



Development	First floor extension to existing single storey dwelling including modifications to existing bay window. First floor to accommodate 3 No. bedrooms and associated facilities, recessed windows to rear. 2. All requisite ancillary site works
Location	La Petite Maison, 61 Meath Road, Bray, Co. Wicklow
Planning Authority	Wicklow County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560976
Applicant(s)	Stephen Moore
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Jacqueline Finn Imedla Mortimer
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	20 th May 2026
Inspector	Matthew O'Connor

Table of 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	9
7.0	The Appeal	9
8.0	Assessment	12
9.0	Appropriate Assessment (Screening)	18
10.0	Water Framework Directive	19
11.0	Recommendation	19
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	19
13.0	Conditions.....	20

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is 0.028ha and is situated at 'La Petite Maison', No. 61 Meath Road in the settlement of Bray, Co. Wicklow. The subject site comprises a single storey cottage with a stated floor area of 74sq.m on a narrow site. The dwelling is gable fronted and differs from the prevailing design of other houses on this section of Meath Road. The site is served by a vehicular entrance and has a grassed area and driveway in its front curtilage. The side (northern) boundary is formed by a low-level block wall whilst the side (southern) boundary contains a mix of post and wire fence and timber panels along with planting/hedging. There is a yard area to the rear.
- 1.2. The character of the immediate area is residential and the residences along Meath Road are primarily detached single storey dwellings of similar architectural design. There are no Protected Structures or National Monuments within or immediately adjoining the appeal site. The site is not located within a Flood Zone.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The subject development comprises the construction of a 56sq.m first floor extension to the existing dwelling. The extension will accommodate 3 no. bedrooms and associated facilities along with recessed windows to the rear. The development also includes modifications of an existing bay window and all associated site works to facilitate the development.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Grant permission for the development, subject to 5 no. conditions. I note the conditions are generally standard in nature but are summarised as follows:
- Condition 1: Development carried out in accordance with plans and particulars.
 - Condition 2: Payment of financial contribution.
 - Condition 3: Working/Construction Hours.
 - Condition 4: Dwelling/extensions shall be jointly occupied as a single housing unit.
 - Condition 5: Surface water/Drainage specifications.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

- The Planner's Report forms the basis for the grant of permission. This report had regard to the submitted documentation, locational context of the site, planning history, policy framework of relevant development plans and any inter departmental/referral reports or consultees.
- The assessment of the Planning Authority deemed the principle of the development as acceptable.
- In terms of impacts to visual and residential amenities, the Planning Authority noted the proposed extension and acknowledged the site is small with a narrow road frontage. It was accepted the development changes the overall design of the existing dwelling which is generally a departure from the established architectural vernacular of the immediate area. The Planning Authority stated that the same design approach was refused permission under Reg. Ref. 20/311 by Wicklow County Council but granted permission by An Bord Pleanála under Ref. ABP-307687-20 and that overshadowing and overlooking were not serious concerns. The assessment of An Bord Pleanála accepted that the design approach is similar in nature to 'Sunningdale House' on Putland Road and that there are various dwellings of differing design on Meath Road.
- With regard to roads, access and car parking, the Planning Authority stated that there appears to be no significant amendments to access or parking arrangements
- In relation to green infrastructure and landscaping, the Planning Authority stated that the footprint of the proposal is not significantly different from the existing dwelling and that there are no proposed landscaping interventions which is acceptable given the size and scale of the proposed development.
- In terms of services, the Planning Authority noted that there are no specific interventions and this is deemed to be acceptable on account of the size and scale of the proposal.
- No concerns raised in respect on Appropriate Assessment or Environmental Impact Assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Irish Rail – No response received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. Three third party observations were received and the issues raised are similar to those in the appeal. Nevertheless, the issues of concern relating to the proposed development were summarised by the Planning Authority as follows:

- Out of character with the accepting area.
- Overdevelopment of site.
- Number of previous refusals.
- Visual impact.
- Impact on light and amenities.
- Overlooking.
- Distances to neighbouring properties.
- Limited road frontage.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. There have been a number of proposals for the redevelopment of the subject site with the following planning history noted:

W.C.C Ref. 25/177: Application for extension of appropriate period - 20/311 - 1.56sq.m first floor extension to existing single storey dwelling (74sq.m) including modifications to existing bay window. First floor to accommodate 3 No. bedrooms and associated facilities, recessed windows to rear. 2. All requisite ancillary site works. Applicant: Stephen Moore. Status: WITHDRAWN.

