



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

**ACP PL-500569-DS-26**

<b>Development</b>	Domestic extension, refurbishment and associated works.
<b>Location</b>	4 Elmwood Avenue Lower, Ranelagh, Dublin 6.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	WEB2157/25
<b>Applicant</b>	Sinead Finnegan
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant permission subject to conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party v. decision
<b>Appellants</b>	(1) Maoiliosa Henry (2) Andrew and Aneta Byrne
<b>Observers</b>	Philip O'Reilly; Brian Murphy
<b>Prescribed Body</b>	Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	6 March 2026

**Inspector**

**B. Wyse**

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. Number 4 Elmwood Avenue Lower is a two storey, mid-terrace red brick house in the centre of Ranelagh, a short distance off Ranelagh main street. All the properties in the vicinity are serviced via a rear access lane.
- 1.2. The house currently includes a full width ground floor rear extension that takes up about half of the small rear garden or yard and a partial width original small first floor extension or return with a sloping roof above on the north east side and adjoining Number 3. The houses either side, Numbers 3 and 5, have similar paired original extensions or returns at first floor level. The house also has an accessible attic space lit by two rear facing rooflights.
- 1.3. The appellants houses are those adjoining either side (Numbers 3 and 5). Number 3 is more or less in its original format with just a small additional sunroom type extension at ground floor level. There is a substantial modern extension at ground floor level to the rear of Number 5. There is a variety of rear extensions to the houses in the general vicinity, including substantial two storey extensions. One of the nearby houses, backing onto the lane from Elmpark Avenue, includes a dormer roof extension.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development as originally proposed, included the following:
  - Demolition of existing rear extensions.
  - Construction of full width ground floor rear extension (23sqm). This would be L-shaped and extend the full depth of the garden/yard along the north east side and leaving just a small courtyard space off the access to the rear lane. The extension would accommodate a kitchen/dining area.
  - Construction of a two storey partial width extension or return above (28sqm). This would extend the full depth of the ground floor extension to the end of the garden/yard along the north east side. The upper, second floor level, would extend from an enlarged attic area or dormer. The first floor level would accommodate a bedroom and bathroom. The enlarged attic area would

accommodate a bedroom and the extended second floor level would accommodate a home office, walk-in wardrobe and bathroom.

- Refurbishment of the house generally etc.

2.2. The planning authority sought further information expressing concerns that the proposal represented over-development on a restricted site within an Architectural Conservation Area and invited revised designs to; reduce the size of the first floor extension; omit the second floor extension; and revise the design and scale of the proposed dormer.

2.3. Revised drawings submitted on 7 November 2025 provide for; a reduced first floor extension; omission of the second floor extension; and a revised dormer.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

The decision to grant permission is subject to 11 conditions.

##### **3.1.1. Conditions**

Conditions of particular note include:

Condition 1 – development to be carried out as amended by further information received on 04/11/2025. Note – this date appears to be in error. Further information documents are stamped as having been received on 07/11/2025.

Condition 3 – development to be amended so the proposed dormer window shall have a maximum width of 3500mm, be set centrally and be served by a singular central window. Reason: In the interests of orderly development and visual amenity.

Condition 4 – attic space not to be used for human habitation unless it complies with the building regulations. Reason: To provide for an adequate standard of development.

#### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

##### **3.2.1. Planning Reports (dated 10/07/2025 and 5/12/2025)**

Basis for decision. Include:

- Further information submission satisfactorily addressed the concerns raised about the first and second floors of the extension. The revised first floor

extension considered to mirror the pattern of development in the vicinity of Elmwood Avenue and the adjoining Elmpark Avenue.

- The revisions to the dormer not considered sufficient and required further amendment to allow it to sit more comfortably on the rear roof slope.
- No requirement for environmental impact assessment or appropriate assessment.

### 3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Drainage Division – recommended a grant of permission subject to standard conditions.

### 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Relevant Article 28 bodies (Architectural Conservation Area etc.) circulated but no submissions received.

Uisce Eireann – no submission received.

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

Six submissions, mostly from nearby residents, variously refer to issues relating to overdevelopment, conservation and the impact on residential amenities of adjoining properties. The issues are similar to those raised in the grounds of appeal (see Section 7.1 below).

## 4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. None relevant.

## 5.0 **Policy Context**

### 5.1. **Development Plan**

Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

**Zoning:** Z2 Residential neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas). *To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.*

The subject property is located within an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).

