



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500642-DR-26

Development	Redevelopment and extension of house with associated works.
Location	14 Saint Thomas Road, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, A94 AE89
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25B/0626/WEB
Applicant(s)	Ian and Chloe Mullen
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Michael and Bernadette Gill
Observer(s)	None

Date of Site Inspection

3rd April 2026

Inspector

Paul Christy

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	5
2.0	Proposed Development	5
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	5
3.2.	Planning Authority Reports.....	6
3.3.	Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4.	Third Party Observations.....	6
4.0	Planning History.....	7
4.1.	Saint Thomas Road.....	7
4.2.	Wider Locality:.....	7
5.0	Policy Context.....	8
5.1.	National Guidelines: Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024 (Dept. of Housing, Local Government and Heritage).....	8
5.2.	Development Plan: Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan, 2022-2028.....	8
5.3.	Natural Heritage Designations.....	9
6.0	EIA Screening.....	9
7.0	Water Framework Directive Screening	10
8.0	The Appeal	11
8.1.	Grounds of Appeal.....	11
8.2.	Applicants' Response	11
8.3.	Planning Authority Response	13
8.4.	Observations	13

8.5.	Appellants' Comments On Applicants' Response To Appeal	13
8.6.	Planning Authority Comments On Applicants' Response To Appeal.....	14
9.0	Assessment	15
9.1.	Overview	15
9.2.	Amenities of No.12 Saint Thomas Road (The Appellants' Property)	15
9.3.	Amenities of No.16 Saint Thomas Road.....	23
9.4.	Other Matters	25
10.0	AA Screening.....	26
11.0	Recommendation.....	26
12.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	27
13.0	Conditions.....	27

Appendix A – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located in a large, suburban area of Blackrock, south Dublin characterised by a typical suburban layout comprised of detached and semi-detached dwellings. The subject property is a two-storey, semi-detached hipped roof dwelling with a typical front garden and a more generous, lengthy rear garden c.38m in length from the rear elevation of the main module of the dwelling.
- 1.2. On the north-eastern side, a single-storey annex (3.03m in height) runs along the full depth of the dwelling and wraps around part of the rear elevation also. In turn, what appears to be a rear porch then projects from the rear of the single-storey extension. The single-storey annex is set back 0.84m from the party boundary along its full length. The main two-storey module is set back c.3.4m from the party boundary on the north-eastern side.
- 1.3. On the south-western side, the single-storey annex to the rear is set back c.3.6m from the party boundary with No.16.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development includes:
 - The removal of the existing ground floor annex.
 - The development of a significantly increased footprint at ground floor level, relative to the existing ground floor annex. The proposed ground floor is in close proximity to the neighbouring properties on either side.
 - Two-storey development along the north-eastern side of the main module, with an additional two-storey projection situated broadly within the centre of the plot.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

- 3.1. Decision: Grant permission, subject to conditions. December, 2025.
Condition 2 is relevant to the appeal and provides as follows: *'The glazing within the first-floor bathroom and walk in wardrobe rooms on the side elevation shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable. REASON: In the interests of residential amenities.'*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. [Planning Report]: One report on file dated 23rd December, 2025. The report addresses the proposed upper floor (subject of the concerns in the third party appeal) as follows.

3.2.2. In the section headed 'Rear Extension', the key comments include that:

- *'the proposed works are centralised within the rear of the subject dwelling and are significantly set back from both party boundaries';*
- no windows are proposed side elevations;
- undue overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing impacts are unlikely and the residential amenity of the adjoining dwellings will be maintained.

3.2.3. In the section headed 'Side Extension', the key comments include:

- *'A side first floor extension is proposed to be constructed over the existing single-storey flat roof element¹.'*
- *'The proposed works will be largely constructed to match the existing dwelling in terms of design and height and will be setback from the existing party boundary with no.12. Excessive overshadowing and overbearing impacts are therefore considered to be avoided'.*

3.2.4. [Drainage Planning]: No objections, subject to standard conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. Two observations received.

3.4.2. An observation submitted by 'Studio 3 Architecture' on behalf of Michael and Bernadette Gill (the Appellants) addressed separate concerns in relation to the proposed ground floor and first floor. The first floor concerns are covered in the grounds of appeal (refer Section 8.1). The concerns in relation to the first floor are:

- Extent, extending 7m behind the existing two-storey house, adding a room of 60m² is excessive. The height, at 3.2m, also seems unnecessarily high at the boundary.

¹ It is infact proposed to remove the existing ground floor side extension and construct a two-storey side extension in its place.

- Request that the depth is reduced to 5m so that it is approximately in line with the rear extensions of Nos. 12 and 16. Also request a reduction in the height.

3.4.3. An observation submitted by 'Studio 3 Architecture' on behalf of the owners of No. 16 Saint Thomas Road located immediately to the south-west of the subject property (Orla O'Grady Walshe) includes the following concerns:

- Proposal is oversized and will have a negative effect on their current enjoyment of their property, particularly their outdoor space.

- Ground Floor Extension:

~ Is excessive, will eliminate eastern light and be extremely imposing on their patio area. The height at 3.2m seems unnecessarily high at the boundary, and the depth of the roof build up seems excessive.

~ Request: a reduction of the depth of the extension so that it is in line with the extensions of the properties on either side; and that the flat roof be stepped downwards along the boundary above the kitchen area.

