



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501051-WW-26

Development

Conversion for existing attic 2 bedroom and bathroom raising the ridge level and all associated site works.

Location

Mountrath , Meath Road , Bray

Planning Authority

Wicklow County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2560904

Applicant(s)

Rowan Blake

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse Permission

Type of Appeal

First Party Normal Planning Appeal

Appellant(s)

Rowan Blake

Observer(s)

Vanessa Mooney and Michael Smith

Martin & Shirley Cleary

Sinéad Costello

Date of Site Inspection

22nd June 2026

Inspector

Mary Crowley

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	4
2.0	Proposed Development.....	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1.	Decision	5
4.0	Planning Authority Reports	6
4.1.	Planning Reports	6
4.4.	Other Technical Reports.....	6
4.5.	Prescribed Bodies.....	6
4.7.	Third Party Observations	7
5.0	Planning History.....	7
6.0	Policy Context.....	7
6.1.	Development Plan	7
6.2.	Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018 – 2024	9
6.3.	Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines.....	9
7.0	Natural Heritage Designations	10
8.0	EIA Screening.....	10
9.0	The Appeal	10
9.1.	Grounds of Appeal.....	10
9.2.	Planning Authority Response.....	12
9.3.	Observations.....	12
9.4.	Further Responses	13
10.0	Assessment	13
10.3.	Principle.....	14
10.4.	Overbearance & Visual Impact	14

10.5. Overlooking & Loss of Privacy	15
10.6. Impact on Daylight Access	17
11.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening	18
12.0 Water Framework Directive.....	18
13.0 Recommendation.....	19
14.0 Reasons and Considerations	19
15.0 Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	21

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site with a stated area of 0.142 ha is located on a back land site with access off Meath Road to the east and close to the junction with Putland Road. The site contains a detached single storey dwelling with a hip pitched roof, parking to the front with rear amenity space. It is noted that the dwelling has been extended previously to the rear. The character of the immediate area is residential and the residences along Meath Road are primarily detached single storey dwellings of similar architectural design. The site is within close proximity of Bray town centre, Bray seafront and Bray train station. There are no Protected Structures or National Monuments within or immediately adjoining the appeal site. The site is not located within a Flood Zone.
- 1.2. I refer to the photos and photomontages available to view throughout the file. Together with a set of photographs of the site and its environs taken during the course of my site inspection serve to describe the site and location in further detail.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission was sought from Wicklow County Council on the 8th November 2025 for the conversion of Conversion of existing attic to habitable accommodation (2 bedrooms and a bathroom) including
- Raising the existing ridge level.
 - Changing the roof profile from hipped ends to gable ends
 - New windows to the new gable walls (front and rear)
 - 4 new velux rooflights, 1 to the south side and 3 to the North side of the roof.
 - Raising existing rear chimney to suit new roof profile.
 - Remove the existing chimneys to the side
 - All at roof level
- 2.2. The stated gross floor area of the existing house is 180 sqm. The stated gross floor area of the proposed works is 55 sqm.
- 2.3. Further Information was submitted on the 10th February 2026 and may be summarised as follows:
- Overlooking

- View to the West - The distance to houses is approximately 50m. There is no significant increase in overlooking possibilities.
- View to the East - Current view to adjoining residences from the ground floor windows facing East are provided. Accepted that there is an increase in overlooking and that it is not significant and that no other houses are affected by the proposed development. Email of support from the Resident of Immal (the residence to the East of the proposed development) stating that having reviewed the details of the planning application they have decided to take no further action in relation to the application submitted.
- Overshadowing - Shadow Study concluded that the effect of the raised ridge does not overshadow adjacent dwellings to the degree that a significant decrease in day or sunlight entering into the house is expected.

2.4. The following was submitted with the FI submission:

- Cover Letter
- Shadow Study
- E mail of support from the Resident of Immal
- Updated site plan showing the position of residence to the east of the proposed development. Submitted that the footprint is shown incorrectly on the Ordinance survey map.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.2. WCC issued notification of decision to refuse permission on the 4th March 2026 for the following reason:

Having regard to the location, orientation and proximity of the proposed first floor east facing gable window to the shared boundary with the property to the east, it is considered that the proposed development would result in the undue increased level of overlooking and loss of privacy and amenity of the private amenity space of the adjoining dwelling to the east, would be contrary to the zoning objective of the application site, "to protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing

residential areas” and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4.0 Planning Authority Reports

