



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500201-WC

Development	House with rear balcony and new garden office structure and new rear bridge with new pedestrian and vehicular entrance with two off-street car parking spaces and associated hard and soft landscaping.
Location	World's End, Dromderrig, Kinsale, Co Cork
Planning Authority	West Cork County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	254412
Applicants	Nicola Moore & Colm Daly
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellants	Gerry & Tina Reynolds
Observers	Dorothy Russell Deirdre Mangan Tim Rafferty and Fiona O'Callaghan

John Ward

Date of Site Inspection

27th of January 2025

Inspector

Siobhan Carroll

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1. Decision	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
5.1. Project Ireland 2040 - National Planning Framework – First Revision – April 2025	8
5.2. Cork County Development Plan 2022 - 2028	9
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	10
5.4. EIA Screening	10
6.0 The Appeal	11
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	11
6.2. Applicant Response	12
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	14
6.4. Observations.....	14
7.0 Assessment.....	17
7.1. Design and impact on residential amenity	17
7.2. Vehicular access and car parking	20
7.3. Other issues.....	22
8.0 AA Screening.....	22

9.0 Water Framework Directive 23

10.0 Recommendation 24

11.0 Reasons and Considerations..... 24

12.0 Conditions 25

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

Appendix 2 – Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at World's End, Dromderrig, Kinsale, Co. Cork. It is situated circa 700m to the south of the town centre of Kinsale. The site overlooks Kinsale harbour to the east.
- 1.2. World's End is situated to the west of the Pier Road, the R600. There is access to World's End from the northern end through a Y-junction at R600, after which it rises rapidly in a southerly direction with a relatively levelled section in the vicinity of the appeal site. The other access to Worlds End is from a much narrower and steeper road, the junction of this section of road with Pier Road is located immediately to the south of St. John's Terrace.
- 1.3. The site has a stated area of 0.032 hectares. The eastern roadside boundary is formed by stone wall which contains a pedestrian entrance. The site level rises steeply in the section towards the western boundary. The adjacent property to the north no. 9 World's End is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. It adjoins a three-storey three bay dwelling. The northern site boundary is defined by a wooden panelled fence. The site extends back to the west circa 25m. There is a large dormer dwelling located circa 16m to the west of the site boundary which is accessed from Compass Hill to the west.
- 1.4. The adjacent property to the south no. 10 World's End is a three-storey detached dwelling. The property Ferryview House is situated to the east of the site on the opposite side of the road. It is a three-storey detached dwelling which is in a derelict condition. Immediately to the north of this property is an area containing three car parking spaces.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the construction of a house with rear balcony and new garden office structure and new rear pedestrian bridge with new pedestrian and vehicular entrance and two off-street car parking spaces and associated hard and soft landscaping.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Cork County Council by Order dated 8th of October 2025 decided to grant permission for the proposed development subject to 6 no. conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- 3.2.2. Further Information was requested in relation to the following matters;

1. Stability of Embankment
2. Visual Integration
3. Retention of Existing Roadside Boundary Wall
4. Residential Amenity Impacts
5. Surface water drainage

- 3.2.3. Planner's Report: Further Information Assessment: report dated 8/10/2025: In relation to the matter of site stability, it was noted that no significant excavation of bedrock was required with the site and that a site-specific construction methodology has been submitted. In relation to the frontage presentation, it was noted that the proposed off white coloured render would be more muted and was deemed acceptable. Regarding the matter of the retention of the existing roadside boundary wall the survey indicated that it is not an historic wall and on the basis that it is located outside the ACA its retention cannot be insisted upon. In relation to residential and amenity impacts it was concluded that there would be no undue impacts in terms of overshadowing or overlooking. The surface water drainage proposals were considered acceptable. A grant of permission was recommended.

3.2.4. Other Technical Reports

- 3.2.5. Area Engineer – Further information sought in relation to the submission of a drainage impact assessment and a connection agreement from Irish Water that they are willing to accept Storm Water, Wastewater/sewerage from the site and they will supply the site with Water.

