



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500428-DF-25

Development	Construction of second floor rear extension with all associated site works.
Location	30 Main Street, Howth, Co. Dublin, D13 P8K7
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F25A/0876E
Applicant(s)	Sarah Fleming
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Sarah Fleming
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	18 th February 2026
Inspector	Barry Diamond

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0	Planning History.....	5
5.0	Policy Context.....	6
6.0	EIA Screening.....	8
7.0	The Appeal	9
8.0	Assessment	10
9.0	AA Screening.....	16
10.0	Water Framework Directive	17
11.0	Recommendation.....	18
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	18

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is a two storey mid-terrace dwelling which fronts directly onto Main Street and has direct front door access onto the pavement. The building is of a vernacular style and has a render finish, a slate roof and the window fenestration to the front elevation onto Main Street is symmetrical with a vertical emphasis.
- 1.2. The rear of the dwelling is relatively constrained and backs onto Campbell's Terrace, a row of town houses which are set behind the street frontage and accessed via an archway off the Main Street. The subject dwelling sits at a lower level than Campbell's Terrace and has a constrained rear yard area which is well enclosed.
- 1.3. The surrounding development in the immediate area is residential with a variety in roof heights and a mixture of dormer styles. Commercial development and the Church of the Assumption are located to the north close to the junction of Main Street and St. Marys Road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The proposed development comprises a number of different elements which includes;
 - The removal of the rear roof pitches;
 - A second floor extension complete with hidden roof terrace;
 - Stair block rear extension; and
 - Elevational alterations and associated works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 13th November 2025 the Planning Authority issued a decision to refuse permission for the following reason:

1. The proposed development by reason of the design, scale and massing presents as an unduly dominant structure within the streetscape which would be wholly inconsistent with the established character of the area resulting in detrimental impacts which would adversely affect the Howth Historic Core Architectural Conservation Area and surrounding visual amenity. The development as proposed

would fail to accord with Policy HCAP15 and Objective HCAO24 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 which requires proposals for any development, alteration or extension affecting a building that contributes to the character of an ACA to be sensitively sited and designed, are compatible with the special character, and are appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, architectural treatment, layout, materials, impact on architectural or historic features. The proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments, which in itself and cumulatively would contribute to an erosion of the distinctive and attractive character of the area and Architectural Conservation Area and as such be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The decision of the planner reflects the processing of the application and the decision to refuse planning permission. It includes the following points:

- The second floor rear extension would not impact upon the existing front facing pitched roof or chimney of the dwelling, however, the rear extension would rise 1.4 metres above the existing roof line;
- A number of the windows to the rear are to be fitted with obscure glazing;
- There are no concerns with overlooking or overshadowing;
- The design lacks the cohesion and symmetry which is portrayed on the host building;
- The proposal would have an overbearing impact on the established roof scape along Main Street;
- The second floor stairs would protrude from the main building mass and would create a disarticulated façade at second floor level;
- The plans do not demonstrate that this contemporary design would be complementary to or enhance the building on this exposed street;
- The site is within the Howth Historic Core Architectural Conservation Area;
- There are very prominent views of the building along Main Street;

- The extension is considered to be overbearing, visually obtrusive in the streetscape and would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area; and
- There are no concerns that the development would adversely impact any designated sites.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Water Services Section: no objection subject to conditions.
- Conservation Officer: Recommends amendments to the proposal to remove the second floor extension from the plans.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- An Taisce – No response
- Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage – No response
- Heritage Council – No response

3.4. Third Party Observations

None

4.0 Planning History

Site

None

Other relevant history

F22A/0157 - On the 23rd June 2022 permission was granted for the construction of a new first floor level extension with pitched roof over the modified existing single storey extension to the rear, front windows & door replacement and internal renovation of the dwelling, together with external landscaping and all associated works at 47 Main Street, Howth, Co. Dublin, D13R9F8

F09A/0289 – In September 2009 permission was granted for 2 no. three bedroom & 1 no. two bedroom duplex residential units (393 sq.m.) on Porto Fino between 53 Church Street/Harbour Road, Howth, Co Dublin (An Architectural Conservation Area).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 is the operational plan for the area. The appeal site is zoned 'RS,' Residential with the associated land use objective 'to provide for residential development and to protect and /or improve residential amenity.' The appeal site is also located within the Howth Historic Core Architectural Conservation Area. It is also within a Highly Sensitive Landscape and a Coastal Landscape Character type and is within the Dublin Airport Noise Zone D.

