



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

**PL-500854-DR-26**

---

<b>Development</b>	The removal of a non-original porch structure and provision of single storey side extension.
<b>Location</b>	4, Vesey Mews, Dun Laoghaire, Dublin, A96K651
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	D25A/0924/WEB
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Tara Justin
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant Permission + Conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Aoife & Xavier van den Brande
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None

**Date of Site Inspection**

1<sup>st</sup> May 2026

**Inspector**

Paul Christy

**Contents**

1.0 Site Location and Description ..... 5

2.0 Proposed Development ..... 5

3.0 Planning Authority Decision ..... 6

    3.1. Decision..... 6

    3.2. Planning Authority Reports..... 7

    3.3. Prescribed Bodies ..... 8

    3.4. Third Party Observations ..... 8

4.0 Planning History ..... 8

5.0 Policy Context..... 10

    5.1. Development Plan: Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan,  
    2022-2028..... 10

    5.2. Natural Heritage Designations..... 12

6.0 EIA Screening..... 12

7.0 Water Framework Directive Screening ..... 12

8.0 The Appeal ..... 14

    8.1. Grounds of Appeal..... 14

    8.2. Applicant’s Response ..... 15

    8.3. Planning Authority Response ..... 16

    8.4. Observations ..... 16

9.0 Assessment ..... 16

    9.1. Overview ..... 16

    9.2. Potential Impacts on the Architectural Heritage of the Area ..... 17

9.3.	Amenities of Adjoining Properties.....	21
9.4.	Other Matters .....	24
10.0	AA Screening.....	26
11.0	Recommendation.....	26
12.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	26
13.0	Conditions.....	27

**Appendix A – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening**

## 1.0 **Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The subject property is a two-storey, semi-detached former coach house located to the (south) rear of, and formerly associated with No.4 Vesey Place and now converted for residential use. The property is located within the Vesey Place, De Vesci Terrace and Willow Bank Architectural Conservation Area ('ACA'). The Local Authority's 'Character and Appraisal' document for the ACA notes that coach houses/mews buildings were constructed in pairs of semi-detached buildings to the rear of Nos. 2-10 Vesey Place. No.4 Vesey Place, and indeed all of the properties in the two terraces comprising Vesey Place, is on the Record of Protected Structures.
- 1.2. The Vesey Place buildings had, and have, deep rear gardens and thus the mews properties are located at some remove from the 'parent' properties. The mews buildings are orientated at right angles to, and positioned immediately adjacent to, an adjacent laneway, Vesey Mews. In turn, Vesey Mews is immediately adjacent to another road, Knapton Lawn, with the two being separated by a traditional stone wall.
- 1.3. The subject property is separated from the curtilage of No.4 Vesey Place by a traditional stone wall. It benefits from relatively generous garden space totalling c.155m<sup>2</sup> to the side and rear. Immediately to the west of the property is the curtilage of a similar mews building, together with the said mews building (No.3) in residential use. To the east is the other half of the pair of semi-detached mews buildings also in residential use (No.5), and to the north is the curtilage of No.4 Vesey Place.

## 2.0 **Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The proposed development includes:
  - A 10.5m long x 4.65m wide x 3.25m high single-storey side extension to an existing two-storey mews dwelling, and containing a bedroom, living room and bathroom. The extension is connected to the 'parent' dwelling via a 1.3m x c.6.9m covered corridor comprised of a 'Hardwood Floor Finish', a roof formed of glazed roof lights, and glazed panels at either end;
  - The removal of what is described as a 'non-original' porch. The porch is attached to the elevation against which the covered corridor is to be formed.
  - A sedum green roof.

### 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

#### 3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Grant permission, subject to five standard conditions, plus two specific conditions. January, 2026. The two specific conditions are as follows:

*'3. Prior to the commencement of development, the Applicant is requested to provide an updated surface water management design demonstrating that the outlets from the green roof drainage system discharge to an infiltration or rainwater reuse system at ground level for the written agreement of the Planning Authority (drainage department). This can be a soakaway (with the offset distance for infiltration from adjacent buildings or structures to the professional judgement of a suitably qualified engineer to ensure the proposed system has no impact on neighbouring properties), rainwater harvesting system, permeable paving designed with an allowance for roof discharge (e.g. difuser box) etc.*

*REASON: In order to ensure that the proposed development is in accordance with Section 10.2.2.6 Policy Objective EI6: Sustainable Drainage Systems of the County Development Plan 2022-2028, specifically, that all surface water run-off generated by the development is infiltrated or reused locally with no overflow to the public sewer.*

*4. A Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be prepared prior to commencement of development for review as required. The plan shall include details of arrangements for routes for construction traffic, parking during the construction phase, the location of the compound for storage of plant and machinery and the location for storage of deliveries to the site. All necessary measures shall be taken by the Applicant and Contractor to:* a. *prevent any mud, dirt, debris or building material being carried onto or placed on the public road or adjoining properties as a result of the site construction works* b. *repair any damage to the public road arising from carrying out the works* c. *avoid conflict between construction activities and pedestrian/vehicular movements on the surrounding public roads during construction works.*

*REASON: In the interest of orderly development.'*

- 3.1.2. The Authority's 'Reasons and Considerations' included the consideration that the development '*would not detract from the amenities of the area or the ACA*'.

