amenities.

10.3.3. However, notwithstanding the proposal meeting the aforementioned residential standards, as outlined above, I have significant concerns about the proposal, on account of the scale and configuration of the site, being piecemeal in nature and out of character with the pattern and grain of residential development within the wider village. For these reasons, I do not consider it to be compliant with Objectives SPQHO42, SPQHO56, CSO69 or CSO72 of the FDP.

10.3.4. Objective SPQHO56 encourages new community and social facilities in conjunction with residential development. Given that such requirements would typically relate to large scale residential development (as per Objective CIOSO5), and not to proposals for individual houses, I do not consider that such a provision would apply in this instance.

10.4. Access

10.4.1. The PA's second refusal reason relates to access and transportation issues. Concerns were raised by the Transportation Department that the development would intensify use of the shared access road and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard. It was further considered that insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that adequate sightlines could be achieved without encroaching on adjoining lands.

10.4.2. The PA's first refusal reason also raised concerns about the potential for the proposal to give rise to car dependency on account of the absence of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure linking to the village centre and the poor availability of public transport.

10.4.3. The first party contends that the proposal for 1 no. dwelling does not constitute significant intensification that would give rise to a traffic hazard and it is stated that the issue of safe access has been dealt with in detail by the Commission previously. The appellant also states that the issue of connectivity to the village centre can be dealt with by way of the delivery of a footpath that can be secured by planning condition requiring its construction or by way of a development contribution. I note that this proposal was also considered by the Commission in the context of the appeal under

ABP-322789-25 where it was determined that there was not a sufficient basis to attach such a condition.

Connectivity to Village

- 10.4.4. The FDP places a strong emphasis on the integration of sustainable mobility via walking and cycling into new and existing developments in line with national and regional policy - which promotes sustainable mobility as a core principle of compact growth. FDP Policy CSO52 (Safe and Convenient Road, Pedestrian and Cycle System) seeks to ensure the provision of safe and convenient pedestrian, cycling and road systems, whilst Policy CMP7 (Pedestrian and Cycling Network) seeks to secure a high-quality, connected and inclusive pedestrian and cycling network.
- 10.4.5. The Commission has recently refused permission (under ABP-320990-24 and ABP-322789-25 for example) on the basis of absence of safe pedestrian and cycle connectivity between proposals on the subject laneway and Ballyboughal village core.
- 10.4.6. I note from my site inspection that the nearest section of existing public footpath is located adjacent to the Dooroge estate c. 150m north of the entrance to the laneway from the R108. The appellant considers that the construction of a footpath extension linking the laneway and village core can be secured by condition as detailed above.
- 10.4.7. The existing entrance to the subject site is located within the 50 km/h speed limit zone of Ballyboughal village and, in this context, the provision of a new pedestrian link from the site to the village core would represent a significant planning gain for the residents of the Grange, would facilitate future development of adjoining zoned lands and would also benefit a number of other existing dwellings fronting onto the R108 at this location.
- 10.4.8. However, notwithstanding these potential benefits and the appellant's reference to their pedestrian connectivity proposals put forward under ABP-322789-25 (which was refused by the Commission on 07/10/2025), I note that they have provided no documentation in respect to the footpath extension which is proposed to link the laneway and village core.
- 10.4.9. Therefore, while I accept that the provision of a footpath extension would represent a notable planning gain, the principle of which would be supported by higher level policy and FDP sustainable mobility objectives, I am not satisfied that adequate detail has been provided to confirm its feasibility and I do not consider that the information on file

provides a sufficient basis on which to attach such a condition as suggested by the appellant. On balance, I consider that the proposal is premature in advance of more detailed analysis of the proposal and agreement regarding the construction of the footpath. I recommend to the Commission that permission is refused on this basis.

