



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500926-DF-26

Development	Single storey extension to front of existing dwelling.
Location	7 Springlawn Drive, Blanchardstown, Dublin 15, D15 A9XF.
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	FW25A/0543E
Applicant(s)	Noeleen Vaughan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	James O'Connor
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	27/04/2026.
Inspector	Deirdre Scully.

Table of Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
6.0 EIA Screening.....	10
7.0 The Appeal	11
8.0 Assessment.....	13
9.0 AA Screening.....	16
10.0 Water Framework Directive	16
11.0 Recommendation	17
12.0 REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS	18
13.0 Conditions	19

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The appeal site is located at no.7 Springlawn Drive, Blanchardstown, Dublin D15 A9XF and the site has a stated area of 0.03 hectares. The site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, located in a cul-de-sac within the larger Springlawn housing estate, and is positioned approximately mid-way along on this cul-de-sac road. The Springlawn estate consists of, for the most part, two-storey demi-detached housing built over the mid and late 20th century.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development, as described within the public notices, comprises of the construction of a single storey extension to the front of the house.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Fingal County Council issued a notification of decision to grant permission with eight conditions for the proposed development on the 24th of November 2025. One condition of note in the decision is Condition 3.

Condition 3 states

“All development hereby permitted shall be located within the site boundaries.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.”

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

One planning report is filed for this application, dated as typed on the 10th of February 2026 and is contained within the Chief Executives Order of the 12th of February 2026.

The following provides a summary of key points made in the Planners Report:

- The report considered the proposed front extension under seven points (i) the principle of the development; (ii) impact on residential and visual amenity; (iii) access and parking (iv) water services (v) other items (vi) screening for Appropriate Assessment and (vii) screening for Environmental Impact Assessment.
- Principle of Development: The proposed development is located within an area zoned “RS- Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity” in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and the works would be considered consistent with the zoning objective.
- Objectives and policies referred to relevant to the consideration of the application are referenced. These are Section 3.5.13.1, Policy SPQHP41 (residential extensions), Objective SPQHO45 (domestic extensions) and GINHP25 (Landscape types), DMSO205 (Sustainable Drainage) and Airport Noise (DMSO105); (See paragraph 5.1.5 of this report for text for these). Also referenced is text regarding residential extensions within the relevant parts of the Development Management Chapter in Section 14.10.2 of the Fingal Development Plan and car parking standards (Table 14.19).
- Residential and Visual Amenity: With regard to residential amenity the planner states that, taking into account the concerns raised and recommended condition, considers that the proposed development due to its subordinate scale, single storey nature and orientation, is appropriate, and would not adversely impact on residential amenity. As regards visual amenity the planner states that the extension design is subordinate and integrates to the house and the finishes proposed matching the house are appropriate, and do not raise visual amenity concerns.
- Access and Parking: The report states that the development would not result in intensification of parking requirements and supports the recommended condition from the Transportation Department.
- Drainage: A condition regarding surface water management contained in Water Services report is recommended.

- Other Items- Accuracy/Detail of Drawings: With regard to the points raised by 3rd parties relating to the applicant's plans and elevations submitted the planner states that these are sufficient to enable the assessment of the proposed development application lodged.
- The planners report outlined the following in respect of Appropriate Assessment: The proposed development site is not connected with any European (Natura 2000) sites and there is no realistic pathway between the Proposed Project site and any other European sites. Having regard to the nature, scale and location of the Proposed Project, in comparison with the existing baseline, it is considered that there is no likelihood of significant effects on any European sites during construction or operation of the Proposed Project, and it's further considered that there are no other plans or projects that will act in combination with the Proposed Project to have a significant effect on European sites. It is considered that the Proposed Project, individually or in combination with another plan or project, will not have a significant effect on any European sites. This assessment was reached without considering or taking into account mitigation measures or measures intended to avoid or reduce any impact on European sites.
- With regard to Environmental Impact Assessment Screening, the Planners Report states that: The proposed development is not listed in Schedule 5 (part 1 or Part 2) of the Planning and Development Regulations as amended. No Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Two technical reports are included in the file from (i) Water Services, (dated 14/12/2025), no objection and recommend a condition regarding Sustainable Urban Drainage; and (ii) Transportation, (dated 14/12/2025) who note the driveway is large enough with the proposed works to accommodate parking and recommend conditions regarding repair, visibility and drainage.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Two observations were submitted during the application process to Fingal County Council from adjoining properties on either side of the applicant.