4.1. Planning Reports

Planning Application

4.2. The Case Planner in their first report of 18th December 2026 requested the following further information as summarised:

- Planning / Design Report and / or Revised Drawings to address concerns in relation to the potential for overlooking of neighbouring dwellings including their private amenity spaces due to the inclusion of new first floor windows on both the eastern and western gable elevations and the potential for overshadowing of neighbouring dwellings, especially the dwelling to the north, as a result of the change of roof type and its raised ridge

Further Information

4.3. The Case Planner in their second report of 27th February 2026 and having considered the FI submitted recommended that planning permission be refused for reasons of overlooking and loss of privacy and amenity of the private amenity space of the adjoining dwelling to the east. The notification of decision to refuse permission issued by WCC reflects this recommendation.

4.4. Other Technical Reports

- Chief Fire Officer – No stated planning objection.

4.5. Prescribed Bodies

4.6. None

4.7. Third Party Observations

4.7.1. **Planning Application x 4** – There were 4 no observations recorded at the planning application from (1) Sinead Costello, (2) Veronica & Michael Clarke, (3) Martin & Shirley Cleary and (4) Dr Vanessa Mooney. The concerns raised relate to

- Overlooking and loss of sunlight
- Development does not accord with CPO 6.21 of the County Development Plan and the Development and Design Standards therein as set out in the Appendix 1
- The proposed dwelling is out of character with the area, is inconsistent with the surrounding low level bungalows, would be overbearing and would potentially have an impact on the value of the dwellings in the area

4.7.2. **Further Information x 3** – There were 3 no observations recoded at the FI stage from (1) Dr Vanessa Mooney & Mr Micheal Smith, (2) Martin & Shirley Cleary and (3) Sinead Costello. Additional concerns raised relate to:

- View to the east is distorted. Submitted that the images submitted in response to the FI request only show a very narrow view to the west. View will actually be created directly into bedrooms and amenity area of adjoining property. Some photos appear to be taken from ground floor level and not from the level at which the windows are proposed.
- Understand the applicants need to provide for their family's additional accommodation needs and hoped that a way can be found to mitigate the overlooking issues

5.0 Planning History

5.1. There is no evidence of any previous planning appeal on this site.

6.0 Policy Context

6.1. Development Plan

6.1.1. The operative plan for the area is the ***Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028***. Chapter 4 of the Development Plan relates to 'Settlement Strategy'. Bray is designated as a Key Town within the metropolitan area.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The extension should be sensitive to the existing dwelling and should not adversely distort the scale or mass of the structure.
- The extension shall not provide for new overlooking of the private area of an adjacent residence where no such overlooking previously existed.
- In an existing developed area, where a degree of overlooking is already present, the new extension must not significantly increase overlooking possibilities. If for example

a two-story dwelling already directly overlooks a neighbour's rear garden, a third storey extension with the same view will normally be considered acceptable.

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

6.2. Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018 – 2024

6.2.1. The Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018 – 2024 (LAP) expired in 2024. I refer to **Volume 2, Part 5 Local Area Plan Maps of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028** where it states that the *existing Local Area Plan will remain in place until that LAP is superseded by a new plan* and which now form part of the County Development Plan. It is further stated that in light of the provisions of the Planning & Development Act 2024, from 2025 onwards 'Local Planning Frameworks' will be prepared and adopted as variations to this County Development Plan in lieu of existing Local Area Plans which will remain in effect until they are replaced. While each LAP is published separately to the County Development Plan, in order to ensure consistency in the proper planning of the County, the land use zoning map and key development objectives maps have been included in the County Development Plan. It is noted that the Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2025 is indicated as being at the pre-draft stage which ran from November to December 2024.

6.2.2. In the Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan Land Use Zoning Map the appeal site is zoned **RE: Existing Residential** where the objective is *to protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas and where house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity* will be provided for.

6.3. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

6.4. The following planning policy and guidance is relevant:

- National Planning Framework - First Revision (2025)

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

7.0 Natural Heritage Designations

7.1. The appeal site is not located on or within any designated Natura 2000 sites.

8.0 EIA Screening

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

9.0 The Appeal

9.1. Grounds of Appeal

9.1.1. The First Party appeal against the decision to refuse permission has been prepared and submitted by DRB Design on behalf of the applicant and may be summarised as follows:

- The refusal is disproportionate and contrary to the principle of proper planning and sustainable development which requires balanced decision making rather than absolute protection from any change.
- The development is consistent with national and local policy supporting compact growth and the efficient use of serviced residential sites
- Eastern Gable Window - The refusal is based solely on the perceived impact of the east facing Gable window, located approximately 7.3 meters from the boundary with the property to the east. The planning authority accepts that
 - 1) one no undue overshadowing arises

2) the roof flights do not cause overlooking and

3) the West facing Gable window is acceptable.