ABP Ref. ABP-307687-20 (W.C.C Ref. 20/311): Permission GRANTED by An Bord Pleanála who overturned the decision of Wicklow County Council to refuse permission for 1. 56sq.m First Floor Extension to Existing single storey dwelling (74sq.m) including modifications to existing bay window. First floor to accommodate 3 No. Bedrooms and

associated facilities, recessed windows to rear. 2. All requisite ancillary site works. Applicant: Stephen Moore.

W.C.C Ref. 19/50: Permission GRANTED to extend the appropriate period of a permission - 13/630116 - 1. new 52sq.m Mansard Roof Extension over existing round floor (74sq.m) including Dormer Windows to West & East Elevations, 2 No. Rooflights to West facing elevations and high level windows to South elevation to washrooms. 2. All other ancillary site works. Applicant: Stephen Moore.

ABP Ref. PL 39.243054 (W.C.C Ref. 13/630116 also written as 13/116): Permission GRANTED by An Bord Pleanála who upheld the decision of Wicklow County Council to grant permission for a development consisting of 1. new 52sq.m. Mansard Roof Extension over existing ground floor (74sq.m) including Dormer Windows to West & East Elevations, 2 No. Rooflights to West facing elevations and high level windows to South elevation to washrooms. 2. All other ancillary site works. Applicant: Stephen Moore.

W.C.C Ref. 10/630083 also written as 10/83): – Permission REFUSED for 1. 52sq.m first floor extension to existing single storey dwelling including modifications to existing bay window. First floor to accommodate 3 no. bedrooms and associated facilities, recessed windows and water storage facility. 2. All requisite ancillary site works. Applicant: Stephen Moore.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the relevant Development Plan for the appeal site.

5.1.2. Chapter 4 of the Development Plan relates to ‘Settlement Strategy’. Bray is designated as a Key Town within the metropolitan area.

5.1.3. Chapter 6 of the Development Plan relates to ‘Housing’ with Section 6.4 setting out a number of general housing objectives. The following housing objective is considered to be relevant:

CPO 6.14 To densify existing built-up areas subject to the adequate protection of existing residential amenities.

CPO 6.21 In areas zoned 'Existing Residential' house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity will normally be permitted (other than on lands permitted or designated as open space, see CPO 6.25 below). While new developments shall have regard to the protection of the residential and architectural amenities of houses in the immediate environs, alternative and contemporary designs shall be encouraged (including alternative materials, heights and building forms), to provide for visual diversity.

5.1.5. Chapter 14 of the Development Plan relates to 'Flood Risk Management' and the following objective is considered to be relevant:

CPO 14.12 Excessive hard surfacing shall not be permitted for new, or extensions to, residential or commercial developments and all applications will be required to show that sustainable drainage techniques have been employed in the design of the development.

5.1.6. Volume 3 of the Development Plan contains a number of Appendices of which Appendix 1: 'Development and Design Standards' is considered to be of particular relevance to the subject development. Section 3.18 relates to 'House Extensions' and states:

The construction of extensions to existing houses will be encouraged generally as it usually provides a less resource intensive method of expanding living space than building a new structure. Given the range of site layouts prevailing, it is not possible to set out a set of 'rules' that can be applied to all extensions, but the following basic principles shall be applied:

- The extension should be sensitive to the existing dwelling and should not adversely distort the scale or mass of the structure.
- The extension shall not provide for new overlooking of the private area of an adjacent residence where no such overlooking previously existed.
- In an existing developed area, where a degree of overlooking is already present, the new extension must not significantly increase overlooking possibilities. If for example a two-story dwelling already directly overlooks a neighbour's rear garden, a third storey extension with the same view will normally be considered acceptable.

- New extensions should not overshadow adjacent dwellings to the degree that a significant decrease in day or sunlight entering into the house comes about. In this regard, extensions directly abutting property boundaries should be avoided.
- While the form, size and appearance of an extension should complement the area, unless the area has an established unique or valuable character worthy of preservation, a flexible approach will be taken to the assessment of alternative design concepts.

5.2. Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018 – 2024

5.2.1. It shall be noted that the Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018 – 2024 (LAP) is no longer in force having expired in 2024. The Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2025 is indicated as being at the pre-draft stage which ran from November to December 2024. For context, I note that the appeal site was zoned 'RE- Existing Residential' with an objective *'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas'*.

