



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500790-DN-26

Development	Proposed two storey rear extension, two new windows at ground floor and retention of in-curtilage parking area.
Location	21 Montrose Drive, Artane, Dublin 5, D05V8C3
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	3298/25
Applicant(s)	Brian & Bernie Moran
Type of Application	Retention Permission & Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Isabella Turner & Mark Ryan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	9 th May 2026
Inspector	Barry Diamond

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision.....	3
4.0	Planning History	5
5.0	Policy Context.....	6
6.0	EIA Screening.....	8
7.0	The Appeal	8
8.0	Assessment.....	9
9.0	AA Screening.....	14
10.0	Water Framework Directive	15
11.0	Recommendation	16
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	16
13.0	Conditions	16

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The proposed site is circa 243sqm and comprises an existing two storey semi-detached dwelling which has garden areas to both the front and the rear. The dwelling has a hipped roof and is finished in a profiled concrete roof tile, the walls are finished in a painted roughcast render. The rear boundaries of the site are defined by 2 metre high concrete block walls.
- 1.2. The application dwelling adjoins No. 19 Montrose Drive which is located to the west of the site and is of a similar design, height and finishes. No. 23 Montrose Drive is located to the east and sits significantly behind the front building line of the application dwelling. A shared access laneway runs along the eastern boundary between the application site and No. 23 Montrose Drive. The application site backs onto No. 89 Ardmore Drive which is located to the south.
- 1.3. The site is set within a residential area which is dominated by two storey semi-detached dwellings, of a similar design and finishes to the subject dwelling.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development seeks permission for the extension and alterations to a dwelling which include;
 - The erection of a two storey extension to the rear;
 - Two new windows at ground floor on the eastern gable elevation;
 - A new dished pavement to the public footpath for the existing off-street parking and drive-in to the front; and
 - All other ancillary works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 22nd January 2026 the Planning Authority issued a decision to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

3. The proposed development shall be amended as follows: a) The side elements of the first floor rear oriel bay window shall be permanently finished with opaque glazing. Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: in the interests of residential amenity.

5. The proposed development shall comply with the following requirements of the Council's Transportation Planning Division: a) The vehicular access shall have a maximum width of 3.0m and shall not have outward opening gates. b) The pedestrian access shall not have outward opening. c) Footpath and kerb to be dishd and new entrance provided to the requirements of the Area Engineer, Roads Maintenance Division. d) All costs incurred by Dublin City Council, including any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development, shall be at the expense of the developer.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and traffic safety.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The decision of the planner reflects the need for amendments during the processing of the application and the decision to grant planning permission. It includes the following points:

- The proposed first floor oriel window on the southern elevation may result in overlooking of No. 19 Montrose Drive and the side elements of the window should be finished in obscure glazing;
- Following construction of the extension, there would be 46sqm of rear amenity space remaining which would be acceptable;
- The proposed extension would not diminish the level of daylight over existing levels;
- Any issues of boundary disputes are non-planning matters;
- The existing access does not have planning permission and is 4.3 metres wide which is not acceptable;

- Retention of the access is not part of the proposal;
- No surface water drainage details have been provided;
- Further information was requested to include the retention of the access within the description of development and should be a minimum of 2.5 metres and a maximum of 3 metres. Additional details and amended plans were also requested on how surface water was to be managed on the site which should include SUDS.

3.2.2 Further information was submitted and the planner comments:

- The amended information to address surface water is sufficient and the Drainage Division are satisfied subject to conditions; and
- The amended access details are acceptable and an amended site notice to include the retention permission was erected.

3.2.3 Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division: no objection subject to conditions.
- Transport Planning Section: no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Éireann– No response.

3.4. Third Party Observations

The third party appellants own a dwelling immediately to the west of the appeal site (No. 19 Montrose Drive) and they raised an observation during the processing of the planning application which is attached to the file. I consider that the issues raised are also mirrored in their submissions to the Coimisiún and are not replicated in this section.