- Therefore, the only concern relates to a single window not the overall design, this indicates that the development is largely compliant with residential amenity standards.
- As submitted to WCC the owner of the adjoining property, most directly affected by the proposed first floor window has confirmed, in writing, that they have reviewed the submitted plans and do not object to the proposed development. This is a material consideration. Submitted that not all relevant evidence on the planning file was fully considered.
- While the planning authority refers to a distance of approximately 7.3 metres to the boundary, this measurement does not reflect the actual functional separation between the proposed window and any usable private amenity space shed structure. When this existing structure is taken into account the separation distance from the proposed first floor window to the adjoining garden area extends to approximately 12.03 meters.
- Reference is made to a neighbouring property that was granted planning permission (Reg Ref 25/60976 (Wicklow County Council) refers) which features a new first floor window with a distance of less than 6.9 meters to their neighbours rear boundary, without condition applying to the windows.
- The separation distance from the eastward facing window to the nearest point of the property it faces is over 23 meters.
- It is submitted that refusal of the entire development on the basis of one window, where:
 - No overshadowing impact arises
 - No dominance or overbearing impact is identified
 - The development otherwise complies with zoning objectives

Is disproportionate and contrary to the principle of proper planning and sustainable development, which requires balanced decision making rather than absolute protection from any perception of change.

9.1.2. The first party appeal was accompanied by a copy of the following

- Application Cover Letter
- FI Response including Shadow Study (January 2026)

9.2. Planning Authority Response

9.2.1. Wicklow County Council in their submission to ACP set out the following as summarised:

- The reports on file address the issues raised in the first party appeal.
- A previous application for a first floor extension similar to that proposed was initially refused by WCC but granted on appeal - ABP 307687-20 refers. The orientation of the subject site has a different context in that it is not constructed to the rear of other adjoining dwellings and the rear elevation faces side on to rear garden of an adjoining property, with the deep recessed windows serving to restrict views so that they are directed across the roof of an existing large single storey structure to the rear of the adjoining property. This was not the case with this current scheme as the proposed window provided full splay views.
- The FI was accessed, and this is clearly set out in the reports on file. To state that weight should be given to this inserted correspondence over other submissions is not considered appropriate or in compliance with the provisions of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).
- It was not considered appropriate to condition the window in question to be obscured for 2 reasons: the amenity of the bedroom it is to serve and that when the window is opened, it would result in the same overlooking issue.
- No further details have been submitted as part of the appeal that would address the concerns raised in the refusal reason.

9.3. Observations

9.3.1. There are 3 no observations recorded on the appeal file from (1) Vanessa Mooney and Michael Smith, (2) Martin & Shirley Cleary and (3) Sinéad Costello. The concerns raised may be summarised as follows:

- Overlooking and loss of privacy of Imaal, Ard na Greine, Belle Vue and Brentwood from the proposed east gable window due to its height, proximity to boundaries and extent of first floor extension. No design or technical proposals have been submitted or suggested to resolve or mitigate these concerns.
- Reference is made to SPPR1 of the Sustainable and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (separation of 16m). If permission granted, the siting of the

proposed roof extension would result in restriction on the siting of any future development on the site to the east at Imaal.

- The application does not demonstrate that the proposed development will not result in an undue adverse impact on daylight access within adjacent existing dwellings within the meaning of Section 3.1.8 of Appendix 1 of the Development Plan.
- Disproportionate to have a situation whereby one dwelling is granted planning permission with a design which benefits that dwelling to the cost of the privacy of residents of other dwellings.
- The scheme would be contrary to the zoning objective of the site, *“to protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas”* and to Section 3.1.8 of Appendix 1 of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022 – 2028.

9.4. Further Responses

9.4.1. None

10.0 Assessment

10.1. This assessment is based on the plans and particulars submitted with the planning application on 8th November 2026, as amended by plans and particulars submitted on 10th February 2026 by way of FI together with plans and particulars submitted in the course of the appeal.