5.3. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

5.3.1. The following planning policy and guidance is relevant:

- *National Planning Framework - First Revision (2025)*
- *Eastern & Midland Regional Assembly: Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy (RSES) 2019 to 2031.*
- *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).*
- *Development Management: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007).*

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

5.4.1. The appeal site is not located on or within any designated Natura 2000 sites, with the nearest designated sites set out as follows:

- Bray Head SAC (Site Code: 000714) approx. 0.48km to the south;
- Ballyman Glen SAC (Site Code: 000713) approx. 3.06km to the west;
- Knocksink Wood SAC (Site Code: 000725) approx. 4.9km to the west;
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code: 003000) approx. 5.66km to the northeast;

- Glen of the Downs SAC (Site Code: 000719) approx. 6.14km to the southwest;
- The Murrough SPA (Site Code: 004186) approx. 7.52km to the southeast;
- Dalkey Islands SPA (Site Code: 004172) approx. 8km to the northeast;
- Wicklow Mountains SAC (Site Code: 002122) approx. 8.33km to the southwest;
- Wicklow Mountains SPA (Site Code: 004040) approx. 8.8km to the southwest; and,
- The Murrough Wetlands SAC (Site Code: 002249) approx. 9.76 to the southeast.

5.4.2. The Bray Head pNHA (Site Code: 000714); Ballyman Glen pNHA (Site Code: 000713); and, Dargle River Valley pNHA (Site Code: 001754) are located approximately 0.49km to south; 3.05km to the west; and 3.26km to the west; respectively of the appeal site.

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1. The subject development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

Two third party appeals have been lodged against the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission. The appeals are made by the residents of the adjacent properties either side of the subject site. The appeals raise similar issues however; the key points of the respective appeals are each summarised as follows:

Imelda Mortimer

- Proposal is out of character for this end of Meath Road which consists of all bungalows.
- Properties adjoining No. 61 Meath Road would be overshadowed and overlooked.
- Development will result in a precedent being set and a possible depreciation of house prices.
- Permission was previously sought on numerous occasions for this same proposed development and refused. Nothing has changed regarding the plans submitted and should be refused again for the same reasons.

Jacqueline Finn

- The proposal is out of character with existing properties at the southern end of Meath Road. All bungalows of a similar height and design with pitched roofs. While they vary in detail, they have a uniformity that contributes to the character of the area.
- The proposed development would set an undesirable precedent.
- The flat-roofed extension is at variance with the design of the existing houses. The appeal site is small and building the house upwards rather than outwards speaks volumes.
- Adding five rooms (3 no. bedrooms and 2 no. bathrooms) on top of a small house will destroy the streetscape that has hardly changed in almost 100 years.
- The proposal represents a gross over-development of the site which is limited in extent and frontage. The visual impact on the appellants property will be severe and unacceptable.
- The existing house is close to the boundary and southeastern wall of the house. The proposal will be higher than the neighbouring house and chimneys. The water storage tank shown on the site map will to add to the height.
- The finished roof levels shown in the drawing are incorrect as they do not relate to the height point of the proposed house and do not take into account the fall in levels of the road.
- The increase in height, particularly the replacement roof, will diminish visual amenity and will significantly reduce light entering the kitchen. The height increase of the roof to the front of will have a similar effect and will seriously reduce the amenity enjoyed and value of property.
- Previous applications were refused permission on grounds of height and design and nothing has changed in relation to the conclusions reached by the planning authority.
- The development will strongly effect Music Teacher business to the side of the house due to noise and hassle.
- There are no details of how long the construction works will take in months/years.
- Meath Road and Putland Road are busy roads both on a bus route which has added to heavy footfall and congestion. Where are building supplies etc to be kept on garden to front and yard to the back.

- Common sense should prevail and a townscape of bungalows to similar height and design since the 1920s should not be tossed aside for one inappropriate building which is of a different height and design.

7.2. Applicant Response

7.2.1. A response to the appeal has been received on behalf of the applicant and is summarised as follows:

- In relation to 'Doraville', this house is sited to the south of the subject property and will still enjoy eastern, southern and western sun path.
- In relation to 'Waterford', nothing has changed regarding the circumstances on the ground since 2020 when the previous application, Reg. Ref. 20/311 was refused by Wicklow County Council and subsequently granted by An Bord Pleanála.
- The logical conclusion to come to for An Coimisiún Pleanála would be to uphold the latest decision of Wicklow County Council to grant permission.
- Whilst Site Coverage and Plot Ratio of the development falls well within the stipulated guidelines within the Development Plan, now and then, high densities and lower separation distances are now acceptable with the Compact Settlement Guidelines.
- Coupled with the design of the extension which seeks to avoid overlooking; the proposal as granted does not injure the adjoining properties. It will of course be visually different to the current dwelling and the argument in relation to this stands today.
- In 2020, the decision of Wicklow County Council to refuse permission under Reg. Ref. 20/311 was appealed with arguments showing that the area in question has/had a diverse range of building types and heights adding to its visual interest and complexity. These points still apply today.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- None.

