



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL500704-LH-26

Development	Retention permission for an unauthorised residential structure in the rear garden with all associated site works
Location	41 Sliabh Breagh, Ardee, Co Louth, A92 K281
Planning Authority	Louth County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	25/165
Applicant(s)	Stephen Callan
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Stephen Callan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	2 nd April 2026
Inspector	Andrew Hersey

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1 The site is located at 41 Sliabh Breagh, Ardee, Co Louth, A92 K281. The site comprises of an end of terrace dwelling with front and rear gardens
- 1.2 The rear garden and other rear gardens along the terrace are accessed via a lane to the back of the houses.
- 1.3 There is a detached single storey structure in the rear which is accessed via the said laneway. A fence has been erected in the site to subdivide the single storey structure from the main residence on site. The south elevation of the single storey structure faces onto the laneway. There is a pedestrian gate to the side which leads to a path to the front door access to the single storey structure

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The proposed development is for the retention of a single storey structure in the rear garden of an end of terrace dwelling in Ardee. The structure is described as 'residential' in the development description.
- 2.2 Drawings submitted with the application show the dimensions of the structure to be 4.380 x 7.580m with a monopitch roof.
- 2.3 As indicated on the drawings, the building consists of two rooms: a kitchen/living area with an adjoining WC, and a bedroom
- 2.4 The height of the building is shown as 2.8 metres at the highest point

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision – Refuse Permission for the following reasons:

1. *This development for which retention permission is sought represents a significant overdevelopment of this site and is considered to be contrary to section 13.8.35 and policy objective HOU 34 of the Louth County Development Plan 2021 - 2027 (as varied) in that the proposed development will not allow for a functional and useable external space for recreational and domestic purposes for residents of the existing dwelling and will also have an unacceptable impact*

upon the amenity of neighbouring residents through loss of privacy. It is considered that this development will set a harmful precedent and will be contrary to the sustainable and orderly development of the area.

2. *The accommodation proposed to be retained does not meet the minimum standards as set out in Housing Quality for Sustainable Communities Guidelines, 2007. The minimum standards for overall floorspace, internal room sizes, storage and private amenity space are not provided. In addition, no provision for bin storage, bicycle storage or bulky storage have been provided. The building for which retention permission is sought is of poor design and results in substandard residential accommodation. To grant permission would therefore consolidate an unauthorised development and would set a harmful precedent for future similar development and would be contrary to the sustainable and orderly development of the area.*

3.1.2. Planning Authority Reports

The case planners report raises the following issues;

- The proposal is consistent with the site's A1 Existing Residential Land Use Zoning Objective.
- That the proposal has been assessed as a dwelling and is therefore subject to the standards as set out in the guidelines 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities DEHLG (2007)' which sets out minimum sizes for floorspaces within a residential unit. The report states that the said development subject to this appeal does not comply with the standards as set out in this guideline.
- The planners report states the continued use of the existing structure would be not appropriate on this site, as the minimum standards cannot be achieved and as such a quality residential environment cannot be achieved.
- That the design and material finish of the building are of poor quality, and do not result in a good standard of habitable accommodation, and so would not normally be acceptable as a standalone living unit.

- The case planner cites the minimum open space standards for a one-bedroom unit as outlined in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2022), which specify a requirement of 20 sq. m. The report indicates that this standard cannot be met on the site. It also highlights the absence of adequate provision for refuse bin storage and bicycle parking.
- Again the planners report refers to SPPR1 of the *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2022)* which requires a minimum of 16 metres between first floor windows.
- The report notes that the structure occupies an elevated position relative to the dwellings immediately to the north within the same terrace as No. 41. Given this elevated siting and its close proximity to the rear walls and private amenity areas of these neighbouring properties, the development is considered likely to adversely affect their residential amenity through overlooking.
- The report also refers to the lack thereof of parking to serve the proposed unit. A number of submissions on file refer to parking on the rear lane which has resulted in congestions issues.