4.0 Planning History

No relevant history.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The Dublin City Development Plan, 2022-2028 identifies that the site is located within an area zoned 'Z1 – Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods'. The relevant zoning objective is 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities'.

5.1.2 Chapter 5 of the Development Plan deals with the matter of quality housing and sustainable neighbourhoods while Chapter 15 sets out Development Standards.

5.1.3 Appendix 18 – Ancillary Residential Accommodation

1.1 General Design Principles - Applications for extensions to existing residential units should:

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

1.2 Extensions to Rear First floor

Rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:

- Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries.
- Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability.
- Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.
- External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.

1.4 Privacy and Amenity

It is important to make sure that any extension does not unacceptably affect the amenities of neighbouring properties. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and

sunlight. It is advisable to discuss proposals with neighbours prior to submitting a planning application.

1.5 Separation Distances

In cases where the back or gable of one dwelling faces onto the rear of another a certain degree of separation is required to avoid an overbearing impact. The requirement for 22 metre separation in such cases may not be applicable and reductions may be acceptable subject to a high design standard with particular regard to the inter-relationship between buildings. Extensions should not dominate or appear overbearing when viewed from adjoining properties.

1.6 Daylight and Sunlight

Large single or two-storey rear extensions to semi-detached or terraced dwellings can, if they project too far from the main rear elevation, result in a loss of daylight to neighbouring houses. Furthermore, depending on orientation, such extensions can have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight received by adjoining properties. On the other hand, it is also recognised that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable.

5.1.4 Appendix 5: Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements

4.0 Car Parking Standards

4.3 Parking in Front Gardens

4.3.1 Dimensions and Surfacing

Table 2: Maximum Car Parking Standards for Various Land Uses

5.1.5 Policy SI22 - Sustainable Drainage Systems - To require the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in all new developments, where appropriate.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The appeal site is not located on or within proximity to any designated Natura 2000 sites, with the nearest designated sites being the North Dublin Bay SAC (000206) North Bull Island SPA (004006) which are both located c. 4.11km to the southeast of the site and also Ballydoyle Bay SAC (000199) and Ballydoyle Bay SPA (004016) which are both located c. 6.14km to the northeast of the site.

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of my report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.2. The appellants (No. 19 Montrose Drive) grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of light to the rear windows, doors and garden;
- The extension would be visually obtrusive and overbearing;
- The existing boiler house on the shared boundary may be damaged by the works and could create a fire hazard, there is no permission to demolish the boundary wall as set out in the Land and Conveyancing Law Reform Act 2009;
- Overlooking from the rear first floor bay window;
- The extension should be single storey only and there are no other two storey rear extensions;
- The extension is out of character with the local area
- Any removal of the shared boundary wall would be a breach of planning control;
- Loss in property value due to the neighbouring extension
- The vehicular access should be a maximum of 2.6 metres wide;
- Details of boundary treatments should be provided
- Impact of noise during construction;
- There should be separate foul sewer and surface water drainage; and

- The developer will need to comply with all Health and Safety Regulations as well as other Regulations.

7.3. Applicant Response

The applicant for planning permission has engaged Martin Brennan Architecture Ltd to make representations on their behalf which can be summarised as follows:

- Shading will only occur on the neighbouring property (No.19) prior to 7am in the morning due to the orientation of the existing dwellings;
- The first floor element of the extension is located away from the common boundary and protrudes less than the ground floor element;
- All construction will be within the applicants own property;
- There will be no overlooking of No. 19 Montrose Drive as Condition 03 of the Planning Authority's decision required obscure glazing to be fitted to the oriel window which the applicant is happy to comply with;
- The two storey extension is modest and complies with the DCDP; and
- The extension blends sympathetically with the original dwelling and the surrounding area.

7.4. Planning Authority Response

The conditions of the grant of planning permission are requested to be upheld and a condition requiring a Section 48 development contribution is requested.