## 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Report: With regards to built heritage issues, the Planner's report referred to the report of the Authority's Conservation Division and quoted the conclusion therein that the development: *'is not considered to visually detract from the Protected Structure and/or views of the Mews dwelling within the ACA'*. The Planning Authority was also satisfied that the development does not interfere with views of the ornate gable wall of the subject mews dwelling, and that there will be no loss of any of its original fabric. It was also concluded that: *'Whilst...the proposed extension partially extends beyond the northern building line of the mews dwelling, the degree of this is not considered so significant that it would have a detrimental visual impact on the mews dwelling particularly as a number of properties have structures such a (sic) sheds directly north of the mews dwellings on Vesey Mews either in the mews property itself or in the rear gardens of De Vesce Terrace.'*
- 3.2.2. In terms of residential amenity and visual impact, the Report identified a number of factors in support of the proposal including, inter alia: the Applicant's statement that it will not impact on the party wall with No.3; the overall design being of high quality; it will not have any significant impact on the visual amenity of the existing house or neighbouring properties; it will be largely imperceptible from the mews laneway; the rear garden will be c.80m<sup>2</sup>, exceeding the 48m<sup>2</sup> requirement in the Development Plan (Section 12.3.7.9); it is not considered that there is any potential for negative overshadowing/overlooking impacts to neighbouring property being flat-roofed and single storey in height.
- 3.2.3. Transportation Planning: No objection, subject to standard conditions.
- 3.2.4. Conservation Division: Generally positive report in context of referring to relevant Development Plan provisions, recent planning history at the site, and other decisions in area relating to side extensions of suitable proportions and height.
- 3.2.5. Drainage Planning: Refers to the proposed sedum green roof and advises that these can be susceptible to failure and, in order to comply with Policy Objective E16 (Sustainable Drainage Systems) in the Development Plan, requests an updated surface water management design demonstrating that the outlets from the green roof drainage system discharge to an infiltration or rainwater reuse system at ground level. Several examples of such solutions are listed including, inter alia, a soakaway<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> This request is addressed in Condition 3 of the Authority's decision.

### 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. None.

### 3.4. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.4.1. Seven submissions were made to the Local Authority and may be considered in terms of three categories as set out below.
- 3.4.2. The submissions of Aoife and Xavier van den Brande (the Appellants), Eamon Galligan, Jane Dane, Andrew Jones, and Catherine Vaughan and Patrick Nolan all raise issues in relation to the northern building line of the mews dwellings generally as per the contents of the Appeal.
- 3.4.3. Susan McKevin, and R & H Lane are residents of dwellings on Knapton Lawn. Knapton Lawn immediately adjoins Vesey Mews, the two being separated by an old stone wall. Their concerns are in relation to construction traffic using Knapton Lane.
- 3.4.4. Catherine Vaughan and Patrick Nolan (submission made on their behalf by Peter Roberts Architects) reside at No.3 Vesey Mews adjacent to the subject property. They raise a number of concerns, supported by photographs, in addition to those noted at para. 3.4.2:
- ~ Bulk and Height: The structure will be a dominant element as viewed from the laneway and the surrounding buildings.
  - ~ Shared Party Wall: The original wall is formed of a combination of random rubble and brick, and is in good condition. Concerned re the use of the wall to support the proposed development. Any interference may result in 'irreparable damage'. Refer to a brick arch which, they are advised, indicates the location of a historic capped well, which needs to be protected.
  - ~ Visually obtrusive and loss of light: This will arise as a result of the height of the proposed structure that will rise over the shared boundary wall and close to the height of the cross wall.

### 4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. Subject Site: P.A. Ref. D24A/0943, ACP Ref. 321856 Erection of a flat roof ancillary outbuilding to serve as home office and gym. 2025 Refusal for the following reason:

*'The Board noted the unique design and architectural expression of the mews dwelling on the site of the proposed development, including its original ornate gable wall on the northern facade and also noted the formal*

*relationship that exists between the subject mews dwelling and the main house (number 4 Vesey Place), a Protected Structure, where this northern facade of the mews dwelling addresses the rear of number 4 Vesey Place as part of a coherent design motif along Vesey Mews northern building line, and which is an exemplar of the Victorian architectural style that contributes to the character and setting of the Protected Structure and to the Vesey Place, De Vesci Terrace and Willow Bank Architectural Conservation Area.*

*The Board further noted that the proposed development would be sited at a position that would break this established northern building line and interfere with the view of the original ornate gable wall from the main house, which the Board considered would negatively impact upon the existing built form and relationship which exists between the Mews dwelling and the main house, a Protected Structure. Accordingly, it is considered that, the proposed development would adversely impact on the character and setting of the Protected Structure and on the Architectural Conservation Area and would set an undesirable precedent for other such development. The proposed development would be contrary to the relevant provisions of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2029, including Policy Objective HER8 (Work to Protected Structures) that requires the relationship between Protected Structures and any complex of adjoining buildings are respected. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.'*

*In disagreeing with the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission with conditions attached, including a recommended condition to relocate the proposed building to the west of the existing Mews House, the Board firstly shared the concerns of the Inspector that the location of the proposed development to the north of the existing mews house on site was of concern because it would break the established northern building line, and also noted the Inspector's view that it's relocation to such a position would avoid any negative visual impact on the northern gable wall and on the character and setting of the Protected Structures in the vicinity. On this matter, the Board concluded that such a design change would warrant a detailed assessment through a new consent process and accordingly, the Board did not ultimately pursue this recommendation in arriving at its decision.'*

- 4.2. 2 Vesey Mews: P.A. Ref. D17A/0080, ACP Ref. 248378 Alterations and extensions to an existing house 2017 Split Decision. Permission was granted for the extension to the western side. Permission was refused for the rear (northern) extension and the removal of plaster finish to the external stone walls of the house. The reason given was generally as per that for ACP Ref. 321856 in respect of the subject property.