- First Floor Extension: While the first floor is set back from the boundary, believe that it is too large and will have a serious effect on the quantity of morning light they currently enjoy. Neither of the adjacent properties have extended at first floor level. An attic room could be achieved without any impact on adjacent properties.
- Request that the first floor is omitted. If the first floor is permitted, a flat roof be considered to reduce the impact of overshadowing.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. **Saint Thomas Road**

- P.A. Ref. D20A/0665 (No.22) (Includes) Two-storey extension to side and rear; and ground floor rear extension. 2020 Grant.
- P.A. Ref. D14B/0140 (No.20) (Includes) Single-storey rear extension. 2014 Grant.
- P.A. Ref. D20A/0962 (Includes) Single-storey extension to side and rear. 2021 Grant.

4.2. **Wider Locality:**

- P.A. Ref. D19B/0056, ACP Ref. 304281 (13 The Rise, Mount Merrion) First floor extension and hipped roof. 2019 Refusal of upper floor property

to side/rear of dwelling on grounds of overbearance and overdominance viewed from adjoining property.

- P.A. Ref. D24A/0706/WEB, ACP Ref. 321332-24 (15 The Rise, Mount Merrion) Inter Alia, Ground Floor Extension. 2024 Decision to remove P.A. Conditions restricting/reducing scale of extension.
- P.A. Ref. D17A/0278, ACP Ref. 248692 (17 North Avenue, Mount Merrion) First Floor and Ground Floor Extensions. 2017 Grant.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Guidelines: Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024 (Dept. of Housing, Local Government and Heritage)

5.1.1. Section 5.3.1 'Separation Distances', SPPR 1 includes, inter alia:

'There shall be no specified minimum separation distance at ground level or to the front of houses, duplex units and apartment units in statutory development plans and planning applications shall be determined on a case-by-case basis to prevent undue loss of privacy.'

In all cases, the obligation will be on the project proposer to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the planning authority or An Bord Pleanála that residents will enjoy a high standard of amenity and that the proposed development will not have a significant negative impact on the amenity of occupiers of existing residential property.'

5.2. Development Plan: Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan, 2022-2028

5.2.1. Zoning: The subject site lies within Land Use Zoning Objective A. The relevant objective is: 'To provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.'

5.2.2. Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation: Policy Objective PHP19 (includes): 'It is a Policy Objective to: Conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaptation of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF'.

5.2.3. Residential Amenity

~ Development Management Standard 12.3.7.1(ii) Extensions to the Rear (Ground Floor): *'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.'

~ Development Management Standard 12.3.7.1(ii) Extensions to the Rear (First Floor): *'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 (includes, inter alia):*

- *Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries.*
- *Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries'.*

~ Development Management Standard 12.3.7.1(iii) Extensions to the Side (Ground Floor): *'will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity'.*

~ Development Management Standard 12.3.7.1(iii) Extensions to the Side (First Floor): *'First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. However, in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front façade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.'*

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. The site is located: 1.28km to the south-west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (Site Code 004024); 1.28km to the south-west of the Booterstown Marsh Proposed Natural Heritage Area (Site Code 001205); and c.1.45km to the south-west of the South Dublin Bay Proposed Natural Heritage Area (Site Code 000210).

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 in Appendix of this report). 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).

7.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

- 7.1. The subject site is located: c.960m to the north-west of, and c.1.26km to the south of the Brewery Stream river waterbody (IE_EA_09B130400); c.875m to the west of the Dublin Bay coastal waterbody (IE_EA_09_0000); and is situated over the Dublin ground waterbody (IE_EA_G_008).
- 7.2. The main elements of the proposed development are set out at para. 2.1 above. In addition, it is proposed to dispose of surface water via an on-site soakaway, and to connect to the existing public sewer connection at the adjacent public road.
- 7.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 7.4. I have assessed the proposed redevelopment and extension of the subject dwelling, the associated site works, and the proposed disposal of surface water via an on-site soakaway and disposal of foul effluent to the existing public mains sewer, 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.
- Whilst there is a potential hydrogeological pathway between the site and the Dublin ground waterbody as a result of soil exposure during groundworks and excavation during the construction, given the small-scale of the proposed development and the assimilative capacity of the waterbody, which will dilute any potential effects, it can be concluded that there is no conceivable risk to this waterbody either qualitatively or quantitatively.
 - The nearest surface waterbody, the Dublin Bay coastal waterbody, is located c.875m to the east of the subject site, and there is no known hydrological connection between the two. Furthermore, it is proposed to dispose of effluent via the adjacent public sewer system.
- 7.5. Conclusion: 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.

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

8.1.1. One no. appeal was received from Michael and Bernadette Gill, the owners of No.12 Saint Thomas Road (the property located immediately to the north-east of the subject property). The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Residential amenity: In their observations submitted to the Local Authority, they were particularly concerned about part of the first floor extension to the rear of the subject property (the ensuite bathroom). In their opinion, it will be overbearing and overshadowing when viewed from their patio.
- Inaccuracies (underestimation) in the Local Authority Planner's report: Refer to the description in the Report of the location of the first floor extension relative to the party boundaries (*'the proposed works are centralised within the rear of the subject dwelling and are significantly set back from both party boundaries'*). The first floor extension is not centralised within the rear of the subject dwelling. Thus the conclusions in the Planner's report dismissing any concerns re overshadowing, overbearance etc are *'inaccurate and unreliable'*.
- (In)Consistency of the Local Authority: Compares subject proposal with *'an almost identical proposal'* nearby (No.13 'The Rise'). The Local Authority refused a first application on the grounds of detrimental impacts on adjacent residential amenities. The Authority granted permission for a subsequent application but imposed a condition omitting an element of the first floor to protect adjacent residential amenities².