10.2. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report/s of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle
- Overbearance & Visual Impact
- Overlooking & Loss of Privacy
- Impact on Daylight Access

10.3. Principle

- 10.3.1. Planning permission is sought for the conversion of the existing attic to accommodate two bedrooms and a bathroom (55 sqm) by raising the existing ridge level and changing the roof profile from hipped ends to gable ends. The proposal also includes the insertion of new windows to the new gable walls (front and rear) and 4 new velux rooflights, 1 to the south side and 3 to the North side of the roof.
- 10.3.2. The Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan Land Use Zoning Map as set out in Volume 2, Part 5 Local Area Plan Maps of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 identifies the appeal site on lands zoned *RE: Existing Residential* where the objective is *to protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas* and where house improvements, alterations and in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity shall be provided for.
- 10.3.3. I am further satisfied, having regard to the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028, that the scheme would comply with the overarching objectives of the Development Plan in terms of compact growth within existing settlements (CPO 4.2); increased densities (CPO 4.3); and house improvements, alterations and extensions (CPO 6.21).
- 10.3.4. As documented the appeal site is wholly contained within an established suburban area where the zoning objective for the site provides for residential extensions and alterations to an existing dwelling for residential purposes and where a domestic extension such as that proposed would not be an unexpected development. Overall, I am satisfied that that the principle of the development is acceptable at this location subject to the acceptance or otherwise of site specifics / other policies within the development plan and government guidance and discussed below.

10.4. Overbearance & Visual Impact

- 10.4.1. In addition to reconciling the need to meet the requirements of the applicant to maximise accommodation any extension or alterations at this location should maintain the visual amenities, scale and architectural character of the parent building and wider area without compromising the residential amenities of adjoining properties in terms of privacy and access to daylight and sunlight. The latter is discussed separately below.

- 10.4.2. I refer to Section 3.18 'House Extensions' as set out in Appendix 1: 'Development and Design Standards' of the Development Plan where several "*basic principles*" are set out. These include extensions being sensitive to the existing dwelling without adversely distorting the scale or mass of the structure while complementing the area, unless the area has an established unique or valuable character worthy of preservation. The full wording of Section 3.18 House Extensions of the Development Plan is set out in Section 6.1 of this report above.
- 10.4.3. The raising of the roof ridge height from 5.25m to 6.549m and the change of roof profile from hipped ends to gable ends is a modest domestic extension that does not increase the footprint of the dwelling. The design and scale of this attic conversion does not overwhelm or dominate the original form or appearance of the parent house. While there is a clear uniformity of design in the streetscape of the adjoining detached dwellings to the south fronting onto Putland Row that provides an architectural richness to the area I am satisfied that, as observed on day of site inspection much of the views of the appeal site are generally obscured with only intermittent views possible and therefore to permit same would not detract from the visual amenity of Putland Row.
- 10.4.4. The proposed extension represents a modest and proportionate extension to an existing dwelling within an established suburban area. I do not consider that the scheme would if permitted, form an unduly overbearing or dominant element when viewed from the adjoining properties or surrounding areas.
- 10.4.5. Overall, I am satisfied that the form, size and appearance of the attic extension is acceptable and that it would not adversely distort the scale or mass of the parent structure. While there is an established rich suburban character in the immediate area, I consider that the proposed works would not be overbearing or detract from the visual amenities of the area. No issues arise in in this regard.

10.5. Overlooking & Loss of Privacy

- 10.5.1. WCC issued notification of decision to refuse planning permission for a single reason stating that the location, orientation and proximity of the proposed first floor east facing gable window to the shared boundary with the property to the east, would result in the undue increased level of overlooking and loss of privacy and amenity of the private amenity space of the adjoining dwelling to the east (Imaal) and would be contrary to the zoning objective of the application site. The full wording for this reason for refusal is set out in Section 3.1

above. Further, the observers to the appeal raise particular concerns regarding overlooking and loss of privacy to the properties to the south of the appeal site and fronting onto Putland Road, namely Ard na Greine, Belle Vue and Brentwood from the proposed east gable window.

10.5.2. As set out above Section 3.18 'House Extensions' of Appendix 1: 'Development and Design Standards' of the Development Plan outline a number of "*basic principles*" that include new extensions not overlooking the private area of an adjacent residence where no such overlooking previously existed and where a degree of overlooking is already present, the new extension must not significantly increase overlooking possibilities.