- 4.3. P.A. Ref. D18A/0044, ACP Ref. 301374 Alterations and extensions to an existing house 2018 Grant. Condition 2 required revised plans clearly showing the omission of the stairwell to the northern elevation and its relocation internally within the proposed (side) extension, Reason: In the interests of clarity.
- 4.4. 3 Vesey Mews: P.A. Ref. D05B/0763 Extension to side and rear (northern side). 2006 Grant, subject to standard conditions.
- 4.5. 5 Vesey Mews/5 Vesey Place: P.A. Ref. D18A/0086 Various works, including side extension. 2018 Grant, subject to standard conditions.

## 5.0 Policy Context

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

- 5.1.1. Zoning: The subject site lies within Land Use Zoning Objective A. The relevant objective is: *'To provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.'*
- 5.1.2. Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation: Policy Objective PHP19 (includes): *'It is a Policy Objective to: Conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaptation of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF.'*
- 5.1.3. Residential Amenity: Development Management Standard 12.3.7.1(iii) Extensions to the Side (Ground Floor): *'will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity'.*
- 5.1.4. Protected Structures: Policy Objective HER8: 'Work to Protected Structures' *'It is a Policy Objective to (includes, inter alia):*
- (i.) *Protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.*
  - (ii.) *Ensure that any development proposals to Protected Structures, their curtilage and setting shall have regard to the 'Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities'.*
  - (iv) *Ensure that any development, modification, alteration, or extension affecting a Protected Structure and/or its setting is sensitively sited and designed, and is appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, layout, and materials.*

- (v) *Ensure that the form and structural integrity of the Protected Structure is retained in any redevelopment and that the relationship between the Protected Structure and any complex of adjoining buildings, designed landscape features, or views and vistas from within the grounds of the structure are respected'.*
- (viii) *Protect the curtilage of protected structures and to refuse planning permission for inappropriate development within the curtilage and attendant grounds that would adversely impact on the special character of the Protected Structure'.*

5.1.5. Architectural Conservation Areas: Policy Objective HER13: *'It is a policy objective to (includes, inter alia):*

- (i) *Protect the character and special interest of an area which has been designated as an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).*
- (ii) *Ensure that all development proposals within an ACA be appropriate to the character of the area having regard to the Character Appraisals for each area.*
- (iii) *Ensure that any new development or alteration of a building within an ACA or immediately adjoining an ACA is appropriate in terms of the proposed design, including scale, height, mass, density, building lines and materials.*
- (iv) *Seek a high quality, sensitive design for any new development(s) that are complementary and/or sympathetic to their context and scale whilst simultaneously encouraging contemporary design which is in harmony with the area. Direction can also be taken from using traditional forms that are then expressed in a contemporary manner rather than a replica of a historic building style.*
- (vi) *Seek the retention of all features that contribute to the character of an ACA including boundary walls, railings, soft landscaping, traditional paving and street furniture'.*

5.1.6. Section 12.11.4 'New Development Within an ACA' (includes, inter alia):

*~ 'All developments within an ACA should be site specific and take account of their context without imitating earlier styles. New developments should be to a high standard of design and should have a positive contribution to the character of the ACA.*

*~ Where proposals include modifications and/ or alterations, extensions, or roof alterations affecting structures within an ACA, these should be sensitively designed and sited appropriately, generally subsidiary to the main*

*structure, and not constitute a visually obtrusive or dominant form of development, which would be detrimental to the character of either the structure, or its setting and context, within the ACA.*

*~ When considering development of a site within an ACA (including backland sites), proposals should be sympathetic to the existing character of the area and reflect or refer to the established environment in terms of design, massing, scale, established plot layouts and their relationship to historic streetscape pattern’.*

5.1.7. Private Garden Space for Houses: Development Management Standard 12.8.3.3(i): Includes a minimum private open space requirement of 60m<sup>2</sup> for houses with three bedrooms.

5.1.8. Mews Buildings:

*~ Policy PHP22 ‘Mews Lane Housing’ ‘It is a Policy Objective to facilitate measured and proportionate mews lane housing development in suitable locations.’*

5.1.9. Surface Water: Policy Objective E16: Sustainable Drainage Systems ‘*It is a policy Objective to ensure that all development proposals incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).*’

## 5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

5.2.1. The site is located: c.597m to the south-east of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (Site Code 004024); c.750m to the south-east of the South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (Site Code 000210); 1.14km to the west of the Dalkey Coastal Zone and Killiney Hill Proposed Natural Heritage Area (Site Code 001207); and c.597m to the south-east of the South Dublin Bay Proposed Natural Heritage Area (Site Code 000210).

## 6.0 **EIA Screening**

6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads).

## 7.0 **Water Framework Directive Screening**

7.1. The subject site is located: c.420m to the east of the Brewery Stream river waterbody (IE\_EA\_09B130400); c.540m to the south of the Dublin Bay

coastal waterbody (IE\_EA\_09\_0000); and is situated over the Kilcullen ground waterbody (IE\_EA\_G\_003).