8.0 Assessment

8.1 Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, 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 considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Residential Amenity

- Drainage
- Access & Parking
- Other Matters

8.2 Principle of Development

8.2.1 The proposed development comprises a two storey extension to the rear of an existing dwelling along with a number of other alterations, including a change to the vehicular access which is acceptable in principle within the Z1 'Sustainable Residential Neighbourhood' zoning objective.

8.2.2 I note that the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is supportive of residential extensions. In this regard Appendix 18, Section 1.1 'General Design Principles' of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (DCDP) acknowledges that such developments play an important part in promoting a compact city as well as facilitating sustainable neighbourhoods where a wide variety of families can reside. I consider that the principle of a residential extension is acceptable subject to issues of design, neighbour amenity and other relevant factors.

8.3 Design

8.3.1 The proposal includes a single storey and two storey rear extensions. The single storey element sits adjacent to No. 19 Montrose Drive which is set just off the common boundary. The extension includes space for a new kitchen and dining area at ground floor with an additional bedroom at first floor. Other changes to the existing building include a new WC at ground floor and the inclusion of two ground floor windows on the eastern elevation.

8.3.2 The existing dwelling is 8.4 metres in height while the proposed extension is limited to a maximum of 6.96 metres and therefore the extension is subordinate in height to the existing dwelling and would not alter the roofscape along Montrose Drive. The proposed finishes are listed as being insulated concrete block walls and concrete roof tiles to match the existing dwelling. The window fenestration on the upper floors, mirrors those of the existing first floor windows. A large patio door opens onto the rear garden area at ground floor level, however, there is no visibility of this aspect of the proposal from any public vantage point due to the intervening buildings.

- 8.3.3 The proposed extension has been designed so that the single storey element has a larger floorspace than the two-storey element. The single storey element has a flat roof with a parapet height of 3.5 metres above finished ground level and extends c. 5.6 metres from the rear building line of the existing dwelling. The two-storey element is 6.96 metres in height and extends c.4.4 metres from the existing rear building line. The proposed two storey element of the extension is set back off the boundary line with No. 19 by approximately 1.8metres.
- 8.3.4 Building along the common boundary line was raised as a concern by the third party, however, the proposed extension is set off the common boundary and there are no proposals to demolish the common boundary within the submitted drawings. Section 1.2 of Appendix 18 of the DCDP does not place any embargo on building along the common boundary, rather, the length of the extension along the common boundary is a criteria. While the DCDP does not specify why the length of the extension along a boundary is an issue, it is considered that the purpose is to assess the impacts upon neighbouring residential amenity.
- 8.3.5 The additional groundfloor windows on the side gable elevation would have some public views, however, the windows are small scale and would have a limited impact on the overall design appearance of the dwelling.
- 8.3.6 I am of the opinion that the design, scale, finishes and window fenestration are acceptable in accordance with the policies for residential extensions contained within the DCDP.

8.4 **Residential Amenity**

- 8.4.1 The impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring properties is an essential part of the assessment and in this regard I consider that dominance, overshadowing/loss of light and overlooking are the main areas to be considered in respect to residential amenity.
- 8.4.2 The rear building line of the third party's dwelling (No. 19) runs parallel to the application dwelling with no notable rear extensions. The proposed extension has been designed so that the single storey element of the extension sits adjacent to the common boundary with No. 19 and is limited in height (3.5 metres) with the two storey element of the extension set back off the boundary. Given the set back of the two storey element off the boundary and the limited height of the single storey

extension I do not consider that the proposal would have any adverse impact in relation to dominance.