5.1.2 The following sections /policies / objectives are pertinent:

SPQHP41 seeks to support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

SPQHO45 seeks to support dwelling extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

Objective DAO11 and DMSO105 – Requirement for Noise Insulation - The site is identified in the Plan as being located within Dublin Airport Noise Zone D which requires noise insulation where appropriate.

Objective DMSO23 – Separation Distance: A separation distance of a minimum of 22 metres between directly opposing rear first floor windows shall generally be observed unless alternative provision has been designed to ensure privacy.

Objective DMSO27 – Minimum Private Open Space Provision - Ensure a minimum open space provision for a 3 bedroom house or less to have a minimum of 60 sq. m. of private open space located behind the front building line of the house.

Section 14.8.2 Separation Distances - A minimum standard of 22 metres separation between directly opposing rear first floor windows shall be observed.

Section 14.10.2 Residential Extensions: supports applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend as the needs of the household change, subject to specific safeguards. In particular, the design and layout of residential extensions must have regard to and protect the amenities of adjoining properties.

Section 14.10.2.5 sets out standards with respect to Roof Alterations including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions. Consideration and regard must be had to:

- The character and size of the structure;
- Its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
- Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
- Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
- Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures and prominence.
- Dormer extensions to roofs will be evaluated against the impact of the structure on the form, and character of the existing dwelling house and the privacy of adjacent properties.
- The design, dimensions, and bulk of the dormer relative to the overall extent of roof as well as the size of the dwelling and rear garden will be the overriding considerations, together with the visual impact of the structure when viewed from adjoining streets and public areas.
- Dormer extensions shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries and shall be set down from the existing ridge level so as not to dominate the roof space.
- The quality of materials/finishes to dormer extensions shall be given careful consideration and should match those of the existing roof.
- The level and type of glazing within a dormer extension should have regard to existing window treatments and fenestration of the dwelling.
- Regard should also be had to extent of fenestration proposed at attic level relative to adjoining residential units and to ensure the preservation of amenities.
- Excessive overlooking of adjacent properties should be avoided.

14.19.3.3 Architectural Conservation Areas Changes and development within ACAs should be carried out in a manner sympathetic to its distinctive character.

Policy HCAP14 – Architectural Conservation Areas - Development within or affecting an ACA must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting wherever possible. Development shall not harm buildings, spaces, original street patterns, archaeological sites, historic boundaries or features, which contribute positively to the ACA.

Policy HCAP15 – Character of Architectural Conservation Areas - Support and encourage the sympathetic and appropriate adaptive reuse, refurbishment, and

upgrading of protected structures and buildings or structures that contribute to the character of an Architectural Conservation Area ensuring that their special interest, character and setting is retained.

Objective HCAO24 – Alteration and Development of Protected Structures and ACAs - Requires proposals for any development, modification, alteration, extension or energy retrofitting affecting a Protected Structure and/or its setting or a building that contributes to the character of an ACA are sensitively sited and designed, are compatible with the special character, and are appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, architectural treatment, layout, materials, impact on architectural or historic features.

Objective SPQHO43 – Contemporary and Innovative Design Solutions - Promote the use of contemporary and innovative design solutions subject to design respecting the character and architectural heritage of the area.