- 7.2. The main elements of the proposed development are set out at para. 2.1 above. In addition, it is proposed to dispose of wastewater via connection to an existing public sewer connection. Whilst the Application Form indicated a proposal to dispose of surface water via connection to an existing public drain, the submitted plans included a sedum roof. The Local Authority Drainage Division indicated a strong preference for an on-site infiltration or rainwater reuse system.
- 7.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 7.4. I have assessed the proposed extension of the subject dwelling, the associated site works, the disposal of foul effluent to an existing mains sewer, and the Local Authority's preference for disposal of surface water via an on-site infiltration system, and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- Whilst there is a potential hydrogeological pathway between the site and the Kilcullen ground waterbody as a result of soil exposure during groundworks and excavation during the construction, given the small-scale of the proposed development and the assimilative capacity of the waterbody, which will dilute any potential effects, it can be concluded that there is no conceivable risk to this waterbody either qualitatively or quantitatively.
  - The nearest surface waterbodies, the Brewery Stream river and the Dublin Bay coastal waterbody, are located c.420m and 540m respectively from the subject site, and there is no known hydrological connection between the site and each of these waterbodies. Furthermore, it is proposed to dispose of effluent via the adjacent public sewer system.
- 7.5. Conclusion: I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

## 8.0 The Appeal

### 8.1. Grounds of Appeal

8.1.1. One no. appeal was received from Aoife and Xavier van den Brande, the owners and residents at 4 Vesey Place. The grounds of appeal are summarised on the Appeal form as follows:

- The proposed plans break the established northern building line of the historic coach houses, negatively impacting on the ACA and the 4 Vesey Place Protected Structure.
- Refer to previous decisions to refuse applications that would break the northern building line (ACP Refs. 321856 in respect of 4 Vesey Mews; and 248378 re 2 Vesey Mews).

8.1.2. Attached to the Appeal is a report prepared by Jim Brogan, Planning & Development Consultant in respect of a previous application at the site - P.A. Ref. D24A/0943, ACP Ref. 321856 Erection of a flat roof ancillary outbuilding to serve as home office and gym. 2025 Refusal (refer para. 4.1). The Appellants state that the report: '*provides greater detail and context on the historical northern building line*'. The following points contained in the Report are considered to be of relevance to the subject case:

- The Appellants have undertaken significant works at their property on foot of a 2024 Permission from the Local Authority. Asserts that, for reasons subsequently set out, the proposed development was not reconcilable with the protection of the setting of the Protected Structure and area's status as an ACA.
- The party wall determines that the subject property is outside of the curtilage of 4 Vesey Place, but is immediately proximate to it and is within the ACA.
- It is clear from the Local Authority's 'Character and Appraisal' document for the ACA<sup>2</sup> that the mews are buildings of significance and that they also have a very special relationship with their original parent houses on Vesey Place.
- Refers to the Commission's consideration of this relationship in deciding on ACP Ref. 248378 at No.2 Vesey Mews. Quotes from the Inspector's report:

---

<sup>2</sup> 'Vesey Place, De Vesey Terrace, and Willow Bank Architectural Conservation Area-Character Appraisal and Recommendations': Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council (undated)

~ the party wall and separate ownerships do not irrevocably disassociate the historical context or the formal relationship between the two buildings;

~ description of the design features of the ornate gable wall of the subject property, which design has been incorporated into the neighbouring mews dwellings also and therefore provides a coherent design motif along Vesey Mews, which also contributes to the character, form and setting of the Protected Structures on Vesey Place.

~ the statement in Section 13.8 of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines<sup>3</sup> that works outside of the curtilage of a Protected Structure that have the potential to impact on their character should be given the same consideration as for proposed development within a curtilage.

- The Inspector's conclusions that the proposed extension would break the established building line and would interfere with the views of the original ornate gable wall from the Protected Structure, and that the proposed would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would adversely impact on the character and setting of No.2 Vesey Place a Protected Structure.
- The Inspector's recommendation to refuse on grounds related to the issues as set out above and the Commissions' acceptance of the recommendation.

## 8.2. Applicant's Response

8.2.1. The Applicant's response to the grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Includes a letter of support from a medical practitioner setting out the practical health benefits that the proposed development would provide for a member of the Applicant's family.
- Includes a letter from the Applicant's Agents, Buckley Partnership Architects. The key points made in this letter are:

~ The proposal was designed with careful consideration for its context. Points noted include - the extension is single-storey and the height matches that of the rear party boundary wall, and it is situated

---

<sup>3</sup> 'Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities': Dept. for Housing, Local Government and Heritage, 2011.

entirely within its own boundary without impacting on any surrounding walls.

~ The privacy of the Appellants' property will be safeguarded by the trees on either side of the party boundary; the height of the party boundary wall; and the distance between the rear of the Appellants' home and the proposed extension.

- The Planning Consultant's report attached to the Appeal is in respect of a historic application at the site and '*has no relevance*' to the subject application.
- There are precedents for the breaking of the building line. Only a small portion of the development '*extends beyond the notional building line to which (the Appellants) refer*'.
- A 'Proposed Long Section' drawing through the Appellants' property and rear garden inclusive of trees, and the Applicant's rear garden inclusive of trees and proposed extension is attached.

### 8.3. **Planning Authority Response**

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

### 8.4. **Observations**

- 8.4.1. None.

## 9.0 **Assessment**

### 9.1. **Overview**

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

- The potential impacts on the architectural heritage of the area in the context of recent planning history; and
- The potential impacts on the amenities of adjoining properties.

