



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500173-DL

Development

Síneadh nua a thógáil ar thaobh agus ar chúl teach cónaithe tréigthe agus athchóiriú a dhéanamh ar theach cónaithe tréigthe agus ceangal a dhéanamh leis an bpríomh-séarachas poiblí agus na hoibreacha láithreáin gaolmhara go léir.

Location

17 EASTÁT ROSEMOUNT, LEITIR
CEANAINN , BAILE AN MHAIGHDEAN

Planning Authority

Donegal County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2561174

Applicant(s)

Dela Kerr

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission + Conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party Planning Appeal

Appellant(s)

Jacinta Bradley

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

22/1/26

Inspector

Ronan Murphy

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site which has a stated area of 0.181ha and is located to the southern side of Letterkenny Town Centre. The area in which the site is located is an established residential area.
- 1.2. The appeal site currently comprises of a two-storey vacant, semi-derelict, semi-detached dwelling located at the end of Rosemount Estate. The dwelling fronts directly onto Rosemount Estate.
- 1.3. The dwelling is attached to No.16 Rosemount Estate to the south-west, a single storey dwelling (and other buildings / gardens) to the northeast, an area of open space to the north-west and Rosemount Estate to the east.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises of a two-storey extension to the side and rear of a dwelling at No.17 Rosemount Estate, Letterkenny, Co. Donegal.
- 2.2. At ground floor level the proposed extension would comprise of a sitting area, a shower room, and a double bedroom. At first floor level the proposed extension would comprise of a lounge area, a bathroom, and a double bedroom.
- 2.3. The proposed extension would have an overall floor area of 86m² and a maximum height of c. 6.3m with a mono-pitched roof.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1 By order dated 2/10/25 the Planning Authority decided to grant retention planning permission subject to 7 conditions. The conditions are generally standard for the developments of this type.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.1.2 There are two planning reports on file. The first planners report dated 18/8/25 states that the principle of restoring a derelict dwelling for residential use within the town centre should be supported. However, the subdivision of an existing dwelling and the extension of the same to provide multiple units however is subject to further consideration.

3.2.1.3 The area planner highlights concern with respect to the overall design of the extension, the finish of the proposed extension should integrate with the brick quoining detailing on the existing dwelling, and the proposed extension should not obstruct or impact the gated entry of the neighbouring dwelling to the northeast of the site. Further information was requested on this basis.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Roads: Report dated 23/7/25 outlining no objection but states that but any damage to roads and footpaths must be repaired to Roads Engineer's satisfaction.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None of file

Further information

3.4 The applicant responded to the Further Information request on 6/9/25, the response included the following:

- Cover Letter from DML Architecture and Building Surveying
- Drawing No. 0372 06 025 'Further Information Site Layout Plan'
- Drawing No: 0372 06 025 'Non-Obstruction Access Site Layout Plan'
- Drawing No: 0371 06 025 'Proposed'
- Drawing No. 0371/01 08 025 'Proposed FI'

3.4.1 The second planning report dated 30/9/25 states that the proposed development would not injure the amenities of the area, would not be prejudicial to public health, and would not endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The area planner therefore recommended that planning permission should be granted.

3.4.2 I make the Coimisiún aware that unsolicited Further Information was received by the planning authority on 1/10/25. This comprised of an e-mail stating that the applicant would prefer a mono pitched roof as show in option 2 of the drawings.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal site

Reg. Ref. 24/61931 – Application to reconstruct, extend and convert the existing derelict house to 4 apartments). Application withdrawn.

