



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL-500361-CC-25

---

<b>Development</b>	Construction of part single and part two-storey rear extensions, alterations to existing building and all associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	Bellevue House, No.3 Bellevue Terrace, Military Road, Cork.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Cork City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	25/43939
<b>Applicant</b>	Roy Thomas
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellants</b>	1. Nicola Maxwell 2. Maria Geaney and Edward McBride
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> February 2026
<b>Inspector</b>	Gary Farrelly

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

The subject site has a stated area of 0.016 hectares and comprises of Number 3 Bellevue Terrace, a terraced three-storey property located off Military Road, Cork City. Military Road is located to the south of Collins Barracks which is located north of Cork city centre. The subject property is sited to the east of Military Road and adjoins a doctor's surgery practice to the south and two residential properties to the north; Numbers 1 and 2 Bellevue Terrace.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

Permission is sought to demolish an existing 22.77sqm ground floor extension and a 2.52sqm two storey extension to the rear of the property and replacement with a part single and part two storey extension. The proposed ground floor extension will measure 31.74sqm and the first-floor extension will measure 12.88sqm. The existing property will be altered to provide 1 no. 2-bed apartment on the ground floor, 1 no. 1-bed apartment on the first floor and 1 no. studio type apartment on the second floor. The existing front door of the property will be relocated to the corner of the building with a new window replacing the existing. The building is served by an existing public water mains and wastewater main. Surface water is proposed to be managed via the public sewer/drain.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

The planning authority (PA) decided to grant permission by Order dated 5<sup>th</sup> November 2025, subject to twelve conditions.

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### Planning Reports

There are a total of two planner's reports on file which assessed the proposed development in terms of its principle, density and unit mix, visual impact, overlooking, overshadowing and the amenity of future residents. Concerns were raised regarding

the impact of the development on Number 2 Bellevue Terrace and a daylight, sunlight and overshadowing assessment was requested. After submission of further information, including a daylight and shadow study, a grant of permission was recommended which was endorsed by the Senior Executive Planner.

#### Other Technical Reports

Drainage Report (*dated 12/6/25*) – This report outlined no objection to the development.

Environment Report (*dated 23/6/25*) – This report outlined no objection to the development subject to conditions.

Housing Report (*dated 22/7/25*) – This report noted the Part V certificate of exemption and had no objection to the development.

### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

None

### **3.4. Third Party Observations**

A total of two third party observations were submitted to the PA from the residents of Numbers 1 and 2 Bellevue Terrace raising concerns with the impact of the proposed development on adjoining residential amenity in terms of overshadowing and loss of daylight and the amenity of future occupiers due to the design of the apartments. A peer review of the submitted daylight and shadow study and drawings from an architect was also submitted which raised concerns with same.

## **4.0 Relevant Planning History**

None

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028

The subject site is zoned 'ZO 1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' where the objective is to protect and provide for residential uses and amenities. Paragraph ZO 1.1 further stipulates that the provision and protection of residential uses and residential amenity is a central objective of this zoning.

#### Adaptation of Existing Homes, Infill Development and Conversion of Upper Floors – Sections 3.45 and 3.46

Retaining and adapting, as appropriate, existing housing stock is important to ensure that homes meet the requirements of modern society whilst still ensuring that this is not done at the expense of unreasonable impact on adjoining properties. Within historic parts of the City there is considerable underutilisation of upper floor space. Bringing this space back into productive use as homes will make a valuable contribution to providing new homes, investment in historic buildings and regenerative benefits for commercial areas.

#### Objective 3.4 – Compact Growth

Optimising the potential for housing delivery on all suitable and available brownfield sites will be achieved by:

- o. Encouraging the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings, rather than their demolition and reconstruction.

#### Objective 3.9 - Adaptation of Existing Homes, Infill Development and Conversion of Upper Floors

Cork City Council will support and encourage the adaptation of existing homes (consistent with NPO 35 of the NPF), infill development and the conversion of upper floors in commercial areas in principle to ensure that homes, small sites and vacant space are utilised for new housing supply whilst still ensuring high standards of residential amenity for existing adjoining homes.

### Objective 8.18 - Reuse and Refurbishment of Historic Buildings

a. The City Council will actively encourage the re-use of historic buildings in the interests of conservation and environmental sustainability to minimise waste and optimise on the embodied energy in existing buildings.