- (i) Finbar Kelleher. This submission raised concerns regarding the impact of the extension on the enjoyment of his front garden, loss of morning sunlight, increased scale of building along the boundary (due to long extension) and lack of clear information in the drawings and sought for the application to be refused permission.
- (ii) James O'Connor. The submission objects to the application due to the loss of daylight from the main habitable room and south east facing garden, overbearing and oppressive impact/continuous built form along the boundary (taking into account the existing extension to the rear), the cumulative impact and overdevelopment of the site and boundary, inadequate and inaccurate drawings, the apparent encroachment of the extension into Mr. O'Connor's property shown in the drawings, and a breach of the Fingal Development Plan Sc. 14.10.2.1 requiring front extensions respect the scale, design and visual and residential amenities and significant breaks in the building line should be resisted where they negatively impact adjoining properties.

4.0 Planning History

No recent planning history is identified for the subject site.

Relevant Planning History on Springlawn Drive and Environs:

FW18A/0131: Permission GRANTED for single storey pitch roof extension (0.9m depth) over living rooms and porch to front of existing dwelling, garage conversion and first floor extension of converted garage, 4 Springlawn Drive.

F97B/0545: Permission GRANTED for 1st floor extension over garage, porch and garage extension at ground level, 9 Springlawn Drive.

F98B/0575: Permission GRANTED at for two storey side extension, 7 Springlawn Court.

F95B/0384: Permission GRANTED for single storey extension and porch at front with garage conversion, 21 Springlawn Drive.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029

Zoning

5.1.1 The site is zoned for Objective RS – Residential purposes within the Fingal Development Plan with the objective to “provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity”. The vision for this zoning objective seeks to “ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity”. Residential development is listed as a use that is “permitted in principle” under this zoning objective.

5.1.2 The site is located in the Landscape Character area defined as River Valleys/Canals type. (Section 9.6.14).

5.1.3 The area falls with Noise Zone D for Dublin Airport as set out Table 14.16 (“*All noise sensitive development within this zone is likely to be acceptable from a noise perspective*”) of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029

5.1.4 Section 3.5.13.1 of the Plan relates to Residential Extensions and outlines that: “*The need for people to extend and renovate their dwellings is*

recognised and acknowledged. Extensions will be considered favourably where they do not have a negative impact on adjoining properties or on the nature of the surrounding area”.

Policies and Objectives

5.1.5 The following provisions of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 are of relevance:

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

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

Objective SPQHO43: Contemporary and Innovative Design Solutions: *Promote the use of contemporary and innovative design solutions subject to design respecting the character and architectural heritage of the area.*

Other policies and objectives referenced by the Planners Report are:

Policy GINHP25 - Preservation of Landscape Types: *Ensure the preservation of the uniqueness of a landscape character type by having regard to the character, value and sensitivity of a landscape when determining a planning application.*

Objective DMSO205 - Surface Water Management Plan: *Require the preparation of a Surface Water Management Plan as part of all new developments which shall include the following:*

- *Identify and assess the existing surface water movements through the development before considering and developing a surface water management system using SuDS, having regard to our Fingal Guidance Document – Green/ Blue Infrastructure for Development, as amended. (Appendix 11).*

- *Incorporate SuDS along the route of the water movement to enhance the water quality effects of nature-based systems at the different stages – Treatment Train approach from source to discharge.*

DMSO105 - Development within Airport Noise Zones : *Strictly control inappropriate development and require noise insulation where appropriate in accordance with Table 14.16 above within Noise Zone B and Noise Zone C and where necessary in Assessment Zone D, and actively resist new provision for residential development and other noise sensitive uses within Noise Zone A, as shown on the Development Plan maps, while recognising the housing needs of established families farming in the zone. To accept that time based operational restrictions on usage of a second runway are not unreasonable to minimize the adverse impact of noise on existing housing within the inner and outer noise zone.*