Traffic Hazard

- 10.4.10. The laneway currently features a wide splayed entrance onto the R108 junction with the sightline to the south being somewhat restricted. The existing vehicular access to the appeal site is located at an offset position on the west side of the site's boundary to the laneway (adjoining the neighbouring recreational complex) and, as such, the sightline to the west as one exits the property is substandard.
- 10.4.11. In respect of sightlines from the laneway's access onto the regional road, I note that permission was previously granted to the appellant (Naul Road Development Ltd.) under Reg. Ref. F22A/0239 for alterations to the existing entrance to provide improved sightlines onto the R108. This matter has also been considered under ABP-314914-22, ABP-318005-23, ABP-320990-24 and ABP-322789-25, where compliance with Reg. Ref. F22A/0239 was considered and/ or required as a condition of permission. While the permitted works have not yet been carried out, the permission remains live, and I am satisfied that subject to its full implementation, the proposal would achieve sightlines in line with DMURS. This requirement can be addressed by condition in the event of a grant of permission and I note that this was also the recommendation of the previous Inspector under the most recently appeal in respect of development on the laneway under ABP-322789-25. I also consider that, where the Commission are minded to grant permission in this case, a prohibition on the occupancy of the proposed dwelling until the modified entrance is operational, and functioning to the satisfaction of the PA, could be imposed by condition.
- 10.4.12. In respect to the issues raised regarding the redline boundary and whether or not the applicant has sufficient interest over these lands to carry out necessary junction upgrade works, I note that these matters were previously dealt with as part of the appellant's application under P.A. Ref. F22A/0239 and I draw the Commission's attention to the Site Local OS Map on file in this regard, which illustrates the extent of the appellant's land ownership up to and including the junction.

- 10.4.13. The PA's Transportation Department have raised an issue in respect to the substandard nature of sightlines onto the laneway serving the proposed dwelling. I consider that the proposed layout, which sees the parking area being located on the south-east side of the property, would improve driver visibility to the west. However, notwithstanding that the laneway is a low pedestrian activity environment, I would have concerns about the inadequate sightlines and lack of pedestrian-driver intervisibility that would be created to the east of the proposed vehicular access, where the proposal adjoins both a footpath and the substantial roadside boundary wall of the neighbouring property. I consider that this built context, would function to obstruct driver visibility of pedestrians and other vehicles when exiting the site, would give rise to an unacceptable traffic hazard.
- 10.4.14. The absence of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure linking the appeal site to Ballyboughal village is acknowledged and this has been dealt with above. Furthermore, regarding intensification of use of the access laneway which has historically been shared between residential and commercial/ agricultural uses, I consider the proposal to be acceptable given the site's location within the Rural Village boundary, the pattern of existing and permitted residential development on the laneway and having regard to the modest scale of the development and the limited trip generating potential of same.
- 10.4.15. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed access arrangements onto the R108, subject to implementation of the aforementioned condition relating to Reg. Ref. F22A/0239, would not endanger public safety and I am of the opinion therefore that the second reason for refusal based on this specific traffic hazard can be overcome. However, I am not satisfied that the design and layout of the proposed dwelling provides for adequate sightlines to the east and I have concerns that this would give rise to both poor driver visibility and driver-pedestrian intervisibility at the entrance to the site and therefore, to a traffic hazard.

10.5. Other Matters

Parking

- 10.5.1. Proposal to provide for 2 no. in-curtilage car parking spaces in a car parking zone 2 (as per Table 14.18) is compliant with Table 14.19 Car Parking Standards which allows

for a norm of 1 no. car parking spaces in the case of 1-2 bed dwellings. In this context, the FDP clarifies that the term 'norm' refers to the number of spaces that will generally be permitted unless specific changes are considered necessary to ensure the proper planning and sustainable development of a proposed development. Given the issues raised earlier in this assessment in respect to the lack of public transport and poor pedestrian connectivity to the village core, I consider the provision of 2 no. car parking spaces would be warranted in principle in this instance and would not give rise to a material contravention of the FDP. However, this recommendation should be understood in the context of my concerns outlined in Section 10.4 of this report in respect to the proposal being largely car dependent and entirely reliant on unsustainable transport modes.

