



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

# Inspector's Report

## PL-500874-DN-26

---

### Development

Two storey dwelling in side garden of existing semi-detached dwelling, new shared driveway, alteration to existing boundary wall, and associated site works.

### Location

94, Ashcroft, Raheny, Dublin 5, D05 NN99.

### Planning Authority

Dublin City Council North.

### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB 5868/25.

### Applicant(s)

Maura & Ossie Finnie.

### Type of Application

Permission.

### Planning Authority Decision

Refuse permission.

### Type of Appeal

First Party

### Appellant(s)

Maura & Ossie Finnie.

### Observer(s)

Colin Hughes & Orlaith Cruise  
Paul & Jane McCormack  
Edel & Colum Arthur

**Date of Site Inspection**

19<sup>th</sup> May 2026.

**Inspector**

Des Johnson

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in an established housing estate, to the east of Springdale Road, south of Tuscany Downs and a short distance north of the Dublin-Belfast main rail line in Raheny, Dublin 5.
- 1.2. No.94 is a two storey semi-detached dwelling at the end of a row of mostly two-storey terraced dwellings. The site is roughly triangular in shape and forms a side garden for No.94. To the northwest it has a boundary with the rear gardens of a terrace (96-99 Ashcroft) of two-storey dwellings.
- 1.3. No.94 has a restricted triangular shaped rear garden in addition to triangular shaped side garden.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises a detached flat roof two-storey detached dwelling in the side garden of an existing semi-detached dwelling, with shared driveway, and alterations to an existing boundary wall. The proposed dwelling has two bedrooms with 3 bed spaces in total. It is sited forward of the established front building line of the dwellings to the east.
- 2.2. The gross floor area of the proposed dwelling is stated to be 106sqm and the site area is 0.014ha. It is proposed to connect to existing services.
- 2.3. The application form indicates that the applicant is not aware of any previous application made in respect of this land. The applicant is stated to be the owner of the site.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

The planning refused permission for two reasons.

#### 3.1.1. Reasons for Refusal

These relate to the following:

1. Constrained site. Breach of established building line. The scale and massing in close proximity to adjoining property boundaries would result in an overbearing

and visually obtrusive impact contrary to Development Plan requirements (Section 15.13.3). Serious injury to residential amenities of adjacent properties, contrary to the Development Plan and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Open space provision would provide substandard residential amenity for future occupiers. Precedent for substandard development. Serious injury to the residential amenities of the area, contrary to the Development Plan and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The site is zoned Z1 with the objective *to protect, provide and improve residential amenities*. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to assessment of impacts on the surrounding area and compliance with relevant Development Plan criteria. The private open space proposed is identical in layout and area to the previous refusal under Ref: WEB 2031/25. The Open Space would provide an extremely low level of residential amenity, and the stated area is not definitive from the drawings submitted. There would be a significant breach of the front building line of houses to the east. The development would be visually obtrusive and incongruous on the streetscape. There is a disconnect between the proposed floor space and the portion to be used for bedrooms. The scale of this proposal would be overdevelopment with poor residential amenity and undue impacts on adjacent dwellings. The Transportation Planning Division states that the proposed vehicular entrance widening does not comply with Development Plan, and the existing width exceeds the standards without the benefit of planning permission. It recommends Further Information. The planning authority does not consider the proposed parking arrangement with the space for the proposed house sitting in front of the existing dwelling No. 94 Ashcroft to be desirable with the parking space sitting in what would commonly be the front garden of the existing/adjacent dwelling. Preferably both existing and proposed houses would have their own separate vehicle entrance. No drainage information has been submitted with the application.

There were 3 Third Party submissions relating to overbearing and separation distance, appearance and visual impact, daylight and sunlight, inadequate private open space, parking provision, and previous refusal. These were considered in the assessment.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Report – recommends Further Information requiring details of management of surface water and Flood Risk Assessment.
- The Transport Planning Division recommends Further Information

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

There are 3 Third Party Observations submitted relating to this appeal.

## 4.0 Planning History

4.1. Reg Ref: WEB 2031/25 – Refusal to two-storey dwelling in the side garden of existing semi-detached dwelling with shared driveway. There were two reasons for refusal summarised as follows:

1. Breach of established building line. Overbearing impact on residential amenities. Contrary to Section 15.13.3 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. Conflict with Z1 zoning.
2. Inadequate private open space provision. Substandard residential amenity for future occupants. Contrary to the zoning objective. Undesirable precedent.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is the statutory plan for the area.