### Housing Quality and Standards – Section 11.89

The minimum size of habitable rooms for houses and apartments / flats shall conform with appropriate National guidelines or standards in operation at the date of application for planning permission, including the minimum dimensions as set out in ‘Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities’ (2018), and ‘Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities: Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities’ (2007).

### Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing (DSO) – Sections 11.97 and 11.98

A daylight analysis will be required in relation to smaller applications where there are impacts on habitable rooms and the nature of the impact is not clear (e.g. if simple rules of thumb cannot be effectively applied to determine daylight levels on adjacent properties).

It is very important that DSO assessment is clearly set out to aid the planning assessment and is legible to non-technical people. To this end assessments should include an assessment of the scheme utilising best practice tools, such as BRE guide ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight’ (2nd edition) or BS 8206-2: 2008 – ‘Lighting for Buildings – Part 2: Code of Practice for Daylighting’ to satisfy minimum standards of daylight provision. In doing this it is very important that all measures of daylight (Vertical Sky Component, Average Daylight Factor and No Skyline) and sunlight (annual probable sunlight hours) are assessed in order to avoid presenting a partial, or biased, analysis of performance.

### Section 11.99

Assessments should clearly:

- Assess the DSO levels of the buildings and spaces impacted by the scheme;

- Provide an overview of the impacts of the scheme on surrounding buildings / homes and their constituent rooms, including any mitigating circumstances and clearly indicate any factors not calculated (e.g. trees);

#### Separation, Overlooking and Overbearance – Section 11.104

Overbearance in a planning context is the extent to which a development impacts upon the outlook of the main habitable room in a home or the garden, yard or private open space servicing a home. In established residential developments any significant changes to established context must be considered. Relocation or reduction in building bulk and height may be considered as measures to ameliorate overbearance.

#### Adaptation of Existing Homes – Sections 11.142 and 11.143

The design and layout of extensions to houses should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards sunlight, daylight and privacy.

Extensions should:

- Care should be taken to ensure that the extension does not overshadow windows, yards or gardens or have windows in flank walls which would reduce the privacy of adjoining properties.

#### Conversion of Existing Houses to Flat Accommodation - Section 11.152

Houses suitable for family accommodation may not be subdivided and converted to flats. Notwithstanding same, the subdivision of housing above business premises, housing on key transport routes and certain large houses may be permitted in some instances provided:

- The minimum size of the unit is above standards outlined in this Plan (apart from historic buildings where flexibility maybe applicable);
- Apartments are self-contained (apart from in exceptional circumstances with regard to historic buildings);
- Parking space provision is not at the expense of a garden/courtyard;
- There is adequate amenity area;
- Each apartment has a refuse bin storage area and washing/drying facilities accessible to the occupants.

## 5.2. National Policy

- Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (revised 2025) and National Development Plan 2021-2030

### National Policy Objective 45

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.

## 5.3. National Guidelines

- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2023) (Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage)

Circular Letter NSP 04/2025 states that the 2025 Design Standards for Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, are applicable to any application submitted from 9th July 2025 and the revocation of the 2023 Guidelines does not apply to appeals or planning applications that were subject to consideration within the planning system on or before the 8th of July 2025 (i.e. the subject application was lodged with the PA on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2025).

## 5.4. Other Guidelines

- Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A guide to good practice (BRE, 2022)

## 5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is not located within any designated natural heritage site. The nearest designated site is Cork Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) (Site Code 004030) which is located approximately 3.1km southeast of the subject site. The area also forms part of the Douglas River Estuary proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA).

## 5.6. Environmental Impact Assessment

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, (or Part V of the 1994 Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. I refer the Commission to Appendix 1 in this regard.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A total of 2 no. third party appeals were lodged to the Commission from the residents of the adjoining properties Nos. 1 and 2 Bellevue Terrace. The grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- It is requested that the Commission ensures that the development does not have an unnecessarily detrimental impact on residential amenity in terms of light reduction and overbearance. There is no objection in principle in bringing the vacant building back into residential use and 3 no. apartments is considered a suitable and sustainable use for the area. It is recommended to the Commission that the rear extension is reduced in size or removed altogether.
- The proposed two-storey extension would be overbearing in terms of its impact on amenity space and living room area served by a ground floor window. A number of photographs (Plate 1 and Plate 2) are provided illustrating the effect of the development in the context of Number 2 Bellevue Terrace (Appendix A). It is questioned why the Council did not alter the design in a meaningful way and set it back from the boundary to address the impact of overbearance and loss of light.
- The Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 specifies that the design and layout of extensions to houses should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards sunlight, daylight and privacy.
- The existing ground floor extension and first floor timber frame annex is located along the southern shared boundary of the site, however, the proposed