8.1.2. Conclude by requesting that the proposed en-suite bathroom on the first-floor (located at the south-eastern 'corner' of the proposed first floor) be omitted by condition.

8.2. Applicants' Response

8.2.1. A Response was submitted by 'Manahan Planners' on behalf of the Applicants. A 'Daylight and Sunlight Assessment Report' prepared by 'H3D' (Daylight and Sunlight Consultants) was submitted with the Response. The Response is comprised of six sub-sections [(a) – (f)] and can be summarised as follows:

² The Commission refused an appeal at this site, ACP Ref. 304281-19 and this case is considered as part of my assessment at Section 9 below.

(a) [Scale and Height of Ground Floor Concerns]:

Refers to the reasons for acceptance of the ground floor in the Local Authority report including: *'similarly large rear extensions on Saint Thomas Road'*; the ground floor element being a modest projection beyond the rear building line of the adjoining properties; the proposed 3.2m height is considered modest; other ground floor extensions in the area have varying and in some cases higher roof profiles; the setback from both properties.

(b) [First Floor Extension Concerns]:

Rehearse the Local Authority's assessment, and acceptance of: the proposed master bedroom and ensuite; and the proposed first floor side extension. Re the latter, also note the *'additional safeguard'* contained in the requirement in Condition 2 for opaque or frosted glazing for the proposed first floor gable windows on the north-eastern side.

Refer to the overshadowing analysis report submitted with the Response and the conclusion that the proposed development will not give rise to any unacceptable overshadowing of the Appellants' property or patio.

(c) [Ground Floor Window Proximity Concerns (On North-eastern Elevation ie. on Appellants' side)]³: Repeat their comments in relation to the first floor windows (refer above).

(d) [Alleged Inaccuracy In Planner's Assessment]:

The term used by the Planner ie. *'centralised within the rear'* *'reasonably describes the general positioning of the first floor extension element in the context of the overall rear elevation of the building'*.

The first floor setback of 840mm (from the north-eastern boundary), combined with the subsidiary scale of the first floor works relative to the main dwelling, the absence of overlooking windows on the side elevations, and the conclusion of the overshadowing analysis report demonstrates that residential amenity at No.12 is adequately protected. The Planner's conclusions remain sound.

(e) [Expert Report Submitted With Response]: This commentary includes technical data (standards, and measurements against these standards). It refers to an 'Overall Conclusion', which Conclusion states that *'Daylighting and Sunlighting would not be significantly affected'*.

(f) [Alleged Inconsistency With Previous Decision (Nearby No.13 The Rise)]:

Each application must be assessed on its own merits;

³ This concern was referenced in the Appellants' submission to the Local Authority, but not in the Appeal.

The subject site differs from the other referenced site in terms of specific configuration, boundary relationships, orientation, and the design and layout of the proposed extension

The current Development Plan is a different Plan to that in force at the time of the earlier decisions.

8.3. Planning Authority Response

- 8.3.1. Refers the Commission to the previous Planner's report and considers that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the Authority, would justify a change of attitude.

8.4. Observations

- 8.4.1. None.

8.5. Appellants' Comments On Applicants' Response To Appeal

- 8.5.1. On 27 April 2026, in accordance with Section 131 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended), the Commission wrote to the Appellants inviting a submission or observation in relation to the Applicants' response to the Appeal. The Appellants responded on 7th May, 2026. The response contains both reiterations of issues previously raised in their Appeal, and new issues/commentary. The new issues and commentary may be summarised as follows:

- Disagree with Applicants' statement that their (the Appellants') rear extension is above average height and volume. Also note that Fig. 3 in the Applicants' statement is incorrect as a subsequent revised plan was approved by the Local Authority.
- Refute the Applicants' assertions that developments permitted by the Local Authority at Nos. 8, 20 and 22 Saint Thomas Road set a precedent for the proposed development on basis that: the referenced cases had different spatial contexts; and the subject extension is '*considerably larger and extending further into the garden than any of the six semi-detached houses*'⁴.
- Challenge the 'Daylight and Sunlight Assessment' report submitted with the Applicants response:

⁴ Saint Thomas Road is comprised of a mixture of detached and semi-detached houses. The subject property is in the middle of three pairs of semi-detached houses.

- ~ The Authors acknowledge that the extension will throw shadow in the evening but, whilst providing shadow diagrams for 10am, 12pm, 2pm and 4pm, they leave out the times the Appellants are concerned about (6-8pm) and those which impact on No.16 (6-8am). They do include an analysis of 6pm on 21st June but this is when the sun is at its highest and shadows at their shortest.
- ~ Appellants have undertaken their own analysis using tools at suncalc.org. to establish shadow lengths and angles. Data is provided in a table, and the data is also transcribed onto drawings of both the development as proposed, and *'should the first floor extension be truly centralised'*.
- ~ Conclude that should the proposal go ahead as planned, the shadowing *'is very substantial'*.
- ~ Also conclude that similar shadowing will occur at No.16 for 6-8am.
- ~ The conclusion in the Report that *'All garden spaces of the nearest adjoining properties pass the analysis for overshadowing to adjacent'* is *'simply not correct'*.
- 'Daylight to Windows – Adjacent Properties' section of Report:
 - ~ Two important windows (one on rear elevation, and one west facing on side elevation) of No.12 omitted from analysis. Light from the latter is significantly reduced.
- 'Sunlight to Windows – Adjacent Properties' section of Report:
 - ~ Relevant fig., Fig.5, has no windows annotated.
 - ~ Three windows are listed for No.12 in Table 2 (but) it is clear from the data that the west facing window was not analysed.
 - ~ References to 'Airfield House' *'clearly casts doubt on the integrity of this part of the Report'*.