Development Management Standards

5.1.6 Development Management Standards are set out within Chapter 14 of the Development Plan. Section 14.10.2 of the Development Plan relates to residential extensions and outlines that: The following text is of relevance to the proposal:

“The need for housing to be adaptable to changing family circumstances is recognised and acknowledged and the Council will support applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend as the needs of the household change, subject to specific safeguards. In particular, the design and layout of residential extensions must have regard to and protect the amenities of adjoining properties, particularly in relation to sunlight, daylight and privacy. The design of extensions must also have regard to the character and form of the existing building, its architectural expression, remaining usable rear private open space, external finishes and pattern of fenestration. Additionally, careful consideration should be paid to boundary treatments, tree planting and landscaping. The following section provides guidance in relation to, front extensions, side extensions, rear extensions, first floor rear

extensions, roof alterations including attic conversions and dormer extensions.

14.10.2.1- Front Extensions

Porch extensions, other than those deemed to be exempted development, should be of appropriate design and scale relative to the design of the original house. The scale, height and projection from the front buildings lines of the dwelling should not be excessive so as to dominate the front elevation of the dwelling. The porch should complement the existing dwelling, and a contemporary design approach may be considered. Front extensions will be assessed in terms of their scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. Significant breaks in building line should be resisted unless the design can demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the proposal will not impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwelling. Sufficient depth to the forecourt is required to ensure off-street parking is not impacted.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located in or adjacent to any site designated for Natural heritage. The nearest designated site to the appeal site is approximately 0.84km to the south- the Royal Canal proposed NHA (0002103).

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal in respect of the decision to the GRANT of permission has been submitted by a third party observer to the application on the subject property, who resides in the adjoining attached property. The following provides a summary of the grounds of appeal-

- The Commission is requested to REFUSE Permission as it is the view of the appellant the decision made by Fingal County Council did not adequately address their concerns as raised during the application process on the impact that the proposed development would have on the residential amenity of their property, in particular their principal habitable room. It is the appellants view that the proposed development would have a negative impact on their residential amenity, thus breaching the policies and objectives of the Fingal Development to protect residential amenity.
- The appellant points to their original submission to Fingal Council which raised seven concerns, and sets out a ground for appeal to the Planning Authority's response in each.
- Loss of Daylight to main habitable room and south-east facing front garden due to the impact of the 1.7m extension along the shared boundary. The appellant states that the Planning Authority did not assess the depth of the extension, the aspect or position of the extension on the shared boundary and the dismissal of the daylight and amenity concerns is not supported.
- Overbearing and oppressive impact and continuous built form; raising concerns regarding an existing 3.1m rear extension in combination with the proposed development and the depth of the new extension to the rear, being in excess of other similar developments; to which the appellant concludes that there is an absence of analysis of the cumulative boundary condition.
- Cumulative impact and overdevelopment; the front extension will intensify the impact of development in this constrained area, with massing disproportionate to the site's capacity. The appellant states the boundary adjacent section of the site is already significantly developed and this was not evaluated.

- Inadequate and inaccurate drawings; the drawings submitted for the planning application stage were incomplete and did not provide sufficient information to allow the Planning Authority to properly assess the impact of the proposed development; particularly the rear extension. They also lack detail regarding guttering, overhang and impact on the shared boundary. The appellant questions the evidential basis for concluding that overbearing and related impacts do not arise and the sufficiency of the drawings as a foundation is questioned.
- Boundary concerns; the submitted plans showed the proposed works extending into the appellants garden and clarification is necessary.
- Site constraints; the existing rear extension is likely to be over/proximate to the public foul sewer located in the rear gardens and that access to such may not have been maintained.