3.2 Prescribed Bodies

None on file

3.33 Third Party Observations

There are 5 submissions on file which raises the following issues:

- That the structure is not suitable for residential purposes and does not provide for amenity space or storage
- The proposal impacts upon the amenities of adjacent properties.
- There is no lighting in the laneway to the rear of the terrace and therefore it is unsafe for existing residents.
- Fire Safety

- Traffic & Congestion on laneway
- Sets a poor precedent for other such developments on laneway
- The owner of the property does not live on the site

4.0 Planning History

4.1 Planning Reg. Ref. 24/107 refused retention permission for Retention of a domestic outbuilding comprising of a games room/home office and store with all associated site works refused permission.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

5.1.1 The Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027 is the statutory development plan in force in the area at present.

5.1.2 The site is zoned as R1 'Existing Residential' the zoning objective of which is to:

The objective for this zoning is to conserve and enhance the quality and character of established residential communities and protect their amenities. Infill developments, extensions, and the refurbishment of existing dwellings will be considered where they are appropriate to the character and pattern of development in the area and do not significantly affect the amenities of surrounding properties. The strengthening of community facilities and local services will be facilitated subject to the design, scale and use of the building or development being appropriate for its location

5.1.3 Section 13.8, in part, infers that residential development proposals should have regard to the provisions of the 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities' (2007), the 'Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments – Guidelines for Planning Authorities' (as amended), and any successor documents

5.1.4 Section 13.8.36 addresses policy relating to the development of family flats and independent living units within the curtilage of an existing dwelling. The plan clearly

states that any application for such development must be accompanied by a justification outlining the need for the proposed unit.

5.1.5 HOU34 refers to an objective which encourages and promote the development of underutilised infill, corner and backland sites in existing urban areas subject to the character of the area and environment being protected

5.2 *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2022)*

5.2.1 SPPR1- refers to separation distances between first floor window

5.2.2 SPPR2 - refers to minimum private open space requirements for residential units.

5.3 *Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (2007)*

5.3.1 Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (2007), published by the Department of the Environment Heritage and Local Government, is a national guidance document on best practice in residential design. It sets out principles for creating sustainable communities, including standards for space, layout, and amenity. It is commonly used in planning assessments to evaluate housing quality.

5.4 *Design Standards for Apartments: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2025)*

5.4.1 The *Design Standards for Apartments: Guidelines for Planning Authorities Apartments (2025)* guidelines, issued by the Department of Housing Local Government and Heritage, is a national policy document that sets out minimum standards for the design and provision of apartment development in Ireland. It establishes requirements for floor areas, storage, private amenity space, and overall design quality.

5.5 *Natural Heritage Designations*

- The Stabannan-Braganstown SPA (Site Code 004091) is located 5.45 km to the north east of the site
- Dundalk Bay SPA (Site Code 004026) is located 13.5km to the north east of the site

- Dundalk Bay SAC (Site Code 000445) is located 13.5km to the north east of the site

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1 See completed Form 1 & 2 on file. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required

7.0 The Appeal

7.1 Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1 A first party appeal was lodged on the 29th January 2026. The appeal in summary raises the following issues;

- That the development is modest in scale, domestic in nature and located within a residential curtilage.
- The refusal reasons are not supported by objective assessment
- The proposal aligns with the criteria for a family flat / independent living unit under Section 13.8.36 of the Louth County Development Plan
- Any residual concerns can be mitigated by conditions
- The appellant considers that a condition can be imposed restricting its use as ancillary residential accommodation to the principal dwellinghouse and shall not be used, sold, leased, rented, let or otherwise occupied as a separate independent dwelling.
- That a condition be imposed stating that the accommodation shall not be used for independent habitation, and shall remain ancillary to the main dwelling, not forming a separate residence independent of the principal dwellinghouse.
- That a condition be imposed stipulation that the said building is not used for commercial purposes.
- That a condition be imposed to reduce the floor area to 25sq.m.