extension will now share the northern boundary of the site with No. 2 Bellevue Terrace. This is a significant increase in scale from the existing arrangement, and it will have a significant impact on the daylight reception of the rear elevation ground floor windows of No. 2 Bellevue Terrace, which are already severely constrained in terms of access to light, as well as the private amenity space.

- A peer review of the applicant's daylight and shadow study submitted at further information stage was undertaken by an architect and this found that the submitted drawings and documents submitted to the PA were ambiguous and lacked measurements and dimensions. Additionally, it found that no details were provided regarding the software used and noted the incorrect use of the 2009 BRE Guidance which has been superseded by 2022 BRE Guidance.
- The peer review also found that the 45-degree rule was not applied properly in excluding windows on the east elevation of No. 2 Bellevue Terrace. The architect of the peer review conducted a study and found that the ground floor window of No. 2 falls within the 45-degree angle and, therefore, should not have been excluded from the daylight VSC assessment.
- The peer review also noted the carrying out of daylight distribution and daylight factor assessments on rooms within No. 2 which require knowledge of the internal dimensions of these rooms which the applicant does not have. It is contended that the application would have avoidable negative impacts on No. 2 Bellevue Terrace, as well as the future occupants of the apartments.
- Concerns are also raised by the resident of No. 1 Bellevue Terrace regarding the exclusion of this property from the daylight and shadow study.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant issued a response to the grounds of appeal which is summarised as follows:

- A redesign of the first-floor apartment to exclude the rear extension is not feasible as it would not take account of the minimum design standards for

apartments or the requirement of the building regulations. The minimum floor area cannot be met with the inclusion of the stairs.

- The existing building is in very poor condition and the proposed rear extensions can successfully provide the necessary accommodation for 3 no apartments which are fully compliant with the 2025 Apartment Guidelines for Planning Authorities.
- The drawings submitted with the application are to scale and clearly show the dimensions of rooms. They are not in any way vague or ambiguous.
- The submitted daylight and shadow study addressed the issues on adjoining property and concluded that there would be no significant impact.
- A submission from the author of the daylight and shadow study is provided. The ground floor window on the east elevation of No. 2 is the smaller of two windows into the existing living room, the other being located on the front elevation facing west. VSC and APSH results are now attached for the ground floor window as well as the east elevation's first and second floor windows serving a potential bedroom and bathroom.
- The existing VSC on the east elevation ground floor window serving the living room of No. 2 is 19.61% and the proposed VSC is 18.46%. Whilst the window is below the recommended 27% in both cases, its new value is not less than 0.8 times its former value, and therefore, the condition that would indicate that the diffuse daylighting of the existing building may be adversely affected has not been met in this instance.
- All existing windows on the rear elevation of No. 2 do not fall within 90 degrees of due south so sunlight will not be adversely affected by the proposal to any of these windows.
- The existing yard area of the site is enclosed by walls on all four sides and fails to reach the recommended 2 hours of sunlight requirement on 21<sup>st</sup> March as it currently exists. The garden of No. 2 has a 0% amenity result as existing so no further impact of any proposal can be calculated. The amenity space to No. 1 is largely unaffected as the property is fully due north of the proposal and is in compliance with the BRE requirement. The distance of No. 1 will mean the

proposal will not have any substantial effect on daylight or sunlight to the building.

- The development will benefit the appellant's property as it is proposed to obscure two existing first and second floor windows that overlook the yard of No. 2 Bellevue Terrace.
- It is requested that the Commission rejects the appeal and grants permission for the proposed development.

### 6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

The PA did not issue a response to the grounds of appeal.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

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

- Principle of the development
- Overbearance
- Daylight and Sunlight

7.2. Firstly, I highlight to the Commission that the appellants have raised concerns regarding the submitted plans and elevation drawings being ambiguous and lacking measurements and dimensions. In response, the applicant has stated that the drawings are to scale and show the dimensions of the rooms. Having measured the submitted drawings I note that they are to scale.