7.4. Observations

- None.

8.0 **Assessment**

Having examined the application details and other associated documentation on file, the third party appeals, having conducted an inspection of the site, and having reviewed relevant local policies and guidance; I consider the main issues in these third party appeals can be addressed under the following headings:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Layout
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Other Issues
- Appropriate Assessment (Screening)

8.1. **Principle of Development**

8.1.1. The proposed development seeks permission to extend an existing dwelling in an established residential area. I note from review of the planning history that permission has been granted previously to extend the subject dwelling. Given the nature of the proposal, it is my opinion that an extension would comply with the overarching objectives of the Development Plan in terms of compact growth within existing settlements (CPO 4.2); increased densities (CPO 4.3); and, house improvements, alterations and extensions (CPO 6.21). In addition, the appeal site is located within the built-up area of the settlement of Bray which was zoned 'RE- Existing Residential' under the new expired Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018 – 2024. I therefore consider the principle for this residential development to be acceptable and would be consistent with the prevailing character of this urban location. That said, while the principle of development is supported on the subject site, in my view, it is imperative that such a proposal is in keeping with the pattern of development in the vicinity and would not be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining properties or the character of the area.

8.2. **Design and Layout**

8.2.1. The grounds of appeal state that the proposed development would be out of character with this section of Meath Road which consists of similarly designed bungalows. The development would be inappropriate on account of height and design and would set

an undesirable precedent. It is also stated that numerous previous applications on the site were refused permission on grounds of height and design and that nothing has changed regarding the plans submitted and so permission should be refused. The appeals also claim that the proposal represents a gross over-development of the site and the addition of the first floor level would destroy the streetscape and have a severe visual impact on neighbouring properties. Additionally, it is claimed that the finished roof levels detailed on the planning drawings are incorrect as they do not relate to the height point of the house and do not take into account the fall in levels of the road.

8.2.2. In terms of assessing the general design and configuration of the proposal, I note from the outset that there is a considerable planning history associated with the appeal site. Whilst applications were previously refused by the Planning Authority for extensions to 'La Petite Maison', permission has been approved by An Bord Pleanála for an upper floor level extension under Refs. PL 39.243054 and ABP-307687-20 respectively. With this in mind, I refer the Commission to the development approved under ABP-307687-20 and inform that the subject design is principally unchanged from the development granted permission in 2020. In essence, the proposal seeks to extend the existing single storey cottage to provide a first floor level extension (56sq.m) containing 3 no. bedrooms and a bathroom. The existing ground floor level will be reconfigured to accommodate the modifications to the house. The proposed development will result in the overall redesign of the dwelling with pitched roof being changed to a flat roof which would have a main ridge height of 6.65 metres (excluding plant area). The footprint of the dwelling on the site would remain unchanged. The dwelling would be finished with external insulation and render with zinc capping and timber cladding to projecting features.

8.2.3. Section 3.1.8: House Extensions of Appendix 1 – 'Development & Design Standards' of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022 states that extensions to existing houses will be encouraged generally and that it is not possible to set out a set of 'rules' that can be applied to all extensions. That said, a number of basic principles can be applied which include extensions being sensitive to the existing dwelling and should not adversely distort the scale or mass of the structure; shall not provide for new overlooking of the private area of an adjacent residence where no such overlooking previously existed; where a degree of overlooking is already present, the new extension must not significantly increase overlooking possibilities; adjacent dwellings

should not be overshadowed to the degree that a significant decrease in day or sunlight entering into the house comes about; and, while the form, size and appearance of an extension should complement the area, unless the area has an established unique or valuable character worthy of preservation, a flexible approach will be taken to the assessment of alternative design concepts. With the above parameters in mind, I note that considerations in relation to overlooking and overshadowing will be assessed under Section 8.3 of this report.