- 3.2.6. Area Engineer – report dated 6/10/2025: There is no objection to permission being granted with the attachment of conditions referring to no surface water to be permitted to flow onto public road/footpath.
- 3.2.7. Archaeologist – report dated 30/4/2025: Further information required (1)
Consideration should be given to retain the post-medieval building (part of)/boundary with arched entrance at the street front (in accordance with Objective HE16-6) (2)
The applicant shall engage the services of a suitably qualified Archaeologist/Built Heritage specialist (with experience in built heritage surveys) to undertake a Historic Building survey, assessment and report on the proposed development.
- 3.2.8. Archaeologist – report dated 13/10/2025: The submitted archaeological/architectural heritage report serves as a record of the remaining structures on the site with a full historical and cartographic review having taken place. No further requirements.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. The Planning Authority received 8 no. submissions/observations in relation to the application. The main issues raised in the submissions/observations are similar to those set out in the third party appeal and observations to the appeal. One submission was in support of the proposal.

4.0 Planning History

Site

- 4.1.1. Reg. Ref. 15/4167 & PL04.245078 - Permission was granted for a development comprising the demolition of an existing dwelling (145sq m) at No. 9 World's End and the construction of 3 no. 3 storey, terraced townhouses (466sq m) with off street parking, connection to public drainage systems and all ancillary site works at World's End, Kinsale, Co. Cork. (This development was not carried out.)

Adjacent site

- 4.1.2. Reg. Ref. 17/4083 & PL04.248314 – Permission was granted for the demolition of existing three-storey dwelling and construction of replacement with a four-storey dwelling at Ferryview House, Worlds End, Dromderrig, Kinsale, Co. Cork. (This development was not carried out.)
- 4.1.3. Reg. Ref. 25/4404 - Permission was granted for the demolition of an existing front wall and bike shed, and construction of new detached three-storey 3-bedroom dwelling with rear balcony, new pedestrian and vehicular entrance with four off-street car parking spaces and all associated site works at World's End, Dromderrig, Kinsale, Co. Cork. (the site is located to the south of no. 10 World's End)

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Project Ireland 2040 - National Planning Framework – First Revision – April 2025

- 5.1.1. The NPF includes a Chapter, No. 6 entitled 'People, Homes and Communities'. It sets out that place is intrinsic to achieving good quality of life.
- 5.1.2. National Policy Objective 7 seeks to “deliver at least 40% of all new homes nationally, within the built-up footprint of existing settlements and ensure compact and sequential patterns of growth.”
- 5.1.3. National Policy Objective 43 seeks “to prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.”
- 5.1.4. National Policy Objective 45 seeks to “increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration, increased building height and more compact forms of development.”

5.2. Cork County Development Plan 2022 - 2028

- 5.2.1. Volume Five refers to West Cork and Section 1.5 refers to Kinsale. 5.3.2. Under the provisions of the Plan as indicated on the zoning Map of Kinsale the appeal site is zoned Existing Residential/Mixed Residential.
- 5.2.2. Volume One refers to Main Policy Material
- 5.2.3. Chapter 3 – Settlement and Placemaking
- 5.2.4. Section 3.5.13 refers to Infill Housing - To make the most sustainable use of existing urban land within the built envelope of a settlement, the planning authority will encourage the development of infill housing on suitable sites, subject to adherence to residential amenity standards and avoiding any undue impacts on the established character of an area. The layout and design of infill schemes should respect existing building lines and should generally follow established roof profiles, buildings heights and use of materials within the street.
- 5.2.5. County Development Plan Objective PL3-2: Encouraging Sustainable and Resilient Places. As part of the Council's commitment to deliver compact growth and resilient places, the Plan supports (b) The development of brownfield, infill and under-utilised lands within the built envelope of the existing settlement network.
- 5.2.6. Chapter 12 – Transport and Mobility
- 5.2.7. Table 12.6: Car Parking Requirements for New Developments.
- 5.2.8. Residential: Dwelling houses – Parking Provision Requirement – 2 spaces per dwelling unit.
- 5.2.9. Chapter 16 – Built and Cultural Heritage
- 5.2.10. County Development Plan Objective HE16-16: Protection of Non-Structural Elements of Built Heritage – Protect non-structural elements of the built heritage. These can include design gardens/garden features, masonry walls, railings, follies, gates, bridges, shopfronts and street furniture. The Council will promote awareness and best practice in relation to these elements.
- 5.2.11. Chapter 18 – Zoning and Land Use
- 5.2.12. Section 18.3.3 refers to Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses (ER)