Site to the south

Reg. Ref. 24/60926-Application for the change of use of domestic garage to residential use along with all other associated site works. Permission granted, subject to conditions. This decision was subject to a third-party appeal to An Bord Pleanála, where the decision of the Planning Authority was overturned and permission was refused for the following reason:

- 1. The Board considered that the proposed change of use of the subject premises would have a seriously detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties due to insufficient separation distances between opposing windows, in contravention of Specific Planning Policy Requirement (SPPFR) 1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) (Separation Distances), would be substandard in terms of private open space provision for the occupant(s) of the proposed residential unit, in contravention of Specific Planning Policy Requirement (SPPF) 2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) (Minimum Private Open Space Standards for Houses), and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area*

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The *Donegal County Development Plan 2024-2030* is the operative plan. However, the appeal site is located within the settlement of Letterkenny and therefore the *Letterkenny Plan 2023-2029* is also applicable. The site is zoned Town Centre with reference to Map 7.1 'Land Use Zoning Map' of the Letterkenny Plan. The related objective, as set out in Table 7.1 of same is to '*sustain and strengthen the core of Letterkenny as a regional centre of residential, commercial, retail, cultural and community life and to support active travel and public transport provision.*'

5.1.2 Relevant Policies and Objectives of the Letterkenny Plan include the following:

Objective LK-H-O-1 of the Letterkenny Plan is to ensure that an appropriate quantum and mix of housing types, tenures, densities and sizes is provided in suitably located residential areas and in appropriate brownfield/infill areas, in order to meet the needs of the population of Letterkenny, including the provision of private housing, social housing, affordable housing, student housing, traveller accommodation and appropriate residential care solutions designed for older persons and/or persons with disabilities. All housing developments will be subject to compliance with all relevant policies and standards contained in this plan and the County Development Plan.

5.1.4 Relevant Policies and Objectives of the *Donegal County Development Plan 2024-2030* include the following:

Policy UB-P-9 of the *Donegal County Development Plan 2024-2030* is both to protect the residential amenity of existing residential units and to promote design concepts for new housing that ensures the establishment of reasonable levels of urban residential amenity.

Policy UB-P-10 of the *Donegal County Development Plan 2024-2030* is to require layouts of residential development to be designed and constructed having regard to best practice in terms of Universal Design, including the guidance for housing development set out in the National Disability Authority publication "Building for Everyone: A Universal Design Approach".

Policy TC-G-P-3 of the County Development Plan is to positively support proposals for infill and backland residential and commercial developments where they would:

- Not have a significant adverse effect on existing residential and visual amenities.
- Respect the existing character, scale and setting of the local built environment.

Policy AH-P: which seeks to protect, conserve and preserve vernacular structures, historic building stock and enhance the established character, forms, material features, and settings of vernacular buildings and historic building stock that are considered to be intrinsic elements of the character of a place.

Policy A-P-10: which seeks to ensure that conversions or extensions to vernacular buildings and the provision of new adjoining buildings/traditional historic building stock shall be of a scale and form that complements the existing building and ensures that the distinctiveness and character of the vernacular form is retained and respected.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. The appeal site is not located on or within any designated Natura 2000 site(s) or Natural Heritage Area(s).

5.2.2. The Lough Swilly SAC (Site Code: 002287) is located c.2.3km to the northeast of the site and the Lough Swilly SPA (Site Code: 004075) is located c. 2.7km to the northeast of the site.

5.2.3 In addition to this, the Lough Swilly Including Big Isle, Blanket Nook & Inch Lake pNHA (Site Code: 000166) is located 1.3km to the southeast of the site.

5.2.4 A screening exercise for Appropriate Assessment will be undertaken in Section 8 below.

5.3. EIA Screening

5.3.1 See completed Form 2 attached by way of appendix to this report. Having regard to the nature, size, and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out

in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

5.4 Water Framework Directive

5.4.1 The purpose of the EU Water Framework Directive is an initiative aimed at improving water quality throughout the European Union. The Directive was adopted in 2000 and requires governments to take a new approach to managing all their waters; rivers, canals, lakes, reservoirs, groundwater, protected areas (including wetlands and other water dependent ecosystems), estuaries (transitional) and coastal waters.

5.4.2 An Coimisiún Pleanála and other statutory authorities cannot grant development consent where a proposed development would give rise to a reduction in water quality.

