



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501068-DF-26

Development

Construction of a single storey, 2 bedroom detached house, fronting onto Roselawn Road, on a subdivision of the site of the existing house 54 Clonsilla Road and the site of approved house, 54A Clonsilla Road.

Location

54 and 54A Clonsilla Road,
Blanchardstown, Dublin 15, D15
AXV6.

Planning Authority

Fingal County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

F26A/0007E

Applicant(s)

Veronica Curmei

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse Permission

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Veronica Curmei.

Observer(s)

1. Deirdre & Alan Murphy.

Date of Site Inspection

21/05/2026.

Inspector

Deirdre Scully.

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	4
2.0	Proposed Development	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History	9
5.0	Policy Context.....	10
6.0	EIA Screening.....	17
7.0	The Appeal	17
8.0	Assessment.....	19
9.0	AA Screening.....	28
10.0	Water Framework Directive	29
11.0	Recommendation	30
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	30
13.0	Conditions	30

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located within the rear garden of 54 Clonsilla Road, Blanchardstown, a semi-detached two storey house on a corner, and the adjoining side garden of No.54, now a separate plot numbered 54a Clonsilla Road with a permission for a two-storey detached house, currently nearing construction completion. The site plot consists of the most southerly part of both gardens, accessed from the north-eastern side garden wall of 54a which bounds the property at Roselawn Road. The site has a stated area of 0.017 hectares. Clonsilla Road is a busy link road between the suburban villages of Blanchardstown and Clonsilla, with a mix of mostly 20th century traditional suburban two-storey semi-detached housing and some single storey bungalows. A small apartment scheme at two storey height is located opposite 54 Clonsilla Road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, as described within the public notices, comprises of the construction of a single storey, 2 bedroom detached house, fronting onto Roselawn Road, on a subdivision of the site of the existing house 54 Clonsilla Road and the site of approved house, 54A Clonsilla Road.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Fingal County Council issued a notification of decision to refuse permission for the proposed development on the 3rd of March 2026. Two reasons for refusal were given. These stated:

(1) The proposed dwelling by virtue of its rearward position in regard to 54 & 54A Clonsilla Road, its detached form, its single-storey scale, and its deficient and substandard private open space provision, appears cramped and contrived within the restricted plot and fails to have cognisance of the character of the local area. Therefore, the development is considered inappropriate backland development at odds with the surrounding pattern of development and the visual amenity of the area and will set an

undesirable precedent for similar developments. As such, the development contravenes the 'RS' Residential zoning objective, Section 14.10.1, Objectives DMSO31 & DMSO32 and Table 14.4 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and is contrary to the requirements of SPPR 2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) which has been issued to Planning Authorities under section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The development is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

(2) The subject site is located in an area which is considered an 'intermediate - peripheral location' as per the SPPR 3 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024). The development of a 2-bedroom dwelling with zero car parking provision is contrary to the requirements of SPPR 3 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) which has been issued to Planning Authorities under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. In addition the lack of provision of in-curtilage parking would lead to on-street parking which by its nature would lead to a conflict between pedestrian and road user. The development as such is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

One planning report is filed for this application, dated the 3rd of March 2026 and contained within the Chief Executives Order of the same date. The following provides a summary of key points made in the Planners Report:

-
- The report considered the development of the two-bedroom infill bungalow under four points (i) the principle of the development; (ii) impact on the visual and residential amenity of the area; (iii) access, parking and transport (iv)

services and drainage, (v) screening for Appropriate Assessment and (vi) screening for Environmental Impact Assessment.

- 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 development of a dwelling in principle would be considered acceptable subject to the appropriate planning and design standards of the Development Plan.
- The Report lists Sections, policies and objectives and residential standards objectives relevant to the consideration of the application relating to infill housing and new residential development- Section 3.5.13, Policy SPQHP38- compact growth, Objectives SPQHO35- private open space, SPQHO37- residential consolidation, SPQHO38- sustainable density, SPQHO39-new infill development, SPQHO40- corner sites, SPQHO42- underutilised corner/infill sites, SPQHO43- innovative design, Development Management Objectives DMSO19- new residential development, DMSO21- floor plans, DMSO23- separation distances, DMSO27- private open space standard, DMSO31- infill development, DMSO32- infill criteria) and text regarding infill residential development and parking standards contained in Section 14.10.1, including Table 14.4, and the relevant sections of the Fingal County Development Plan, 2023-2029, regarding Landscape Character Assessment, Aircraft Noise, Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Urban Drainage.
- The Report also identifies the Government publication *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities* (2024) and four SPPRs relevant: SPP1- Separation distances, SPPR2 – open space standards, SPPR3- car parking and SPPR4- cycle parking and storage.
- The report refers to planning history of site (i) (F25A/0007E)- permission refused by Fingal County Council for the construction of a two-storey house at this location, which was refused by the Coimisiún following a first party appeal (ABP 322178-25) and (ii) the grant of permission for 54a Clonsilla Road (F24A/0231); and (iii) a refusal of permission for a dormer bungalow at the this location (F07A/0225) and FW12B/0004- a grant of permission for 28 sq. m. extension to no.54 Clonsilla Road.

