



## Inspector's Report

**PL-500599-DN-26**

<b>Development</b>	First-floor extension for a toilet and shower room.
<b>Location</b>	13 Kirwan Street, Stoneybatter, Dublin 7, D07 C9Y2.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council North
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	WEB5381/25
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Christopher McGeady
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant Permission + Conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	John & Norette Burke
<b>Observer(s)</b>	Damian Ryan Muirin Gowen
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> of March 2025
<b>Inspector</b>	Adrian Ormsby

## Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision .....	4
4.0	Planning History.....	5
5.0	Policy Context.....	5
5.1.	Dublin City Development Plan 2022-28 .....	5
5.2.	Relevant Guidance .....	8
5.3.	Natural Heritage Designations.....	8
6.0	EIA Screening.....	9
7.0	The Appeal .....	9
8.0	Assessment .....	12
8.1.	Introduction.....	12
8.2.	Principle of the Development.....	12
8.3.	Built Heritage considerations including scale bulk and massing .....	12
8.4.	Residential Amenity considerations i.e. Daylight and Sunlight impacts, overshadowing and overbearing. ....	13
8.5.	Concerns regarding legal entitlement to build over laneway.....	17
9.0	AA Screening.....	18
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	18
11.0	Recommendation.....	19
12.0	Reason .....	19
	<b>Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening .....</b>	<b>21</b>

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located in a residential area characterised by a 2-storey terraced housing backing onto a terrace of single storey houses. The application site fronts onto Kirwan Street and backs onto the rear of houses on Kirwan Cottages. The subject site includes a two storey brick finish house.
- 1.2. The Commission is advised that on the date of the site inspection the rear wall of No. 13 has been removed and hoarded up. This appears to be shown as a temporary wall on the submitted drawing no. 1672.15.
- 1.3. Having inspected the site the Commission is advised that existing site layout drawing no. 1672.30 does not accurately reflect the footprint of the subject site with the rear protrusion not evident on site.
- 1.4. It is also evident from the same drawing and also the proposed site layout drawing no 1672.35 that the footprint of number 14 Kirwan Street (Appellant site), the rear of no 13 Kirwan Street Cottages (Observer) and the rear protrusion to No. 12 Kirwan Street are not accurately shown.
- 1.5. The stated site area is 0.006ha.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The application comprises-

- A first floor extension with toilet and shower room
- Floor area-
  - Existing- 65.66 sq.m
  - Proposed- 6.2 sq.m
- The extension is shown as extending 2.6m from the existing first floor rear elevation leaving c. 2.13m to the rear boundary of the application site.
- The extension is shown to a height of 5.56m with a flat roof.
- The external walls of the proposal are to be finished in brick.

The application is accompanied by a Daylight & Sunlight Impact Report prepared by Solearth and a Construction Management Plan.

- 2.2. The Commission should note there is an extant permission on this site for a ground floor extension that is not yet constructed. It appears the subject application intends to build the extension subject to the permitted ground floor extension. In this regard it is considered the proposed development description does not accurately describe the extent of development actually proposed.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

Permission was granted subject to 8 no. standard conditions.

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

##### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

- The planning report dated 24-11-25 can be summarised as follows-
  - The site is governed by the land use zoning Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) – Zone Z2 with objective ‘To protect, and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas’, under which residential extensions are permitted in principle.
  - Key considerations include planning history of the site, impact on adjoining properties including the character of the area and residential amenity.
  - The development was found not to seriously injure the amenities of the area or property in the vicinity.

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

Drainage Division: No objection subject to conditions

#### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

- TII- Section 49 levy if applicable

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

- Four received. The concerns raised are similar to those summarised in the appeal below.