Howth Historic Core
Howth Historic Core Architectural Conservation Area
Architectural Conservation Area Statement of Character – Fingal County Council
2006

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

‘Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities’, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, (2024)

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located on or within proximity to any designated Natura 2000 sites, with the nearest designated sites being the North-West Irish Sea SPA (SPA: 004236) and Howth Head SAC (SAC: 000202) which are located c. 0.34 km to the northeast of the site.

6.0 EIA Screening

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. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is

also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of my report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1 The appellants grounds of appeal were submitted by Colgan & O'Reilly Architects and can be summarised as follows:

- The building is not a protected structure and is located on the edge of the Architectural Conservation Area;
- The existing roofline and front elevation, including sash windows and chimneys will be unaltered by the proposed extension;
- The set back design of 53 Church Street/Porto Fino, Harbour Road, Howth (Ref: F09A/0289) aided in the development of the design of the current application proposal. This upper floor extension was set back 1 metre from the front elevation and was considered acceptable by the Planning Authority;
- There is a complete palette of finishes from traditional to modern along this section of Main Street;
- The streetscape at this end of Main Street is very mixed as per the Howth Historic Core Statement of Character;
- The planners report refers to views uphill, however, the HCS only refers to views downhill;
- The backdrop of the hill and the skyline must be influencing factors when looking uphill and the proposed extension does not break the skyline;
- The proposed extension is subservient in the background;
- Policies HCAP15 & SPQHO43 of the FCDP need to be read together, with the latter allowing for contemporary designs;
- There is no special character to the application dwelling;
- The scale of the existing house on the application site is maintained at street level;
- The extension is a requirement to meet family needs;

- Neighbouring houses are considered to be modern in construction and design, with some being heavily modified and these set the character of the immediate area; and
- The Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines recommend in ACA's that replacement in replica should only be contemplated where there is a terrace which does not apply in this instance.

7.2. **Planning Authority Response**

The refusal of planning permission is requested to be upheld, however, in the event that permission is granted a condition requiring a Section 48 development contribution or Special Development Contribution is requested.

7.3. **Observations**

None

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1 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, having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Residential Amenity
- Other Matters

8.2 **Principle of Development**

8.2.1 The proposed development comprises a rear two storey extension of an existing dwelling, which is located within zoning 'RS,' Residential, with the associated land use objective 'to provide for residential development and to protect and /or improve residential amenity.' The site is also located within an Architectural Conservation Area, a Highly Sensitive Landscape and a Coastal Landscape Character type.

8.2.2 I note that the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 (FDP) is supportive of residential extensions. In this regard Section 14.10.2 Residential Extensions supports

applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend existing dwellings as the needs of the household change, subject to specific safeguards. The sites location within an Architectural Conservation Area, a Highly Sensitive Landscape and a Coastal Landscape Character area does not preclude development, rather, the design of the development must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and not harm the landscape setting. I consider that the principle of a residential extension is acceptable subject to issues of design, neighbour amenity and other relevant factors.

8.3 Design

8.3.1 The proposed development comprises the creation of a second floor rear extension above an existing two storey rear annex. The proposed extension provides for an additional bedroom, walk-in wardrobe and ensuite. An enclosed stairwell is to be erected in parallel to the existing rear annex and the proposed second floor extension. The stairwell is proposed to be three storeys in height and extends from the existing rear courtyard of the dwelling. A hidden roof terrace is also proposed between the proposed second floor rear extension and the front facing roof plane of the existing dwelling.

8.3.2 The proposed second floor rear extension is to be constructed via demolishing the roof of the existing rear annex and constructing the new extension on top. The extension will have plastered walls to match the existing dwelling and a flat roof which is to have a sedum finish to aid compliance with SUDS. This extension is set back 4.69 metres from the front building line of the dwelling and the rear extension is indicated to protrude 1.44 metres above the existing ridge line of the dwelling. There are windows proposed along the front facing aspect of the extension which have a horizontal emphasis. It is indicated that the existing ridge line of the dwelling and the front facing roof plane along with the chimneys will not be altered.

