



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

**PL-500550-SD-26**



<b>Development</b>	A new part single / part two-storey dwelling, with new vehicular access from Peamount Lane and the provision of a proprietary wastewater treatment system.
<b>Location</b>	Milltown Lodge, Peamount Lane, Newcastle, Co. Dublin, D22DE92.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	South Dublin County Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	SD25A/0247
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	David Nolan & Geraldine O'Donnell.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse Permission.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	David Nolan & Geraldine O'Donnell.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	12/03/26.

**Inspector**

Anthony Abbott King.

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site comprises part of the landholding attached to Milltown Lodge. Milltown Lodge is a modern detached property positioned within a large oblong residential plot on Peamount Lane.
- 1.2. Peamount Lane (denoted Milltown Lane on Google Maps) is a single carriageway rural lane / access road to “Newcastle Golf Centre” from Peamount Road (R120) with no road markings or public footpath.
- 1.3. There are a number of existing residential properties accessed from Peamount Lane on the north-eastern section of the Lane in the location of the appeal site. The western section of Peamount Lane defines the eastern boundary of the Peamount Health campus.
- 1.4. The appeal site is located to the southeast of Milltown Lodge positioned between Milltown Lodge and Carrokeel Lodge. It is a wedge shaped landholding with the narrower end of the wedge enjoying road frontage onto Peamount Lane.
- 1.5. The appeal site is delineated by linear mature planting from the immediate curtilage of Milltown Lodge to the northwest and from Carrokeel Lodge to the southeast. It presents as an independent development site with an indented access and gated entrance from Peamount Lane.
- 1.6. The site area is given as 0.1538 hectares.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises a new dwelling house and vehicular entrance from Peamount Lane.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Refuse planning permission for the following reason(s)

- 3.1.1. (1) *Having regard to the residential nature of the proposed development and ‘EE’ land use zoning objective of the site, under which ‘Residential’ uses are ‘Not Permitted’ on*

*'EE' zoned lands as per Table 12.20 (Use Classes Related to Zoning Objective) of the 2022-2028 South Dublin County Development Plan, the development of a dwelling at the subject site would not accord with provisions of the 2022-2028 CDP, and furthermore, if permitted, would set an undesirable precedent for similar development which would not accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

*(2) As per SDCC Roads department report, the proposed development, by reason of its location on Peamount Lane which is not to Roads standard with regard to width and construction, and is not served by footpath/s or public lighting, would by reason of increased traffic generation on a substandard road endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard. The development cannot, therefore, be favourably considered by the Planning Authority.*

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The decision of the CEO of South Dublin County Council reflects the recommendation of the planning case officer.

The planning case officer concluded that the overall design of the proposed dwelling was considered acceptable and would generally respect the character of the surrounding area. The development complied with the relevant criteria for development on infill/corner and/or side garden sites, as provided for in Section 12.6.8 of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028. The infill house would also comply with the minimum requirement for a 3-bedroom house.

However, the substantive matter of the zoning objective (to provide for enterprise & employment related uses), which does not permit residential development, resulted in the development as proposed not being considered favourably. A refusal of permission was recommended, as the principle of residential development would be contrary to the "EE" zoning objective.

Furthermore, the proposed development by reason of increased traffic generation from the infill dwelling on a substandard road would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard. Therefore the proposal should be refused.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- The Roads Department of the planning authority recommends refusal of planning permission given that the access laneway is approximately 3m in width, insufficient to accommodate 2 passing cars, has no footpath / public lighting and the construction depth of the road is substandard. Furthermore, the applicant has not submitted sufficient detail to fully access the proposed new vehicular entrance to the access laneway.
- The Environmental Health section of the planning authority recommends the submission of further information in the matter of the proposed proprietary wastewater treatment system. The applicant is requested to submit a site assessment with details of the waste water treatment system proposed.

### 3.3. Third Party Observations

There are no third party submissions on file.