## 4.0 Planning History

4.1. WEB2734/24 / ACP ref. ABP-322349-25. Permission granted 06/08/2025 subject to conditions. Condition 2 stated-

*2. The proposed development shall be amended by the omission in its entirety of the proposed first-floor extension. Revised drawings showing compliance with this requirement shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority, prior to commencement of development.*

*Reason: To preserve the character and appearance of the residential conservation area and in the interest of residential amenity.*

A note to the Direction stated-

*“In the absence of a daylight and sunlight analysis, there was inadequate information available for the Commission to be satisfied that that the proposed first floor extension, would not have a negative impact on the residential amenities of the properties in the vicinity.”*

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-28

- The site is zoned ‘Z2 - Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas)’ with a stated objective ‘*To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.*’
- Chapter 11- Built Heritage and Archaeology

- *BHA9- “To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin’s Conservation Areas – identified under Z8 and Z2 zoning objectives and denoted by red line conservation hatching on the zoning maps. Development within or affecting a Conservation Area 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.*

*Enhancement opportunities may include:*

- 1. Replacement or improvement of any building, feature or element which detracts from the character of the area or its setting.*
- 2. Re-instatement of missing architectural detail or important features.*
- 3. Improvement of open spaces and the wider public realm and reinstatement of historic routes and characteristic plot patterns.*
- 4. Contemporary architecture of exceptional design quality, which is in harmony with the Conservation Area.*
- 5. The repair and retention of shop and pub fronts of architectural interest.*
- 6. Retention of buildings and features that contribute to the overall character and integrity of the Conservation Area.*
- 7. The return of buildings to residential use.*

*Changes of use will be acceptable where in compliance with the zoning objectives and where they make a positive contribution to the character, function and appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting. The Council will consider the contribution of existing uses to the special interest of an area when assessing change of use applications, and will promote compatible uses which ensure future long-term viability.*

- Chapter 15- Development Standards-
  - Section 15.15.2.2- Conservation Areas (including Z2)

*All planning applications for development in Conservation Areas shall:*

- *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.*
- *Positively contribute to the existing streetscape Retain historic trees also as these all add to the special character of an ACA, where they exist.*

*Further guidance on Conservation Areas is set out in Chapter 11 Section 11.5.2-*

- Volume 2- Appendix 16 is titled 'Sunlight and Daylight'
  - Section 3.0 and 3.1 discusses BR 209 (2011) – Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A Guide to Good Practice (Second Edition).
  - Section 3.6 is titled 'Understanding and Expectations' and states
 

*“If, over the coming years, a revised version of BR 209 is to be issued, the guidance within this new version will take precedence.”*
  - A revised version of BR 209 (2011) issued in 2022 and therefore it takes precedence.
- Volume 2- Appendix 18 deals with Residential Extensions.
  - Section 1.2 deals with extensions to rear and states-
 

*“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 Daylight and Sunlight-
- “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.”*

## **5.2. Relevant Guidance**

- BR 209 (2022) – Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A Guide to Good Practice

## **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

The proposed development is not located within or immediately adjacent to any European 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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Please refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The main planning grounds of the third-party appeal are summarised below-

- Appellants are residents of 14 Kirwan Street the attached property to the east of the application site.
- Compliance with DCDP policy and impacts on conservation area. Identifies policy BHA9. Proposal is not sensitive to the setting and character of the area.
- Scale, bulk and overbearing.
  - Does not align with existing scale, height and massing of surrounding context.
  - Kirwan St are two storey terraced properties.
  - Addition of a first floor sets an undesirable precedent, significantly impacts historical scale and massing of the area.
  - Precedents cited by the Applicant are not appropriate to the context of the site as described.
  - Kirwan Cottages are to the rear of the site.
  - Refers to ACP Inspectors comments on ABP-322349-25 regarding relationship between Kirwan Cottages to rear and Kirwan Street-proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the residential conservation area contrary to BHA9 and the Z2 zoning objective.

- Loss of light- Does not protect amenities of adjoining properties, significant impacts upon light and privacy.
  - There are deficiencies in the submitted Daylight and Sunlight Assessment- no map clearly identifying windows considered
  - It is not accepted that there will be no noticeable reduction in daylight (VSC). Refers to DCC planning report and references to the 45 degree rule of thumb.
  - Appellant enjoys high quality sunlight into home. Impacts to same will reduce enjoyment of the home. The Appellant's bedroom closest to proposal receives highest quality sunlight. The proposal less than a meter away will reduce the amount of receivable light.
  - Refers to 'original observation' and comments from Chris Shakleton a daylight and sunlight specialist which disagreed with the conclusions reached in the applicants report i.e.-
    - *For existing neighbouring dwellings who's daylight might be impacted on by a proposed development, the BRE document sets out a two step test; stating that a kitchen, living room, or bedroom window may be adversely affected if, after the proposed development: the centre of the window in question has a vertical sky component (VSC) of less than 27% and its VSC is less than 0.8 times its former value (i.e. more than 20% loss)"*

The proposal represents a change ratio of 0.72 and is non complaint as it results in a loss of 28% of skylight, above the 20% indicated in the methodology above.