## 9.2. Potential Impacts on the Architectural Heritage of the Area

- 9.2.1. As previously noted in Section 1, the subject site is located within the Vesey Place, De Vesci Terrace and Willow Bank Architectural Conservation Area ('the ACA'), and is also situated to the rear of 4 Vesey Place Protected Structure. The key concerns of the Appellants, which concerns were also expressed in five submissions to the Local Authority (including that of the Appellants), is the breaking of the northern building line of the mews buildings negatively impacting on the ACA and the 4 Vesey Place Protected Structure.
- 9.2.2. The Local Authority takes a different view from the Appellants. It considers that the development will not: '*visually detract from the Protected Structure and/or views of the Mews dwelling within the ACA*'. Specifically, the Authority accepts the development partially extending beyond the northern building line.
- 9.2.3. The Agent for the Applicant states that the Appellants have not recognised the fact that only a small portion of the proposal extends beyond the northern building line. They also refers to precedents for the breaking of the building line and include a diagram showing such precedents at Nos. 3, 6, 9 and 10 Vesey Mews.
- 9.2.4. The policy context for development potentially impacting on Protected Structures and ACA's as set out in paras. 5.1.4 – 5.1.6 is, in my opinion, one of considerable precaution in protecting these built heritage assets. Previous decisions of the Commission consistently reflect this precautionary approach and I set out the key relevant details of each of these decisions below, two of which are also referenced in the Appeal.
- 9.2.5. Subject Site: [ACP Ref. 321856 2025 Refusal] The proposed development was for a flat roof ancillary outbuilding to serve as a home office and gym. The building was detached from, but located directly in front of, the northern facade/gable of the subject mews dwelling. The full details of the single refusal reason are set out at para. 4.1, wherein it can be seen that the reason for refusal included dual concerns around the breaking of the established northern building line and the impact on the relationship between the subject mews dwelling and '*the main house*' (No.4 Vesey Place).
- 9.2.6. No.2 Vesey Mews: [ACP Ref. 248378 2017 Split Decision] The proposal included extensions to this mews dwelling both to the side (rear) and in front of the northern building line. The original application to the Local Authority included development directly in front of the northern facade. The Appeal included revisions retaining development in front of the northern building line but removing development from directly in front of the northern facade/gable.

The length of the proposed projection beyond the northern building line was similar to the length of the mews dwelling itself. The Commission issued a split decision. The second part refused the proposed extension in front of the northern gable generally as per the refusal reason for ACP Ref. 321856 (ref. 4.1). Condition 2c) of the first part of the Commission's decision required the reduction of the remainder of the development so as it did not project beyond the northern building line: *'the side of the rear extension shall be stepped back to the corner of the plaster pilaster of the northern elevation so as not to disturb this feature.'* The reason given by the Commission was: *'In the interest of clarity and visual amenity.'*

- 9.2.7. Of note in relation to this decision is that the 2016-2022 Development Plan in place at the time included a Candidate Architectural Conservation Area, and that this was not referenced in the Commission's decision Order.
- 9.2.8. Although not referenced in the Appeal, the issue of the northern building line was addressed in a further decision of the Commission in relation to No.2 Vesey Mews and I review this decision in the following paragraph.
- 9.2.9. No.2 Vesey Mews: [ACP Ref. 301374 2018 Grant] The proposal was for a development similar to that proposed in the previous application, except that it generally followed the northern building line. However, also included 'in front of' the northern building line, although not directly in front of the mews dwelling, was a small stairwell serving a basement level, together with an associated safety barrier. The stairwell projected c.2.5m beyond the northern building line and was c.2.37m wide. The Local Authority approved the application, subject to a condition (Condition 2) omitting the stairwell. Two third party appeals were submitted. Included in the issues raised was the breaking of the northern building line, contrary to the previous decision of the Commission. In responding to the Appeal, the Applicants submitted revised plans omitting the protruding structure. Condition 2 of the Commission's decision required the omission of the stairwell and its relocation internally.
- 9.2.10. I would again advise that the circumstances of this decision in relation to the ACA were as set out in para. 9.2.7, and the decision Order of the Commission again did not refer to this issue. Of further note in relation to this application is that a garden shed and garden wall were already in place at the location where the protruding stairwell was to be located.
- 9.2.11. Local Authority Decisions: Only two other relatively recent planning cases (not appealed to the Commission) are identified on the Local Authority website. Both are of some relevance to the subject Appeal and I therefore briefly summarise each of these below.

- 9.2.12. No.5 Vesey Mews: [L.A. Ref. D18A/0086 2018 Grant] This was for a side extension and I would advise that the building line respected the northern building line of the mews dwelling.
- 9.2.13. No.3 Vesey Mews: [L.A. D05B/0763 2006 Grant] This was for a small extension partly to the front of the building line and partly on the footprint of an existing shed. In the Planner's report it was noted that the site was not within the proposed ACA and that, given the scale and location of the extension, the proposed development would not materially affect the character of any protected structure or the proposed ACA.
- 9.2.14. It is clear from the previous three decisions of the Commission that it has taken a very consistent approach to the protection of the built heritage of the area and that, with specific relevance to the subject case, it has been consistently opposed to proposals to break the northern building line of the mews buildings. Furthermore, the two decisions in relation to proposed development at No.2 Vesey Mews were made before the ACA was formally designated, and the second decision included the omission of a minor projection measuring c.2.5m x c.2.37m.
- 9.2.15. **Protected Structure (Impact On)**: The ornate northern gable wall of the subject structure is noted as being a key feature defining the strong relationship between the subject mews structure and No.4 Vesey Place, a Protected Structure. The proposed development is to the side of the ornate gable wall, and will not directly impede the line of sight between the subject property and No.4 Vesey Place. The proposed northern elevation is set back c.5.3m from the party boundary with No.4 Vesey Place. The party wall between the two properties is c.1.75m high and the trees planted beside the wall extend a further c.0.75m in places. The No.4 Vesey Place building is set back c.34m from the previously-referenced northern building line.
- 9.2.16. Having regard to the aforementioned, and to the proposed 3.25m height of the structure at its northern end, I am satisfied that there will be no material impact on the Protected Structure or its curtilage.
- 9.2.17. **ACA (Impact On)**: In their cover letter with the application to the Local Authority, the Agents for the Applicant state that '*The proposed extension has been visually separated from the existing house by the provision of separating glazed doors and roof light; (and) the materials selection contrasts with the existing structure thereby respecting the integrity of the original structure*'. In her report, the Local Authority's Conservation Officer acknowledges this approach and advises that: '*The contemporary design approach and finishes proposed allows the extension to be legible as a later addition and in this regard complies with best conservation practice. The flat*