5.4.3 The Swilly (Donegal)_010 (IE_NW_39S020300) is c. 497m to the southeast of the site. This waterbody classification is currently under review. This is illustrated on the EPA mapping (<https://gis.epa.ie/EPAMaps/>).

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

5.4.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The proposal is an extension to an existing dwelling and is connected to storm water and public sewerage infrastructure.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 A third party appeal against the decision of Donegal County council to grant planning permission has been received from Jacinta Bradley. The appellant states that the appeal is supported by a number of named residents within Rosemount, however,

these named people have not signed the appeal. The appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The dwelling is to be used as a multi occupancy unit, imposing a planning condition restricting the use to single occupancy is not considered effective, as such a condition would be impossible to enforce in practice.
- Proposal would lead to the overdevelopment of the site, with the exception of the proposed parking area, the entire site is being built upon. This would leave no private garden or amenity space, which is entirely inconsistent with the established character of the terrace. The built footprint would extend right up to the rear and side boundaries, which is a clear departure from the prevailing character of the area.
- The buildings modest scale, traditional proportions and long-standing presence are integral to the rhythm and architectural continuity of the streetscape. Altering or removing its original features would undermine the very principles that policies AHP-9 and AH-P-10 seek to protect.
- No's 16 and 17 together form an essential part of the historic row, any changes would inevitably diminish the collective value and character of the entire terrace.
- The plan would increase the accommodation for up to 12 people. The intensity is wholly inappropriate and would constitute overdevelopment.
- The loss of all garden space would lead to a significant loss of residential amenity for current and future residents, contravening policy UB-P-9 which seeks to protect the amenity of existing residential units and reasonable levels of urban residential amenity.
- Rosemount Terrace, Duffy's Lane, and Rosemount Villas share a single, narrow entry / exit road which is already subject to congestion and restricted access. The addition of a development housing up to 12 further occupants and their vehicles would exacerbate these problems, increasing congestion, reducing safety for pedestrians and cyclists, and potentially preventing access for essential services.

- Two parking spaces is inadequate for a development of this nature. The lack of adequate footpaths already causes a danger which will be exacerbated.
- Basic amenities such as water supply and sewerage are already under strain due to existing and recent developments, the proposal includes at least 4 toilets, and the sewerage system cannot cope. No development should proceed until this infrastructure is upgraded. There are no imminent plans to upgrade the storm and foul water systems in the area.
- The proposed development is inconsistent several principles set out in the County Donegal Development Plan including those relating to sustainable development. The development has no clear provision for sufficient parking and does not address the practical realities of intensified residential use in a constrained historic setting. This would set an unwanted precedent for further overdevelopment in this historically significant part of Letterkenny.
- This should not be looked at in isolation but rather as one of a number of recent planning applications in the area which have the potential to have a hugely detrimental impact on the Rosemount area of Letterkenny and its current residents.
- There is no opposition to the restoration of No.17 to residential use. A sensitive approach and appropriate redevelopment-returning the property to use as a single-family home with adequate off-street parking would be welcomed and supported. However, there is strong opposition to any further overdevelopment which undermines the heritage, infrastructure, amenity, and residential character of Rosemount Terrace. The Residents Association are seeking to have Rosemount made an Architectural Conservation Area and any developments needs to respect our built heritage and community.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1 No response on file.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

6.3.1 Letter dated 25/11/25 stating that all matters raised by the appellant haven been previously addressed in the planning reports which were endorsed and signed by the Senior Executive Planner. The Coimisiún are requested to uphold the decision to grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

6.4. **Observations**

6.4.1 There are no observations on file.

6.5. **Further Responses**

6.5.1 There are no further responses on file.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the appeal details and all other documentation on file, including the reports of the local authority, the initial application and the applicant's response to further information and inspected the site, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Rosemount Terrace
- Design
- Amenity impacts
- Parking
- Flood Risk Management
- Other matters
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. **Principle of Development**

7.2.1 The site is zoned Town Centre with reference to Map 7.1 'Land Use Zoning Map' of the Letterkenny Plan. The related objective, as set out in Table 7.1 of same is to

'sustain and strengthen the core of Letterkenny as a regional centre of residential, commercial, retail, cultural and community life and to support active travel and public transport provision.'

