



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500841-DF-26

Development	Modifications to extension
Location	9 Neptune Terrace, Skerries, Dublin, K34 YP08
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F25A/1094E
Applicant(s)	Derek Marry
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Retention
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Derek Marry
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	19 th May 2026
Inspector	Shane McGlynn

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.....	8
7.0	The Appeal	8
8.0	Assessment	10
9.0	AA Screening.....	15
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	16
11.0	Recommendation.....	17
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	17
13.0	Conditions.....	17
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	19
	Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination	22

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.035 ha, comprises a 2-storey terraced dwelling at 9 Neptune Terrace, Skerries, Co. Dublin. Neptune Terrace comprises a terrace of properties on the eastern side of the R128 Holmpatrick in Skerries Town Centre. The terrace and surrounding area is characterised by a mix of town centre uses, including residential.
- 1.2. The subject dwelling has recently been extended to the rear at ground and first floor level with a dormer window provided at roof level. The submitted application plans illustrate an existing flat roof 2-storey extension which projects a maximum of 8.7m from the rear building line of the main dwelling. The extension has an overall width of 6.1m at ground floor level and 4.6m at first floor level. The floor area of the existing extension is not clearly stated in the application material. An existing dormer window is set within the rear roof profile.
- 1.3. The remaining rear garden within the site is substantial and extends c. 30m beyond the rear extension. A single storey outbuilding is contained within the rear garden. There is no vehicular access to the site. Pedestrian access is off the R128 to the front and a laneway to the rear.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises retention of modifications to rear ground and first floor extension; change of external finish of rear dormer window from metal cladding to render.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority made a decision to refuse retention permission on 27th January 2026 for the following reason:

The applicant has not adequately addressed the reasons for refusal of F24A/0967E for the proposed development. This proposal to revise the dimensions of previously approved application Reg. Ref: F24A/0534E, would by virtue of its inappropriate

scale and mass and the consequent concerns relating to the overbearing impact and significant overshadowing on the adjoining property to the north, seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity, contravene materially a condition attached to an existing permission, and therefore would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The Chief Executive's Decision reflects the Planner's Report.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

- The principle of development is acceptable in accordance with the site's 'TC' zoning objective, Section 3.5.13.1 and Section 14.10.2 of the County Development Plan.
- Site is located in Flood Zone A, however no flooding impacts anticipated given nature of proposal.
- Proposal is substantially similar to modification to ground floor extension previously refused.
- Previous concerns of Planning Authority regarding overshadowing and overbearance on neighbouring property to north have not been addressed. Proposal therefore remains unacceptable.
- Proposed modifications to first floor extension are acceptable overall, however window on southern elevation overlooks adjacent property and obscure glazing should be provided.
- Alteration to external finish of dormer extension is acceptable.
- Dormer meets existing ridgeline of dwelling, contrary to previously granted dormer. This alteration has not been included in the subject application and contravenes Section 14.10.2.5 of the County Development Plan, and is therefore unacceptable.
- There is no requirement for appropriate assessment or environmental impact assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Conservation Office – No specific comments or requirements.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject Site

P.A Ref. F24A/0967E Permission REFUSED on 16th December 2024 for revisions to condition 2(c) of reg. ref. F24A/0534E to omit the reduction in overall depth of the ground floor rear extension by 1.5 meters.

- Reason for refusal states: *“The proposal to revise condition no.2(c) of previously approved application Reg. Ref: F24A/0534E, and omit the reduction in overall depth of the ground floor rear extension by 1.5 metres, would by virtue of its inappropriate scale and mass and the consequent concerns relating to the overbearing impact and significant overshadowing on the adjoining property to the north, seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity, contravene materially a condition attached to an existing permission, and therefore would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”*

P.A Ref. F24A/0534E Permission GRANTED on 12th September 2024 for partial demolition of the existing dwelling, construction of a new porch to front, construction of a new 1 and 2 storey extension to the rear, an attic conversion to include a dormer window to the rear, SuDS drainage system, and associated site works.