10.5.3. The refusal is based solely on the impact of the proposed east facing gable window with the residential property to the east. With regard to the remaining proposed windows, including the gable window to the west and the roof lights I accept that:

- the roof flights do not cause undue overlooking to adjoining residential properties noting that the roof lights on the southern side serve the proposed landing and staircase and roof lights to the north, while serving the two proposed bedrooms and a bathroom address the front garden of the property to the north and no issues of undue overlooking arise.
- the West facing Gable window is acceptable having regard to its set back from the adjoining property to the west

10.5.4. In relation to the proposed east gable window, it was evident on day of site inspection that it would result in an unacceptable increased level of overlooking of the rear amenity space to the property to the east, namely Imaal, currently not experienced. While I note the email of support from the resident of Imaal, stating that having reviewed the details of the planning application they have decided to take no further action in relation to the application submitted I do not consider this of itself negates the necessity to protect the residential amenities of this property from unobstructed overlooking. As set out above there is no objection to the principle of the proposed development. However, as this is a backland site in close proximity to adjoining dwellings a carefully considered design response is necessitated to mitigate any potential overlooking. I am not satisfied that this has been achieved in this instance and therefore I support the decision of WCC and recommended that permission be refused on these grounds.

10.5.5. With regard to proposed first floor east facing gable window and its impact on residential properties to the south, fronting onto Putland Road, I note the concerns raised by the observers to the appeal. I am satisfied that there will be no undue overlooking of Belle Vue and Brentwood. However, I am concerned that there may be potential for overlooking of Ard na Greine and to a lesser extent Ardkeen. Noting the orientation of the appeal site relative to these dwellings together with the separation distances between both, the extensive established boundary hedging and vegetation between the properties and the nature of the proposed use in the attic conversion namely a bedroom that will be served by this east gable window I do not consider that any potential for undue overlooking would be so significant as to warrant a refusal of permission. Accordingly, I consider that no significant impact arises in this regard.

10.5.6. Reference is made in the reason for refusal to the *RE- Existing Residential* zoning for the site and the associated zoning objective “*to protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas*” and that to permit the proposed attic conversion would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. Having regard to the foregoing assessment I agree that to permit this development in light of the impact to residential amenities would be contrary to this zoning objective. Refusal is recommended.

10.6. Impact on Daylight Access

10.6.1. I note the concerns raised by the Observers to the appeal that the proposed development does not demonstrate that the proposed extension will not result in an undue adverse impact on daylight access within adjacent existing dwellings within the meaning of Section 3.1.8 of Appendix of the Development Plan.

10.6.2. I refer to the Shadow Study submitted by way of FI where it was concluded that any additional overshadowing that falls outside of the appeal site is localized and of a short duration, typically when the sun is low and light levels low, and that the effect of the raised ridge does not overshadow adjacent dwellings to the degree that a significant decrease in day or sunlight entering into the house.

10.6.3. Having regard to the Shadow Study submitted, taken together with the plans and particulars on file I am satisfied that the scheme proposed respects the amenities of the neighbouring properties in that it will not result in any significant undue overshadowing or

significantly diminish existing day lighting standards to the adjoining properties and will not therefore be detrimental to neighbouring amenity.

11.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 11.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). The proposed development essentially comprises an extension to an existing dwelling. The appeal site is located in an urban area and is not located within or immediately adjoining any designated Natura 2000 sites.
- 11.2. The subject site is approximately 0.5 km from the nearest designated site which is the Bray Head Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 000714). Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small scale and nature of the development;
 - The location of the site on serviced lands in an urban area and distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.
 - Taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority
- 11.3. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

12.0 Water Framework Directive

- 12.1. The subject site is in a serviced urban area and is to connect to the existing sewer network. There are no water courses in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site which is situated within an established urban area.
- 12.2. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal

will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.

- 12.3. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive. Accordingly, the subject development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive.

13.0 Recommendation

- 13.1. Having considered the contents of the application the provision of the Development Plan, the grounds of appeal and the responses thereto, my site inspection and my assessment of the planning issues, I recommend that permission be **REFUSED** for the following reason.

14.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 1) Having regard to the location, orientation and proximity of the proposed first floor east facing gable window to the shared boundary with the residential property to the east, it is considered that the proposed development would result in the undue increased level of overlooking and loss of privacy and amenity of the private amenity space of the adjoining dwelling to the east, would be contrary to the RE Existing Residential zoning objective for the site, “to protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas” and to permit same would therefore be 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.

Mary Crowley

Senior Planning Inspector

23rd June 2026

15.0 Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501051-WW-26
Proposed Development Summary	Conversion for existing attic 2 bedroom and bathroom raising the ridge level and all associated site works.
Development Address	Mountrath , Meath Road , Bray
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?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	The development is not a Class

☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____