- That a condition be imposed to provide for a storage area of 4sq.m.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

7.3.1 A response from the Planning Authority was received on the 25th February 2026 and raises the following issues:

- That the key and pertinent planning issues pertaining to this site in the context of the proposal subject of this assessment have been considered and are set out in the planning report dated 16th December 2025.
- That the proposal is described in the appeal documentation submitted to An Coimisiún Pleanála is for the retention of “ancillary accommodation”. This description has been altered to that received by the Planning Authority on 10th November 2022
- There is substantive evidence, through the planning history (previous planning reference 24/107 and Planning Enforcement ID: UD/24/059) that the unit is not ancillary to the existing dwelling at No. 41 Sliabh Breagh and has been in use as a separate residential unit, and as such the Planning Authority assessed the unit as a standalone residential unit
- That the appellant also seeks to rely on previous appeal decision ABP-313754-22 (not on the site associated with this appeal) which assessed, *inter alia*, an independent living unit. The current proposal was not described as an independent living unit, nor was there evidence submitted alongside the application to illustrate compliance with Policy 13.8.36 (Family Flat/Independent Living Unit) of the Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied). Notwithstanding the nature of the structure, separated from the main dwelling house, if assessed as an independent living unit the proposal has not been demonstrated to comply with Section 13.8.36 of the Development Management Guidelines of the Plan. Section 13.8.36 states that an independent living unit may be granted permission to accommodate an immediate family member of the main household on the site. It also requires that the rationale for the development should be clearly set out, and that it should not be sold or let as an independent unit. As there was no evidence submitted to show the use of the unit was for an immediate family member of the main household, nor was a

clear rationale set out, and owing to the history of leasing of the unit as a separate residential unit, the applicant did not evidence compliance with Section 13.8.36 of the Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied)

- The appellants' statement invites ACP to grant permission to retain the structure and to limit the internal floor space to 25sq.m (where the existing is 29.5 sq.m) and to apply a condition restricting the unit to ancillary/family use in the same ownership as the main dwelling. The Planning Authority would respectively request that having regard to the planning history of the site and the live enforcement action pertaining to the use of the structure as a separate living unit, to uphold the Planning Authority's decision to refuse permission

7.4. Observations

None received

8.0 Assessment

8.1. I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file and I have inspected the site and have had regard to relevant local development plan policies and guidance.

8.1.2 I am satisfied the substantive issues arising from the grounds of this third party appeal relate to the following matters;

- Principle of Proposed Development/Development Plan Policy
- Design of Unit and compliance with Quantitative Standards.
- Traffic Safety
- Other Issues

8.2 Principle of Proposed Development/Development Plan Policy

8.2.1 The proposed development site is located within an area designated in the Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027, as varied (hereunder referred to as the plan) with zoning objective A1 'Existing Residential' which seeks in part *is to conserve and enhance the quality and character of established residential communities and protect their amenities. Infill developments, extensions, and the refurbishment of*

existing dwellings will be considered where they are appropriate to the character and pattern of development in the area and do not significantly affect the amenities of surrounding properties.

- 8.2.2 Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposed development which is for a 'Residential' structure is compatible with this land use subject to the protection of the amenities of adjacent properties as stated in the objective.
- 8.2.3 It is also considered that the proposal should be assessed against Poilcy HOU34 which encourages and promote the development of underutilised infill, corner and backland sites in existing urban areas subject to the character of the area and environment being protected. It is considered that the proposal in principle is compliant with this policy.
- 8.2.4 It is noted that the proposed development is for the *Retention of a residential structure in the rear garden with all associated site works* whereas the appeal refers to retention of 'ancillary accommodation'
- 8.2.5 The appeal also seeks to have the development granted and requests that any issues with respect to the proposal can be resolved by way of planning condition for instance storage requirements etc.
- 8.2.6 It is considered that having regard to the development description and having regard to the response to the appeal submitted by the council's planning department that the proposal is clearly for the retention of a separate standalone residential unit and not ancillary accommodation as suggested in the appeal and therefore it shall be assessed as such.
- 8.2.7 In this instance, it is not considered appropriate to assess the proposal with reference to Section 13.8.36 of the Development Management Guidelines, which relates to ancillary accommodation. As this is not the nature of the application submitted, it is recommended that the Commission does not evaluate it on that basis.