Landscaping

- 10.5.2. The PA's response to the appeal seeks the attachment of a tree bond. The report of the PA's Parks and Green Infrastructure Division (08/11/2025) refers to existing planting along southern boundary - the removal of which should be addressed by condition. I did not observe any trees or other planting on site during my site inspection and do not consider such a condition to be required on this basis.

Foul Drainage

- 10.5.3. A new connection is proposed to an existing 150mm wastewater sewer and private pumping station which services the surrounding dwellings on the laneway and which has capacity to service the proposal. The wastewater from the pumping station is pumped north for c. 250m under the R108, ultimately outfalling into the existing public sewer system at Ballyboughal, Dooroge. I note that equivalent servicing arrangements were recently permitted in respect of the development sites to the east. The Water Services section in their report of 12/08/2025 raised no objections to the proposal subject to the attachment of standard conditions on foul water management and discharge arrangements. The UE foul water capacity register states that the Ballyboghil WWTP (Reg#0108) has potential spare capacity and there is a submission on file from Uisce Eireann (UE) dated 14/02/2025 stating that the proposed wastewater connection is feasible without infrastructure upgrade. On this basis, I consider it appropriate that the matter of a connection agreement with UE be addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Water Supply

10.5.4. A new connection is proposed to the existing watermain on the laneway, which is not taken in charge but is in the private ownership of the appellant, which in turn connects to an existing 250mm watermain located under the R108 to the east of the site. The UE Water Supply Capacity Register for Fingal states that there is potential capacity available in Ballyboughal and there is a submission on file from Uisce Eireann (UE) dated 14/02/2025 stating that the proposed water connection is feasible without infrastructure upgrade. On this basis, I consider it appropriate that the matter of the feasibility of connecting to the UE network be addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Surface Water Drainage

10.5.5. It is proposed to treat and infiltrate the surface water runoff from the site using on site SuDS techniques which comply with the GDSDS, with the runoff outfalling into the stream to the south of the laneway. I note that the Water Services section in their report of 12/08/2025 raised no objections to the proposal subject to the attachment of standard conditions on surface water management and discharge arrangements. Having regard to the small scale nature of the proposal and the view of the PA, I consider this approach to be reasonable.

Noise

10.5.6. As detailed in Sections 3.3 and 5.3 of this report, the site is located in Dublin Airport Noise Zone D with Objective DAO11 requiring the provision of noise insulation measures in this location where deemed necessary. The applicant did not provide any specific information in respect to proposed noise mitigation measures and the DAA sought that this issue (and specifically compliance with BSI Standards Publication BS8233:2014 Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings (Table 4)) be addressed by condition. I am satisfied that this is a minor design detail which is capable of being addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the size and configuration of the site and the nature and form of the development proposed, the proposal would constitute ad-hoc, piecemeal development and would be out of character with the pattern and grain of existing and permitted development at this location on the edge of Ballyboughal Village. In this regard, the proposed development would be contrary to Objectives SPQHO56 (Rural Villages), CSO69 (Scale of New Housing Developments in Towns and Villages) and CSO72 (Compact, Organic and Sequential Development of Towns and Villages) of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029 and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the lack of information supplied within the application and the appeal, it has not been demonstrated that the design and layout of the proposed dwelling provides for adequate sightlines and pedestrian-driver intervisibility or that a pedestrian footpath can be provided connecting the proposed site to the village core of Ballyboughal at this time. In the absence of adequate sightlines and pedestrian and cycle infrastructure from the site linking to the village, it is considered that the proposed development would be largely car dependent, would promote unsuitable transport modes and would give rise to traffic hazard. The proposed development would therefore be 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.