- 8.4.3 The extension does not include any windows in the western elevation, however, there is a bay window proposed in the southern elevation which would provide views of the rear garden of No. 19. The views from this window would already be available to some extent from the existing bedroom window, however, the bay window has a western facing aspect which does not currently exist. The Planning Authority imposed a condition (No. 3) which required the western facing element of this window to be finished in obscure glazing. I concur that this would be an appropriate condition to ensure that there is no adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining dwelling.
- 8.4.4 Rear extensions to semi-detached dwellings do have the potential to overshadow a neighbouring dwelling. However, in this case the extension adjacent to the shared boundary is single storey in height and is directly south facing limiting the impact of any overshadowing to the early morning. In the circumstances I consider that the overshadowing effects upon the adjoining dwelling at No. 19 Montrose Drive would be limited and therefore are acceptable.
- 8.4.5 The dwelling at No. 23 Montrose Drive is set back c.7.9 metres behind the front building line of the application building which means that the proposed extension runs along the gable elevation of this neighbouring dwelling. There is only one gable window on the opposing elevation of the neighbouring dwelling (No. 23) which is a small narrow window located on the first floor, which is finished in obscure glazing. There are no windows at first floor level on the proposed extension and given that the extension runs along the side gable of No. 23 and is separated by a shared access lane c. 2.44 metres wide I do not consider that the proposed extension would have any significant impact on this property.
- 8.4.6 Section 1.5 of Appendix 18 of the DCDP acknowledges that the former 22 metre separation distance between opposing elevations of dwellings may not be applicable and reductions may be acceptable subject to a high design standard. In this case the proposed extension will back onto properties in Ardmore Drive to the south, however, a separation distance of 28 metres will still be achieved following the construction of the extension and therefore the proposal is considered acceptable in this regard.

8.4.7 Concerns were raised by the third party regarding noise and dust during the construction phase. Construction impacts can impact upon amenity, however, these are normally short term and can be controlled through the use of appropriately worded conditions. A condition was attached to the Planning Authority's decision notice and I am of the view that a similar condition should be attached in this case.

8.4.8 Overall I consider that the proposed extension will not have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of any of the neighbouring dwellings.

8.5 **Drainage**

8.5.1 Policy SI22 of the DCDP requires Sustainable Drainage Systems to be incorporated into new development proposals. It is indicated by the applicant that the surface water drainage for the proposal will include a rain water butt, a raised planter, permeable paving and a BRE365 complaint soakaway.

8.5.2 I note that the Planning Authority has indicated that a condition (No. 6) is necessary to ensure that the drainage proposals are in accordance with BRE Digest 365 and CIRIA C753 and no surface water from the proposed extension is to drain to the public sewer. I agree that this condition would be a necessary safeguard to ensure that adequate surface water drainage facilities are provided within the site.

8.6 **Access and Parking**

8.5.1 The proposed development includes the retention of an existing parking area to the front of the dwelling and the dishing of the pavement area. Section 4.3 of Appendix 5 of the DCDP indicates that off-street parking will be restricted in areas with a high reliance upon on-street parking. In the case of Montrose Drive, I note that there are a large number of properties with in-curtilage parking and there is not a reliance upon on-street parking. I consider that the use of the front amenity area of the dwelling for off-street parking is acceptable in the context of the area and I also note that the Planning Authority did not raise an issue with the principle of in-curtilage parking.

8.5.2 Paragraph 4.3.1 of Appendix 5 of the DCDP indicates that vehicular openings shall be at least 2.5 metres or at most 3 metres in width and shall not have outward opening gates. While the existing entrance is noted to be 4.3 metres in width, amended plans were submitted to the Planning Authority, amending the access width to 2.8 metres with dishing of the pavement provided.

8.5.3 I note that the Planning Authority has indicated that a condition (No. 5) is necessary to ensure that the access arrangements are constructed to the specifications set out in Appendix 5 of the DCDP. I agree that this condition would be a necessary safeguard to ensure that the access arrangements do not prejudice road safety.

8.6 **Other Matters**

8.6.1 I note that boundary issues were raised by the third party, however, these are not matters which can be adjudicated by the Coimisiún. I refer to Section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007) which states that the planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land with Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) stating that 'a person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under this section to carry out any development'.

8.6.2 While the devaluation of property in the area was raised as a concern this is not normally considered to be a material consideration and I have not been provided with any evidence that such an effect would occur or that it would be disproportionate.