## 4.0 Planning History

4.1. There is no recent relevant planning history on the appeal site.

4.2. I note the following application on a larger landholding, which included the appeal site.

- Under Reg. ref. S02A/0140 planning permission was refused by the planning authority and on appeal (11/11/2022) *inter alia* for change of use from covered golf driving range building to light industrial/small enterprise units for the following reasons:

*(1) The site is located on lands zoned Objective B in the South Dublin County Council Development Plan 1998, to protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture. Light industrial use/ Office Use less than 100 square metres is open for consideration in this zone where it is located in villages to serve local needs. The proposal is not located in a village and does not serve local needs. The development would contravene*

*materially a development objective indicated in the development plan for this are 'To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture'.*

*(2) The proposed development and the works to be retained are unacceptable as Peamount Lane is substandard in terms of width and construction. The Lane has no footpath/public lighting and the generation of additional traffic (cars, commercial vehicles) on the laneway would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard.*

4.3. I note the following applications on adjacent sites in the vicinity:

- Under reg. ref: SD23B/0416 planning permission was granted (20/04/2024) at Carrokeel Lodge (adjoining the appeal site to the southeast), Peamount Lane for renovation of existing detached dwelling comprising of single storey peripheral extension subject to 14 conditions.
- Under reg. ref: SD05A/0866 planning permission was granted (12/12/2005) for a two-storey four bedroom detached dwelling with garage to the northeast of the subject landholding consequent to the earlier grant of outline permission reg ref: SD04A/0737.
- Under reg. ref: SD04A/0737 out line planning permission was granted (05/04/2005) for a detached house (200 sqm) to the northeast of the subject landholding on lands (0.3 hectares) within Newcastle Golf Centre.
- Under reg. ref: SD03A/0098 planning permission was refused (10/04/2003) for a dormer bungalow detached garage and vehicular access onto Peamount Lane to the southeast of the appeal site for 3 reasons.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

The local policy framework is provided by the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028. The relevant policies and objectives in the development plan relate to the functional area of South Dublin County Council (SDCC) and are set-out below:

- Zoning

The relevant land-use zoning objective is "EE" (Map 4): 'To provide for enterprise and employment related uses'.

Residential is a "Not Permitted" use (See Table 12.10).

I note the lands on the opposite side of Peamount Lane (including the Peamount Healthcare Centre) are zoned "RU" for the purpose of protecting and improving rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture.

Residential is an open for consideration use under the "RU" zoning objective.

Chapter 12. 2.1 (Land-Use Zoning Tables) provides *inter alia* the following definition for a (iii) "Not Permitted" use:

*Land uses that are listed as 'not permitted' under each of the zoning objectives are considered not to be acceptable. Each use listed under this category would not, therefore, be favourably considered by the Planning Authority.*

The following definition for a (iv) 'Non-Conforming Uses' is as follows:

*There are instances throughout the County where land uses do not conform with the zoning objective of a site. These include instances where such uses:*

- 1. were in existence on 1st October 1964 (that is, prior to planning legislation), or*
- 2. have valid permission, or*
- 3. have no permission and may or may not be the subject of enforcement proceedings.*

*Development proposals that relate to uses referred to under categories 1 and 2 above, particularly those that would intensify non-conforming uses, will be permitted only where the proposed development would not be detrimental to the amenities of the surrounding area and would accord with the principles of proper planning and sustainable development. This includes the integration of land use and transport planning.*

I do not consider that the proposal for an infill house on a greenfield site satisfies the criteria listed.

- Infill Development

Chapter 12 (Implementation and Monitoring) Section 12.6.8 (Residential Consolidation), *inter alia* Paragraph Corner / Side Garden Sites is relevant.

Development on corner and / or side garden sites should be innovative in design, appropriate in context and should meet the following criteria:

- In line with the provisions of Section 6.8 Residential Consolidation in Urban Areas the site should be of sufficient size to accommodate an additional dwelling(s) and an appropriate set back should be maintained from adjacent dwellings ensuring no adverse impacts occur on the residential amenity of adjoining dwellings;
- Corner development should provide a dual frontage in order to avoid blank facades and maximise passive surveillance of the public domain;
- The dwelling(s) should generally be designed and sited to match the front building line and respond to the roof profile of adjoining dwellings where possible. Proposals for buildings which project forward or behind the prevailing front building line, should incorporate transitional elements into the design to promote a sense of integration with adjoining buildings;
- The architectural language of the development (including boundary treatments) should generally respond to the character of adjacent dwellings and create a sense of harmony. Contemporary and innovative proposals that respond to the local context are encouraged, particularly on larger sites which can accommodate multiple dwellings;
- A relaxation in the quantum of private open space may be considered on a case- by-case basis whereby a reduction of up to a maximum of 10% is allowed, where a development proposal meets all other relevant standards and can demonstrate how the proposed open space provision is of a high standard, for example, an advantageous orientation, shape and functionality;
- Any provision of open space to the side of dwellings will only be considered as part of the overall private open space provision where it is

useable, good quality space. Narrow strips of open space to side of dwellings shall not be considered as private amenity space.