8.3 Design of Unit and compliance with Quantitative Standards.

- 8.3.1 The proposed development comprises of a detached single storey building with a monopitch roof.

8.3.2 The south elevation faces onto the laneway to the rear of the terrace of houses and has the appearance of a shed from this view.

8.3.3 Similar structures associated with neighbouring properties also front onto the same lane, and the building subject to this appeal does not appear materially different from them. In this context, I do not consider its appearance to be out of character with the area.

8.3.4 The case planner has assessed the proposal against the quantitative standards as set out in 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities DEHLG (2007)'.

8.3.5 In the report, the case planner presents a table outlining the minimum floor areas required for each part of a dwelling, alongside the floor areas proposed in this application for which retention permission is sought. This table is copied below.

	Target Gross Floor Area	Min living room	Aggregate Living Area	Aggregate Bedroom Area	Storage
1 Bed 2 Person house (single storey)	44 sqm	11 sqm	23 sqm	11 sqm	2 sqm
Proposed	29.5 sqm	n/a	Kitchen / living / dining space: 18.52 sqm	7.616 sqm	None provided

8.3.6 It is clear from the table that the proposal does not meet the minimum standards as set out in the guidelines

8.3.7 The Design Standards for Apartments: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2025) sets out minimum floor area requirements for new apartments; however, this guidance is often applied in the assessment of standalone units such as that proposed in this appeal. The following table results from an assessment of the proposal against these standards.

	Target Gross Floor Area	Min living room	Aggregate Living Area	Aggregate Bedroom Area	Storage
1 Bed 2P unit (Apartment Guidelines 2022)	32 sqm	Not specifically prescribed	Not specifically prescribed	Not specifically prescribed	Min. 3 sqm (storage)
Proposed	29.5 sqm	n/a	Kitchen / living / dining space: 18.52 sqm	7.616 sqm	None provided

8.3.8 It is clear from the above that the proposal does not meet the required standards as set out in Design Standards for Apartments: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2025)

8.3.9 In terms of open space requirements, I refer to SPPR2 of the *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2025)* which states that 20sq.m. is required to serve 1 bed units.

8.3.10 The site layout plan submitted with the proposed development shows an area of 30sq.m. but this is to serve the existing house on site which forms part of the terrace and the proposed residential unit subject of this appeal.

8.3.11 If the existing dwelling is a three-bedroom unit, SPPR 2 requires a minimum private amenity space of 40 sq.m. Combined with the requirement for the proposed unit, this results in a total requirement of 60 sq.m. As only 30 sq.m. is provided, the proposal falls significantly short of the required standard for private open space. The proposal therefore represents overdevelopment.

8.3.12 With respect to the forgoing it is considered that the proposed residential unit fails to meet the minimum thresholds as set out in planning guidance with respect to quantitative standards. In terms of visual amenity, while I do have some reservations with respect to the design of the proposal, it is not visible in the wider area and is therefore considered acceptable in this context.

8.3.13 However, and notwithstanding the above, the unit fails to meet with the quantitative standards as set out in the S28 guidance as stated above.

8.4 Traffic & Parking

- 8.4.1 The proposal does not include for any parking to serve the proposed residential unit, and I note that submissions on file raise issues with respect to congestion on the lane.
- 8.4.2 On the day of the site visit there were no cars parked on this part of the lane and while narrow it would be possible to drive down the same, though if there were a car parked on it then this would prevent others from passing.
- 8.4.3 In this respect, it is considered it would not be possible to provide for car parking on the lane to serve the proposal.
- 8.4.4 Table 13.11 of the Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027 shows for requirements for car parking standards for residential units and states that in peripheral locations (such as the location proposed), 2 spaces are required per residential unit. SPPR3 of the *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2022)* also infers that 2 spaces are required to serve a residential unit at such peripheral locations
- 8.4.5 No car parking spaces are proposed and as such the proposal will result in haphazard parking potentially along the lane which will result in traffic congestion and impacts upon public safety.