5.2.13. The objective for this zoning is to conserve and enhance the quality and character of established residential communities and protect their amenities. Infill developments, extensions, and the refurbishment of existing dwellings will be considered where they are appropriate to the character and pattern of development in the area and do not significantly affect the amenities of surrounding properties. The strengthening of community facilities and local services will be facilitated subject to the design, scale, and use of the building or development being appropriate for its location.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1. Sovereign Islands SPA (Site Code 004124) is situated 5.1km to the south-east of the appeal site.

5.3.2. Old Head of Kinsale SPA (Site Code 004021) is situated circa 8.9km to the south of the appeal site.

5.3.3. Courtmacsherry Estuary SAC (Site Code 001230) is situated circa 11.3km to the west of the appeal site.

5.3.4. Courtmacsherry Bay SPA (Site Code 004219) is situated 11.3km to the south-east of the appeal site.

5.4. EIA Screening

5.4.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal was submitted by Shipseybarry Architecture Masterplanning Urbanism on behalf of the appellants Gerry and Tina Reynolds. The issues raised are as follows;

- The appellant's property no. 10 World's End is the property adjoining the appeal site to the south.
- It is submitted that the proposed development fails to address the right to light of the two north facing gable windows of no. 10 World's End and the rooflight to the north facing pitched roof to the rear. Window 'A' referred to in the appeal is located in the northern gable of the property at first floor and serves a study. Window 'B' which is referred to is a rooflight which is located in the northern elevation of the roof plane. The rooflight serves a stair hall. Window 'C' which is referred to in the appeal is located in the northern gable of the property at ground floor and serves a bathroom.
- The appellants confirm their ownership of the party wall which they wish to remove in the future to allow further light to the lower-level window of their property.
- The applicant has submitted a shadow study of the immediate area for assessment. The appellants primary concern refers to the loss of lux and quality of daylight to the sitting room at first floor level.
- Regarding the south facing window off the dining area on the second floor of the proposed dwelling concern is expressed that it would establish a right to light on the applicant's southern gable and that it would compromise any development of the appellants site in the future.
- The appellants raise concerns in relation to the location and arrangement of the proposed western rear dining terrace on the second floor on the basis that there is potential for overlooking and loss of privacy. They note that opaque screening is proposed at this location to the south, however that the western terrace is not addressed to their satisfaction.

- Overlooking arising from the upper section of the rear garden is raised due to the boundary treatment proposed.
- It is highlighted that the swept path analysis does not factor in on-street parking which is prevalent in the area. In practical terms it is considered that the proposed garage parking area would not be useable. This would result in additional on-street parking and congestion in the area.

6.2. Applicant Response

A response to the third party appeal was received from Ryan W. Kennihan Architects on behalf of the applicants Nicola Moore and Colm Daly. The issues raised are as follows.