8.6. Planning Authority Comments On Applicants' Response To Appeal

- 8.6.1. The Commission also invited a submission or observation from the Local Authority in accordance with the procedures set out in the preceding paragraph. The Authority replied on 5th May, 2026 and the contents were generally as per the Authority's previous submission (refer para. 8.3.1).

9.0 Assessment

9.1. Overview

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

- The potential impacts on the amenities of the adjacent No.12 (the Appellants' property); and
- The potential impacts on the amenities of the adjacent No.16.

9.2. Amenities of No.12 Saint Thomas Road (The Appellants' Property)

9.2.1. Existing Spatial Context: Currently, the houses on either side of the party boundary between the subject property and No.12 are, broadly speaking, mirror images of each other in that both dwellings are comprised of a two-storey module set back generally equal distances (c.3.3m) from the party boundary, and both also include single storey side extensions set back similar distances (c.0.9m in the case of No.12; and 0.84m in the case of the subject property) from the party boundary. There are two windows and a door on the side elevation of the extension to No.12 facing the party boundary. In their submission to the Local Authority, the Appellants included a photograph from the inside of one of their side windows and indicated that it served a kitchen. There is a window and door on the side elevation of the subject property side extension facing the boundary.

9.2.2. At my site inspection I was allowed access to the rear of No.12. During my inspection, I observed that No.12 is at a slightly lower level than the subject property⁵. A low level wall (the height being slightly above the sill levels of the windows on either property) runs along the party boundary before the wall then extends to a higher height (generally at the eaves levels of the side extensions) at a point broadly in line with the rear elevations of each dwelling. The passageway leading to the rear of No.12 is c.0.9m wide. There are skylights and solar panels on the roofs of both the side extension to, and main module of, the side of No.12 facing the subject property.

9.2.3. A single-storey rear extension has also been added to No.12 and the side wall facing the subject property is in line with that of the aforementioned side

⁵ Detailed levels not included on submitted plans.

extension so that both read as one continuous elevation. The rear extension has a hipped roof and at my site inspection I noted that a row of skylights has been added to the roof facing the rear garden. I also noted that a patio has been developed immediately to the rear of the rear extension extending c.5.4m into the rear garden at its deepest. The remainder of the rear garden is at a slightly higher level and is accessed by two steps from the patio. Immediately adjacent to the south-western corner of the rear extension a corrugated roof over an open barbecue extends from the top of the (higher) party boundary wall. The corrugated roof extends for c.2.5m along the party boundary and adjoins a garden shed, with the shed being at a slightly higher level. In turn, the shed adjoins a greenhouse. All three structures are immediately adjacent to the party boundary.

- 9.2.4. Appeal Concerns; and Applicants' Response: In their Appeal and in their submission to the Local Authority, the Appellants note a particular concern about the ensuite bathroom element of the first floor extension. In their opinion, it will be overbearing and overshadowing. In their submission to the Local Authority, the Appellants also referred to '*the first floor extension*'. They noted the setback from the boundary and referred to the blocking of westerly light from their kitchen and single-storey extension lit by rooflights, and patio.
- 9.2.5. In their submission to the Appeal, the Applicants rehearse the Local Authority's assessment, and acceptance of: the proposed master bedroom and ensuite; and the proposed first floor side extension. Re the latter, they also note the 'additional safeguard' contained in the requirement in Condition 2 for opaque or frosted glazing for the proposed first floor gable windows on the north-eastern side. Finally, the Applicants also refer to the overshadowing analysis report submitted with the Response and the conclusion that the proposed development will not give rise to any unacceptable overshadowing of the Appellants' property or patio.
- 9.2.6. The policy context for the consideration of the impact of residential extensions on the amenities of adjacent residences is clear in its general message that careful consideration must be given to the impacts of such developments on adjacent properties. Specifically, developments should not have a 'significant' negative impact (refer para. 5.1.1 in relation to SPPr1, second item; and para. 5.2.3 in relation to the Development Plan policies on Residential Amenity, second item). Having regard to this policy context, the potential impacts to be assessed include potential: overlooking; overshadowing; overbearance; and impact on light. I address each of these below.

Overlooking

- 9.2.7. Overlooking from the proposed upper floor is not considered to be a significant issue. Of the four windows proposed on the side and rear elevations of the upper floor, three are for a bathroom, a walk-in-wardrobe and an ensuite. These could be finished in opaque or obscure glazing. The proposed rear elevation window serving the proposed 'master bedroom' will not change the existing situation to any significant degree, in my opinion, and it is similar to other upper floor windows approved by the Commission. I therefore have no objection from this point of view
- 9.2.8. With regards to the ground floor, fenestration proposed for the north-eastern gable is comprised of a window and door serving a utility room, while a further window is proposed for a dining area in the kitchen/dining room. The proposed utility room window and door are adjacent to a low section of the party boundary wall and would exceed the height of the wall. Having regard to the proximity of this door and window to the party boundary, to the proposed use of the room as a utility room, and to the presence of windows on the side elevation of No.12, it is reasonable to require that the window and any glazing on the proposed door should be formed opaque or frosted glass, in my opinion. It is also my opinion that this will adequately address concerns in relation to this matter raised in the Appellants' submission to the Local Authority.
- 9.2.9. With regard to the dining area window, from my site inspection and inspection of the submitted plans, it would appear that the position of the window is such that it is adjacent to the raised party boundary wall. This would prevent any overlooking of the adjacent property. However, the position of this window relative to the raised party boundary wall has not been definitively clarified on the submitted plans. Accordingly, my recommendation includes a condition requiring that this window is aligned with the raised party boundary wall to prevent overlooking, given that there is ample scope along this length of the ground floor elevation to do so.