Section 11.5.2 ACAs. Includes:

*ACAs are designated in recognition of their special interest or unique historic and architectural character, and important contribution to the heritage of the city.*

*The protected status afforded by inclusion in an ACA only applies to the exterior of structures and features of the streetscape.*

*While the purpose of ACA designation is to protect and enhance the special character of an area, it should not be viewed as a means of preventing new development but rather to help guide and manage change to ensure developments are sympathetic to the special character of the ACA.*

Policy BHA7 ACAs. Includes:

*(a) To protect the special interest and character of all areas which have been designated as an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). 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.*

*(c) Contemporary design which is in harmony with the area will be encouraged.*

Policy BHA8 Demolition in ACAs. Includes:

*There is a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of a structure that positively contributes to the character of the ACA except in exceptional circumstances where such loss would also contribute to a significant public benefit.*

Section 15.15.2.2 Conservation Areas. Applications for development to include:

*Respect the existing setting and character of the surrounding area.*

- Be cognisant and/ or complementary to the existing scale, building height and massing of the surrounding context.*
- Protect the amenities of the surrounding properties and spaces.*
- Provide for an assessment of the visual impact of the development in the*

*surrounding context.*

- *Ensure materials and finishes are in keeping with the existing built environment.*

Appendix 18 Ancillary Residential Accommodation.

Section 1.0 Residential Extensions. Includes:

*Given the wide variety of house types and styles within Dublin City, it is not possible to deal with every type of addition. Rather, this section sets out a number of general principles that should be addressed in all cases and which will be applied by the planning authority in assessing applications for permission.*

Section 1.1 General Design Principles. Includes that applications for extensions to residential units should:

- *Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling.*
- *Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight.*
- *Achieve a high quality of design.*

Section 1.2 Extensions to Rear. Includes:

*Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining. The extension should match or complement the main house.*

*First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the planning authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities.*

*In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:*

- *Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries.*
- *Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability.*

- *Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.*
- *External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.*

Section 1.6 Sunlight and Daylight. Includes:

*Large single or two-storey rear extensions to semi-detached or terraced dwellings can, if they project too far from the main rear elevation, result in a loss of daylight to neighbouring houses. Furthermore, depending on orientation, such extensions can have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight received by adjoining properties. On the other hand, it is also recognised that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable. Consideration should be given to the proportion of extensions, height and design of roofs as well as taking account of the position of windows including rooms they serve to adjacent or adjoining dwellings.*

Section 5.0 Attic Conversions/Dormer Windows. Includes:

*The conversion of attic spaces is common practice in many residential homes. The use of an attic space for human habitation must be compliant with all of the relevant design standards, as well as building and fire regulations. Dormer windows, where proposed should complement the existing roof profile and be sympathetic to the overall design of the dwelling. The use of roof lights to serve attic bedrooms will be considered on a case-by-case basis.*

Guidance includes:

- *Use materials to complement the existing wall or roof materials of the main house.*
- *Meet building regulation requirements.*
- *Be visually subordinate to the roof slope, enabling a large proportion of the original roof to remain visible.*
- *Relate to the shape, size, position and design of the existing doors and windows on the lower floors.*
- *Be set back from the eaves level to minimise their visual impact and reduce the potential for overlooking of adjoining properties.*

## 5.2. Relevant Ministerial Guidelines

### **Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities – Department of Arts, Heritage and Gaeltacht, 2011**

Chapter 6 Development Control

Section 6.8.1 Extensions. Includes:

*The cumulative effect of minor additions can compromise the special interest of a structure and the character of an ACA. The planning authority should consider this when assessing a proposal for even small extensions.*

## 5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant.

## 6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

6.1. 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.

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. **Maoiliosa Henry, 5 Elmwood Avenue Lower**, the adjoining house to the southwest.

The main grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The further information submitted was inadequate. The first floor extension was not reduced, nor was the bedroom omitted. The second floor extension was not omitted but rather revised to increase the roof-level extension. The proposed dormer was neither centrally located nor visually subordinate to the roof.
- Section 1.1, Appendix 18 of the development plan provides general design principles for residential extensions.