The site is zoned Z1 (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods) with the objective *to protect, provide and improve residential amenities*.

Policy QHSN6 – refers to Urban Consolidation. It is policy to promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification through consideration of applications for infill development, backland development ... subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.

Policy QHSN10 – refers to Urban Density. It is policy to promote residential development at sustainable densities throughout the city in accordance with the core strategy, particularly on vacant and/or underutilised sites, having regard to the need for high standards of urban design and architecture and to successfully integrate with the character of the surrounding area.

Section 15.13.3 refers to Infill/Side Garden Housing Development. The development of a dwelling or dwellings in the side garden of an existing house is a means of making the most efficient use of serviced residential lands. Such developments, when undertaken on suitable sites and to a high standard of design, can constitute valuable additions to the residential building stock of an area and will generally be allowed for by the planning authority on suitable large sites. The planning authority will favourably consider the development of infill housing on appropriate sites, having regard to development plan policy on infill sites and to facilitate the most sustainable use of land and existing urban infrastructure. In general, infill housing should comply with all relevant development plan standards for residential development including unit sizes, dual aspect requirements, internal amenity standards and open space requirements. In certain limited circumstances, the planning authority may relax the normal planning standards in the interest of ensuring that vacant, derelict and under-utilised land is developed.

The planning authority will have regard to the following criteria in assessing proposals for the development of corner/side garden sites:

- The character of the street.

- Compatibility of design and scale with adjoining dwellings, paying attention to the established building line, proportion, heights, parapet levels and materials of adjoining buildings.
- Accommodation standards for occupiers.
- Development plan standards for existing and proposed dwellings.
- Impact on the residential amenities of adjoining sites.
- Open space standards and refuse standards for both existing and proposed dwellings.
- The provision of a safe means of access to and egress from the site.
- The provision of landscaping and boundary treatments which are in keeping with other properties in the area.
- The maintenance of the front and side building lines, where appropriate.
- Level of visual harmony, including external finishes and colours.
- Larger corner sites may allow more variation in design, but more compact detached proposals should more closely relate to adjacent dwellings. A modern design response may, however, be deemed more appropriate in certain areas and the Council will support innovation in design.
- Side gable walls as side boundaries facing corners in estate roads are not considered acceptable and should be avoided.
- Appropriate boundary treatments should be provided both around the site and between the existing and proposed dwellings.
- Use of first floor/apex windows on gables close to boundaries overlooking footpaths, roads and open spaces for visual amenity and passive surveillance.

## 5.2. Relevant National Guidelines

*Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024.*

Planning Authorities and An Coimisiún Pleanála are required to have regard to the Guidelines and apply any specific planning policy requirements in the carrying out of their functions.

SPPR 1 – Separation Distances.

Policy that Development Plans shall not include an objective in respect of minimum separation distances that exceed 16m between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units or apartment units above ground floor level.

There shall be no specific minimum separation distance at ground floor level or to the front of houses, duplex units or apartment units in statutory Development Plans and planning applications shall be determined on a case-by-case basis to prevent undue loss of privacy

### SPPR 3 – Minimum Private Open Space Standards for Houses

Policy requirement that proposals for new houses meet the following Minimum private open space standards:

1 bed house	20sqm
2 bed house	30sqm
3 bed house	40sqm
4 bed + house	50sqm

### SPPR 3 – Car Parking

Policy that in city centres and urban neighbourhoods of the 5 cities defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.1 and Table 3.2) car parking provision should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated. The maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development at these locations, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 1 no. space per dwelling.

## 5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

North Dublin Bay SAC – c.1.050 km to the south-east

North Bull Island SPA & pNHA – c. 1.050km to the south-east.