Overshadowing

- 9.2.10. Section 4 of the 'Daylight and Sunlight Assessment' report submitted with the Applicants' response to the Appeal addresses this issue. The analysis focuses on the rear gardens of No.12 (and No.16). It includes 'before' and 'after' comparison diagrams at different times for each of: March 21st (10.00, 12.00, 14.00 & 16.00); June 21st (10.00, 12.00, 14.00, 16.00 & 18.00); September 21st (10.00, 12.00, 14.00 & 16.00); and December 21st (10.00, 12.00, 14.00). Specifically in relation to the patio area of No.12 as referenced in the Appeal, of the sixteen comparisons included in the Report, only one –

that for 18.00 on June 21st - shows additional shadowing in the rear garden area of No.12. It would appear from this image that most, if not all, of the patio area is already in shadow in the 'Existing' scenario, and that the additional shadowing in the 'Proposed' scenario is in respect of the additional garden area to the rear. The Report concludes that: *'All garden amenity spaces of the nearest adjoining properties pass the analysis for overshadowing to adjacent gardens.'*

- 9.2.11. In their response to the Applicants' submission, the Appellants challenge the veracity of the 'Daylight and Sunlight Assessment' report. In particular, they identify gaps in the report. Specifically, with the exception of the assessment for 6pm on June 21st, it does not address evening (6-8pm) scenarios ie. the times that the Appellants use their garden and that they are specifically worried about. The Appellants also note that June 21st (the only evening scenario included in the Report) is when the sun is at its highest and shadows are at their shortest.
- 9.2.12. Whilst I note the Appellants' concerns, I also note that the Appellants' property includes an extensive, south-facing rear garden (32m deep x 11m wide), and that it is located within an urban area where a degree of overshadowing effects would be anticipated. In this context, the Building Research Institute's (UK) BRE 209 standard recommends that at least half of a garden or open space can receive at least two hours sunlight on March 21st after a development has been completed. The 'Existing' and 'Proposed' images for 21st March included in the 'Daylight and Sunlight Assessment' submitted with the Applicant's response to the Appeal demonstrate that no difference in shadowing is projected for 10am, 12 noon and 4pm. The images also demonstrate that more than half the garden will receive sunlight at these times. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the BRE test is adequately met and that the proposed will not give rise to any significant overshadowing of the Appellants' property.
- 9.2.13. The "Daylight and Sunlight Assessment" identifies additional shadowing affecting the side passageway of No.12 in ten of the sixteen images across all four dates. However, this is not an amenity garden area. Rather, it is a narrow, utility passageway enabling movements from the front to the rear of the property. Given also the urban context as previously noted, the overshadowing impacts on the passageway are not considered to be significant.

Overbearance

- 9.2.14. Two-Storey Side Extension: The two-storey side extension is set back 0.84m along its entire length from the party boundary with No.12. It extends along

the full length of the main two-storey module of the subject dwelling, and projects a further c.2.6m to the rear of the main module. It also extends c.1.1m beyond the front elevation. From the perspective of No.12, the proposed two-storey element runs along the entire depth of the main module and side extension, and for more than half the depth of the rear extension. It is, therefore, stepped back c.1.9m from the rear elevation of the rear extension of No.12.

- 9.2.15. From ground level, the proposed eaves height is c.5.44m and the proposed ridge height is c.7.04m. Having regard to the aforementioned metrics and their cumulative impact when considered in conjunction with the proposed setback of 0.84m, it is my opinion that the proposed upper floor projection will be over-dominant as viewed from the Appellants' property, notwithstanding the urban location of the proposal. These concerns arise primarily due to the projection of the upper floor element beyond the common rear elevation of both the subject property and the Appellants' property, and the short distance between the two. It is my further opinion that the most reasonable outcome is to reduce the proposed upper floor of the side extension so that it is generally in line with the rear elevation of the main module of the dwelling (and, therefore, that of the Appellants' property). A reduction that would omit the upper floor of the side extension to the south of the 'stud wall' that partially divides the ensuite would still enable the achievement of an ensuite room, albeit at a smaller scale than that proposed on the submitted plans.
- 9.2.16. I note the references of the Appellants and the Applicants to planning history at the nearby No.13 The Rise. That application sought permission for revisions to a previously permitted development to include a first floor extension at the rear corner of the house, with the nearest part of the extension being set back 1.1m from the party boundary with an adjacent dwelling. Permission was also sought for a hipped roof addition to a previously approved first floor flat roof to the rear, and positioned towards the centre of the plot. The Local Authority refused the application and the Commission refused a first party appeal generally as per the refusal reasons of the Local Authority (ACP Ref. 304281). The Commission's reason referred to the proposed height, design and depth of the hipped roof and ensuite extension and it was considered that the proposed extension, in its entirety would be overly dominant and appear overbearing when viewed from the adjoining property to the north. I have considered the relevance of this Commission decision to the proposed two-storey side extension. Whilst each case must be decided on its own merits, there are certain commonalities between the referenced case and the subject case, and I am satisfied that

my recommendation is not inconsistent with the previous Commission decision.