7.2.2 Residential use is 'Open for Consideration' in such areas, with reference to Table 7.2 'Land Use Zoning Matrix'. In relation to same, I am of the view that the use as proposed is appropriate for a town centre location such as this one, subject to the proposal being in accordance with other relevant provisions of the plan which shall be considered below.

7.3 Rosemount Terrace

7.3.1 The third-party appeal states that the proposed development would impact on the buildings modest scale, traditional proportions and long-standing presence which are integral to the rhythm and architectural continuity of the streetscape.

Rosemount Terrace

7.3.2 Rosemount Terrace comprises a terrace of 2 storey dwellings which were built between 1908 and 1910. The subject site and No.16 Rosemount Terrace are detached from the terrace of dwellings.

7.3.3 The third-party states that the proposed extension would interrupt the rhythm and architectural continuity of the streetscape. In addition to this, I note the concerns of the third-party that altering or removing the original features of the existing dwelling would undermine the principles that policies AHP-9 and AH-P-10 seek to protect.

7.3.4 I have considered the concerns of the third parties in this regard. However, I make the Coimisiún aware that the existing dwelling is not a Protected Structure and is not included on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage. In addition to this, while the third-party states that the Residents Association are seeking to have Rosemount made an Architectural Conservation Area, I note that the area is not included in any such designation.

7.3.5 Finally, I note that while the terrace of dwellings along Rosemount Terrace are identified as being within a 'Long Established Residential Area,' as set out in Map 7.1 of the *Letterkenny Plan and Local Transport Plan 2023-2029*, the appeal site is not included within this designation, but it is adjacent.

7.3.6 Having considered the above, I am satisfied that the appeal site is not a Protected Structure and is not within an Architectural Conservation Area. However, the appeal site is adjacent to an area which has a level of protection ('Long Established Residential Area'), and this should be considered when assessing the application.

7.4 Siting and Design

7.4.1 The proposed extension would have a height of 6.3m which is c.0.8m lower than the existing dwelling on the land. In addition to this, the proposed extension would be set back c. 0.5m from the front of the main dwelling on the land.

7.4.2 The proposed extension would have a width of c. 3.6m and a depth of c. 12.8m along the side elevation. In terms of floor area, the proposed extension would have an area of c. 37.97m² at ground floor level and c.48.03m² at first floor level (a total of 86m²).

7.4.3 I have considered the proposed extension in light of **Objective LK-H-O-1** of the Letterkenny Plan which broadly seeks to ensure that an appropriate quantum and mix of housing types are provided in suitably located residential areas and in appropriate brownfield/infill areas, in order to meet the needs of the population of Letterkenny. The appeal site is within an existing residential area of Letterkenny in close proximity to the town centre. While I note the concerns of the third party, the existing dwelling is currently vacant and would appear to be in a semi-derelict state. In my opinion, an appropriate extension would allow for the continued residential use of the building in a viable manner which is up to modern standards. This would be a positive outcome and would comply with **Objective LK-H-O-1** of the Letterkenny Plan.

7.4.4 In addition to this, I am satisfied that the design of the proposed development is suitably subordinate to the main dwelling on the land and as a result views of the proposed extension would be limited to the north-east of the site, which is not within the public realm and therefore there would be no impact on the rhythm and architectural continuity of the Rosemount streetscape.

7.5 Amenity impacts

The proposed two-storey side extension would adjoin the north-eastern boundary of the land and would be set back c. 2m from the southern boundary of the land (with No. 16 Rosemount Terrace).

Overshadowing

7.5.1 No. 16 Rosemount Terrace to the south-west of the site and has a north-west / south-east orientation. The arc of sunlight during the day would mean that development at No.17 Rosemount Terrace would not have an undue impact on the levels of light entering the back garden and rear windows of No. 16 Rosemount Terrace.