- Generally extensions in the vicinity are modest in scale. The rear gardens and courtyards are retained for private amenity space. There are no extensions to attic space – rooflights only have been provided.
- The scale, mass and bulk of the proposed development remains excessive, would dominate the existing dwelling and have an adverse impact on adjacent properties.
- The proposed attic extension would set an undesirable precedent.
- The proposed development is not sympathetic to the character of the terrace and the Architectural Conservation Area.
- The proposed first floor extension contains openable bedroom and bathroom windows that would overlook the private amenity space of Number 5.
- The drawings misrepresent the extension to Number 5 – it only projects 4.5m from the rear building line and there is no extension to the south.
- The 3m high picture windows and doors in the proposed ground floor extension would overlook Number 5.
- The windows in the proposed second floor roof extension would overlook Number 5, including through rooflights to kitchen and bathroom areas and through a rear bedroom window.
- The proposal would give rise to overshadowing and overbearing relative to Number 5 which is located to the south west. No shadow profile has been provided.
- No details provided in relation to construction along common boundary walls.
- If a similar development was permitted at Number 5 there would be significant issues of overlooking and overshadowing to Numbers 4 and 6, creating a domino effect.
- The resulting site coverage, at 80%, would be nearly double that set out for conservation areas.
- The proposed c.5sqm of open space does not conform to development plan standards.

- The revised drawings fail to show; side elevations; north point; contiguous building details; and floor areas of existing and proposed development, contrary to the requirements of the regulations.

Contents of the Addendum are also noted as are the contents of the enclosed submissions to the planning authority.

7.1.2. **Andrew and Aneta Byrne, 3 Elmwood Avenue Lower**, the adjoining house to the northeast.

The main grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The revised first floor level extension remains disproportionate and would significantly impact Number 3 due to loss of natural light. Light would also be reduced at attic level.
- The contention that the revised first floor extension mirrors surrounding properties is not accurate.
- Even the modified dormer would give rise to overlooking and loss of light.
- There is a lack of technical detail in relation to several structural issues.
- The proposal would conflict with development policies relating to residential amenity, extensions and alterations, and conservation.
- The proposal would diminish the value of the outdoor amenity space at Number 3 and potentially reduce the value of the property.

7.2. **Applicant Response**

Includes:

- Cites examples of grants of permission for three storey rear returns to mid-terrace period homes at Morehampton Terrace, Dublin 4.
- Dormers are a longstanding feature of the roofscapes of Elmwood and Elmpark Avenues.
- The revised drawings submitted are in compliance with the Regulations.

- Cites examples of numerous permissions granted for similar developments on Elmwood Avenue.
- There is a large rear extension at Number 5.
- It is intended to use opaque glass in the window to the first floor bedroom to prevent overlooking.
- There would be no overlooking from ground floor windows.
- While it is not accepted that there would be any overlooking from the proposed dormer window, any screening measures deemed appropriate by ACP can be incorporated.
- No. 5 is to the south of the subject property so no overshadowing would arise.
- Technical details and construction concerns along common boundaries will be addressed by a structural engineer to ensure compliance with the building regulations.
- Given the nature of the houses in Elmwood and the surrounds higher site coverage is inevitable.
- The revised plans comply with the relevant regulations and the appellants had no difficulty in making their submissions.
- There would be no undue overshadowing to No.3 given that the proposed first floor extension is less than 4.5m in depth.
- There is no basis to the contention in relation to potential loss of property value.

Submission includes photographs that are noted.

### **7.3. Planning Authority Response**

The Commission is requested to uphold the planning authority decision subject to the attachment of a condition requiring a Section 48 development contribution.

### **7.4. Maoiliosa Henry (Number 5) response to appeal of Andrew and Aneta Byrne (Number 3)**

This indicates agreement with the appeal grounds submitted and reiterates concerns raised earlier.

**7.5. Andrew and Aneta Byrne (Number 3) response to appeal of Maoiliosa Henry (Number 5)**

This essentially indicates agreement with the grounds of appeal and reiterates concerns raised earlier.

**7.6. Observations**

**7.6.1. Brian Murphy, 4 Elmpark Avenue**

Number 4 Elmpark is located opposite the subject property on the far side of the rear lane.

Includes:

- The proposed first floor bedroom window is not in keeping with the pattern of development in the vicinity and would overlook the observers property due to its size and position.

Enclosed submission to the planning authority and photographs noted.

**7.6.2. Philip O'Reilly, 68 Gandon Close, Harolds Cross, Dublin 6W.**

Includes:

- Agreement with the third party appeals.
- The development does not adhere to the zoning objective.
- The proposal would be totally out of scale with the neighbouring environment with no regard to its residential amenity or architectural character.
- The dormer element would not be subordinate to the hosting roof profile.

Enclosed submission to the planning authority noted.