## 6.0 **EIA Screening**

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

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The First party grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- Residential development is permissible under the zoning for the area
- The proposal represents a sustainable, high-quality response to an urban infill site
- While the proposed dwelling would project beyond the front building line to the east, it would not project beyond the side elevation of No. 95 Ashcroft to the west. The subject site is a constrained triangular site
- SPPR 1 explicitly states that there should be no specific minimum separation distance at ground floor level or to the front of houses and that applications should be assessed on a case-by-case basis
- The design is carefully calibrated to mitigate impact. The plan steps in at first floor level from the western boundary varying the distance to the boundary from 697mm and 802mm at its closest, and c. 2.8m at its furthest separation
- An angled window on the rear elevation serving the single bedroom directs views over the small rear garden. Private open space provision exceeds the SPPR 2 requirement for a 2-bed house which is 30sqm. A total of 40sqm private open space is proposed. Exceeding the requirement by 33%. The provision in two separate zones is a functional design strategy for a triangular infill site
- The appellant agrees to a condition requiring the width of the shared entrance be to a maximum of 4m, and also that the entrance design guarantees the required setback of 4.3m from the street tree trunk. This would formalise the existing entrance which currently exceeds standards
- The appellants would accept a standard condition requiring the submission of a detailed surface water drainage layout for the written agreement of the planning authority prior to commencement of development

### 7.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority requests that the decision to refuse be upheld. If permission is granted, conditions should be attached relating to Section 48 development contribution, and naming and numbering.

### 7.3. Observations

There are 3 Observation submissions objecting to the proposed development. They may be summarised as follows:

#### Observation 1

- The proposed development if permitted would have an overbearing impact and lead to loss of privacy. There would be direct overlooking of the Observers private open space, kitchen and upstairs bedrooms.
- The proposal breaches an established building line to the east. This fundamental shift would disrupt the character of the streetscape and would dominate the Observers property
- The proposal would give rise to substandard development and a dangerous precedent. It would be overdevelopment of a restricted site leading to a loss of light, loss of privacy and would be out of character with the area.

#### Observer 2

- The Observers supports the planning authority's reasons for refusal and question the validity and sustainability of the proposed development
- This is the second application in seven months for exactly the same development. This is an abuse of the planning process putting an unfair and costly burden on 3<sup>rd</sup> Parties
- The existing vehicular entrance is unauthorised
- The proposed development is in breach of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) as it fails to integrate or improve the character of development in the area, would create an unnecessary disamenity on adjoining neighbours, and fails to provide a satisfactory level of amenity for future residents

- The proposed development fails to meet the requirements of the Dublin City Development Plan. No case has been made to relax normal planning standards. There would be negative impacts on adjoining residents through overlooking, overbearing impact and overshadowing. It would be an unsustainable intensification of the site. There would be a material breach of objectives and policies for infill development, density, Private Open Space, car parking and general compatibility with the character and pattern of development in the area
- A Daylight Sunlight analysis should have been submitted.

### Observer 3

- The Observers support the planning authority's reasons for refusal
- The proposal does not 'protect and improve' residential amenity
- The proposal directly contravenes Section 15.13.3 which states that 'side walls as side boundaries facing corners in estate roads are not acceptable'.
- Key considerations in assessing the application should include privacy, daylight and sunlight impacts on residential properties in close proximity
- The angled first floor window faces directly on to the garden of No. 99 with no mitigation noted
- The rear garden depth does not meet Development Plan requirements and is difficult to see how external open spaces will achieve direct sunlight on March 21<sup>st</sup>.
- It is acknowledged that the vehicular entrance is more than double the maximum permissible and that the on-street tree is vulnerable. The grounds of appeal state that this can be resolved but no information is submitted to illustrate
- There is potential for negative precedent.

## 7.4. Further Responses

None on file.

## 8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. The proposal is for a detached flat roof two-storey dwelling in the side garden of an existing semi-detached dwelling, with shared driveway, and alterations to an existing

boundary wall. The proposed dwelling has two bedrooms with 3 bed spaces in total. It is sited substantially forward of the established front building line of the dwellings to the east. The gross floor area of the proposed dwelling is stated to be 106sqm and the site area is 0.014ha. It is proposed to connect to existing services.

8.2. The planning authority refused permission for two reasons. Reason 1 refers to the breach of the established building line, the proposal is an overbearing and visually obtrusive feature, serious injury to the residential amenities of adjacent property, and contrary to the Development Plan. Reason 2 refers to substandard private open space provision and precedent for substandard development.