8.5 Residential Amenity Impacts

- 8.5.1 The proposed residential unit is located 4-5 metres from the existing residential dwelling on the site and the FFL is elevated over that of the existing dwelling by at least 1.3 metres.
- 8.5.2 No overlooking issues occur as there are no windows located on the northern elevation of the residential unit. With respect to windows on the eastern elevation I do not consider that there will be significant overlooking to the adjacent property to the east as a consequence of the same.
- 8.5.3 Overshadowing issues are likely to be confined to the rear garden of the existing residential unit on site which forms part of the terrace due to the difference in levels. (though I note that there is no section drawing illustrating this)

8.5.4 With respect to the above, I consider that there is potential for impact to the residential amenities of the existing residential unit on site in terms of overshadowing and overbearing of the rear garden of this property which has been made considerable shorter and smaller because of the proposed development.

9.0 AA Screening

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

9.2 The subject site is located

- 5.45km to the south west of The Stabannan-Braganstown SPA (Site Code 004091)
- 13.5km to the southeast of the Dundalk Bay SPA (Site Code 004026)
- 13.5km to the southeast of the Dundalk Bay SAC (Site Code 000445)

9.3 The proposed development comprises of the construction of a residential structure in a suburban area. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

9.4 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, and its location in a suburban area, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site

9.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The relatively small scale nature of the works proposed
- The lack thereof of any hydrological connection from the proposed development to the Natura 2000 site.
- Having regard to the screening report/determination carried out by the Planning Authority

9.6 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

9.7 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The subject site is located is 500 meters to the River Dee to the north

10.2 The proposed development comprises of a detached residential unit in a suburban area

10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.4 I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

10.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows [insert as relevant]:

- The minor scope of the works and nature of the development
- The 500m distance to the nearest water body and the lack of hydrological connections to the same.

10.6 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 be refused for the following reasons:

1. The development for which retention permission is sought constitutes overdevelopment of the site, as it fails to provide adequate, functional, and usable external space for recreational and domestic use for both the existing dwelling and the proposed unit. It would also adversely impact the amenity of the existing property by reason of overbearing and overshadowing effects. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the A1 zoning objective, which seeks in part to protect the amenities of adjoining properties, and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The proposed development makes no provision for car parking, which is likely to lead to informal and unregulated parking in the surrounding area. This could give rise to traffic congestion, would compromise safety and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. The proposed residential unit to be retained does not meet the minimum standards as set out in the guidelines, Housing Quality for Sustainable Communities Guidelines, 2007, the Design Standards for Apartments: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2025) and the minimum requirements for private open space provision as set out in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2022) and is therefore contrary to Section 13.8 of the Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027, as varied.

The minimum standards for overall floorspace, internal room sizes, storage and private amenity space are not provided. In addition, no provision for bin storage, bicycle storage or bulky storage have not been provided. The building for which retention permission is sought therefore results in substandard residential accommodation. To grant permission would therefore set a harmful precedent

for future similar development and would be contrary to the sustainable and orderly 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

Andrew Hersey
Planning Inspector

29th April 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL500704-LH-26
Proposed Development Summary	residential structure
Development Address	41 Sliabh Breagh, Ardee, Co. Louth
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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) 	
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)?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 Class 10 (b) (i) Part 2 Housing Projects
<input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <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?	

<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. No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> 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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 Class 10 (b) (i) Part 2 Housing Projects – 500 houses

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference Number	PL500704-LH-26
---	----------------

Proposed Development Summary	Residential Structure	
Development Address	41 Sliabh Breagh, Ardee, Co. Louth	
<p>The Board carried out a preliminary examination [ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended] of at least the nature, size or location of the proposed development, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</p> <p>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>		
Characteristics of proposed development	<i>The proposed development comprises of Retention permission for a detached residential structure in the rear garden of a house</i>	
Location of Proposed Development	<i>The development is situated in an suburban area in Ardee, Co. Louth where services are present. There are no sensitive environmental receptors on site or in the vicinity of the same.</i>	
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	None of relevance	
Conclusion		
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA	Yes or No
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.	Yes
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.	No
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.	No

Inspector: Andrew Hersey

Date: 29th April 2026

DP/ADP: _____

Date:

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)