- The Planning Officer considered the proposed rear ground floor extension would be visually obtrusive due to its length and dominant nature, would have an overbearing impact on the adjoining property to the north and would cause significant overshadowing given the orientation of the site.
- The Planning Authority accordingly attached a condition requiring agreement of revisions to the development, including condition 2, which states (my emphasis added):

“Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority revised plans and elevations to demonstrate the following:

(a) A revised rear dormer set down by 200mm below the roof ridgeline.

(b) The omission of a porch area to the front (west) of the dwelling.

(c) The reduction in the overall depth of the ground floor rear extension by 1.5 metres. Once agreed, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed drawings thereafter.

REASON: In the interest of visual amenity.”

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Fingal County Development Plan, 2023-2029 (as varied)

The appeal site is zoned **TC – Town and District Centre**, with an objective to *“protect and enhance the special physical and social character of town and district centres and provide and/or improve urban facilities.”*

The site is located within the **Skerries Architectural Conservation Area** (ACA ID DF-ACA-29).

Section 3.5.13.1 Residential Extensions

Policy SPQHP41 – Residential Extensions: Support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

Objective SPQHO45 – Domestic Extensions: Encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area.

Section 14.10.2.3 Ground Floor Extensions (rear)

Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining to serve the dwelling house. The proposed extension should match or complement the existing dwelling house.

Section 14.10.2.4 First Floor Extensions

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

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

Section 14.10.2.5 Roof Alterations including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions

The quality of materials/finishes to dormer extensions shall be given careful consideration and should match those of the existing roof.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal sites is not located within or adjoining any designated site.

The nearest European Sites in close proximity to the appeal site are as follows:

- c. 110m from North-West Irish Sea SPA (site code: 004236)

- c. 670m from Skerries Islands SPA (site code: 004122)
- c. 2.5km from Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code: 003000)
- c. 3km from Rockabill SPA (site code: 004014)

The nearest Natural Heritage Areas in close proximity to the appeal site are as follows:

- c. 670m from Skerries Islands NHA (site code: 001218)
- c. 1.9km from Loughshinny Coast pNHA (site code: 002000)

6.0 EIA Screening

Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity/ the absence of any connectivity to any sensitive location, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A First Party Appeal was received from the applicant, Derek Marry, against the decision made by the Planning Authority to refuse retention permission for the development.

The following is a summary of the grounds of appeal:

- Identifies a permission (ACP ref. PL06F.321733 refers) for retention of rear extension at another site located in proximity to the subject site and with similar circumstances, including zoning and ACA designation, first party appeal on foot of refusal by Planning Authority. Highlights for comparison purposes that this permitted development extends further to the rear than the subject proposal.
- The existing rear extension to adjacent property to south (No. 10 Neptune Terrace) is significantly larger than the subject proposal. Highlights also that

the Commission had regard to precedent of other extensions in the vicinity of the site in assessing ref. PL06F.321733.

- There is no reference to material contravention in the Planning Authority's decision, therefore the Commission are not restricted in respect of the criteria under Section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000.
- The setback of the extension from the northern site boundary is intended to reduce the potential impact on the neighbouring property to the north.
- Highlights there was no objection to the proposal from neighbouring property to north.
- Shadow analysis provided with appeal demonstrates that the proposed modified extension to be retained reduces shadow impact on the adjacent property to the north compared with the permitted extension.
- Increased depth of ground floor extension is minor and not material in terms of overbearing impact.
- The overall footprint of the development is 0.4 sq.m smaller than that permitted under F24A/0534E.
- The dormer meeting the existing ridgeline does not materially affect visual impact of subject proposal, as it is a very minor detail and not visible from the public street. Drawings submitted with appeal have accurately illustrated the existing dormer.
- The dormer issue could have been addressed by way of condition and the Commission is accordingly invited to attach such a condition to any grant of permission.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The response from the Planning Authority notes the content of the first-party appeal. The Planning Authority request that the Commission support the Planning Authority's decision in this instance.