8.2.4. In noting the above and having regard to the nature of the proposed development, I would acknowledge that when considered on its own individual merits, the introduction of a first floor level to a single storey dwelling on street/road where the prevailing built form is primarily single storey houses would evidently alter the setting of the streetscape. However, I am of the view that the subject dwelling of 'La Petite Mason' already has a contrasting design and form from the other houses on the eastern side Meath Road which were all formerly of a consistent architectural design. As such, I consider that there is scope for a flexible design approach to be taken on the subject site. In addition, having conducted a site inspection, I also note that there is a mix of house designs in the locality with differing types of bungalows opposite to the site along with various modifications/adaptions to the established cottages on Meath Road which have introduced dormer and first floor levels. In addition, I also note that 'Sunningdale' is approximately 60 metres to the south of the appeal site on the junction of Putland Road and Meath Road. This building is listed on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH Ref. 16301021) and is described as an 'International Style' house which was built c. 1930. The NIAH appraisal states that the house '*adds considerably to the variety of the streetscape*'. Whilst I accept that this particular house is unique to this area and of its time (close to a century old), it nonetheless demonstrates a mix of house typologies in this area that contrasts from the claim of uniformity and indicates that a variation in house design can be accommodated.

8.2.5. Therefore, it is my view that the subject development constitutes a contemporary house design that is conducive to modern accommodation and would be a positive contribution to the streetscape of this section of Meath Road and the surrounding roads/streets. Moreover, as previously outlined, the subject proposal is of a similar scale, design, height and internal configuration to that of a previously approved

development granted by An Bord Pleanála under Ref. ABP-307687-20 in 2020 and I find no reason to deviate from this position in this instance.

8.3. **Impact on Residential Amenity**

8.3.1. The appellants have raised concerns in relation to loss of light, overshadowing and overlooking on their respective properties from the subject development. In the interests of clarity, I shall consider each topic under the following sub-headings:

Overshadowing and Loss of Light

8.3.2. The appeals claims that the subject development would lead to overshadowing of adjacent properties which will negatively impact the enjoyment of their residence and result in the loss of light. I note that neither of the appellants have submitted any Sunlight/Daylight/Shadow Assessment in respect of the subject development to demonstrate impacts on neighbouring properties. I also note that the applicant did not provide any such assessments at application stage but an appendix with the appeal response includes the previous First Party Appeal (ABP-307687-20) which included shadow analysis diagrams for March, June and December for the revised development which is comparable the proposal now before Commission. With this in mind, I do not consider that the subject development would be materially different for the previous conclusion reached that the first floor extension would not result in any undue overshadowing of neighbouring properties. Furthermore, I have formed my own opinion on the subject development and consider that there would be no significant impacts in terms of overshadowing and loss of light on the basis of the extent of the proposed first floor level development which will not project beyond the footprint of the existing house, the flat roof design and the northwest-southeast alignment of the houses on Meath Road which would currently cast shadows to the front, side and rear of the properties throughout the year on account of their close proximity.

8.3.3. In this regard, I consider that any potential changes in shadowing or loss of light would not result in significant impacts on the appellants' property and its occupants. It is my also opinion that any potential changes in the shadow effect or lighting would be minimal in the context of the existing built environment and I consider it to be reasonable on account of the scale of the proposed works to the house and the site

location within an established residential area. On this basis, I consider the subject development to be acceptable.

Overlooking/Loss of Privacy

8.3.4. According to the appeals, the subject development will overlook neighbouring properties and result in a loss of privacy. I note in this regard that the appeals are silent as to where overlooking and diminishment of privacy would occur. In my consideration of the development, I have had regard to the submitted planning drawings and I note that there are no first floor level windows on the side (north-facing) elevation. Two windows are proposed on the side (south-facing) elevation to serve an en-suite bathroom and a stairwell. I am of the view that these obscured windows to non-habitable spaces would address concerns in terms of perceived or actual overlooking from the subject dwelling to the neighbouring residence to the north. Therefore, I do not consider that the development would impact on privacy or result in overlooking to the appellants' properties to warrant a refusal of permission. It is also my opinion that any perceived impacts on the appellants' properties would be acceptable for that of an established built-up residential area. Nevertheless, I recommend, should the Commission be minded to grant permission, that a suitably worded condition be attached requiring obscured glazing on the aforementioned windows. In the interests of completeness of assessment, I do not consider that there are any concerns in terms of overlooking to other dwellings. Whilst the first floor level will introduce new bedroom windows on the rear (east) facing elevation that will be approximately 7 metres from the rear boundary with 'Hoeyfield' on Putland Road; the orientation of the development will not directly overlook the neighbouring dwelling and there is an existing structure in the rear garden which will limit direct views into the private open space.