Emma Gosnell
Planning Inspector
4th February 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500046-DF
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of dwelling with all associated site works
Development Address	The Grange, Ballyboughal, Fingal, Co. Dublin
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	Part 2, Class 10(b)(i) Infrastructure – dwelling units – 500 units. Proposal is for 1 no. dwelling units and is therefore sub-threshold.

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500046-DF
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of dwelling with all associated site works
Development Address	The Grange, Ballyboughal, Fingal, Co. Dublin
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 proposal is for 1 no. dwelling and associated site works on a site of c. 0.03ha. No demolition works are proposed. The development is significantly below the class threshold of 500 dwellings. The project due to its size and nature would not give rise to significant use of resources or production of waste during both the construction and operation phases. Access and connectivity proposals need further consideration – see Section 10 of Inspector's Report.

	The proposed development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, and is not vulnerable to climate change.
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).	<p>The site is located in the designated rural village of Ballyboughal. There is a concentration of similar low-density housing in the area.</p> <p>The nearest Natura 2000 sites are the Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code 000208) approx. 5km to the south-east and Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code 004015) approx. 6km to the south-east. There is no other nationally designated site on or in the vicinity.</p> <p>The site is not within a designated ACA and there are no Protected Structures or other Cultural Heritage sites on or immediately adjoining the site.</p> <p>Having regard to the above and the simple nature and limited scale of the proposed development, I am satisfied that impacts on environmental sensitivities can be adequately assessed in this case without the need for EIA.</p>
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 effects and opportunities for mitigation).	<p>Due to the small scale of the development, the construction stage will not be significant in terms of duration or complexity.</p> <p>The main operational impacts would be limited to traffic, residential amenity, and the wastewater (and surface water) emissions arising from the site. These elements would be subject to standard assessment/design. And, while I have outlined concerns about connectivity, I am satisfied that this can be assessed without potential for significant environmental effects that would require EIA.</p> <p>There would be no significant cumulative impacts with other projects.</p>
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: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required.)

Appendix 2 - Appropriate Assessment Screening

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Case file: PL-500046-DF	
Brief description of project	Normal planning appeal. Construction of 1 no. dwelling and all associated site works at The Grange, Ballyboughal, Fingal, Co. Dublin – see Section 2.0 of Inspector’s Report for further details.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	<p>The appeal site is undeveloped and is located in the designated rural village of Ballyboughal where there is a concentration of similar low-density housing set within a wider rural hinterland. No demolition or substantial site clearance/ enabling works are required as the site is already cleared. The development involves 1 no. house together with its ancillary infrastructure – parking, servicing etc. Proposed water supply is via a new connection to the existing public mains on the laneway (which is privately owned by the appellant). The proposed surface water outfall is to an existing watercourse located at the far side of the laneway. Foul drainage will be dealt with via a new connection to an existing private pump station within The Grange and then via a public sewer at the R108 – full details in Section 10 of Inspector’s Report.</p> <p>There are no watercourses or other ecological features of note on the appeal site that would connect it directly to European Sites in the wider area. The Ballyboghill River (EPA Code: IE_EA_08B012200)) which is located c. 10m to the south of the appeal site. The site is also underlain by the Swords groundwater body (EPA Code: IE_EA_G_011). The Ballyboghill River travels through agricultural lands before entering the Rogerstown Estuary (and by implication Rogerstown Estuary SPA and SAC) c. 5.5km to the south-east near the M1 motorway thereby providing a potential indirect link between the appeal site and these 2 no. European sites.</p>
Screening report	No – brief AA screening statement made in Section 6 of submitted Planning Statement.
Natura Impact Statement	No
Relevant Submissions	<p>The PA referred to the application to the relevant prescribed Bodies. A report was received from Dublin Airport Authority.</p> <p>The Planning Authority undertook an Appropriate Assessment Screening (I refer to the Commission to their report of 01/00/2025) which identified the Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code 000208) and Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code 004015) to the south-east as the closest European Sites. The report states it is reasonable to conclude, on the basis of the information available, that the development on its own or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to result in any potential significant effects on the European Site on the basis that the proposed project is not connected to/ has realistic pathways to any European site given the distances involved and lack of connectivity.</p>