*roof successfully minimizes the perceived scale of the building and as such, it is not considered to visually detract from the Protected Structure and/or views of the mews dwelling within the ACA'.*

- 9.2.18. The Conservation Officer's comments are noted. They indicate the general compliance of the proposed development with the ACA-related policies of the Development Plan, notably PO HER13 and Development Management Standard Section 12.11.4 and are generally agreed. However, the report is silent on one issue, that of the impact of the proposed development on the northern building line of the mews property. PO HER13(iii) seeks to ensure that any new development or alteration of a building within an ACA or immediately adjoining an ACA is appropriate in terms of, inter alia, '*building lines*'. The Local Authority Planner does directly address the building line issue in his report and states that, whilst acknowledging that the proposed extension partially extends beyond the northern building line: '*the degree of this is not considered so significant that it would have a detrimental visual impact on the mews dwelling particularly as a number of properties have structures such as sheds directly north of the mews dwellings ... either in the mews property itself or in the rear gardens of De Vesce Terrace*'.
- 9.2.19. The entire roof level of the proposed development projects beyond the northern building line of the mews dwelling for a depth of c.3.2m. Part of the ground floor also projects the same depth, part is recessed back 1.65m and therefore projecting c.1.5m beyond the northern building line, and the connecting corridor is stepped back behind the northern building line. The width (east-west) of the projecting area measures 4.15m compared to the 5.38m width of the existing mews structure. The Applicant states that '*only a small portion*' of the proposal extends beyond the building line and also advises that this portion is to accommodate an accessible bathroom. The Applicant further states that the building line is not a continuous building line (and that) there currently exists precedent built accommodation to neighbouring properties in either direction from the subject property. A diagram included in the Applicant's response to the Appeal identifies '*6 no. rear return extensions built beyond the notional line to which the Appellants refer*' and, furthermore, that all six project further than what is proposed in the subject proposal.
- 9.2.20. With regards to the rationale put forward by the Applicant and the Local Authority, I would advise that none of the referenced existing structures have been validated by any decision(s) of the Commission. Furthermore, it can be seen on the National Irish Imagery Dashboard that most of these structures were in situ at the time of the previous decisions of the Commission in relation to No.2 Vescey Mews as discussed above. A minor extension

projecting beyond the northern building line of No.3 was approved by the Local Authority in 2006 but this decision was prior to the designation of the ACA, and was not implemented.

9.2.21. I have considered the views of the Applicant and Local Authority regarding precedent development, and particularly the fact that the proposed development does not extend as far beyond the northern building line as either the small shed located immediately adjacent to the party boundary on the No.3 side, or the larger rear extension within the same property. I have also considered the presence of the party wall between the subject property and No.4 Vesey Place. As previously noted, the projections beyond the northern building line have not been validated by any decision of the Commission, or the Local Authority<sup>4</sup>. Furthermore, the northern building line is maintained in the adjacent property to the east, No.5. Finally, I also note that in the previously-referenced Local Authority 'ACA Character and Appraisal' document (refer para. 8.1.2), the Authority stresses the significance of the mews structures for the overall ACA composition where it is stated that: *'The mews buildings to the rear of the main houses in De Vesey Terrace and Vesey Place are of significance, firstly, as part of the overall nineteenth-century composition and as they contain original built fabric. They were generally constructed to a lower standard than the houses, but those to the rear of Nos. 1 to 10 Vesey Place are of particularly good quality in design and finish.'* Accordingly, having regard to the extent of the breach of the northern building line as set out at para. 9.2.19, and on balance having regard to the consistent approach of the Commission to-date in relation to the protection of the northern building line as set out previously in my report, which approach included the rejection of contemporary proposals at No.2 Vesey Mews similar in concept to the subject proposal, I am unable to support the proposed projection beyond the northern building line.

9.2.22. Notwithstanding my conclusions in the previous paragraphs, a revised proposal retaining the design palette as submitted but respecting the northern building line of the parent mews dwelling would be acceptable, in my opinion.

### 9.3. Amenities of Adjoining Properties.

9.3.1. The proposed development is effectively to the side of the existing dwelling and, therefore, it is appropriate to consider the development against the

---

<sup>4</sup> The referenced small shed in situ at No.3 is different to the minor extension granted under L.A. Ref. D05B/0763 in 2006 (refer para. 4.4).