Concluding Remarks on Residential Amenity

8.3.5. Overall, in relation to the perceived impacts on residential amenity on the neighbouring properties, I am of the view that any such impacts would not be of such significance so as to warrant alterations to the proposed design or indeed a refusal of permission. The subject development, in my view, represents a modern extension and associated modifications to an existing residential property in an established residential area, where extensions to modify and improve houses are common. I am

of the view that the proposed extension has been sensitively considered and would not result in overshadowing, loss of light, overlooking or loss of privacy to adjacent residences. As such, I consider the proposal to be acceptable.

8.4. Other Issues

8.4.1. Having regard to the grounds of appeal, I shall also consider the following matters raised in the sub-headings below:

Devaluation of Property

8.4.2. I note the concerns raised by the appellants in respect of the devaluation of property in the vicinity of the appeal site. Having regard to my assessment, I do not consider it unreasonable for an existing dwelling on zoned lands in a built-up urban location to be extended/modified and therefore I am satisfied that the proposed development, if approved, would not seriously injure the amenities of the area.

Noise & Nuisance

8.4.3. The grounds of appeal claim the development would impact on neighbouring property due to noise and hassle. It is also argued that the local road network is currently congested and it is queried as to where building supplies/materials are to be stored given the limited site. It is my opinion that construction/development works to an existing dwelling may cause localised nuisance as a result of increased building activity and will change throughout the development process. However, I consider that same is to be expected for the duration of the construction phase. In relation to the concerns regarding placement of building supplies/construction materials, I am of the view that these matters would be considered by the applicant/developer as part of normal best practice construction measures. That said, I consider that concerns in this regard can be addressed and if the Commission is minded to grant permission for the development, I recommend that a condition be attached requiring the applicant to submit a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which would contain details to traffic management, noise, dust, vibration, storage of various materials and other matters during the construction phase.

Working Hours

8.4.4. An appeal has made reference to the Construction/Work Hours and indicates that there are no details as to how long the construction works will take in months/years. I

acknowledge that Condition No. 3 of the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission relates to the restrictions on working hours and it is my view that such a condition is generally standard in nature and aimed at protecting residential amenity. As previously indicated, I acknowledge that construction works in an urban location could present a nuisance and inconvenience for existing residents in the vicinity but I am of the view that same would be limited to the construction phase of development and is to be reasonably expected. Therefore, I consider that such a condition is reasonable and should the Commission be minded to grant permission that a similarly worded condition could be attached.

9.0 **Appropriate Assessment (Screening)**

9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). The proposed development essentially comprises an extension to an existing dwelling. The appeal site is located in an urban area and is not located within or immediately adjoining any designated Natura 2000 sites.

9.2. The subject site is approximately 0.48km from the nearest designated site which is the Bray Head Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 000714). Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale and nature of the development;
- The location of the site on serviced lands in an urban area and distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.
- Taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority

9.3. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. 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 in a serviced urban area and is to connect to the existing sewer network. There are no water courses in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site which is situated within an established urban area
- 10.2. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.
- 10.3. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive. Accordingly, the subject development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that permission is GRANTED for the development in accordance with the following reasons and considerations

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the pattern of development in the area, the design and scale of the proposed extension and the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 (as varied), it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or the character of the streetscape, and would not seriously injure the amenities of surrounding dwellings. 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 in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on 02/12/2025, 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, or as otherwise stipulated by conditions hereunder, and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. In default of agreement the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The dwelling and extension(s) shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: In the interests of clarity and development control.

3. The glazing to the first floor level windows on the side (south-facing) elevation shall be fitted with obscure glazing. This glazing shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. For the interests of clarity, the application of a translucent film to the surface of clear glass does not satisfy the requirements of this condition.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

4. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including noise management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.

5. The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the Planning Authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of any further

works on the site, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the Planning Authority.

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

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 07:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08:00 to 14:00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

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

7. 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.

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.

Matthew O Connor
Planning Inspector

27th May 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500829-WW-26
Proposed Development Summary	First floor extension to existing single storey dwelling (74sq.m) including modifications to existing bay window. First floor to accommodate 3 No. bedrooms and associated facilities, recessed windows to rear. 2. All requisite ancillary site works
Development Address	Petite Maison, 61 Meath Road, Bray, Co. Wicklow
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 Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" 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 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?	

<input 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.	The development is not a Class.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input 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)	
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)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____