9.0 **AA Screening**

9.1 I have considered the development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at 21 Montrose Drive, Artane, Dublin 5, D05V8C3 no relevant designated sites are close by.

9.2 The proposed development comprises the erection of a two storey rear extension to the dwelling and other alterations to the property. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.

9.3 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and nature of the development;

- Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections; and
- The screening decision of the Planning Authority.

9.4 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. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (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 at 21 Montrose Drive, Artane, Dublin 5, D05V8C3 which is 942 metres south of the nearest water body.

10.2 The proposed development comprises a two storey rear extension to the dwelling and other alterations to the property. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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

- Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development ; and
- Distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

10.4 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

That planning permission be granted for the reasons and considerations set out below and subject to the conditions set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the vehicular access along with the design and appearance of the proposed rear extension, the pattern of development in the vicinity, and the requirement to provide details on the proposed drainage, it is considered that, subject to compliance with conditions below, the development proposed would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or residential amenities of property in the vicinity and would not adversely impact on the character of the area. The proposed development, therefore, would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the Planning Authority on the 4th day of July 2025 and the 21st November 2025 except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The western facing elements of the first floor rear window of the proposed extension shall be non-opening and 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.</p>

3.	<p>The rear extension shall be finished in painted render to harmonise with the render finish of the existing dwelling.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.</p> <p>Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
5.	<p>The proposed development shall comply with the following requirements of the Transportation Planning Division of Dublin City Council:</p> <p>a) The vehicular access shall have a maximum width of 3.0m and shall not have outward opening gates.</p> <p>b) The pedestrian access shall not have outward opening.</p> <p>c) Footpath and kerb to be dished and new entrance provided to the requirements of the Area Engineer, Roads Maintenance Division.</p> <p>d) All costs incurred by Dublin City Council, including any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development, shall be at the expense of the developer.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and traffic safety.</p>
6.	<p>The applicant shall comply with the following drainage requirements of the Planning Authority:</p> <p>a) The developer shall comply with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Version 6.0 (available from www.dublincity.ie Forms and Downloads).</p> <p>b) The development is to be drained on a completely separate foul and surface water system with surface water discharging to the public surface water sewer network.</p>

	<p>c) The development shall incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems in the management of surface water.</p> <p>d) The design and construction of soakaways must comply with the requirements of BRE Digest 365 and CIRIA C753. Full details of these shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority (DPPDC Section) prior to commencement of construction.</p> <p>e) All private drainage such as, downpipes, gullies, manholes, armstrong junctions, etc. are to be located within the final site boundary. Private drainage is not permitted in public areas, or areas intended to be taken in charge.</p> <p>f) Proposed new parking area / driveway shall incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems in the management of surface water so that there is no increase in surface water run-off from the development to the drainage network as per the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the protection of public drainage infrastructure, and the satisfactory management of surface water runoff and flood risk as a result of the development</p>
7.	<p>During the construction and demolition phases, the proposed development shall comply with British Standard 5228 ' Noise Control on Construction and open sites Part 1. Code of practice for basic information and procedures for noise control.'</p> <p>Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development and in the interests of residential amenity.</p>
8.	<p>a) All necessary measures shall be taken by the applicant to prevent any spillage or deposition of clay, dust, rubble or other debris, whether arising from vehicle wheels or otherwise, on the adjoining and/or adjacent public road and footpath network during the course of the construction works.</p> <p>b) Any damage to roads, footpaths or other public property caused by the development shall be made good to the satisfaction of the District Engineer.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and proper control of development.</p>

9.	<p>. 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 Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>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.</p>
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Barry Diamond
Planning Inspector

15th May 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500790-DN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Proposed two storey rear extension, two new windows at ground floor and retention of in-curtilage parking area.
Development Address	21 Montrose Drive, Artane, Dublin 5, D05V8C3.
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
<p>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</p> <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) 	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.</p>
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.</p> <p>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road</p>	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	

<p>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)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

This page is intentionally blank