**7.7. Prescribed Bodies**

**7.7.1. Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage**

Includes:

- Noted that many properties at Elmwood Avenue have ground and first floor extensions to the rear. Most also contain roof lights to rear pitch of the roofs.

- No objection to the principle of an extension and concurs with the planning authority's initial assessment on the submitted design.
- The revised design for the ground and first floor extension is broadly acceptable.
- A slight reduction to the height of the first floor extension to sit under the eaves level and have a flush parapet would improve the overall aesthetics and impact of same.
- With respect to the proposed dormer window It is noted that the planning authority has set out revisions to this element by way of condition which would assist in limiting the impact and to which the Department agrees.
- Recommends conditions in relation to these issues.

## 8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. The main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise. The issues can be dealt with under the following headings:

- Residential Amenity
- Conservation

In the interests of clarity the assessment that follows refers to the proposed development as amended by further information submitted to the planning authority on 07/11/2026 and which is the subject of the planning authority decision to grant permission, unless otherwise stated.

### 8.2. **Residential Amenity**

8.2.1. As indicated in the development plan (Appendix 18, Section 1.0 Residential Extensions) it is not possible for the plan to address every scenario that will arise across the city. The plan, therefore, lays down general principles to be applied in the assessment of individual proposals (see Section 5.1 above). The context in the subject case is an old, established, relatively high density, neighbourhood of modest terraced houses with just small yards to the rear and a rear access lane. By definition, therefore, contemporary standards around such matters as site coverage and private

open space cannot be applied if the houses are to be extended at all in order to retain the houses in use and in a manner that reasonably meets modern living requirements.

- 8.2.2. Contrary to the assertions made in the appeals there are a wide variety of rear extensions in the immediate vicinity, many of which are quite substantial. Several of these are two storey and take up the majority of the rear yard. Number 5, the appellant adjacent to the southwest, includes a substantial single storey extension with just a small part of the yard remaining. There is also at least one example of a dormer window at a nearby property on Elmpark Avenue.
- 8.2.3. The proposed extension, as amended, and taking account of the planning authority conditions, would, in my view, be reasonably proportionate within its context and would not have any undue impacts on the residential amenities of nearby properties.
- 8.2.4. Given the location of Number 5 to the south west there is no potential for overshadowing. Also given the layout and height of the ground floor extension to Number 5 there would be no sense of overbearance, in my view. In relation to potential overlooking the only first floor window that would face Number 5 would serve a bathroom and the drawings indicate that this would be glazed with frosted/opaque glass as is standard practice. No overlooking can arise from ground floor windows. The proposed dormer extension would not, in my view, give rise to any undue overlooking, notwithstanding that nearby extensions may include rooflights.
- 8.2.5. In relation to Number 3, adjacent to the north east, I do not consider that adverse effects would arise either. The amended and reduced first floor extension would extend only about 2m beyond the adjoining first extension to Number 3 so that any increased overshadowing would be marginal. The impact of the dormer extension would also be very marginal if any. No undue overlooking would arise and there would be no significant effect on the amenity space to the rear of Number 3. I agree with the applicants that there is no basis to the contention that the proposed development would diminish the value of the property.
- 8.2.6. In relation to the observers property at Number 4 Elmpark, located to the rear and directly opposite the subject property, the main concern here is the potential overlooking arising from the first floor bedroom window. Given the constraints alluded to earlier in this type of neighbourhood it is the case that the proposed rear facing window would be in quite close proximity to the observer's property. The applicant has

stated in the appeal response that it is intended to fit opaque glass to the window to prevent overlooking and this approach has been employed at other extensions in the area. I am satisfied that this would effectively mitigate the issue. It can be required by condition.

- 8.2.7. Various issues are raised by the appellants in relation to technical details around construction, structural concerns, treatment of common boundaries and building regulations. The applicant indicates that these matters will be addressed by a structural engineer. This is standard practice as these matters do not fall within the scope of the planning system.
- 8.2.8. The appellants (Number 5) raise concerns that the drawings submitted to the planning authority as further information and amending the proposed development, do not meet the requirements of the regulations. Noting that while the regulations do lay down very specific requirements in relation to drawings to accompany an application (Article 23) no such requirements are specified in relation to further information (Article 33). I agree with the applicants, therefore, that the drawings submitted do comply with the regulations. I also note that none of the parties appear to have been disadvantaged in making submissions on the application or the appeal.
- 8.2.9. In conclusion, I consider that the appeals in relation to the issue of residential amenity should not succeed.