## 5.2. **Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines**

- The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage 'The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Growth Guidelines for Planning Authorities', (15 January, 2024).
- Department of Environment Heritage and Local Government 'Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas' (2009) and the accompanying Design Manual (2009).

## 5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

There are no natural heritage areas (NHAs) or proposed natural heritage area (pNHAs) in the vicinity of the appeal site, as identified on the relevant zoning maps 3 & 4 of the development plan.

## 6.0 **EIA Screening**

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.

## 7.0 **The Appeal**

### 7.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The grounds of this first party appeal are summarised below:

- The appeal is made in the context of family circumstances and the belief that the decision of the planning authority does not adequately reflect the specific and exceptional nature of the development proposal.

- The proposal is motivated by the requirement for home care to be provided by a member of the family living beside the appellants and is not a dwelling intended for sale, speculation or general residential development. It is claimed that the appeal site has been retained by the appellants for the specific purpose of housing their son.
- Milltown Lodge is the family home of the appellants for 20 years. The appeal site forms part of the wider landholding and is located beside the appellant's dwelling on Peamount Lane. The purpose of the new dwellinghouse is to allow the son of the appellants and his family to return permanently to Ireland in order to provide day-to-day care and support to his parents.
- The specific medical circumstances of the appellant(s) were fully outlined and supported by documentation provided with the application.
- In the matter of the zoning objective, the appellants understand that the zoning objective is 'EE' (Enterprise & Employment) under the current development plan and that residential use is not permissible. However, their personal circumstances in the context of the reality on the ground must be considered in applying the zoning objective to their specific site.
- It is claimed that Peamount Lane and in particular the northeast side of the Lane has an established residential use and character. Furthermore, the construction of neighbouring family homes has occurred in the vicinity in the last 20 years.
- The appeal site is an infill site between two existing dwellinghouses. One of the dwellinghouses has been comprehensively renovated in the last 2 years. The established domestic character of the immediate receiving environment limits its suitability for enterprise or employment development, which would be incompatible with established residential amenities.
- The planning authority assessment of the proposed development accepted that the infill dwelling is appropriate in terms of design and scale, layout and residential standards, visual impact and protection of neighbouring amenities.
- The Commission is respectfully requested to consider whether a literal application of the zoning policy without regard to the appeal site residential

context and specific family circumstances represents the most appropriate planning outcome.

- In the matter of access and road safety, the appellants claim that Peamount Lane is a long established access route serving a number of dwellings located along the Lane. The Lane has operated safely in its current form for many decades without footpaths or public lighting and without change in its basic layout.
- The proposal for a single family dwelling would generate a very small number of additional daily car movements. It is claimed the limited increase in traffic would materially change road conditions or create a traffic hazard particularly in the context of existing usage of the Lane.
- Furthermore, residential permissions have been granted along Peamount Lane over the years notwithstanding the same access road characteristics.

## 7.2. **Planning Authority Response**

The planning authority confirms its decision. The issues raised in the appeal have been covered in the Chief Executive Order.

## 7.3. **Observations**

None.

## 8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. I have 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 planning policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Zoning / principle of development.
- Material Contravention.
- Infill housing requirements and standards.
- New vehicular access & in-curtilage parking.
- Other matters.

### Principle of development

- 8.2. The site is zoned 'EE' in the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028, which provides for enterprise & employment related uses. Residential is a 'Not Permitted' land use.
- 8.3. Table 12.10 (Use Classes Related to Zoning Objective 'EE') of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028, *inter alia* states that residential is a 'Not Permitted' use class within the zone.
- 8.4. The appellant claimed that Peamount Lane and in particular the northeast side of the Lane has an established residential use and character. Furthermore, the construction of neighbouring family homes has occurred in the vicinity in the last 20 years.
- 8.5. I have reviewed the adjacent planning histories in the vicinity. I note that the most recent grant of planning permission for an independent dwelling house on Peamount Lane was in 2005 – please see Section 4.3 of this report.
- 8.6. I do not consider that the planning history context in the vicinity of the appeal site would support Peamount Lane as a location for additional residential unit development.
- 8.7. The appellant claims that the infill site between two existing dwelling houses is within an area with an established domestic character. This limits its suitability for enterprise or employment development, which would be incompatible with established residential amenities.
- 8.8. I accept that the appeal site is an infill location between two detached dwellinghouses. However, I note that the appeal site has the characteristics of an open field rather than the characteristics of the domestic side garden of a dwellinghouse.
- 8.9. The appeal site is physically separated from the curtilage of Milltown Lodge by a mature hedgerow and presents as an independent development site.
- 8.10. I do not consider that the existing residential land use on the adjoining landholdings would exclude enterprise and employment use of the subject site compatible with residential amenities.
- 8.11. Furthermore, the planning case officer considered that the substantive matter of the zoning objective, which does not permit the residential use class within the 'EE' zone,

would preclude a dwelling house on site, as the principle of residential development would be contrary to the zoning objective.