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

- 9.3.2. No.4 Vesey Place (Appellants' Property): The proposal as submitted would be set back c.5.3m from the party boundary with No.4 Vesey Place. The party wall between the two properties is c.1.75m high and the trees planted immediately beside the wall extend a further c.0.75m in places. The No.4 Vesey Place building is set back c.34m from the previously-referenced northern building line. Having regard to the aforementioned and to vegetation evident within the curtilage of the Appellants' property, I am satisfied that there will be no material impact on the residential amenities of the Appellants' property
- 9.3.3. No.3 Vesey Mews: There are no windows proposed on the western side of the proposed development and, therefore, no issues arise in terms of overlooking.
- 9.3.4. In their submission to the Local Authority, Agents on behalf of the owners of No.3 expressed concerns in relation to the height of the structure stating, inter alia, that it was unnecessary for small rooms and would result in overshadowing and loss of light. In his report, the Local Authority Planner considered that: *'the overall design ... will not have any significant negative impact on the visual amenity of the existing house or neighbouring properties'*.
- 9.3.5. The proposed development would be immediately adjoining the boundary with No.3. For approximately two-thirds ('the southern two-thirds') of its length (ie. c.6.97m), it would be adjacent to a raised party boundary wall and Drg No. GA08 shows that the proposed structure would exceed the height of the wall by 0.996m. For the remaining third ('the northern third') the structure would be adjacent to a lower party wall c.1.7m in height, and Drg. GA08 illustrates that it would exceed the party wall by 1.644m.
- 9.3.6. At my site inspection, I was afforded access to No.3. I noted that that part of the No.3 property located immediately adjacent to the southern two-thirds of the proposed structure is an attractive garden area that includes a patio and seating area. A post and rail-type fence is attached to the upper part of the wall on the No.3 side but does not exceed it in height. I also noted that on the No.3 side adjacent to the proposed northern third there was a pitched-roof garden shed (or similar), the eastern eaves of which was level with the top of the existing party wall. The proposed structure extends along approximately

two-thirds of the length of the shed.

- 9.3.7. Having regard to the extent to which the height of both the southern two-thirds and northern third of the proposed structure would exceed the height of the existing party wall, the proximity of the proposed structure to the party wall, and the length that the development would extend along the party boundary, I would agree with the concerns of the owners of No.3, as the proposed would be a discordant feature as perceived from the No.3 side, in my opinion.
- 9.3.8. Finally on this aspect of the Appeal, I would also advise that the photograph inserted into submitted Drg. GA06 is somewhat, if inadvertently, misleading in that whereas it appears in the photograph that there is post and rail fencing extending beyond the height of the party wall and close to the height of the crosswall, no such fence was evident at the time of my inspection. As already noted at para. 9.3.6, although I noted a similar fence close to the top of the wall on the side of No.3, this was not visible from the subject site side.
- 9.3.9. With regard to concerns around the potential loss of light and overshadowing, the southern two-thirds of the proposed structure would exceed the height of the existing party wall by almost 1m. However, with the proposed structure being to the east of the party boundary, it is unlikely that the proposed will give rise to significant overshadowing or loss of light. The northern third exceeds the party boundary by a greater height, ie. 1.64m. However, as well as the mitigation provided by the eastern location of the proposed development, further mitigation is provided here by the presence of both the garden shed-type structure and cross-wall already in situ, both of which already give rise to overshadowing. For these reasons, it is again my opinion that the proposed northern third of the proposed structure will not give rise to significant overshadowing or loss of light. Moreover, as the issue of determining rights to light is a matter for the Courts, I do not consider that the Commission is in a position to draw any conclusions in relation to this matter.
- 9.3.10. For the reasons set out in paras. 9.3.5 to 9.3.7, the proposed development is unacceptable in its current form, in my opinion, and could only proceed on the basis of a reduction in the height of the proposed extension. The submitted plans indicate a height of 3.56m for the proposed structure at its southern end, and a height of 3.41m at its northern end (refer Drg. GA07)<sup>5</sup>. There is scope to reduce the height by 0.66m to 2.9m<sup>6</sup>, in my opinion. It is

---

<sup>5</sup> A height of 3.25m is also indicated on other plans (eg. Drg. GA10). It would appear this indicates the height relative to the finished floor level, and that the levels recorded on Drg GA07 are from the existing ground level.

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

my further opinion that such a reduction is reasonable and appropriate in the circumstance as previously set out, and would mitigate the impact of the proposed development to an acceptable level. This adjustment would also render the development generally compliant with Development Management Standard 12.3.7.1(iii), in my opinion.

- 9.3.11. Also in their submission to the Local Authority, Agents on behalf of the owners of No.3 express concerns in relation to potential structural impacts on the party wall. They note that the original wall is formed of a combination of random rubble and brick and is in good condition, and are concerned re the use of the wall to support the proposed development, fearing that any interference may result in 'irreparable damage'. In their response to the Appeal on behalf of the Applicant, Agents state that the proposed: '*is situated entirely within its own boundary without impact on any surrounding walls*'. The concerns of the owners of No.3 are noted. However, any damage to their property arising from the proposed development would be a civil matter, in my opinion.
- 9.3.12. The Agents for No.3 also state that they are advised that the brick arch on the party wall '*indicates the location of a historic capped well which needs to be protected*'. The Agents do not substantiate this claim, and I note that the Local Authority's Conservation Officer did not raise this as an issue in her report.

#### 9.4. **Other Matters**

- 9.4.1. Development Contributions: The floor area of the proposed development recommended for permission is C.35m<sup>2</sup>. The Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown Development Contribution Scheme, 2023-2028 includes a requirement for payment of contributions for domestic extensions in excess of 40m<sup>2</sup> (Table A and Section 7.1(i) refers). As the proposed development recommended for permission is below the threshold at which contributions become payable, my recommendation does not include a condition requiring the payment of contributions.
- 9.4.2. Remaining Rear Garden Space: The proposed development would increase the number of bedrooms from two to three. Development Management Standard 12.8.3.3(i) of the Development Plan includes a minimum private open space requirement of 60m<sup>2</sup> for houses with three bedrooms. The rear garden space would comfortably exceed this figure after development.