- It is stated in the appeal that the proposed development would cause significant loss of amenity to the appellants property due to its effect on light. The appeal refers to 'right to light'. It is stated in the appeal response that this is a legal matter and not a planning matter.
- The appeal refers to three north facing windows. Two windows are located on the ground floor and are located approximately 1m from the boundary. The other window referred to is a rooflight serving a bathroom.
- The appeal response refers to the accepted guidelines for assessing daylight and sunlight in new development and the effects on existing buildings is the BRE document "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight" (2022). Section 2.2.2 of the Guidelines state, "guidelines given here are intended for use for rooms in adjoining dwellings where daylight is required, including living rooms, kitchens and bedrooms. Windows to bathrooms, toilets, storerooms, circulation areas and garages need not be analysed." It is submitted that this is the commonly accepted standard that only primary habitable rooms are to be considered in the assessment of daylight. Window 'C' referred to in the appeal is into a bathroom which is north facing. Window 'B' referred to in the appeal is a rooflight into stair hall that does and will continue to have a full unobstructed view of the sky and therefore will not be affected by the proposed development.

- Regarding window 'A' referred to in the appeal, this window is in a study, and this is not a primary habitable room.
- The proposed house has been designed to step away from the boundary to mitigate the effects of daylight and massing. The separation distance provided between the neighbouring windows and the proposed dwelling is approximately 2.5m.
- It is noted that the room which window 'A' serves has another west facing window into it providing light and it also has a glazed wall which provides light from across the adjacent hall. It is highlighted that window 'A' is a secondary light source facing north, in a secondary room which has alternative light sources and primary light sources.
- Regarding the neighbour to the north of the site, the applicants took on board the comments regarding potential overshadowing which was stated in the observation to the application. The size of the house was substantially reduced in response to the further information and the stair and lift brought towards the street to reduce the east to west width of the house which reduces the effect on the daylight and sunlight into the house to the north.
- The appeal refers to potential overlooking and loss of privacy. The proposed house only has windows facing the road and to the rear garden which is typical of houses in dense urban environments.
- The south facing window to the main bedroom referred to in the appeal has been removed following the response to further information.
- Where the rear balcony and walkway is proposed screening will be provided by the installation of a 1.8m high opaque screen facing neighbouring properties to the north and south.
- Additional screening could be provided to the west side of the rear balcony along the appellants' boundary.
- It is stated the appellants own a large amount of backland land and that the area behind the site is scrubland and not in use for recreation.

- It is highlighted that under Reg. Ref. 25/4404 permission was granted for a house to the south of the appellants' home. It is stated that the appellants have a large garden area of various exposures and that the proposed rear balcony which faces west to the rear only, will not have any appreciable effect on the appellants' privacy.
- It is stated that it has come to the applicant's attention that incorrect heights and levels representing 'Ferryview House' across the road to the north-west of the site were indicated on the submitted cross sections with the application. It is stated that the levels were taken from a previous planning application which was not correct. Revised drawings indicated the correct height and dimensions of 'Ferryview House' relative to the proposed dwelling have been submitted with the appeal response.
- In conclusion, the applicants submit that the decision of the Cork County Council to grant permission for the proposed development should be upheld in order to facilitate the development of this house in the built up area of Kinsale in support of the Council's goals and in line with recent precedent.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- None received.

6.4. Observations

Observations to the appeal have been received from (1) Dorothy Russell (2) Deirdre Mangan (3) Tim Rafferty and Fiona O'Callaghan and (4) John Ward.

(1) Dorothy Russell

- The observer considers that the design and scale of the proposed dwelling is not in character with the surrounding streetscape. The observer highlights the design and character of the neighbouring properties. No. 10 World's End has a slate roof. No. 9A a townhouse is circa 200 years old. To the south of the site the 10 no. terraced dwellings at Ferryview Cottages were constructed circa 1907. The adjacent dwelling to the north no. 8 was recently renovated with the original façade retained.

- Concern is expressed that the proposed three-storey dwelling and the location of Ferryview House across the road to the east would result in the creation a shadowed location.
- The matter of parking and access of construction vehicles is raised.
- Concern is expressed in relation to the existing vehicular network serving World's End specifically that the access onto the R600 from the road serving World's End is very narrow.
- The observer raises concerns that the access to the proposed garage would be impeded by vehicles of the residents of Ferrybank Cottages being parked beside the white wall.