- 9.2.17. Two-Storey Rear Projection (Containing Master Bedroom): No significant issue arises, in my opinion, having regard to the setback from the party boundary in the context of this urban setting.
- 9.2.18. I would also refer to the first ground of the Appeal quoting the following commentary in the Local Authority Planner's report: *'With regard to the first-floor extension element, it is noted that the proposed works are centralised within the rear of the subject dwelling and are significantly set back from both party boundaries'*; and the conclusion that *'The Planning Authority is therefore satisfied that undue overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing impacts from the two-storey extension are unlikely and the residential amenity of the adjoining dwellings will be maintained'*. The Appellants go on to state that the (associated) *'assessment and subsequent conclusions are based on error'* and quote the distance of the first floor extension to the respective boundaries (3.47m in the case of No.16, and 0.84m for No.12).
- 9.2.19. It may be of assistance to clarify that the referenced comments in the Local Authority Planner's report are contained in a sub-section of the report headed 'Rear Extension'. There is a subsequent section in the report headed 'Side Extension'. From my analysis of both sections, it appears to me that the Planner's reference to the first floor extension works *'being centralised within the rear of the subject dwelling'* is in respect only of the two-storey projection located generally in the centre of the plot as considered in this sub-section of my report. The much closer two-storey element adjacent to No.12 is considered in the Local Authority Planner's section headed 'Side Extension'.
- 9.2.20. Ground Floor: The proposed ground floor projects c4.3m beyond the proposed two-storey element adjacent to No.12, and across almost the entire width of the subject plot. The side elevation of the ground floor element is in line with the two-storey element and, therefore, is also set back 0.84m from the party boundary with No.12. The eaves height is noted on the plans as being 3.2m from ground level. The submitted Cross-Section A-A shows the ground floor floor level as being level with the existing ground floor level.
- 9.2.21. The specific Development Plan policy context for ground floor rear extensions and their potential impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties is contained in DMS 12.3.7.1(ii) 'Extensions to the Rear (Ground Floor)' wherein it is provided that projects: *'will be considered in terms of their length, height, (and) proximity to mutual boundaries'*.
- 9.2.22. I have had regard to the Commission's 2024 decision on Appeal Ref. No. 321332 for the nearby 15 The Rise, Mount Merrion. That proposed

development included a 3.6m high (ground level to parapet level) ground floor rear extension. The extension extended across almost the entire width of the plot, and indeed immediately adjoined the party boundary on one side. The Commission granted the development, and its 'Reasons and Considerations' included having regard to the 'scale and massing of the development proposed' and that the development 'would not seriously injure the residential amenity of surrounding properties'.

- 9.2.23. I have also reviewed the three cases at Nos. 8, 20 and 22 Saint Thomas Road referred to by the Applicants in their submission on the Appeal, and as replied to by the Appellants in their response to the Applicants' submission. These cases were approved by the Local Authority and included significant ground floor rear extensions. The Applicants cite these cases as setting a precedent for this type of development in the area and, in doing so, state that: the height of the proposed extension at 3.2m is considered to be modest and that other ground floor extensions in the area have varying and, in some cases, higher roof profiles; and the ground floor projection beyond the rear building lines of the adjoining properties is considered to be a modest projection. The Appellants disagree with this assessment stating that: Nos. 8 and 22 are large detached houses on substantial plots, while No.20 is at the end of the six semi-detached houses and is adjacent to a large detached house with neither overlooking each other; and the proposed extension is considerably larger and extending further into the garden than any of the six semi-detached houses.
- 9.2.24. Viewed from the perspective of No.12, the proposed ground floor extends c.2.35m beyond the rear elevation of the single-storey rear extension of No.12, ie. to a point broadly in line with where the open corrugated barbecue area roof adjoins the garden shed of No.12. The proposed rear extension height of 3.2m is c.0.8m higher than the eaves level of the rear extension of No.12. However, having regard to the combined effect of the 0.84m setback, the height of the proposed extension relative to the eaves height of the rear extension of No.12, and the existing garden features in No.12 situated along the party boundary (barbecue area roof, garden shed, and greenhouse), I am satisfied that the proposed ground floor shall not be overbearing as viewed from No.12. Any impact will be further mitigated by the proposed continuation of the floor levels of the existing dwelling as shown on the submitted drawing 'Proposed Section A-A'. The rear gardens of the subject property and No.12 both have modest inclines towards their respective rear fences. Thus adherence to the existing floor levels will require modest levelling down of the site. In turn, this will progressively lessen the height of the extension as perceived from No.12.

9.2.25. I am satisfied that my recommendation for the subject case is generally consistent with the aforementioned decision of the Commission as referenced at para. 9.2.22. With regards to the three Local Authority-decided cases referenced by both the Applicants and Appellants, I would note only that each of these cases was somewhat different from the others and that the only discernible pattern is perhaps a generally positive disposition on the part of the Local Authority to accommodating adaptation of the existing housing stock.