- 9.4.3. Services: It is proposed to connect to the existing public sewer. With regards to surface water, the submitted plans include a sedum roof, while on the application form it is indicated that it is proposed to dispose of surface water via a public mains system.
- 9.4.4. In its report, the Local Authority Drainage Division cautions that '*small areas of sedum green roof can be susceptible to failure, potentially resulting in no SuDS measures being provided*'. The Report then refers to Policy Objective E16 (requirement for incorporation of SuDS) and requests an updated surface water management design demonstrating that the outlets from the green roof drainage system discharge to an infiltration or rainwater reuse system at ground level. The report notes a soakaway as an example. The Local Authority's decision included a condition requiring the submission of an updated surface water management system reflecting the concerns of the Drainage Division. My recommendation includes a similar condition.
- 9.4.5. Bulk and Height: In the submissions to the Local Authority a concern was raised that the structure will be a dominant element as viewed from the laneway and the surrounding buildings. I have already addressed the potential impact as viewed from No.3 Vesey Mews (to the east) and 4 Vesey Place (to the north). It is my further opinion that the structure will have minimal visual impact as viewed from No.5 Vesey Mews (the property located immediately to the east), having regard to the heights of the existing mews structure, and party wall and associated planting.
- 9.4.6. With regards to views front the laneway (ie. Vesey Mews), I would not share these concerns, primarily due to height of the boundary wall of the subject property adjacent to Vesey Mews, which wall will largely obscure the structure, and the setback of the structure from the lane (c.3.58m).
- 9.4.7. Use of Knapton Lawn for Construction Purposes: Two submissions to the Local Authority from residents of Knapton Lawn noted concerns in relation to the potential impact of construction traffic on the functioning of Knapton Lawn. The submissions refer to such disruption arising from a previous development at Vesey Mews. Knapton Lawn immediately adjoins Vesey Mews, the two being separated by an old stone wall. They also state that the stone wall separating Vesey Mews and Knapton Lawn is '*very unstable with rocks loose and crumbling*'. One of the submissions included photographs illustrating both traffic issues arising from construction vehicles using Knapton Lawn, and the referenced stone wall. At my inspection, I noted the relatively narrow width of Knapton Lawn (effectively single-carriageway) and thus these concerns are acknowledged. It would be reasonable, in my opinion, to attach a condition to any grant of permission requiring that the developer agrees the details of a plan to minimise any such disruption.

## 10.0 **AA Screening**

- 10.1. I have considered the proposed removal of a non-original porch structure and provision of a single-storey side extension, the Local Authority preference for the disposal of surface water via an on-site soakaway, and the proposed connection to the existing public foul sewer at 4 Vesey Mews, Dun Laoghaire, Dublin in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located c.597m to the south-east of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (Site Code 004024); and c.750m to the south-east of the South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (Site Code 000210).
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reasons for this conclusion are as follows:
- the nature of the works: small scale extension to an existing dwelling with the required disposal of surface water to an on-site soakaway, and connection to the existing public foul sewer;
  - the distance of the site from the nearest European site and the absence of any known connections between the two.
- 10.3. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 11.0 **Recommendation**

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

## 12.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

- 12.1. Having regard to the residential land use zoning of the site in the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, the support in the Development Plan for improvements to and adaptation of existing homes [Policy PHP19], and the development management criteria in the Development Plan for Ground Floor Side Extensions [Section 12.3.7.1(iii)], it is considered that, subject to the conditions below, the proposed development would not unduly impact upon the character of the Vesey

Place, De Vesci Terrace and Willow Bank Architectural Conservation Area, would not unduly impact upon the character and setting of No.4 Vesey Place which is a Protected Structure, would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area and would, therefore, 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 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><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The existing dwelling and proposed extension 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.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of orderly development and to clarify the terms of the permission.</p>
3.	<p>The extension shall be stepped back so as not to extend beyond the northern building line of the existing mews dwelling. Prior to the commencement of development, revised plans providing for compliance with the aforementioned requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To maintain the northern building line of the parent mews property and thereby to preserve the architectural heritage of the area.</p>
4.	<p>The height of the proposed extension shall not exceed 2.9m from the lowest existing ground level. Prior to the commencement of development, revised plans providing for compliance with the aforementioned requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To safeguard the residential amenities of the adjacent No.3 Vesey Mews.</p>

5.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, an updated surface water management design demonstrating the outlets from the green roof drainage system discharging to an infiltration or rainwater reuse system at ground level, for example a soakaway, shall be submitted to, and agreed with, the Planning Authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of public health.</p>
6.	<p>a. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>b. Detailed arrangements for the delivery of materials, and construction traffic generally shall be submitted to, and agreed with, the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To safeguard the amenities of property on both Vesey Mews and Knapton Lawn.</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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

---

Paul Christy  
 Planning Inspector

23rd May 2026

## Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	<b>PL-500854-DR-26</b>
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Removal of a non-original porch structure and provision of a single storey side extension.
<b>Development Address</b>	4, Vesey Mews, Dun Laoghaire, Dublin, A96K651
<b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX /OR LEAVE BLANK</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<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)	
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in <b>Part 1</b> .  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	<b>State the Class here</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</b>	

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

**Inspector: Paul Christy**

**Date: 23rd May 2026**