The Planning Authority request that a financial contribution condition is attached in accordance with their Section 48 Development Contribution Scheme in the event that the Commission decides to grant permission.

7.3. Further Responses

Submission received from **Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (Development Applications Unit)** states the proposed development will not have a negative impact on the ACA.

8.0 Assessment

Having examined all the application and appeal documentation on file and having regard to the relevant local and national policy and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal and the planning authorities' reason for refusal and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise. The main issues, therefore, are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on residential amenity
 - Overbearance
 - Overshadowing
- Quality of external finish to dormer

I highlight to the Commission at the outset that there are 2 distinct elements to the proposed development to be retained: modifications to the ground and first floor extensions; change of external finish of dormer.

8.1. Principle of Development

The site is zoned 'TC – Town Centre' with an objective to *"Protect and enhance the special physical and social character of town and district centres and provide and/or improve urban facilities"*. Extensions are permitted to existing residential dwellings within this zoning objective, and as such the proposed development is acceptable in principle subject to compliance with relevant guidelines and standards.

8.2. Impact on Residential Amenity

Regarding impacts to residential amenity in terms of both overbearance and overlooking, the Planning Officer's report refers to the previous concerns raised in the Planning Authority's assessment of ref. F24A/0967E (see Planning History

above) and notes that these concerns have not been adequately addressed. The PA assessment of that application in turn noted that the residential amenity impacts (overbearance and overshadowing) identified under ref. F24A/0534E had not been adequately addressed. I have had regard to these previous assessments by the PA in my assessment of the subject proposal.

I would highlight to the Commission that the subject proposal for retention comprises a similar but not identical extension to that proposed under refs. F24A/0967E and F24A/0534E. For ease of reference and comparison purposes, I set out below the key differences between the subject proposal for retention (based on the drawings submitted with the application and appeal) and what was permitted under ref. F24A/0534E (as revised by Condition 2):

- The ground floor extension is set back from the northern property boundary, resulting in a reduction in the overall width of the extension from 7.0m to 6.1m.
- The layout of the enclosed courtyard area within the southwest corner of the extension adjoining the southern property boundary have been slightly altered.
- The ground floor extension has been lengthened from an overall length of 7.3m to 8.7m¹.
- Reduction in overall width of first floor extension from 4.9m to 4.6m.
- Repositioning of first floor extension c. 0.9m south, resulting in corresponding increase in setback from northern site boundary and decrease in setback from southern site boundary.
- Overall decrease in floor area of the extension by 0.4 sq.m.
- Change in external finish of dormer from metal cladding to render.

An existing rear extension to a neighbouring dwelling and a previous permission for a rear extension to a dwelling in the vicinity of the appeal site are identified in the grounds of appeal. My assessment has considered the subject proposal on its own merits having regard to the sensitivity of the receiving environment and the specifics of the development.

¹ I highlight to the Commission the Planning Officer's Report refers to an overall length of 9.2m, which appears to be a discrepancy.

Overbearingance

The Planning Authority considers the proposed modifications to the extension would have an overbearing impact on the adjoining property to the north. Additionally, the Planning Officer's assessment of refs F24A/0534E (referred to in the PA's reason for refusal of the subject application) considered that the proposed extension would be visually obtrusive due to its length and dominant nature. This informed the PA's decision to attach condition 2(c) to that permission.

In response, the appellant has contended in the grounds of appeal that the increased depth of ground floor extension is minor and not material in terms of overbearing impact. The appellant has noted that the overall footprint of the development is 0.4 sq.m smaller than that permitted under PA ref. F24A/0534E.