8.3.3 The site is located within the Howth Historic Core Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) and also borders the ACA for St. Nessans Terrace, St. Peter's Terrace, Seaview Terrace and The Haggard. The Planning Authority's Conservation Officer expressed concern with the second floor rear extension due to its mass and height which was considered to be inappropriate for the area given the views of the proposal along Main Street, particularly to the north.

- 8.3.4 The area was designated as an ACA in 2006 and included a Statement of Character, namely, the; 'Howth Historic Core Howth Historic Core Architectural Conservation Area Architectural Conservation Area Statement of Character'. Objective HCAO24, Section 14.19.3.3 and Policy HCAP15 of the FCDP refer to the need for new development to be sensitively sited and designed, to be sympathetic and contribute positively to the character of the ACA.
- 8.3.5 I am of the view that the existing dwelling makes a positive contribution to the ACA and its external appearance has not been altered to any significant extent which would diminish its vernacular form. While the existing rear annex would appear to have been a later addition to the dwelling, its impact is limited as it remains subordinate to the existing dwelling and does not impact upon views of the dwelling from along Main Street.
- 8.3.6 While the proposed second floor rear extension would be set back off the main roof line it would be viewable from both the northern approach from around No. 25 Main Street and the southern approach from around No. 34 Main Street. The views from the northern approach are more long term due to the topography and deflection of the street. From the vantage points indicated, the extension would protrude above the roof line of the existing dwelling by 1.44 metres and would not appear as subordinate to the dwelling, the boxy flat roof appearance of the rear annex, would in my view contrast poorly with the pitched roofs along Main Street making the extension appear top heavy and uncharacteristic of the area.
- 8.3.7 The enclosed stairwell sits at a slightly lower level than the main second floor extension and has a narrow width of 1.9 metres compared to the 4.93 metres for the main bulk of the rear extension. The different dimensions for the stairwell and the second floor extension add a further element of complication to the form of the existing dwelling and the majority of those along Main Street which are defined best by their simplicity of form. In addition, when I viewed the site there were no other three storey buildings within this section of the ACA and I am of the opinion that the scale, massing and design of the extension does not complement the building form of the existing dwelling or the character of the area which would be contrary to Objective HCAO24, Section 14.19.3.3, Policy HCAP15 of the FCDP.
- 8.3.8 The window and door fenestration of the existing dwelling has a symmetrical appearance with vertical emphasis to the windows. This contrasts poorly with the horizontal windows to the front of the extension which would face towards Main

Street. While Objective SPQHO43 of the FCDP promotes the use of contemporary and innovative design solutions, this is subject to the caveat that the proposed design respects the character and architectural heritage of the area. In my view the window fenestration would not complement the building form of the existing dwelling or the character of the area.

- 8.3.9 The proposal also includes some internal changes and alterations to the northern gable of the rear annex to include large window openings to serve existing and proposed rooms. These window openings are not readily viewable from the streetscape and given the limited public viewpoints are acceptable in design terms.
- 8.3.10 The proposed enclosed stairwell will be built off the existing constrained rear courtyard which currently measures c.17.4sqm and will be reduced to 11.6 sqm as a result of the proposed development a reduction of 5.8 sqm. A hidden roof terrace at second floor level is to be created by removing the existing rear facing roof plane of the dwelling and creating a flat roof area between the front roof plane and the proposed extension creating an additional amenity space of 15.8 sqm. The resultant floorspace (27.4sqm) is less than the 60sqm open space standards for a three bedroom house stipulated under Objective DMSO27 of the FCDP, or 40sqm as detailed in SPPR 2 of Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).
- 8.3.11 Although the level of private amenity space falls below the standards, the current two bedroom dwelling is undersubscribed. I am of the opinion that while the level of private space is below the threshold it exceeds the private amenity space which is currently available for the existing dwelling and is considered acceptable in the circumstances. I also note that this was not a concern raised by the Planning Authority in its assessment of the application.
- 8.3.12 I note the new first floor rear extension at 47 Main Street, Howth which was approved under application Ref: F22A/0157, however, that extension had a pitched roof and did not extend beyond the existing ridge line of the dwelling. I also note the upper floor extension granted at Porto Fino between 53 Church Street/Harbour Road, Howth under application Ref: F09A/0289 in September 2009. This development included a flat roof within the redevelopment which went across the entire roof, however, it did not include an increase in the height of the original ridge line.