(2) Deirdre Mangan

- The observer's property is no. 9 World's End.
- The sunlight analysis which was submitted as part of the response to the further information states that the proposed development would have a "minimal effect". It is considered that the proposed development would have a substantial effect with all the daylight from mid-morning through to the late evening being fully blocked by the northern elevation.
- The observer raises concern that the daylight to their kitchen and living room will be overshadowed by the proposed development.
- The proposed northern elevation is flush to the boundary which is shared. The construction of this wall would require access to the observer's property. The observer states that they cannot provide the applicant consent to access their property to carry out the proposed development because the area is in constant use.

(3) Tim Rafferty and Fiona O'Callaghan

- It is submitted that the proposed development will adversely impact on the residential amenity and historic character of World's End.
- The observers consider that the proposed development should be refused on the grounds that the scale, massing and elevational character of the proposed dwelling would adversely impact on the residential amenities

and historic character of the World's End area and that it would be premature pending the approval of an overall masterplan and heritage impact assessment for the Kinsale area.

- Notwithstanding the provision of two internal car parking spaces it is considered that vehicles generated by the proposed development would end up competing for the small number of spaces currently available to the existing residents.
- Paragraph 18.3.3 of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 refers Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses. The objective for this zoning is to conserve and enhance the quality and character of established residential communities and protect their amenities. It advises that, infill developments, extensions, and the refurbishment of existing dwellings will be considered where they are appropriate to the character and pattern of development in the area and do not significantly affect the amenities of surrounding properties. The proposed dwelling is considered to be unusually large for a three-bedroom property. The dwelling has a floor area of 486.6sq m on a 320sq m site. The plot ratio 1:5. The observers consider this is excessive for an infill site in a historic low density residential area.

(4) John Ward

- The proposal represents over development of the site.
- Concern is expressed that a future subdivision of the property could occur providing a separate residential unit.
- The access road serving the site is narrow and there is a pinch point to the front of the site.
- The site was previously a garden. The garden of no. 9 has been restored with part of the garden being used as a car parking space. If the property "Ferryview House" is redeveloped it would further add to congestion in the area.
- Concern is expressed that the proposed development would overshadow neighbouring properties.

7.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details and all other documents on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issue in this appeal to be considered is as follows:

- Design and impact on residential amenity
- Vehicular access and car parking
- Other issues

7.1. Design and impact on residential amenity

- 7.1.1. The primary issues raised in the third party appeal refers to impacts on residential amenity arising from loss of daylight and overlooking from the proposed development. The observation to the appeal submitted by the resident of no. 9 World's End raised concern in relation to overshadowing by the proposed development.
- 7.1.2. It is set out in the appeal that the proposed development would cause loss of daylight to the appellants' property no. 10 World's End to the south of the appeal site. Item no. 4 of the request for further information required the applicants to address residential amenity impacts. Specifically, it was required that sunlight/daylight analysis of the proposed development be carried out with particular focus on the potential impacts from the extended rear projection along the northern side elevation on the adjacent dwelling no. 9 World's End. It was also requested that the rear balcony be set back by 2m from the boundary with no. 10 World's End and that the east facing window in the detached office structure facing the rear of no. 10 World's End be omitted.
- 7.1.3. A Sunlight Analysis was prepared by Ryan W. Kennihan Architects and submitted as part of the further information response. The shadowing diagrams have been

provided in respect of the Summer Solstice, 21st of June, Autumn Equinox, 22nd of September and the Winter Solstice, 21st of December.