7.3. Notwithstanding this, in accordance with Article 23(1)(f) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, there is a requirement to provide the overall height of any proposed structure. Whilst I acknowledge that the PA validated the application, having reviewed the submitted section and elevation drawings (*drawing numbers P4, P5, P6, P7, RF12 and RF13*) I note that the overall height of the

proposed extension has not been stipulated on any of the submitted drawings. I consider this to be a significant omission, in particular for a development of this nature in such proximity to party boundaries. However, the Commission should note that I have proceeded to assess the proposal and impact on adjoining residential amenity having measured the two-storey extension as approximately 6.6 metres.

### **Principle of the development**

- 7.4. The subject site comprises of an existing residential property and is located on lands zoned 'ZO 1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' within the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, where the objective is to protect and provide for residential uses and amenities. Therefore, subject to my assessment on the impact on existing residential amenity, I consider that the proposed development is acceptable in principle.
- 7.5. Moreover, the proposal seeks to bring a vacant residential property back into use and which will provide 3 no. apartments. I consider such proposal, through the reuse of the existing building and a reduction in vacancy, to be in accordance with National Policy Objective 45 of the National Planning Framework. I also note that this national policy is reflected in objective 3.4(o) (Compact Growth) and objective 3.9 (Adaptation of Existing Homes, Infill Development and Conversion of Upper Floors) of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028.

### **Overbearance**

- 7.6. The appellant of No. 2 Bellevue Terrace has raised concerns with regards to the proximity of the rear two storey extension to the party boundary and overbearance impact on the amenity space and ground floor living room. I acknowledge the photographs provided by the appellant illustrating the proximity of the proposed extension. Whilst I note that the PA's assessment included overlooking/loss of privacy and overshadowing matters, I note that there was no analysis on this specific issue. I also note that the applicant's response to the grounds of appeal did not address the overbearance issue.
- 7.7. The Commission should note that Section 11.104 of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 outlines that overbearance is the extent to which a development impacts upon the outlook of the main habitable room in a home or the private amenity space

serving the home with mitigation measures being the relocation or reduction in building bulk and height.

- 7.8. I note that the rear of the application site currently comprises of a two storey corrugated sheeted annex type extension which is approximately 1.5 metres in depth and approximately 5 metres in height, as measured on drawing nos. S1 and S7. It is located along the southern party boundary which adjoins a commercial doctor's surgery. In contrast, the proposed two storey extension will extend approximately 3 metres from the rear boundary wall, will be sited along the northern party boundary and will have a width of approximately 5.2 metres and a height of 6.6 metres.
- 7.9. The Commission should note that I have significant concerns with the proposed development in terms of overbearance on No. 2 Bellevue Terrace. I note that No. 2 Bellevue Terrace is itself constrained due to its mid-terraced nature. It has a single ground-floor east-facing window to the rear which is serving a living room. It is my view that due to the proximity of the proposed development, to the 3.1 metre depth of the two-storey extension, and to its c. 6.6 metre height, the proposed development would seriously injure the residential amenity of No. 2 by reason of loss of outlook and undue sense of enclosure to the ground floor living room window. Accordingly, I consider the proposed development would seriously injure the residential amenity of this property. Therefore, it is my recommendation to the Commission that permission is refused on this basis.

### **Daylight and Sunlight**

- 7.10. The appellants' other primary concern relates to the loss of daylight and sunlight to Nos. 1 and 2 Bellevue Terrace. I also acknowledge the appellant's detailed peer review of the applicant's daylight and shadow study (DSS), and the response from the author of the DSS. The Commission should note that my assessment below in the first instance is based on the potential impact of the development on No. 2 Bellevue Terrace, due to its immediate proximity and No. 1's distance further north from the subject site. Due to the configurations of Nos. 1 and 2, any conclusions on No. 2 would also be relevant to No. 1.
- 7.11. I note that the appellant's peer review highlighted what I consider to be reasonable concerns with the submitted DSS due to its reference to the 2009 BRE Guidelines, which I note have been superseded by the 2022 BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight

and Sunlight, A Guide to Good Practice, together with the omission of the appellant's ground floor living room rear window from the assessment, even though I have measured the centre of the window lies within the 45° angle of the proposed extension.