### 8.3. **Conservation**

- 8.3.1. The issues raised under this heading in the grounds of appeal, and in the second observer submission, focus on the contention that the proposed development does not have due regard to the architectural character of the area, noting in particular its status as an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).
- 8.3.2. As noted above many, and probably most, of the houses in the vicinity have been extended to the rear and these extensions vary widely in terms of scale and design. It is fair to say that the outlook to the rear of the properties, along both sides of the access lane, has been altered very significantly from the original and that it now contributes little in terms of architectural coherence or form. It is very much a utilitarian space, its main contribution being to facilitate the continued habitation of the houses in

line with modern living requirements. This of course is very important to maintaining the viability and upkeep of the ACA.

8.3.3. The primary architectural quality of the ACA is defined by the house frontages and the streetscapes.

8.3.4. In the context of the above, therefore, the proposed development, as amended, would, in my view, have little impact on the character of the ACA. It is not particularly dissimilar to many of the rear extensions that have been added to date and it would have no impact on the front of the house or on the local streetscapes.

8.3.5. The proposed dormer window or extension is cited as particularly problematic and I am inclined to agree that it does present something of a challenge in design terms. By reference to the development plan guidance (Appendix 18, Section 5.0 Attic Conversions/Dormer Windows) it is clear that the extension as proposed would not be subordinate to the roof slope and would leave little or none of the original roof visible (see Section 5.1 above). The planning authority Condition 3 requires the dormer to be modified so as to be no more than 3.5m wide, be centred on the roof slope and to include just one centred window. The effect of reducing the width to 3.5m would be to reduce the external width of the proposed dormer by just under 1.5m. This is significant. In my view pulling the east elevation of the dormer back from the eaves, by about 500mm, is also justified and seems to be contemplated in the second section drawing submitted as further information to the planning authority (see Drawing No.25188-SDR-506, blue line). These amendments, in combination with centring the structure on the roof plane and with the inclusion of a single window of a proportion that relates to the rear windows of the house, would result in a significantly better relationship between the new structure and the existing roof profile and would, in my view, reasonably satisfy the development plan guidance.

8.3.6. The attachment of a similar condition to the planning authority Condition 3, and generally those conditions as recommended by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, would be appropriate.

8.3.7. In conclusion, I consider that the appeals in relation to the issue of conservation should not succeed.

## 9.0 **Appropriate Assessment Screening**

- 9.1. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project within an established and serviced urban area, and taking account of the screening determination of the planning authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.2. 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. Appropriate Assessment, therefore, is not required.

## 10.0 **Water Framework Directive**

- 10.1. 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.
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project in a serviced urban area, 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.

## 11.0 **Recommendation**

- 11.1. I recommend that permission be granted subject to conditions.

## 12.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the nature of the subject property and the local area, comprising relatively dense terraced housing with small rear gardens or yards and rear access lanes, and where there is a wide variety of rear extensions in terms of scales and designs, it is considered that the proposed development, as amended in further information submitted to the planning authority and subject to the following conditions, would not injure the residential amenities of properties in the vicinity or have an

adverse effect on the character of the Architectural Conservation Area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and development of the area.

### 13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of November 2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity.

2. The proposed development shall be modified as follow:
  - (i) The rear dormer structure shall have a maximum external width of 3500mm, be reduced in depth so as to 500mm back from the existing eaves and be placed centrally on the roof plane. It shall include a single central window of a design and proportion that relates to the existing rear windows of the house.
  - (ii) The height of the first floor extension shall be reduced to sit under the eaves level of the house and the parapet shall be of a consistent height.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements, and including a full schedule of material specifications, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing, with the planning authority prior to the commencement of the development.

**Reason:** In the interest of protecting the amenities of the Architectural Conservation Area.

3. External windows serving bathrooms and the rear facing window serving the first floor bedroom shall be glazed with obscure glass.

**Reason:** In order to protect the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

4. The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

**Reason:** To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.

5. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0700 and 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 and 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

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

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

**Reason:** It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as

amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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

---

B. Wyse  
Planning Inspector

19 March 2026

## Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Domestic extension
<b>Development Address</b>	4 Elmwood Avenue Lower, Ranelagh, Dublin 6
<b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK</b>	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(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)	
<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	

<p><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></p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b></p>	<p><b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b></p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	<p><b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b></p>
<p><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></p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b></p>

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_ B. Wyse \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ 19March 2026 \_\_\_\_\_