- A number of photographs are including showing rear first floor window and roof lights windows of ground floor rear return.

## 7.2. Applicant Response in the case of a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Appeal

- None on file

## 7.3. Planning Authority Response

- None on file

#### 7.4. Observations

- Observations were received from
  - Damian Ryan of 13 Kirwan Cottages generally to rear of application site
  - Muirin Gowen of 13 Kirwan Cottages generally to rear of application site
- These observations are summarised as follows-
  - Proposed extension would be overbearing due to height and proximity to rear boundary. Proposal exceeds height of eaves level of existing house and visible from Kirwan Cottages.
  - Although reduced in depth the proposal would cause overshadowing and loss of light.
  - Concerns regarding construction over laneway between Kirwan Cottages and Kirwan Street. There has been no legal resolution to ownership of the lane. There are also construction related impacts to existing properties overhanging the lane e.g. rainwater run-off. Rear doors to the lane act as fire or emergency exits.
  - The submitted Daylight and Sunlight Analysis does not provide adequate information to be satisfied the proposal would not negatively impact residential amenities of properties in the area. There are shortcomings as described in the observation. The 5 windows identified as impacted are incorrectly mapped. South facing double doors to bedroom not considered or bathroom. There is also a small yard not built upon which benefits from sunshine.
  - Precedents referred to by applicant do not reflect the proposal.
  - Proposal would significantly alter the existing historic streetscape of the residential conservation area.

## 8.0 Assessment

### 8.1. Introduction

8.1.1. Having considered all of the above and the information on file I am satisfied the substantive matters for consideration in this appeal are as follows-

- Principle of the development
- Built Heritage considerations including scale bulk and massing
- Residential Amenity considerations i.e. Daylight and Sunlight impacts, overshadowing and overbearing.
- Concerns regarding legal entitlement to build over laneway

### 8.2. Principle of the Development

8.2.1. The site is zoned Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) with an objective *'To protect, and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas'*. The proposed development for a residential extension is an acceptable development in this context subject to other planning considerations discussed below.

### 8.3. Built Heritage considerations including scale bulk and massing

8.3.1. The site is located within a Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) as per the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-28. Number 13 Kirwan Street is a two storey dwelling. The proposed extension is located to the rear of number 13 and will not be visible from Kirwan Street. I am satisfied there will be no adverse impact in this regard.

8.3.2. Kirwan Cottages to the rear of the application site is also zoned Z2 with the same zoning objective. Kirwan Cottages are characterised by single storey dwellings and a triangular style housing layout around the roads.

8.3.3. The roof of the existing dwelling and its eaves are visible from the more northerly parts of the public realm of Kirwan Cottages to the rear of the application site. However it should be noted the current condition of the rear elevation i.e. temporary walls was not overly evident during my inspection.

- 8.3.4. The proposed development is a first floor extension shown to a height of 5.56m with a flat roof. The proposed rear elevation does extend partially above the eaves of the existing houses as shown in drawing no. 1672.25. The external width of the proposed extension appears to be c.3m wide, with the walls to be finished in brick consistent with finishes to housing in the area. I do not consider the proposed scale, bulk or massing excessive in this context.
- 8.3.5. The area of the proposed first floor extension will be visible from public areas generally the further north a person is on the triangular layout. However, I do not consider the extent of visibility, the intrusion above the eaves or the materials proposed would significantly detract from the Z2 zoning objective nor do I consider it would be contrary to or inconsistent with policy BHA9.
- 8.3.6. I note policy BHA9 requires development within Z2 zoning areas to 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. It then details possible enhancement opportunities. In this regard it is considered the proposal to redevelop an existing house for residential use is consistent with Policy BHA9 and therefore I am satisfied the proposal would contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness of Kirwan Street without negatively or detrimentally impacting Kirwan Cottages.
- 8.3.7. I note precedents cited by the Applicant in support of the application. I also note the arguments to these put forward by the Appellant and Observers. I do not consider the provision of precedent examples has any significant bearing on the subject application. However I did observe the first floor rear extension to No. 6 Kirwan Street and I do not consider this to have any significant adverse impact to the character or setting of the Z2 zoning.