7.5.2 A residential property known as 'The Bungalow' is located to the north-east of the site and has a south-west / north-east orientation. The Bungalow is located at a setback of c. 11m from the proposed extension. Given this set back and the arc of sunlight, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would not have an undue impact on light levels for the Bungalow.

Overlooking

7.5.3 I refer the Coimisiún to Drawing No. 0371 06 025 submitted with the Further Information response which shows that there are two windows within the side elevation at first floor level of the proposed extension facing 'The Bungalow'. These windows serve the proposed lounge and a bathroom at first floor level.

7.5.4 I note that 'The bungalow' is a single storey dwelling and its side elevation faces the proposed extension. I am satisfied that the proposed extension would not cause under overlooking of 'The Bungalow.' I have come to this conclusion having regard to the fact that there are no windows directly opposing each other at first floor windows and the setback of 'The Bungalow' from the proposed extension.

Overbearing

7.5.5 Given that the proposed development would not cause any undue overshadowing or overlooking of abutting properties and the fact that the design of the proposed extension would be subordinate to the main dwelling, I am satisfied that overbearing development would not occur.

Overdevelopment

7.5.6 The third-party has outlined concerns that loss of all garden space would lead to a significant loss of residential amenity for current and future residents, contravening policy UB-P-9 which seeks to protect the amenity of existing residential units and reasonable levels of urban residential amenity.

7.5.7 At present there is an area to the side of the existing dwelling which is currently overgrown which has an area of c. 38m². In addition to this, there is an area of c.9m²

in proximity to the south-western boundary of the land with No.16 Rosemount Terrace. Therefore, there is an existing potential private open space of c. 47m² at present on the site.

7.5.8 I refer the Coimisiún to SPPR 2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) which outline that a private open space area of 50m² is required to be provided for a dwelling with 4+ bedrooms. Further to this, it is noted that SPPR 2 states that for building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size or urban infill schemes on smaller sites (e.g. sites of up to 0.25ha) the private open space standard may be relaxed in part or whole, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality and proximity to public open space.

7.5.9 The proposed extension would remove the area of 38m² to the side of the existing dwelling and would therefore leave a private open space area of 9m² located to the south-western boundary of the land. The remaining area of open space area would be sandwiched between the side elevations of the proposed extension and the abutting dwelling at No.16 Rosemount Terrace and would be more accurately described as a lightwell as opposed to a functional area of private open space. In any case, the plans submitted with the application show that there is no access proposed to this area of open space. Therefore, in my opinion, the proposed development effectively proposes no private open space.

7.4.1 Having considered the above and especially the lack of any suitable private open space, it is my opinion that the proposed development would comprise of overdevelopment of the site and would provide a substandard level of residential amenity which would be detrimental to residential amenity of future residents of the dwelling. Notwithstanding SPPR2 of the Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) and the location of the site in proximity to Letterkenny Town Centre, I am not satisfied that there is a justification or reason to discard private open space standards in this case. To allow an extension of the scale proposed, which effectively provides no open space would set a poor precedent for similar developments in the area and would fail to achieve compliance with **Policy UB-P-9** of the *Donegal County Development Plan 2024-2030*. This matter could not be dealt with by way of condition and therefore refusal is recommended.