8.3. There are 3 Observer submissions objecting to the proposed development.

8.4. I consider that the key issues to be addressed in this assessment are as follows:

Policy

Planning History

Breach of established building line

Visual and Residential Amenities

Private Open Space Provision

Access Arrangements

Precedent

### **Policy**

8.5. The site is in an area zoned Z1 (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods) with the objective *to protect, provide and improve residential amenities*. The proposed development is 'permissible' in principle under this zoning, subject to compatibility with other policies and objectives set out in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.

### **Planning History**

8.6. There is a recent planning history relating to this site. Under Register Reference: WEB 2031/25, the planning authority refused permission for the development of a two-storey dwelling on this site. A shared driveway was proposed. The planning authority decided to refuse permission for reasons similar to the current decision. The decision was not

appealed. The decision was made under the provisions of the current Development Plan.

### **Established Building Line and Visual Impacts**

- 8.7. This is a very restricted triangular shaped site. The proposed dwelling is two-storey with flat roof. It extends substantially forward of the established building line of housing to the east (83A-94 Ashcroft). The siting of the proposed dwelling is dictated by the restricted nature and shape of the site.

While the Development Plan does provide for contemporary design on infill/side garden sites, the visual impact in this case is compounded by the proposed siting substantially forward of the established building line to the northeast. The appellant argues that the proposed development is in line with the side elevation of 96, Ashcroft, but I do not consider this to be a visually important building line in comparison to the established building line to the northeast. I contend that the siting of the proposed dwelling, combined with its design, would not be compatible with the established pattern of development in the area and would be visually obtrusive.

### **Visual and Residential Amenities**

- 8.8. The area of the existing dwelling is stated to be 142sqm and the existing area of the attached garden is 194.6sqm. The site area of the proposed dwelling is stated to be 146.6sqm. The dwelling is designed with flat roof at a height of 5756mm while the ridge of the adjacent houses is shown on section at 7536mm. The height of the ground floor is shown at 2760mm. The proposed dwelling has a ground floor element adjacent to the boundary wall with Nos. 96-99 Ashcroft, while the First floor in a staggered design is set back from that boundary by 2312mm at the front, reducing to 697mm at the rear. The proposed dwelling is sited east southeast of Nos. 96-99 Ashcroft.
- 8.9. Having regard to the scale, design and siting of the proposed dwelling, I consider that it would have an overbearing impact of adjacent dwellings to the northwest and be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of those properties.
- 8.10. I consider that there would not be undue loss of sunlight or daylight to adjacent dwellings, as the proposed dwelling is sited east southeast of these properties. There are two windows at first floor level on the rear elevation. These serve a bathroom and bedroom. The bedroom window is angled away from the adjacent properties to the west

northwest. I conclude that the proposed dwelling would not give rise to undue overlooking of adjacent properties.

### **Private Open Space**

- 8.11. There are two small areas of private open space proposed, 22sqm to the rear of the proposed dwelling and 18sqm to the front. The applicant argues that this total provision exceeds the minimum of 30sqm required for a 2-bed house under SPPR 2. The planning authority Reason 2 for refusal contends that the open space provision would be substandard. I conclude that, having regard to the orientation of the proposed development, the proposed 22sqm rear open space would receive little direct sunlight and have limited use as a recreation area for occupants of the proposed dwelling. The front open space of 18sqm is very restricted. I conclude that, due to its fragmented nature, combined with its limited use for residential amenity, the provision of private open space is seriously substandard and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The existence of a sizeable area of public open space nearby to the west does not mitigate the substandard nature of the proposed private open space provision in this case.

### **Access Arrangements**

- 8.12. It is proposed to extend the site for the proposed dwelling partly across the front of the existing dwelling to incorporate a single car parking space to serve the proposed dwelling, and a shared entrance to be provided with the existing dwelling involving the removal of portion of the existing front wall to that dwelling. Objectors argue that the existing access arrangements are unauthorised. The 1<sup>st</sup> Party indicates agreement to a condition requiring the width of the shared entrance to a maximum of 4m while achieving the required setback of 4.3m from the existing street tree on the estate road.
- 8.13. The planning authority does not consider the proposed parking arrangement with the space for the proposed house sitting in front of the existing dwelling No. 94 Ashcroft to be desirable but have not recommended refusal for that reason. The Transportation Division report states that the principle of a shared vehicular entrance is considered acceptable between the two neighbouring dwellings. The proposed vehicular entrance of c.9.0m with the demolition of the existing boundary wall is however not acceptable. The maximum width for a new shared vehicular entrance is 4.0m. It is noted that the existing entrance width is c.5.0m and has been widened without the benefit of planning