- 8.3.13 In my opinion, the architecture along Harbour Road ('Porto Fino' the case cited as precedent) is significantly different than the current application site. On Harbour Road the parapet walls in the area disable some views of the roofs and the higher ridge heights of the adjoining buildings either side of Porto Fino building assists in reducing the impact of the development. From Church Street the view of the building (Porto Fino) is more critical and the building appears as a single storey building with a flat roof and in my view does not blend well with the historic architecture in the area. I am of the opinion that this isolated historic permission does not set a precedent for the application proposal as it is sufficiently removed from the application site, it sits within a different architectural context along Harbour Road, the design does not mirror the design on the application site as it introduced a flat roof across the whole building and the current application proposal includes an increase in height above the ridge line of the existing dwelling.
- 8.3.14 I consider that the design, scale and massing of the rear second floor extension would harm the architectural heritage of the surrounding area and is unacceptable.

8.4 Residential Amenity

- 8.4.1 Objective DMSO23 and Section 14.8.2 of the FCDP indicates that a minimum of 22 metres separation shall be observed between directly opposing rear first floor windows, however, reduced separation distances may be acceptable on a case-by-case basis. SPPR 1 - Separation Distances - Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) states that a minimum of 16 metres separation distance should generally be achieved, however, if there are no opposing windows serving habitable rooms and where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme then a reduction is permissible. In addition, there shall be no specified minimum separation distance at ground level or to the front of houses. refers to the need to maintain a separation distance of 16 metres between opposing first floor windows that serve habitable rooms.
- 8.4.2 The extension will be viewed from Campbell's Court which is located to the rear. When viewed from this vantage point the only windows which look towards the dwellings in Campbell's Court serve the proposed stairwell. It is indicated that the two stairwell windows are to be finished in obscure glazing and there is a separation distance of 12.6 metres from the windows and the nearest residential dwelling in Campbell's Court. Although the separation distance falls below the normal thresholds set out above I am of the view that a hallway is a non-habitable room and the use of

obscure glazing to the windows in the stairwell would mitigate any impact of overlooking from or onto the properties in Campbell Court.

- 8.4.3 The demolition of the northern gable of the rear annex is also proposed which is to be rebuilt to effectively square off the gable with new window openings proposed on each floor of the northern gable of the rear annex. The ground floor window will have a view into the applicant's courtyard and will not result in any overlooking. The existing first floor window serves a shower room, however, it is being enlarged significantly and will serve a first floor living room. The second floor window will serve a bedroom and an ensuite.
- 8.4.4 The window on the second floor is a high level window and is finished in obscure glazing. While it would not normally be acceptable to have a bedroom window finished with obscure glazing, the room is also served by other windows in the front facing elevation and therefore the mitigation measures are considered acceptable. The proposed first floor window will be enlarged significantly to serve a living room and will have views towards the rear of No. 29 Main Street, a residential dwelling immediately to the north. This dwelling has a window opening in a south facing rear annex that serves a utility room. The separation distance between these windows is c.9.37 metres.
- 8.4.5 There is no mitigation proposed for the first floor window opening nor are there any other windows serving this room. I am of the opinion that this window would have a view towards the rear annex of No. 29, however, the living room window in the application building would be considered to be a habitable room, while the utility room would not and therefore the views towards this window at a reduced separation distance would be acceptable. The living room window would only have a limited view of the rear amenity space of No. 29, given an intervening high level wall which exists between the properties.
- 8.4.6 The proposed extension will increase the height of the existing rear annex by 1.87 metres. The nearest dwelling in Campbell's Court (No. 5) has a separation distance of 12.6 metres from the proposed development and I consider that there will not be an adverse impact on that property by reason of dominance or overshadowing given the separation distance.
- 8.4.7 The extension does adjoin the boundary of No. 29 Main Street, however, at this point the proposed works only includes the enclosed stairwell which has a limited depth of