- 7.1.4. On the Summer Solstice, I note that there would be some very marginal additional overshadowing of no. 9 World's End between 1pm and 2pm. On the Autumn Equinox, there would be some additional overshadowing of no. 9 World's End between 12pm and 4pm to the southern gable of the property. On the Winter Solstice, I note that there would be some additional overshadowing of no. 9 between 12pm and 4pm. I note that the rear elevation of the dwelling would receive limited additional shadowing at the Autumn Equinox and Winter Solstice. Accordingly, given that the additional shadowing would very limited, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not unduly impact the amenities of neighbouring property to the north no. 9 World's End in terms of overshadowing.
- 7.1.5. The grounds of appeal raise the issue of loss of daylight to the two north facing gable windows of no. 10 World's End and the rooflight to the north facing pitched roof to the rear. Window 'A' referred to in the appeal is located in the northern gable of the property at first floor and serves a study. Window 'B' which is referred to is a rooflight which is located in the northern elevation of the roof plane. The rooflight serves a stair hall. Window 'C' which is referred to in the appeal is located in the northern gable of the property at ground floor and serves a bathroom.
- 7.1.6. In response to the matter of potential loss of daylight, the first party highlighted that the windows referred to do not serve primary habitable rooms. They submitted that it is the commonly accepted standard that only primary habitable rooms are to be considered in the assessment of daylight. The provisions of the BRE document "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight" (2022) and specifically section 2.2.2 are highlighted in the appeal response. Chapter two of the Guidelines refers to Light from the Sky and section 2.2 refers to Existing Buildings. Section 2.2.2 of the Guidelines states, "the guidelines given here are intended for use for rooms in adjoining dwellings where daylight is required, including living rooms, kitchens and bedrooms. Windows to bathrooms, toilets, storerooms, circulation areas and garages need not be analysed."
- 7.1.7. Accordingly, having regard to the nature of the rooms served by the windows raised in the grounds of appeal and that fact that none serve primary habitable rooms then

as advised in the BRE guidelines they are not intended to be included for analysis in relation to access to daylight. Regarding window 'B' it is highlighted in the appeal response that this rooflight will continue to have a full unobstructed view of the sky and therefore will not be affected by the proposed development.

- 7.1.8. The matter of overlooking is raised in relation to the location and design of the proposed western rear dining terrace on the second floor. While the appellants note that opaque screening is proposed to the south of the terrace they raised concern regarding screening to the west. Overlooking arising from the upper section of the rear garden is raised due to the boundary treatment proposed. In response to the issue of the design of the rear balcony and walkway the first party highlighted that it is proposed to install a 1.8m high opaque screen facing neighbouring properties to the north and south. They also suggest that additional screening could be provided to the west side of the rear balcony along the appellants' boundary.
- 7.1.9. In relation to the siting and design of the proposed balcony, I note that it is setback 2m from the boundary with no. 10 World's End to the south. As detailed on the Proposed Side (South) Elevation on Drawing No. 101 submitted to the Planning Authority on the 12/9/2025 a 1.8m high privacy screen with opaque glazing is proposed to the balcony and the walkway. I consider that these satisfactorily addresses potential overlooking of the neighbouring dwellings to the north and south. I do not consider that additional screening is required to the western side of the balcony. However, should the Commission consider, this would be appropriate the matter could be addressed with the attachment of a condition.
- 7.1.10. Having reviewed the proposed layout of the scheme relative to the existing surrounding properties, I consider having regard to the proposed siting of the dwelling and design and relative separation distances to the existing properties that the proposal would not result in any undue overlooking or overshadowing of neighbouring residential properties.
- 7.1.11. The observations to the appeal state that the design of the proposed dwelling is not in keeping with the character of the area. The context of surrounding and adjacent properties is highlighted including the No. 10 World's End to the south, No. 9 World's End to the north and the 10 no. terraced dwellings at Ferryview Cottages to the south.

7.1.12. As part of the request for further information the applicants were required to address the matter of visual integration. It was stated in the further information request that the proposed white rendered finish would appear too prominent in the World's End and wider townscape. I note that the report of the Planning Officer raised no concerns in relation to the design of the dwelling in terms of its height and contemporary design. In relation to the surrounding streetscape at World's End, I note that there is a mix of house types and design with two-storey and three-storey properties of varying external finishes and roof profiles. Accordingly, there is not a uniformity in terms of the streetscape. The appeal site is an infill site located between a three-storey detached property and an end of terrace two-storey property. The proposed dwelling is three-storey and detached while I note that the roof ridge line is circa 3.06m above that of No. 9 World's End to the north and circa 2.33m above No. 10 World's End to the south a flat roof is proposed which I consider will not appear prominent in the context of the neighbouring properties.