8.4. **Residential Amenity considerations i.e. Daylight and Sunlight impacts, overshadowing and overbearing.**

- 8.4.1. The Commission are referred to the recent Planning History of this site. Planning reference number WEB2734/24 / ACP ref. ABP-322349-25 was granted permission on the 06/08/2025 by the Commission. However condition 2 of the permission stated-

*“The proposed development shall be amended by the omission in its entirety of the proposed first-floor extension. Revised drawings showing compliance with this requirement shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority, prior to commencement of development.*

*Reason: To preserve the character and appearance of the residential conservation area and in the interest of residential amenity.”*

8.4.2. A note to the Commission’s ‘Direction’ stated-

*“In the absence of a daylight and sunlight analysis, there was inadequate information available for the Commission to be satisfied that that the proposed first floor extension, would not have a negative impact on the residential amenities of the properties in the vicinity.”*

8.4.3. The Applicant has now submitted a Daylight & Sunlight Report carried out by ‘Solearth’. In terms of Daylight.

- Section 3 of the report states-

*“Of 19 neighbours windows (including roof windows) assessed for potential impacts, none were deemed to be noticeably impacted”*

- The Commission are referred to the diagram on page 9 of the report in which 19 windows and roof windows are identified.
- Section 4.3 deals with Scoping and considers what is in and what is out. Section 4.3.2 ‘Ex Scope Neighbouring Dwellings:’ states-

*“Assessment of impact to neighbours private outdoor amenity space, as the entirety of the subject building’s ground floor site areas are built over.”*

- Section 6.1 is titled ‘Assessment Process’ and details the creation of a 3D computer model as presented.
- Section 6.2.3 details ‘Test Scenarios and Assumptions -Neighbours’ and highlights how exact information was not available. It details it used information received from the architect amongst other things to develop the model. This appears to suggest the author of the report did not inspect the site and observe properties, amenity spaces and windows evident from the site.
- Section 7.4 sets out the conclusion and states-

*“The proposed development has been successfully designed to avoid any noticeable impacts to the daylight availability and sunlight access of the neighbouring residence assessed.”*

8.4.4. Having inspected the site the Commission is advised that-

- There are small areas considered ‘*private outdoor amenity space*’ to the rear of 14 Kirwan Street and to both the rears of No. 12 and 13 Kirwan Cottages.
  - While the size of these spaces are very small it is likely the spaces do benefit from some access to sunlight especially from the west in the evening time.
  - The footprint of No. 14 Kirwan Street and 13 Kirwan Cottages are incorrectly shown on the submitted drawings.
  - The assertion provided in Section 4.3.2 of the report and detailed above is therefore not considered accurate.
- There are existing windows at the ground level to the rear of both No. 12 and 13 Kirwan Cottages facing southwards not considered in the submitted report.
  - The rear of no. 12 face directly towards the proposed extension. The window on the rear elevation is to a door. The window is not full length and I could not determine the room usage.
  - The observer from No. 13 states there is a-

*‘South facing double doors on my rear bedroom’*

The double door windows are in situ. They are quite large and nearly full length.
  - Both windows to No. 12 and 13. are to small areas of open space with rear boundary walls in close proximity. However they are likely to provide internal access to daylight and sunlight.
  - The footprint to No. 13 Kirwan Cottages is incorrectly shown on the submitted drawings.
- There are two windows and one glazed door to the east elevation of the rear return to no. 12 Kirwan Street. The house to the immediate west of the application site.

- Although no submission has been received from the owner of the property the first floor extension is considered likely to impact these windows to some extent.
- The footprint of this property is incorrectly shown on the submitted drawings.

8.4.5. It is clear the submitted 'Daylight and Sunlight Impact Report' has not considered the following-

- South facing double doors with sizeable glass panes to a bedroom at rear of No. 13 Kirwan Cottages
- South facing door to rear of No. 12 Kirwan Cottages directly facing the proposed extension.
- Three areas of east facing fenestration to ground floor rear return of No. 12 Kirwan Street directly facing proposed extension.
- Existing private amenity spaces to No. 14 Kirwan Street and No. 13 Kirwan Cottages.