The original submission to Fingal County Council is included in the appeal statement and also includes a number of photographs.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority states “while noting the comments in the appeal regarding the rear extension, the Planning Authority have no further comments to make in relation to the proposal which comprised of a single storey extension to front of existing dwelling.” They seek that a financial contribution and tree bond be included by condition, as appropriate, if a decision to grant is made.

7.3. Applicant Response

The applicant (1st party) submitted an response in relation to the appeal statement submitted. They point out that a number of similar single storey front extensions have been built in the surrounding area and have enhanced the area. The submission points to the planners report which considered the proposed extension

as subordinate and would not adversely impact the residential amenity of adjoining properties. They seek that the decision of Fingal County Council is upheld.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file in relation to the appeal, the report of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the policies and objectives of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Residential Amenity
- Precedent
- Cumulative Impacts and Overdevelopment.

As the development form and use proposed is supported by and in compliance with the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029; and taking into account the zoning of the lands as 'RS'; the opinion in the planners report, and the decision to grant permission by the Local Authority, this report does not examine the principle of development.

8.2 Residential Amenity

The scale of extension proposed in this application is 7 sq. m.; and as such it is a small-scale extension to the full elevation of the house, with a depth of 0.7 across the north east room and front door, and 1.7 depth across the living room. The finish proposed is in keeping with generally with the house and raises no concerns. In the original house design, the living room is stepped back from the front hall and garage elevation.

The house to the south-west of the site is separated from the extension and the main house by a side passageway shown on the drawings as being 0.9m in width. The impact on this property of the proposed works is minimal, taking into account the shallow depth of the proposed works and the separation created by the laneway,

even when taking into account the slight step-back of the front elevation of this house from the applicant's property.

For the property on the north-east elevation the impact is different. The width of the extension appears in the drawings to extend onto the adjoining property in some drawings and extend along the party wall in others. The greatest impact of this extension is on this adjoining semi-detached house, where the extension is at its deepest (1.7m) and is built up to the property line. The impact of the relatively small extension is accentuated by the original indent form of the front elevation on both houses.

It is considered that the principle of development of such a small extension is in keeping with the zoning policy and allowing houses to adapt and change to meet household needs. However this needs to be done without causing significant interference with the residential amenity of adjoining properties. In this instance, a small setback of the extension from the building line to allow the adjoining house retain an open aspect and preserve the residential amenity to their front elevation is considered appropriate and a measured balancing of the needs of both.

8.3 Precedent

All applications should be considered on their merits and within the policy context of the statutory plans that are in place. Whilst certain works or extensions may be suitable for a house of the same design in one location; in another location and setting they can be inappropriate. It is therefore important to consider the impact of the extension on its own merits and the impact it will have within the relevant environment context. However precedent and seeking to maintain a particular style and scale of extension has been raised in the third party appeal and the 1st party response and this is therefore examined in this report with regard to the points made.

The Springlawn estate, as with any estate over 40 years old, has a wide mix of extensions and alterations to the front elevations of the housing (porches, canopies, side extensions and garage conversions), as well as some infill housing in side gardens. There a number of front elevation single storey extensions utilising a mix of styles, some with the living room as a bay window, others extending the room. It is noted that only one other property within the cul-de-sac that has a front extension

across all of the front elevation located at the house opposite (F18A/0131), with a shallower depth of 0.9m. I consider that is not generally appropriate to seek to establish a particular design style or standard for an estate based on one type/pattern of front elevation house extensions/porches which has been led by the preference of individual owners; in locations where heritage protection is not a concern. What is important is that each approach taken protects the residential amenity of the house and adjoining properties. Considering the mix of types of works within this area, and the lack of heritage concerns, the type of extension proposed, with any recommended conditions; would be in keeping with the mixed built pattern of improvements to properties in this estate.

8.4 Cumulative Impacts and Overdevelopment of the Site:

The appeal statement and the included original submission to the Planning Authority identify concerns of the appellant regarding the impact of the existing rear extension and their request that the proposed development is considered in combination with this existing extension. It is their opinion that both works in combination would result in overdevelopment and overdominance of the adjoining property on theirs.