7.1.13. Regarding the proposed external finishes, it stated in the response from the applicants that the white render which was originally proposed has been substituted with a more buff neutral render similar to a lime colour. Having regard to the prominent location of the site, I consider that it would be appropriate to attach a condition requiring that the details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes be submitted to the planning authority for their written agreement prior to the commencement of development. Accordingly, should the Commission decide to grant permission for the proposed development I would recommend the inclusion of a condition requiring this.

7.2. Vehicular access and car parking

7.2.1. The grounds of appeal and the observations to the appeal have raised the issues of car parking and vehicular access. The observations also referred to the additional vehicular traffic the proposal would generate and potential for further on-street parking and congestion.

7.2.2. In relation to the requirement for car parking spaces chapter 12 of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 refers to Transport and Mobility. Table 12.6: Car

Parking Requirements for New Developments sets out that for dwelling houses two spaces per dwelling unit are required.

- 7.2.3. The parking provision is illustrated on the Proposed Floor Plans Drawing No: 100. Two parking spaces are proposed within a garage at ground floor within the property. Accordingly, the provision of 2 no. spaces within the site is in line with the requirement for 2 no. car parking spaces per dwelling unit as set out in Table 12.6: Car Parking Requirements for New Developments. As detailed on the Proposed Elevations Drawing No: 101 double garage doors are proposed with a width of circa 4.8m. The Proposed Parking Swept Path Layout, Drawing No: 1730-002 P3 illustrates the vehicular movements providing access and egress to the garage car parking spaces. Accordingly, the proposed design provides sufficient width for vehicles to access and exit the car parking spaces within the garage once there is no car parking directly to the front of the garage doors.
- 7.2.4. I note that under Reg. Ref. 15/04167 & PL04.245078 permission was granted for the development of 3 no. 3 storey, terraced townhouses with off street parking on the appeal site and adjoining site to the north. Accordingly, the principle of the development of infill housing on the site has been established including that limited additional traffic would be generated.
- 7.2.5. The proposal is a small-scale infill residential scheme of 1 no. dwelling with 2 no. on site car parking spaces proposed, therefore having regard to the scale of the scheme it will generate a relatively low level of new traffic onto the existing local network. The Area Engineer their report dated 1/5/2025 raised no concerns in relation to the level of traffic that the proposal would generate, or the on-site car parking proposed.
- 7.2.6. The matter of construction traffic is raised in the observations to the appeal. A preliminary Construction Method Statement was submitted as part of the further information response. I note that it did not address the matter of construction traffic or the disposal of construction and demolition waste. Accordingly, should the Commission decide to grant permission for the proposed development, I would recommend the inclusion of a condition requiring the submission of a Construction Management Plan prior to the commencement of development for the written agreement of the Planning Authority.