Light

- 9.2.26. The submitted 'Daylight & Sunlight Assessment' includes assessments of daylight and sunlight impacts. The Daylight assessment examines five windows on the rear elevation of the Appellants' property (three at first floor level, and two at ground floor level). The Report concludes that all five windows '*are predicted to comply with BRE Guidelines*'. In their response to the Applicant's submission on the appeal, the Appellants state that two important windows (one on the rear elevation, the other on the side elevation) are omitted from the analysis and that light from the latter is significantly reduced.
- 9.2.27. Comparing the relevant image in the Report identifying the windows that were assessed, Fig.3, with my findings at my site inspection, the Appellants' statement in relation to the omission of the two windows is correct. With regards to the rear elevation window, it is unlikely that there will be any significant loss of light, given that the proposed first floor side extension is 'behind' the rear elevation of No.12 where the said window is located. With regards to the side elevation window, I note the Applicant's information that this window serves the kitchen. The light to this window is already impacted by: the adjacent raised party boundary wall; the roof overhanging the Appellants' barbecue area; the side extension roof overhang and guttering; and the proximity of the subject property, inclusive of side extension. The kitchen is also served by a large window and patio doors to the rear, and by seven skylights on the roof of the rear extension. For these reasons, it is unlikely that the proposed development will have a significant impact on the light to this window, in my opinion. Otherwise, as the issue of determining rights to light is a matter for the Courts, I do not consider that the Commission is in a position to draw any conclusions in relation to the matters raised.

9.3. Amenities of No.16 Saint Thomas Road

- 9.3.1. Existing Spatial Context: At my site inspection I was allowed access to the rear of No.16. No.16 is not extended adjacent to the party boundary with the subject property. A single-storey, hipped roof rear extension has been developed towards the other side of the plot on its south-western side. The submitted plans identify the said rear extension projecting 4.99m from the rear elevation of the main module of No.16, and being set back 3.76m from the party boundary with the subject property. A patio is provided between the rear extension of No.16 and the party boundary. On the day of my site inspection, outdoor seating was set out on the patio area. The party boundary is formed of a c.1.7m high wall, and an additional c.0.6m high shrubbery over the wall.

Overlooking

- 9.3.2. The only window that potentially gives rise to overlooking is that for the master bedroom on the upper floor rear elevation. My conclusions at para 9.2.7 apply equally for No.16.

Overshadowing

- 9.3.3. The conclusions for the potential impacts on No.12 as set out at para. 9.2.12 apply equally here to potential impacts on No.16.

Overbearance

- 9.3.4. Proposed Ground Floor Rear Extension: From the perspective of No.16, the proposed ground floor is set back 0.35m from the party boundary and is 3.28m in height along its full length. It extends c.6.8m from the rear elevation of No.16 and, therefore, along the full length of the patio, and for a further c.1.5m beyond the patio.
- 9.3.5. I have considered the length, height and proximity of the proposed rear ground floor extension relative to No.16 in accordance with Development Management Standard 12.3.7.1(ii) (refer para. 5.2.3). In my opinion, the combined effects of the proximity to the party boundary of the extension, its height relative to the height of the existing party boundary, and extent of projection beyond the patio area of No.16, which patio area is located immediately adjacent to the party boundary will give rise to a degree of overbearance on the amenities of No.16. Removal of the shrubbery over the party boundary could result in the extension being c.1.5m higher than the boundary wall (proposed height of 3.2m relative to the wall height of c.1.7m towards the rear elevation of the dwelling). This scenario could be improved with a small number of relatively modest alterations to the proposed development, namely:

- Increase the setback of the south-western elevation from the proposed 0.35m to 0.84m: This setback is considered reasonable in the context of the same setback distance proposed for the ground floor extension on the other side adjacent to No.12. In addition, the extent of remaining internal space and open plan layout will provide sufficient scope to achieve the desired usage of this space.
- Partial reduction of the height of the ground floor: The height of the proposed ground floor is 3.28m. There is scope to reduce the height to 2.9m⁶. It would be reasonable, in my opinion, to require the Applicants to achieve this reduction only on that part of the ground floor between the westernmost 'Flat Roof Light On Kerb Upstands' and the south-western elevation. This would leave the Applicants with sufficient depth in the unaltered section of the roof to retain the aforementioned Roof Light.

9.3.6. These recommended adjustments are consistent with some of the requests contained in the submission made to the Local Authority on behalf of the owner of No.16 and, in my opinion, will mitigate any significant impacts on the amenities of the property.

9.3.7. Finally in relation to this matter, my comments at paras. 9.2.22, 9.2.23 and 9.2.25 in relation to the relevance of planning histories in the area apply equally here for No.16.

9.3.8. Two-Storey Projection Located Generally in the Centre of the Plot: The issues in terms of overbearance pertaining to this two-storey projection for No.16 are generally the same as for No.12, whilst noting that the setback from No.16 (3.47m) is slightly greater than for No.12 (3.34m). My assessment at paras. 9.2.17-9.2.18 in relation to No.12 applies equally, therefore, to No.16.

Light

9.3.9. A submission made on behalf of the owners of No.16 to the Local Authority expressed concerns in relation to the elimination of eastern light and impacts on morning sun at the patio dining area and kitchen extension as a result of the ground floor extension. The submission also stated that the centrally located two-storey element '*will have a serious effect on the quantity of morning light which our client currently enjoys*'. It was requested that the first floor extension be omitted, and that if the extension is to be permitted, a flat roof be considered to reduce the impact of overshadowing. I also note that in their reply to the Applicants' response to the Appeal, the Appellants criticise

⁶ It is my understanding that a floor-to-ceiling height of 2.4m would be acceptable under Building Regulations, and that a further 0.5m would be sufficient to enable joists, insulation, outer covering etc.

the omission in the Applicants' 'Daylight and Sunlight Assessment' report of analysis of the 6-8am period for No.16 and state that a shadowing similar to the evening shadowing that they have calculated for their own property will be caused at No.16, although no evidence is provided in support of this.