1.9 metres from the rear of the application dwelling. At this point the proposed stairwell given its limited depth does not extend beyond the rear building line of No. 29 Main Street. I am of the opinion that dominance or overshadowing of that property would not occur.

8.4.8 No. 31 to the south of the application building does have two windows in the rear elevation, however, the existing annex would already result in some overshadowing of these windows. The proposed second floor extension is being built upwards rather than outwards and I do not anticipate that the increase in height would add significantly to the level of overshadowing.

8.4.9 A roof terrace is proposed between the second floor extension and the existing front roof plane of the dwelling. It is indicated that the roof terrace will have a glazed barrier for safety, however, this high level vantage point would offer views towards the rear amenity space of No. 29 to the north and would provide some views through the rooflights of this dwelling. While these views would be oblique this matter could be mitigated through the use of a planning condition requiring the glazing at the southern end of the roof terrace to be finished in obscure glazing and to be at a height not less than 1.8 metres in order to protect the amenity of No. 29 Main Street. I am of the opinion that a reason for refusal on this aspect of the proposal would not be warranted given the mitigation available.

8.4.10 I consider that no significant adverse impacts to the adjoining properties would occur as a result of the proposed development and I note that the impact on residential amenity was not a concern raised by the Planning Authority.

8.5 Other Matters

8.5.1 The Planning Authority in their response to the appeal submission indicated that if the Commission granted permission, then a Section 48 development contribution or Special Development Contribution would be required. I have reviewed the September 2023 Development Contribution Scheme and I note that it does not apply to extensions to dwellings and therefore the Planning Authority's request is misplaced and no condition would be necessary.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1 I have considered the development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at 30

Main Street, Howth, Co. Dublin, D13 P8K7, no relevant designated sites are close by.

9.2 The proposed development comprises the construction of a second floor rear extension with all associated site works. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal. 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.

9.3 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and nature of the development; and
- Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections; and
- The screening decision of the Planning Authority.

9.4 I conclude that 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 (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 **Water Framework Directive**

10.1 The subject site is located at 30 Main Street, Howth, Co. Dublin which is 16.5 metres west of the nearest water body, however, this waterbody would appear to be culverted. The proposed development comprises the construction of a second floor rear extension with all associated site works and associated alterations to the internal layout and elevations. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.2 I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive 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. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development ; and
- Distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

10.3 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.

11.0 Recommendation

That planning permission be refused for the reasons and considerations set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development by reason of the design, scale and massing presents as an unduly dominant structure within the streetscape which would be wholly inconsistent with the established character of the area resulting in detrimental impacts which would adversely affect the Howth Historic Core Architectural Conservation Area and surrounding visual amenity. The development as proposed would fail to accord with Policy HCAP15 and Objective HCAO24 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 which requires proposals for any development, alteration or extension affecting a building that contributes to the character of an ACA to be sensitively sited and designed, are compatible with the special character, and are appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, architectural treatment, layout, materials, impact on architectural or historic features. The proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments, which in itself and cumulatively would contribute to an erosion of the distinctive and attractive character of the area and Architectural Conservation Area

and as such 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.

Barry Diamond
Planning Inspector

4th March 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500428-DF-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of second floor rear extension with all associated site works.
Development Address	30 Main Street, Howth, Co. Dublin, D13 P8K7
	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 type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<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) <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i></p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3) <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i></p>

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Page is intentionally blank.