7.3. Other issues

- 7.3.1. The observation to the appeal submitted by the owner of the adjoining property to the north no. 9 World's End raised concern in relation to the construction of the northern elevation of the proposed dwelling.
- 7.3.2. It is stated in the observation that the proposed northern elevation is flush to the boundary which is shared and that construction of this wall would require access to the observer's property. The observer states that they cannot provide the applicant consent to access their property to carry out the proposed development because the area is in constant use.
- 7.3.3. In relation to this matter, I note that as indicated on the Proposed Elevations, Drawing no. 101 submitted to the Planning Authority on the 12/9/2025 that the proposed northern elevation of the dwelling would be built up to the northern boundary with the boundary fence being shown retained and the redline boundary running vertically through the centre of the boundary fence. Accordingly, as detailed on the plans the proposed development would not entail alterations to the existing party boundary.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.
- 8.1.2. The subject site is located approx. 5.1km, from Sovereign Islands SPA (Site Code 004124). Old Head of Kinsale SPA (Site Code 004021) is situated circa 8.9km to the south of the appeal site. Courtmacsherry Estuary SAC (Site Code 001230) is situated circa 11.2km to the west of the appeal site. Courtmacsherry Bay SPA (Site Code 004219) is situated 11.2km to the south-east of the appeal site.
- 8.1.3. The proposed development comprises construction of a house with new pedestrian and vehicular entrance and two off-street car parking spaces on a 0.032 hectare site, located on serviced lands within the town of Kinsale.
- 8.1.4. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal in relation to species of qualifying interest within the Natura 2000 sites in relative proximity to the appeal site.

- 8.1.5. No streams/watercourses are identified on site.
- 8.1.6. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The nature of the development proposed which are located on serviced lands
 - The distance to the nearest European sites, and the absence of any hydrological or other pathways
 - Taking into account the screening by the Planning Authority
- 8.1.7. I conclude on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 8.1.8. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, is not required.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

- 9.1.1. The subject site is located at the World's End, Dromderrig, Kinsale, Co. Cork. It is situated circa 700m to the south of the town centre of Kinsale. The Knocknabohilly river (IE_SW_20K190980) is located to the north of the site. It is situated circa 1.77km from the site at the closest point. The Lower Bandon Estuary a transitional waterbody (IE_SW_080_0100) lies to the east, south and west of the site. It is situated circa 125m from the site at the closest point. Kinsale Harbour coastal waterbody (IE_SW_080_0000) is located 1.22km to the south of the site. Kinsale Marsh, Commoge (IE_SW_080_0200) is located 1.1km to the west. The ground waterbody Bandon (Code IE_SW_G_086) underlies the site.
- 9.2. The proposal comprises a residential development of 1 no. house, on a 0.032 hectare site, located on serviced lands within the town of Kinsale. The grounds of appeal have not raised the matter of the Water Framework Directive.
- 9.3. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and,

where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater waterbodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

9.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and small scale of the development.
- The distance to the nearest surface water bodies.

Conclusion

9.5. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1.1. I recommend that permission should be granted subject to the conditions set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

11.1. Having regard to the provisions of the Cork County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 Volume 5 (West Cork) and Section 1.5 which refers to Kinsale, and in particular the 'Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses' zoning objective, and the design, layout and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, that the proposed development would not adversely impact the character of the area or seriously injure residential or visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 12th day of September 2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreements with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connections to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.

3. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

4. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwelling shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

5. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

6. Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.

7. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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

Siobhan Carroll
19th of February 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	PL-500201-WC		
Proposed Development Summary	House with rear balcony and new garden office structure and new rear pedestrian bridge with new pedestrian and vehicular entrance and two off-street car parking spaces and associated hard and soft landscaping.		
Development Address	World's End, Dromderrig, Kinsale, Co. Cork.		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	✓
		No	No further action required
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	✓		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
No		N/A	Conclusion
Yes	✓	Class 10(b)(i) EIA is mandatory for developments comprising over 500 dwelling units or urban development over 10 hectares in	Proceed to Q.4

		size or 2 hectares if the site is regarded as being within a business district. The proposal is significantly below this threshold being 1 no. residential unit and the site has an area of 0.032 hectares which is sub threshold.		
--	--	--	--	--

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	✓	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500201-WC
Proposed Development Summary	House with rear balcony and new garden office structure and new rear pedestrian bridge with new pedestrian and vehicular entrance and two off-street car parking spaces and associated hard and soft landscaping.
Development Address	World's End, Dromderrig, Kinsale, Co. Cork.
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 development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project. It does not require the use of substantial natural resources or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, centres of population and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan. There are no protected species/habitats on site.
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).	Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	

Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA required.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIA required)