	The report also highlights a report from Inland Fisheries Ireland that was received on the previous planning application (F24A/0651E) which confirmed that the proposed development was located in the catchment of the Ballyboughal System (a salmonoid catchment) and highlighted the importance of ensuring receiving foul and surface water infrastructure have adequate capacity to ensure receiving water quality is preserved.
--	---

Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model

Having regard to the source-pathway receptor-model, I consider that there are 6 no. European sites which have the potential to be affected by the proposal. I have excluded all other European sites on the basis of their substantial physical separation from the appeal site and due to the absence of realistic pathways connecting the appeal site to same.

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development	Ecological Connections ²	Consider further in screening ³
Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code 000208)	https://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/sac/000208 (2013) Estuaries [1130], Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140], Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310], Atlantic salt meadows (Glaucopuccinellietalia maritima) [1330], Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi) [1410], Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophila arenaria (white dunes) [2120], Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130].	c. 5km	Yes Indirect hydrological connection via surface/groundwater/foul.	Yes
Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code 004015)	https://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/spa/004015 (2013) Greylag Goose (Anser anser) [A043], Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) [A046], Shelduck (Tadorna tadorna) [A048], Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130], Ringed Plover (Charadrius hiaticula) [A137], Grey Plover (Pluvialis squatarola)	c. 6km	Yes Indirect hydrological connection via surface/groundwater/foul.	Yes

	[A141], Knot (Calidris canutus) [A143], Dunlin (Calidris alpina) [A149], Black-tailed Godwit (Limosa limosa) [A156], Redshank (Tringa totanus) [A162], Shoveler (Spatula clypeata) [A857], Wetland and Waterbirds [A999].			
--	---	--	--	--

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

AA Screening matrix

Having regard to the comparable impacts and effects arising, I deal with the SPA and SAC together below.

Site Name	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code 004015) Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code 000208)	Direct: none Indirect: localized, temporary, low magnitude impacts from noise, dust and construction related emissions to surface water during construction and foul and surface water during operation.	<p>The contained nature of the site (serviced, defined site boundaries, no direct ecological connections or pathways) and distance from receiving features connected to the SPA and SAC make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SPA and SAC for the SCIs and QIs listed in the table above at either construction or operation stage.</p> <p>The development is for a relatively small scale infill proposal (1 no. house) and given the nature of the works within the applicant's existing site and outside the European sites, it is not expected that any habitat fragmentation would take place. The already established pattern of housing development in this location would mean that any limited periods of disturbance caused by the construction works would not add to any disturbance or displacement effects that would result in lessening of species density.</p> <p>Having regard to the separation distance between the site and nearest European site, it can be concluded that there could be no direct impacts, such as loss or reduction in habitat or significant physical disturbance of habitats or species (for example that may occasionally use the agricultural grassland area adjacent to the proposed development site), by the proposed development on any European site. There will be no direct or ex-situ effects from disturbance during construction or operation phases of the proposed development.</p> <p>In terms of emissions to water, the nearest watercourse is the Ballyboghill River (EPA Code: IE_EA_08B012200)) which is located c. 10m to the south of the appeal site. The site is also underlain by the Swords groundwater body (EPA Code: IE_EA_G_011).</p>

		<p>The Ballyboghill 'Barnanstown' River travels through agricultural lands before entering the Rogerstown Estuary c. 5.5km to the south-east near the M1 motorway. With such a distances, any silts or other potential pollutants entering the municipal drainage network or the drainage ditch at the proposed development site at construction and operation stages, even in the most extreme scenarios, would be completely attenuated by the dilution, dispersal and settlement that would occur within first the river system and then the marine environment. There is therefore no prospect that materials carried in drainage water from the proposed development site, could have any measurable effect on the interests of the marine waters at this location.</p> <p>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p>
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
<p>Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site</p> <p>I conclude that the proposed development (alone or in combination with other plans and projects) would not result in likely significant effects on a European Site. No measures specifically intended to avoid or reduce harmful impacts of the proposed development on European sites were taken into account in reaching this conclusion.</p>		
<p>Screening Determination Finding of no likely significant effects</p> <p>In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on European Sites, namely Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code 000208) and Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code 004015) in view of the sites Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.</p> <p>This determination is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relatively minor scale of the development and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site. • Distance from and weak indirect connections to the European sites. • No significant ex-situ impacts on wintering birds. 		