In this regard it is considered the submitted 'Daylight and Sunlight Impact Report' does not accurately present the current situation on the ground at the site and of neighbouring properties, nor does it identify all fenestration likely impacted by the proposed development and therefore the report cannot be relied upon to demonstrate the likely impact of the proposed development upon daylight and sunlight impacts to existing residential properties.

8.4.6. I have reviewed BR 209 (2022) - Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A Guide to Good Practice. Section 1.6 of BRE 209 specifically details that the advice given is not mandatory and should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy. However, it is considered appropriate that these measures are used to consider the impacts of the proposed development upon existing residential amenity.

8.4.7. BR 209 provides a number of measures that contribute to assessing 'Daylight and Sunlight' impacts. In this regard I note-

- Summary Box 2.1.21 of BR 209 details that obstructions (such as the proposed development) can limit access to light from the sky to existing properties.

- Summary Box 2.2.23 and Figure 20 provides a 'Decision Chart' or flow chart for considering diffuse daylight in existing buildings and the impact of proposed developments.
- Section 3.2 provides guidance in relation to safeguarding access of sunlight to interiors of existing dwellings.
- Section 3.3 of BRE 209 considers the impact of development on sunlight to existing amenity spaces such as private gardens.

8.4.8. I am satisfied with accurate and dimensioned drawings that show correct footprints, locations of all existing windows and existing boundaries etc I can assess the proposed development based on the criteria identified in BR 209. However based on the inaccurate information submitted and on file, I am not in a position to carry out an assessment of these impacts.

8.4.9. It is therefore recommended that permission should be refused for the development as proposed.

## 8.5. **Concerns regarding legal entitlement to build over laneway**

8.5.1. I note concerns raised in observations regarding the Applicant's entitlement to develop over a laneway to the rear of the site but shared between the properties of Kirwan Street and Kirwan Cottages. Having inspected the site and considered the information on file, there is some evidence to suggest a laneway may have existed as suggested. However it is noted the area of the laneway appears to have been developed considerably at this time. I do not consider rear doors to the houses of Kirwan Cottages to necessarily be fire exit doors as suggested in one observation.

8.5.2. The observer's concerns appears to relate to title of the alleged laneway. Section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines 2007 deals with this very matter and clearly states-

*"The planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land; these are ultimately matters for resolution in the Courts. In this regard, it should be noted that, as section 34(13) of the Planning Act states, a person is not entitled solely by reason of a permission to carry out any development."*

8.5.3. The Applicant has submitted land registry and folio details that suggests the application site boundary is within his ownership and therefore it is considered he is entitled to make the application. I am satisfied the applicant has demonstrated sufficient legal interest in this regard. Any decision to grant permission would in any event be subject to section 34 (13) of the Act.

## 9.0 AA Screening

9.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on any European sites in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required. This determination is based on:

- The small scale and nature of the scheme,
- The urban location of the site,
- The separation distance from nearest European site, and
- The lack of a direct or indirect pathway to any designated site.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The subject site is located in Dublin City. There are no watercourses within the appeal site and no water bodies in close proximity to the site. The River Liffey is c. 700m south of the application site. No water deterioration concerns are raised in the planning application or appeal.

10.2. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.

10.3. 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.

10.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows-

- The small scale and nature of the development
- Location-distance from nearest water bodies
- Lack of hydrological connections

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

## 11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission is refused for the following reason-

## 12.0 Reason

1. Based on the information on file including inaccuracies in the submitted drawings and deficiencies in the submitted 'Daylight & Sunlight Impact Report' the Commission is not satisfied that the proposed development would not have significant and negative impacts upon the residential amenity of existing neighbouring properties. Accordingly the proposed development is considered contrary to the 'Z2 - Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas)' zoning objective which seeks 'to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas and contrary to 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 me, directly*

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

---

Adrian Ormsby  
Senior Planning Inspector

18<sup>th</sup> of March 2026

### Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500599-DN-26
<b>Proposed Development</b>	First Floor Extension
<b>Development Address</b>	13 Kirwan Street, Dublin 7
<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.
(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.</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 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. <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>	
<input 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>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"/>	<b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b> [Delete if not relevant]
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b> [Delete if not relevant]

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

Date: \_\_\_\_\_