Having inspected the appeal site, having regard to the scale, height and bulk of the extension that would result from the modifications hereby proposed, and having regard in particular to the guidance of sections 3.5.13.1 (Residential Extensions) and 14.10.2.3 (Ground Floor Extensions (rear)) of the County Development Plan, I do not consider that the proposed development would give rise to an overbearing impact on the adjacent property to the north for the reasons set out below.

I note in particular that the modifications would provide an additional degree of setback of the rear extension at both ground and first floor levels from the northern site boundary, thereby reducing overbearing potential. I note also that the overall mass of the ground and first floor extensions would have been reduced by the proposed modifications which are subject of this retention application, albeit negligibly, and therefore overbearing impacts do not arise in respect of mass. I consider that the c. 1.5m increase in the length of the ground floor projection should be viewed in the context of the other proposed modifications to the extension and in my opinion the overall modifications would not result in a more overbearing or visually obtrusive form than the permitted scenario under PA ref. F24A/0534E.

Overshadowing

The Planning Authority stated in their assessment of the extension proposed under ref. F24A/0534E that the proposed ground floor extension would cause significant overshadowing given the orientation of the site and would therefore have a negative impact on the sunlight / daylight that the adjoining property to the north (No. 8

Neptune Terrace) currently receives. The proposed reduction in the overall length of the ground floor extension by 1.5m (as per condition 2(c) of ref. F24A/0534E) was considered adequate to address this issue.

The appellant has provided a shadow analysis for the extension as part of the appeal. The shadow analysis comprises a single spring/autumn diagram, demonstrating an overall reduction in the area of shadow cast on the rear façade and rear windows of the adjoining property to the north. The appellant states that the shadow analysis demonstrates would reduce the vast majority of the shadow impact to No. 8, with only a very minor area of additional shadow within the garden.

The proposed modifications would not increase the length of the first floor rear extension element and would set back the extension somewhat at both ground and first floor levels from the northern site boundary. The elevation drawings submitted with the application illustrate that the ground floor extension element has an overall height of c. 4.2m above the ground level of the rear gardens of adjacent properties to the north and south. Given that the increase in the length of the extension is confined to ground floor level and consists of c. 1.5m, and having regard to the height of this element relative to adjacent properties, I do not consider this element alone would significantly increase overshadowing impacts to the dwelling or rear garden of No. 8 Neptune Terrace and such impacts would be significantly offset in any event by the positive impacts conferred by the proposed setbacks. I am therefore satisfied that any changes to overshadowing on the neighbouring property to the north arising from the proposed modifications would be negligible and that the proposal is acceptable in this respect. I note that a degree of overshadowing is to be expected in built-up urban areas, however I consider that any potential adverse impact in terms of overshadowing within the urban context of the site in Skerries town centre would be minor and acceptable, as such impacts must be balanced against the need to provide a quantum of development which seeks to provide a more compact urban form.

Summary

Having regard to the foregoing, I consider the modifications proposed to be retained to the ground and first floor extensions are acceptable and would remain consistent with the policies of the County Development Plan, in particular Sections 3.5.13.1

(Residential Extensions) and 14.10.2.3 (Ground Floor Extensions (rear)). I do not consider that adverse impacts in respect of overshadowing or overbearance arise in respect of the modifications to be retained.

8.3. Quality of External Finish to Dormer

The subject application includes for retention of change of external finish of rear dormer window from metal cladding to render. The guidance contained in section 14.10.2.5 of the County Development Plan states that the quality of materials/finishes to dormer extensions shall be given careful consideration. I note the Planning Authority considered that change to the external finish of the dormer to be acceptable. From my site inspection, I note that the render finish to the dormer matches the finish to the walls of the extension. I consider that the finishes are of appropriate quality and consistent with the character of the dwelling.

The Planning Officer's Report states that the profile of the dormer deviates from that permitted under ref. F24A/0534E and is contrary to section 14.10.2.5 as it meets the existing ridgeline of the dwelling. I note in relation to this concern that the subject application seeks retention of changes to the external finishes of the dormer only. The layout of the dormer including its height and profile do not form part of the application and I therefore consider that this concern is not within the scope of the Commission's assessment of the subject application for retention. I note the matter of enforcement in relation to the layout of the dormer would fall under the jurisdiction of the Planning Authority.