- 8.12. I concur with the planning case officer. Uses that are 'Not Permitted' on lands cannot be considered acceptable for such use and are not to be favourably considered by the planning authority.
- 8.13. Therefore I conclude that the subject site in terms of land use is not an acceptable location for additional residential unit(s) given that the residential use class is 'Not Permitted' within the 'EE' zone.

Material contravention

- 8.14. Notwithstanding the scale of the development proposed, for one dwellinghouse, and the existing residential land use on part of the applicant landholding (outlined in blue on the submitted site plan), I do not consider that the development of a detached dwellinghouse on a greenfield site satisfies the listed criteria in Chapter 12 of the development plan in order to accommodate the proposed development under the categorisation of extant 'Non-Conforming Uses'.
- 8.15. I consider that the proposed development would materially contravene zoning objective 'EE' of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028, as residential is a 'Not Permitted' use class within the zone.
- 8.16. I consider that Section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, is not applicable in this instance as the Planning Authority did not refuse planning permission on the grounds that the proposed development 'materially contravenes' the development plan rather the development of a dwelling at the subject site would not accord with provisions of the development plan.
- 8.17. The appellant cites family circumstances as a principal ground of appeal.
- 8.18. The applicant's son Christian Hadfield has submitted a letter dated 02/10/2025 informing the planning authority of the urgent need to be housed locally following repatriation from the United States to Ireland to provide essential care and support for aging parents living at Milltown Lodge.
- 8.19. A letter from the Dodsboro Clinic dated 11/12/2024 provides a medical evaluation of one of the applicants, a patient at the clinic, documenting a marked decrease in the

patient's ability to perform daily activities independently and the requirement for full time care.

- 8.20. I note these matters. However, the substantive matter of the zoning objective precludes the construction of a dwelling house on the lands adjoining the existing family dwelling house, as the residential use class is 'Not Permitted' within the 'EE' zone.
- 8.21. Finally, there is significant road frontage along Peamount Lane between the existing residential units located in the northeast section of the Lane and the access junction with Peamount Road (R120).
- 8.22. I consider that the proposal would create a precedent for further residential development on the "EE" zoned lands on the eastern side of Peamount Lane given the number of existing residential properties located within the zone and the potential to increase residential landuse along Peamount Lane such as to cumulatively undermine the objectives of the development plan.
- 8.23. I consider that the principle of an additional residential unit is not acceptable at this location by reason of the proposed infill house itself and the precedent that it would set for further residential landuse on Peamount Lane.
- 8.24. I conclude the proposed development for the provision of an additional dwellinghouse on lands, zoned for the purposes of providing enterprise & employment related uses where residential use class is 'not Permitted,' would in principle materially contravene the 'EE' area zoning objective.
- 8.25. Infill housing requirements and standards

I concur with the planning case officer that the proposed development is largely in accordance with the criteria for the assessment for corner / side garden infill development as provided for in Section 12.6.8 (Infill Development) of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028.

Furthermore, I consider that the proposed dwellinghouse would provide an acceptable level of amenity in terms of internal room size and configuration, open space and storage.

Finally, I do not consider that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the amenities of the existing properties at Milltown Lodge (northwest) and Carrokeel Lodge (southeast) given the separation distance proposed between the infill

dwellinghouse and the existing properties, the mature planting along the shared property boundaries and the orientation of the principal fenestration of the proposed infill dwellinghouse, which would not overlook the adjoining properties.

8.26. New vehicular access and in-curtilage parking

The appeal site enjoys road frontage (15570mm) onto rural laneway known as Peamount Lane (Milltown Lane on Google Maps). The applicant proposes a new vehicular access onto the Lane and in-curtilage parking within the set back of the house from the subject lane (16155mm).

8.27. The laneway is an access road to 'Newcastle Golf Centre' and to residential properties located along the laneway including Milltown Lodge.

8.28. The appellant claims that Peamount Lane is a long established access route serving a number of dwellings located along the Lane. Furthermore, residential permissions have been granted along Peamount Lane over the years notwithstanding the same access road characteristics.