- 7.12. Whilst the applicant has now assessed the window and living room in its response to the grounds of appeal, I nevertheless question why it was omitted in the first instance. Notwithstanding this, the Commission should note that the submitted calculations indicate that the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) are both in accordance with the calculations as set out in Sections 2.2 (Light from the Sky: Existing Buildings) and 3.2 (Sunlighting: Existing Buildings) of the 2022 BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A Guide to Good Practice. Whilst the VSC to the living room rear window will reduce from 19.61 to 18.46, the percentage loss will be 17% and therefore not less than 0.8 times its former value. Therefore, I consider no significant loss of light to this window would occur.
- 7.13. Furthermore, with regards to the impact on the appellant's amenity space, Section 3.3 (Sunlighting: Gardens and Open Spaces) of the 2022 Guide outlines that for a garden to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year, at least half of a garden or amenity area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21<sup>st</sup> March. Having regard to the orientation of the appellants' gardens and depth of the proposed extension, I am satisfied that the garden spaces will not be adversely impacted in terms of overshadowing.
- 7.14. Overall, on the basis of the information submitted, I consider that the proposed development would not result in an adverse impact on the amenity of No. 2 Bellevue Terrace, and by extension No. 1, in terms of loss of daylight or loss of sunlight. Therefore, I am satisfied that the proposed development would be in accordance with Sections 11.142 and 11.143 (Adaptation of Existing Homes) of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028.

## **Other Issues**

### Amenity of Future Residents

- 7.15. Having reviewed the internal layout of the proposed 3 no. apartments and having regard to the 2023 Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (DSNA), I note that the apartment floor areas comply with Specific Planning Policy Requirement (SPPR) 3. A private amenity space area to the rear of the building

measuring 11sqm is proposed to serve the ground floor 2-bedroom apartment which I note complies with the minimum standards set out in Appendix 1 of the DSNA.

- 7.16. Additionally, a ground level communal area to the front of the property measuring approximately 20sqm is proposed to serve all 3 no. units. I note that this is in accordance with the minimum standards for communal amenity space set out in Appendix 1 of the DSNA. However, if the Commission is minded to grant permission, it is my recommendation that this area includes privacy strips between the ground floor windows of the 2-bedroom apartment which will serve a bedroom and a w.c. Furthermore, whilst the PA had concerns regarding the permanent obscuring of the window serving the w.c., it is my view that this feature would be an essential privacy requirement and which would not significantly alter or adversely impact the character of the building. It should be noted that the building is not a Protected Structure nor listed within the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH).
- 7.17. Overall, having regard to the building refurbishment nature of the proposed development as well as its design and layout, I am satisfied that the proposed development complies with Section 11.89 (Housing Quality and Standards) of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 and that an adequate level of amenity will be provided for future occupants.

## **8.0 Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening**

- 8.1. I have considered the project in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The subject site is located approximately 3.1km northwest of Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code 004030). No nature conservation concerns in relation to European sites were raised in the planning application and appeal.
- 8.2. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The nature and scale of the development within an urban area.
  - The separation distance and intervening lands from the nearest European sites.
  - Taking into account the screening determination of the PA.

8.3. 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. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 9.0 Water Framework Directive (WFD) Screening

9.1. The site is underlain by the Ballinhassig East groundwater waterbody (Site Code IE\_SW\_G\_004) which is classed as 'good' status, and 'not at risk', for the 2019-2024 monitoring period. The site does not adjoin any watercourses, and it is not proposed to discharge surface water to same.

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

9.3. 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

It is my recommendation to the Commission that permission is **Refused** for the reasons and considerations set out below.

## 11.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to Section 11.104 (Separation, Overlooking and Overbearance) of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, to the height, bulk and scale of the proposed extension and its proximity to the northern boundary and the adjoining residential property, it is considered that the proposed development would give rise to an unacceptable overbearing impact to the adjoining property. The proposed development would, therefore, seriously injure the residential amenity of property in the vicinity and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

### Declaration

*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.*

---

Gary Farrelly  
Planning Inspector  
13<sup>th</sup> March 2026

## Appendix 1

### Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500361-CC
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of part single and part two-storey rear extensions, alterations to existing building and all associated site works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Bellevue House, No.3 Bellevue Terrace, Military Road, Cork
	<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (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.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>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?</b>	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the proposed 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.	
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</del>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</del>	

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 13<sup>th</sup> March 2026