8.4. Other Issues

Overlooking

The ground floor element of the extension includes a window on its southern elevation opening onto an internal courtyard, the layout of which is revised as part of the proposed modifications. I note the window and courtyard address a stone boundary wall and I do not consider that any overlooking concerns arise as a result of the proposed modifications to this element.

I note that concerns regarding overlooking were not cited by the Planning Authority in their reasons for refusal, however the Planning Officer's Report notes that the window on the southern elevation of the first floor extension would give rise to

overlooking and obscure glazing is recommended. I note from the drawings provided with the appeal that the appellant has stated that the window in question is already obscurely glazed. I consider this addresses the concern identified in the Planning Officer's Report and I conclude that no undue overlooking of neighbouring properties arises in respect of the proposed development.

Financial Contribution

The Planning Authority's response to the appeal request that a financial contribution condition is attached in accordance with their Section 48 Development Contribution Scheme in the event that the Commission decides to grant retention permission. The Fingal County Council Development Contribution Scheme 2026-2030 sets a development contribution rate of €269.34 per sq.m for applications for retention of residential development. The subject proposal for retention of modifications to a residential extension does not result in any overall increase in the floor area of the extension permitted under F24A/0534E, which was accordingly subject to a condition requiring payment of a development contribution. I therefore consider that attachment of a development contribution condition is not warranted in this instance in the event that the Commission consider a grant of permission for retention.

9.0 AA Screening

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

The subject site is located:

- c. 110m from North-West Irish Sea SPA (site code: 004236)
- c. 670m from Skerries Islands SPA (site code: 004122)
- c. 2.5km from Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code: 003000)
- c. 3km from Rockabill SPA (site code: 004014)

The proposed development comprises retention of modifications to an extension. 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 it could not have any effect on a European Site.

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

- The simple nature and limited scale of the proposed works.
- The distance from the nearest European site and lack of connections.
- The outcome of the screening report/determination by Fingal County Council.

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

I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & 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 the project, site and receiving environment
- Location-distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

On the basis of objective information, I consider that the proposed development will not result in a likely 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

I recommend that permission for retention should be GRANTED for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature, scale, location and design of the development to be carried out, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would comply with the zoning objective for the site, the provisions of Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 in particular policy SPQHP41 (Residential Extensions), objective SPQH045 (Domestic Extensions), section 14.10.2.3 (Ground Floor Extensions (Rear)), section 14.10.2.4 (First Floor Extensions), and section 14.10.2.5 (Roof Alterations including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions) of the plan, would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenity of the area, and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be retained in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority and the development shall be retained in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The development shall comply with the conditions of the parent permission under PA Ref. F24A/0534E, save as may be amended by this grant of permission.

Reason: To clarify the scope of the permission.

3. Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

4. The extended house shall be used as a single dwelling unit.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

“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.”

Shane McGlynn
Planning Inspector
27th May 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500841-DF-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of modifications to extension
Development Address	9 Neptune Terrace, Skerries, Dublin, K34 YP08
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes.
	<input checked="" 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)	N/A
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	N/A
<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 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.	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	N/A
<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)	N/A
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"/>	N/A
No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of modifications to extension
Development Address	9 Neptune Terrace, Skerries, Dublin, K34 YP08
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 (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>The proposed development comprises retention of modifications to a rear extension to a dwelling.</p> <p>The proposed development will not give rise to the production of significant waste, emissions or pollutants.</p>
<p>Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas,</p>	<p>The development is located in an urban area. The site is c. 110m from a European Site. Following screening for Appropriate Assessment, it has been ascertained 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.</p> <p>Given the scale and nature of development there will be no significant environmental effects arising.</p>

landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Yes. EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	No.

There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	No.
--	-----

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____