The concerns of the appellant are noted; and also noted is the response of the Planning Authority in their planning report. This appeal considers the application made as before it. In considering the application, all issues are looked at, including taking into account the local context and what is relevant to assessing the impact of the proposed works on their environs.

Whilst the planning application did not include plans and elevations showing the full extent of the existing property (including the existing built extension); this absence has not impeded the assessment of the impact of the front extension. It is also my opinion that the impact of an existing rear extension in combination with the addition of the proposed works to the front elevation would not result in overdevelopment of the site or overbearance on the applicant's property; where a set back to the front extension is conditioned. Considering that current Planning and Development Regulations permit house extensions to the rear of up to 40 sq. m. (subject to set criteria) it is not unreasonable that to expect, in general, that exempt house extensions reaching a depth of 3 or 4 metres can and are built in rear suburban

gardens. Concerns regarding extensions without permission either built above this threshold or in breach of the criteria for meeting the exemption; are a matter for the Local Authority enforcement office.

9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed single storey extension to the front of the dwelling in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located within a well serviced suburb of the town of Blanchardstown and circa 0.55km from the nearest European Site to the east at South Dublin Bay and Tolka Estuary SPA (004024).

The proposed development comprises of single storey extension to the front elevation of the existing dwelling (See Section 2.0). 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 as follows

- The limited scale and nature of the works
- The location of the site within an established, serviced residential area
- Lack of connection to nearest European 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

The subject site is located in Springlawn housing estate, within built-up suburb of Blanchardstown and is approx. 5.5km to the west of the Tolka Estuary and 0.84km from the Royal Canal. The proposed development comprises a new single-storey extension to the front of the existing dwelling; (see Section 2 above for description.)

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal or the planners report.

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

The reason for this conclusion are (i) the nature of the works proposed, which are modest in scale and also (ii) the lack of hydrological connection and distance from the nearest Water bodies.

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.

11.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the provisions of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and to the nature and scale of the proposed development on residentially zoned land, that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, subject to the inclusion of an amending condition. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the provisions of the Fingal

Development Plan 2023-2029 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I recommend that permission be **GRANTED** for the proposed development subject to one new condition to reduce the width of the ground floor extension so that the residential amenity of the adjoining property is protected.

12.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, to the residential land use zoning for the site and the policies and objectives of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 supporting improvements to existing residential properties, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would, therefore, be in accordance with the provisions of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and 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 received by the planning authority, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2	<p>This permission relates solely to that detailed in the statutory public notices and does not refer to any other aspects of the development that may be shown in the lodged plans.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
3	<p>The proposed development shall be amended as follows:</p> <p>(a) The developer shall set-back the extension on the north-eastern elevation from the shared boundary with the adjoining attached property by a minimum of 600mm from the external building line to the boundary wall.</p> <p>Reason: To preserve the residential amenity of the adjoining property.</p>

4	<p>All development hereby permitted shall be located within the site boundaries.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
5	<p>The finishes shall be as indicated on the submitted drawings unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
6	<p>The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.</p>
7	<p>The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.</p>
7	<p>The developer shall comply with the following requirements:</p> <p>(a) Any works to the public road carriageway and public footpath to facilitate the development and any repairs to the public road carriageway necessary as a result of the development shall be at the expense of the developer and completed to the Councils' standards for taking-in-charge and to the satisfaction of the Council.</p> <p>(b) No gate shall open across a public footpath/roadway.</p>

	Reason: In the interests of traffic and pedestrian safety.
8	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.</p> <p>Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
9	<p>The site development works and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the adjoining streets are kept clear of debris, soil and other material and if the need arises for cleaning works to be carried out on the adjoining public roads, the said cleaning works shall be carried out at the developer's expense.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.</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.

Deirdre Scully
 Planning Inspector

11th of May 2026.

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	Single storey extension to front of existing dwelling.
Development Address	7 Springlawn Drive, Blanchardstown, Dublin 15, D15 A9XF
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	No, not a class for Part 1
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1.	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified	No, not a class for Part 2

<p>in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No, Schedule 7A information not provided.</p>

--	--

Inspector: _____

Date: _____