8.29. The planning authority consider that the Lane is substandard for additional vehicular movements, given the narrow single-carriageway width (3m) of the Lane, substandard construction and lack of footpath and lighting. The planning authority recommends a refusal of planning permission.

8.30. The appellant claims that the Lane has operated safely in its current form for many decades without footpaths or public lighting and without change in its basic layout. Furthermore, a proposal for a single family dwelling would generate a very small number of additional daily car movements.

8.31. The planning case officer considered that the proposed development by reason of increased traffic generation from the infill dwelling on a substandard road would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard. I concur with the planning case officer.

8.32. I acknowledge that Peamount Lane provides access to the existing 4 number houses and a golf centre located along the northeast section of the Lane. However, I also consider that the Lane is substandard for further residential development, including potential additional residential development on lands opposite the development site (Peamount Health campus).

- 8.33. The zoning objective on the other side of Peamount Lane from the appeal site is 'RU' (for the purposes of protecting and improving rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture) where residential is an open for consideration use in accordance with Council policy for rural housing.
- 8.34. I consider that the proposed development would set a precedent for further residential development along the substandard access laneway on lands that are zoned 'EE' (enterprise & employment), such as, the appeal site and lands that are zoned 'RU', such as, the lands on the southwest side of the lane presently forming part of the Peamount Health campus.
- 8.35. I conclude that the proposed development for an additional dwelling house on Peamount Lane by reason of increased traffic generation on a substandard road in terms of its width and construction, which is not served by footpath/s or public lighting, and by reason of the undesirable precedent for similar residential development on Peamount Lane would represent a traffic hazard.

8.36. Other Matters

The proposed development would not be served by public waste water infrastructure and that a proprietary wastewater treatment system. However, it would connect to the public water system.

I note that the Environmental Health section of the planning authority requested further information in the matter of site assessment and the details of the waste water treatment system proposed.

There was no site suitability assessment submitted with the application. Therefore, there is insufficient basis on which to determine that the site is suitable for on-site treatment and the disposal of waste water.

I do not consider these matters relevant given that the substantive matter of the zoning objective, which does not permit residential development within an 'EE' zone, would indicate a negative recommendation.

## 9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed development in-light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

The subject site is not immediate or within close proximity to a European Site. The proposed development comprises the construction of a single dwellinghouse.

No significant 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 it could not have any effect on a European Site given the small-scale nature of the development.

I conclude 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.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

### 10.1. The site is not proximate to a visible watercourse.

The proposed development comprises the construction of a single dwellinghouse.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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 the small scale and nature of the development.

I conclude based on objective information, the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration of 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

11.1. I recommend the refusal of planning permission for the following reasons and considerations.

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1.1. Having regard to the residential use proposed (single dwellinghouse) on lands zoned for the purposes of providing for enterprise and employment related uses - objective 'EE', in the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028, where residential as a use class is 'Not Permitted', as per Table 12.10 (Use Classes Related to Zoning Objective 'EE') of the Plan, it is considered that the development of this greenfield site to provide a dwellinghouse and its domestic curtilage would be contrary to the zoning provisions of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be inconsistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Furthermore, the proposed development of an additional dwelling house is unacceptable as Peamount Lane is substandard in terms of width and construction. The Lane has no footpath/public lighting. The development itself and the precedent it would set for the generation of additional traffic on the laneway would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard.

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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.



---

Anthony Abbott King  
Planning Inspector

24 March 2026

## Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500550-SD-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of a dwelling house
<b>Development Address</b>	Milltown Lodge, Peamount Lane, Newcastle, Co. Dublin, D22DE92.
<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>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,</li> <li>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)</li> </ul>	
<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. <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	<b>State the Class here</b>
<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 type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	<b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. <b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b> <b>OR</b> <b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b>	<b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>  Below 500 unit threshold
<b>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)?</b>	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: A. ASH 2

Date: 04/03/26

## Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500550-SD-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of a dwelling house
<b>Development Address</b>	Milltown Lodge, Peamount Lane, Newcastle, Co. Dublin, D22DE92.
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<b>Characteristics of proposed development</b> (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).	<b>Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed.</b> The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project and does not require demolition work. 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.
<b>Location of development</b> (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).	<b>Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed</b> The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, centres of population and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan.
<b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b>	<b>Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.</b>

(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, for a single dwelling house, 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.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Likelihood of Significant Effects</b>	<b>Conclusion in respect of EIA</b>
<b>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</b>	EIA is not required.
<b>There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</b>	
<b>There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</b>	

Inspector: A. ASDH Ly Date: 24/03/26

DP/ADP: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)