permission. The report recommends Further Information requiring revised drawings demonstrating a vehicular entrance consistent with the Development Plan and ensuring a setback is provided from the nearby street tree of 4.3m. In these circumstances, I consider that the proposed access arrangements should not be a reason for refusal. Any enforcement issue arising with the existing vehicular entrance is a matter for the planning authority.

### **Precedent**

- 8.14. The planning authority contends that the proposed development could give rise to undesirable precedent having regard to the substandard provision of Private Open Space. I have already concluded that the proposed open space provision is substandard. I conclude that the proposed development, if permitted, could set an undesirable precedent for further developments with substandard open space provision.

## **9.0 AA Screening**

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in an established residential area in Raheny, Dublin 5, approximately 1.050 km from the nearest European site. The proposed development comprises a detached two-storey, two-bedroom dwelling with shared driveway, and alterations to boundary wall. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European site.

The reason for this conclusion is the nature and small scale of the proposal, the location and separation distance from nearest European site and the lack of connection between the sites, I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2)(under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The subject site is a constrained side garden site located in an established residential area. The proposed development relates to the construction of a detached two-storey, two-bedroom dwelling, shared vehicular access and alteration of boundary wall. No water deterioration concerns are raised in the appeal. I have assessed the development in the context of the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment as there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

## 11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that planning permission be refused.

## 12.0 Reasons

1. The proposed development on a constrained and irregular shaped site, would substantially breach the established front building line to the east, and would, due to its scale, height and siting adjacent to the northwestern site boundary, result in an overbearing and visually obtrusive impact on the neighbouring residential dwellings contrary to Section 15.13.3 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. As such, the proposed development would be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of adjacent properties and would be contrary to the provisions of the statutory Development Plan and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. It is considered that the proposed provision of private amenity space in two highly constrained parcels to the front and rear of the proposed dwelling, bounded by high walls, would provide for substandard amenity for future occupiers of the proposed dwelling and would set an undesirable precedent for substandard

development in the area. As such, the proposed development is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

---

Des Johnson  
Planning Inspector

24 May 2026

## Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500874-DN-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Two-storey, two-bedroom detached dwelling in the side garden of existing semi-detached dwelling, shared driveway, and alterations to existing boundary wall.
<b>Development Address</b>	94, Ashcroft, Raheny, Dublin 5, D05 NN99.
<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 Q.2.
<p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,</li> <li>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	<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 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?</b>	
<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. <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. <b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b> <b>OR</b> <b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b>	S.5 P.2 10(b)(ii) construction of more than 500 dwelling units
<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>	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b>

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix 2

### Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	<b>PL-500874-DN-26</b>
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Two storey flat roofed detached dwelling in side garden of existing semi-detached dwelling, shared vehicular access, and associated site works.
<b>Development Address</b>	94, Ashcroft, Raheny, Dublin 5, D05 NN99.
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<b>Characteristics of proposed development</b>	Two storey flat roofed detached dwelling in side garden of existing semi-detached dwelling, shared vehicular access, and associated site works. The proposed dwelling has two bedrooms with 3 bed spaces in total. It is sited substantially forward of the established front building line of the dwellings to the east. The gross floor area of the proposed dwelling is stated to be 106sqm and the site area is 0.014ha. It is proposed to connect to existing services.
<b>Location of development</b>	Established residential estate.  The subject site is not in a designated area.  My appropriate assessment screening concludes that the proposed development would not likely have a significant effect on any European Site.
<b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b>	The site size measures 0.014ha. The size of the development is small in the context of an urban environment. There are existing dwellings adjacent to the proposed site. There is no real likelihood of significant cumulative effects within the existing and permitted projects in the area.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Likelihood of Significant Effects</b>	No real likelihood of significant effects

<b>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</b>	EIA is not required.
---	----------------------

**Inspector:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**DP/ADP:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)