9.3.10. The 'Daylight and Sunlight Assessment' report submitted by the Applicants includes the following findings.

- an assessment of 9 windows for Daylight found that, according to the BRE Guidelines, the diffuse daylighting will not be adversely affected.
- an assessment of 2 windows for Sunlight (presumed to be the two windows on the eastern elevation of the rear sunroom extension of No.16 and thus facing the subject property), both complied with the BRE Guidelines.

9.3.11. Otherwise, I would note that the proposed rear extension is not untypical of such rear extensions for semi-detached properties in urban locations, and that as the issue of determining right to light is a matter for the Courts, I do not consider that the Commission is in a position to draw any further conclusions in relation to the matters raised. I have already addressed the issue of overshadowing at para. 9.3.3 (and 9.2.12).

9.4. **Other Matters**

9.4.1. Proposed Demolition: As the proposed development includes the demolition of the existing ground floor extension, my recommendation includes a requirement for the submission of a Resource Waste Management Plan to effectively manage the disposal of the building waste to be generated by the demolition.

9.4.2. Development Contributions: The floor area of the proposed development is comfortably over 40m². The Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown Development Contribution Scheme, 2023-2028 includes a requirement for payment of contributions for domestic extensions in excess of 40m² (Table A and Section 7.1(i) refers). As the proposed development is above the threshold at which contributions become payable, my recommendation includes a condition requiring the payment of contributions.

9.4.3. Finishes: It is noted on the submitted plans that the new tiled roof shall '*match existing*'. The plans also include the notation: '*New Structure Clad With External Insulation*'. In the absence of details regarding the proposed elevational treatments, my recommendation includes a condition requiring the prior agreement of these details with the Local Authority.

- 9.4.4. Remaining Rear Garden Space: Development Management Standard 12.8.3.3(i) of the Development Plan includes a minimum private open space requirement of 60m² for houses with three bedrooms. The rear garden space would comfortably exceed this figure after development.
- 9.4.5. Services: It is proposed to connect to the existing public sewer and to dispose of surface water via an on-site soakaway. The Local Authority Drainage Division has no objections.

10.0 AA Screening

- 10.1. I have considered the proposed redevelopment and extension of an existing semi-detached dwelling, associated site works, and proposed disposal of surface water via an on-site soakaway and connection to the existing public foul sewer at 14 Saint Thomas Road, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Dublin in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located 1.28km to the south-west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (Site Code 004024).
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reasons for this conclusion are as follows:
- the nature of the works: small scale extension to an existing dwelling with disposal of surface water to an on-site soakaway and connection to the existing public foul sewer;
 - the distance of the site from the nearest European site and the absence of any known connections between the two.
- 10.3. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that permission for the development be granted, subject to conditions for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 12.1. Having regard to the residential land use zoning of the site in the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, the support in the Development Plan for improvements to and adaptation of existing homes [Policy PHP19], and the development management criteria in the Development Plan for First Floor Rear Extensions and Ground Floor Rear Extensions [Section 12.3.7.1(ii)], it is considered that, subject to the conditions below, the proposed development would not be injurious to the general amenity of the area, and would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable 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 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.	a. The southern half of the proposed upper floor ensuite, ie. that part located generally to the south of the 'stud wall' that partially divides the ensuite as identified on the submitted plans, shall be omitted from the proposed development. b. The proposed ground floor shall be amended as follows: i. the windows serving the proposed ground floor utility room, the glazing on the proposed utility room door and the proposed first floor windows on the north-eastern elevation shall be formed of opaque or frosted glazing. ii. the proposed dining area window on the north-eastern elevation shall be positioned so that it is alongside the higher of the two sections of the party boundary wall. iii. the western elevation shall be set back a minimum of

	0.84m from the party boundary with No.16. iv. the height of the proposed ground floor shall be reduced to a maximum of 2.9m along its full depth between the south-western elevation and the south-western side of the westernmost 'Flat Roof Light On Kerb Upstands' identified on the submitted plans. c. Prior to the commencement of development, revised plans providing for compliance with the requirements of Condition 2a and 2b shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: To protect the adjoining residential amenities. d. Details of the proposed 'New Structure Clad With External Insulation' elevation finishes shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: To cater for orderly development.
3.	Prior to the commencement of development, the developer or any agent acting on its behalf, shall prepare a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) including demonstration of proposals to adhere to best practice and protocols. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness; these details shall be placed on the file and retained as part of the public record. The RWMP must be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement prior to the commencement of development. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times. Reason: In the interest of sustainable waste management.
4.	Surface water arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works. Reason: In the interests of public health.

5.	Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 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 residential amenities 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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

P. Christy

Paul Christy
Planning Inspector

15th June 2026

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500642
Proposed Development Summary	Redevelopment and extension of house with associated works.
Development Address	14 Saint Thomas Road, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Co. Dublin,
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX /OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. ☐ No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1 . EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, 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?	

✓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. No Screening required.		
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold	
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)?		
No ✓	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)	

Inspector: Paul Christy

P.Christy

Date: 15th June 2026