7.5 Parking

- 7.5.1 Concerns are raised that the proposed development is likely to result in additional traffic and parking pressures in the area and that there has been little consideration of the cumulative effect on local roads and parking availability. In addition to this, it is stated that Rosemount Terrace, Duffy's Lane, and Rosemount Villas share a single, narrow entry / exit road which is already subject to congestion and restricted access and the addition of a development housing up to 12 further occupants and their vehicles would exacerbate these problems.
- 7.5.2 I refer the Coimisiún to Table 16.8 of the *Donegal County Development Plan 2024-2030* which shows that a maximum of 2 car parking spaces is required per dwelling house. The plans submitted with the application do not show a location for car parking on site. However, the proposal relates to the refurbishment and extension of an existing dwelling and does not involve the creation of an additional residential unit and therefore, in my opinion there is a credit for existing parking associated with the dwelling.
- 7.5.3 In addition to this, I note that condition is included in the Notification of Decision to Grant Planning Permission which requires that refurbished dwelling is used as a permanent house only and not as a holiday home or as short-term rental accommodation. A similar condition could be included to ensure that the dwelling is used as a single occupancy dwelling, should the Coimisiún be of a mind to grant planning permission. Such a condition would help to ensure that the dwelling is used as a principle, permanent place of residence and not a secondary place of residence that may generate a larger number of car parking users.
- 7.5.4 Having regard to the foregoing, while I acknowledge the concerns of the third parties, given the accessible urban location of the appeal site, I am satisfied that the proposed development complies with the parking standards set out in the *Donegal County Development Plan 2024-2030*.
- 7.5.5 I note that there are concerns relating to congestion and restricted access within the Rosemount Terrace, Duffy's Lane and Rosemount Villas area which share a single access.
- 7.6.5 While I acknowledge the concerns of the third parties and having been on site, I note the narrow nature of the road network in this area, I am satisfied that in the event that

congestion becomes overly problematic; this could potentially be managed by the introduction of restrictive measures by Donegal County Council (such as double yellow lines or permit parking) along Rosemount Terrace and the surrounding road network.

7.7 Flood Risk Management

7.7.1 I have consulted the flood mapping system (www.floodinfo.ie) and I note that the subject land is within Flood Zone 'C'.

7.7.2 Having considered all the foregoing; I consider the proposed development would not result increase the risk of flood either within the site itself or the surrounding area. The proposal is acceptable from a flood risk perspective.

7.8 Other matters

Water / Sewerage Supply

7.7.1 The third-party appeal highlights concern with respect to the fact that basic amenities such as water supply and sewerage are already under strain due to existing and recent developments and that the public sewerage system cannot cope.

7.7.2 In this regard, I note that the developer would be required to enter into water and wastewater connection agreements with Uisce Eireann, prior to commencement of development. This matter could be dealt with by way of condition, should the Coimisiún be of a mind to grant planning permission.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

8.1 I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The application is for a two-storey extension to the side and rear of an existing dwelling within a residential area within Letterkenny town centre.

8.2 The appeal site is not located on or within any designated Natura 2000 site(s) or Natural Heritage Area(s). The Lough Swilly SAC (Site Code: 002287) is located c.2.3km to the northeast of the site and the Lough Swilly SPA (Site Code: 004075) is located c. 2.7kn to the northeast of the site.

8.3 In addition to this, the Lough Swilly Including Big Isle, Blanket Nook & Inch Lake pNHA (Site Code: 000166) is located.1.3km to the southeast of the site.

8.4 There is no hydrological link between the subject site and the European sites.

8.5 Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

9.0 Recommendation

9.1 I recommend that planning permission be refused.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the grounds of appeal, the residential zoning objective, the established pattern of development in the area, the policy framework provided by the *Donegal County Development Plan 2024-2030* and the *Letterkenny Plan and Local Transport Plan 2023-2029*, it is considered that proposed extension which does not provide any private open space would be in contravention of Specific Planning Policy Requirement (SPPF) 2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) (Minimum Private Open Space Standards for Houses), would represent an overdevelopment of the site and would provide a substandard form of residential development which would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of future occupants of the dwelling in contravention of Policy UB-P-9 of the *Donegal County Development Plan 2024-2030*. Granting planning permission would set a poor precedent for similar development in the area and would fail to achieve compliance with and 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.

Ronan Murphy
Planning Inspector

3 February 2026

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500173-DL
Proposed Development Summary	Two storey extension to the side and rear of a dwelling
Development Address	17 Rosemount Estate
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 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	

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

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____