Appendix 3

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality

An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.	PL-500046-DF	Townland, address	The Grange, Ballyboughal, Fingal, Co. Dublin
Description of project		The proposal comprises of the Construction of 1 no. dwelling with all associated site works – see Section 2.0 of Inspector’s Report for further details.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		<p>The site is located within the rural village of Ballyboughal, approximately 6.5km to the north-west of Swords in Co. Dublin. The site itself (area of 0.03ha) is undeveloped and relatively flat and is largely located on the north-west side of an existing residential cul-de-sac at the south-west edge of the village.</p> <p>There are no existing watercourses on or immediately adjoining the site. There is an existing watercourse (the Ballyboghil River (IE_EA_08B012200)) c.10m to the south of the site on the far side of the private laneway. The site is underlain by the Swords groundwater body (EPA Code IE_EA_G_011).</p>	
Proposed surface water details		The proposed surface water outfall is to the aforementioned watercourse – see Section 10.4 of this report for further details.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		The proposed water supply is via a connection to the existing public mains – see Section 10.4 of this report for further details.	

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	The proposed foul water drainage is via a connection to an existing private pump station which in turn connects to the existing public mains – see Section 10.4 of this report for further details.
Others?	<p>According to OPW mapping (www.floodinfo.ie accessed on 23/01/2026), there are no past or predicted flooding events associated with the site.</p> <p>The site is not located within Fluvial Flood Zone A or Flood Zone B according to Map 8 of the SFRA completed for the LCDP.</p> <p>The closest Natura 2000 site are as detailed above in Appendices 1 and 2.</p>

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection

Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)
The Ballyboghill River (transitional)	c. 10m to south	The Ballyboghill River (EPA Code: IE_EA_08B01 2200))	Poor	At Risk	Domestic Wastewater, Agriculture, etc.	Wastewater & Surface water run-off, groundwater.
Swords groundwater body (groundwater)	Below site	Swords groundwater body (EPA Code: IE_EA_G_011)	Good	Not At Risk	Domestic Wastewater, Agriculture, etc.	Wastewater & Surface water via the overlying soil.

Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.

CONSTRUCTION PHASE

No.	Component	Water body receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Surface	The Ballyboghill River (EPA Code: IE_EA_08B012200))	Surface / ground water run-off from the site via overland flows and Existing watercourse to south.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages.	None.	No. Having regard to the limited scale of the works, the application of standard construction practice, and the separation distance from the river, I am satisfied that there would be no significant risk.	Screened Out.
2.	Ground	Swords groundwater body (EPA Code: IE_EA_G_011).	Via the overlying soil.	As above.	None.	No. Having regard to the limited scale of the works and the application of standard	Screened Out.

						construction practice, I am satisfied that there would be no significant risk.	
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
1.	Surface	The Ballyboghill River (EPA Code: IE_EA_08B0122 00))	Surface water run-off from the site. Existing watercourse to south of site.	Hydrocarbon spillage / pollution, siltation, wastewater pollution.	Surface water collection, treatment and disposal via SuDs.	No. As outlined in Sections 10.4 of this report, I do not consider there would be a residual risk in terms of the quantity and quality of discharges from site, which could be linked to this waterbody.	Screened Out.
2.	Ground	Swords groundwater body (EPA Code: IE_EA_G_011).	As above.	As above.	As above.	As above.	Screened Out.
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A