- In the assessment of the visual and residential amenities the Planners Report states that the subject site is considered an infill development on a corner site within an established residential area. In considering the proposed development in the context of DMSO32- criteria for infill on corner/side gardens, the report reviews the depth of the gardens and setbacks for 54 and 54a Clonsilla road and Roselawn Road and expresses concern of the impact in reducing the garden depth at 54 and 54a Clonsilla Road to 7 metres.
- Concern is expressed that the detached and “stand-alone” nature of the development is inconsistent with the character of the area and not appropriate; that the layout is contrived and has a poor interface with the roadside which is inconsistent with the character of the area.
- The planners report takes the view that proposed design is incongruous and poorly integrated with the established height and massing of the existing housing and the 2.4m high wall not providing active street frontage. They note that the internal design complies with the development management standards of DMSO19 of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, but that the rear open space provided does not meet the 30 sq. m. minimum of SPPR2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines.
- As regards parking and movement, the report notes the non-provision of a car park space, and the inclusion of bicycle parking. It points to SPPR3 of the Guidelines and that the site is located within what is defined as an ‘intermediate-peripheral location’ which has a maximum provision of 2 spaces and that they would expect a minimum of one space to be provided. The planners report considers that the lack of parking provision is significantly below the maximum allowable and therefore inappropriate. The bus services locally within walking distance are identified.
- The report states that the Planning Authority considers the proposed dwelling *“is overdevelopment of the corner site and is a form of inappropriate backland development which is at odds with the surrounding pattern of development and the visual amenity of the area,”* thus contravening the relevant objectives of the Development Plan (DMSO31, DMSO32, Table 14.4 and SPPR2 of the Guidelines)

- The report notes that in relation to water services that details are included in the application and that there is no objection from the Water Services Section.
- As regards design and visual amenity the conclusion is reached that the proposed development poorly integrates with the character of the area and is incongruous due to its single storey form, and therefore is not acceptable in terms of visual amenity in this location.

The planners report screens for Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment and screened the proposal out for both.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- 1- Water Services (16/02/2026). No objection, subject to conditions.
- 2- Transportation (02/03/2026). The report notes the location, the lack of car park provision and the local bus services available within 2 mins and the Bus Connects core corridor service within 12 mins walk. The report examines the car and bicycle parking provision of the Development Plan. It notes that the area is within Zone 1 of the Fingal Development Plan parking zones due to the proximity of Coolmine Train Station (1.4km/18min walk away) for which the maximum for a 2 bed unit is 0.5 car spaces. Taking into account the designation of the area as 'intermediate-peripheral' under the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines and SPP3, they recommend that 1 parking space should be provided for this type of location. It recommends that the front wall is lowered to 900mm improve active street frontage to foster pedestrian activity safety and conditions regarding re-instatement of footpath to remove existing vehicular access at this location, and standard conditions regarding services and stormwater.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- 1- Uisce Éireann (28/01/2026), no objection and recommend conditions.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 1- Deirdre & Alan Murphy, 172 Roselawn Road. This submission objects to the proposed development and seeks that permission is refused. They raise concerns regarding overdevelopment of the site, and in particular the lack of parking space and the anticipated increase in on-street parking resulting if the development was to proceed. They point out the busy T junction, and concerns regarding visibility due to on -street parking and two cars not being able to pass comfortably, the high number of collisions and cars parking on the footpath impeding pedestrian and wheelchair users (including a member of their family), and that the fundamental reasons of the previous refusal have not been resolved.

4.0 Planning History

Subject Site:

F25A/0007E (ABP 322178-25): Permission REFUSED by Fingal County Council for the construction of a two-storey house at this site, which, following a first party appeal was REFUSED by the Coimisiún. Reason for appeal refusal were overdevelopment a constrained site resulting in inappropriate backland development at odds with visual amenity of the area and at variance with Objective DMSO31 (Infill development) of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029; and that the proposed access to the car parking space does not provide sufficient visibility with regard to pedestrians and would be at variance with Objective DMSO32 (infill development on corner/side garden sites), and would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard.

F24A/0231: Permission GRANTED for two storey detached dwelling at 54a Clonsilla Road; part of this permission site is within the boundary of the current appeal.

F07A/0225: permission REFUSED for a dormer bungalow at the site. Reason for refusal were overdevelopment on a restricted site, substandard open space and failure to demonstrate adequate water services.

FW12B/0004: Permission GRANTED for 28 sq. m. extension to no.54 Clonsilla Road, which overlaps it's rear garden with the subject site.

Sites within the area:

A number of infill houses on corner sites have been the subject of planning applications in the area, a sample are listed below.

F03A/1497- 159 Clonsilla Road, permission GRANTED for two-storey house.

FW13A/0144- 1 Woodview Close, permission GRANTED for two-storey house.

PartXI/002/20- 169 Clonsilla Road, permission GRANTED for two-storey house.

F02A/0910- 2 Roselawn Walk, permission GRANTED for two-storey house.

F98A/0927- 2 Springlawn Park, permission GRANTED for two-storey house.

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 area is located within Noise Zone D as defined by Table 14.16 in the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029.

5.1.3 The site is located within River Valley and Canal landscape character area of the County in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 which is classed as high value for landscape sensitivity and value. (Table 9.3 of Fingal County Development Plan 2023.2029.)

Policies and Objectives

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

Policy & Objectives in Chapter 3

Policy SPQHO9 – Consolidated Residential Development - *Consolidate within the existing urban footprint, by ensuring of 50% of all new homes within or contiguous to the built-up area of Dublin City and Suburbs and 30% of all new homes are targeted within the existing built-up areas to achieve compact growth of urban settlements, as advocated by the RSES.*

Policy SPQHP38 – Compact Growth, Consolidation and Regeneration - *Promote compact growth in line with the NPF and RSES through the inclusion of specific policies and targeted and measurable implementation measures that:*

- *Encourage infill/brownfield development*
- *Focus growth on the County's designated strategic development areas identified in the Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan*
- *Promote increased densities along public transport corridors.*

Objective SPQHO31 – Variety of Housing Types - *Encourage the creation of attractive, mixed use and sustainable residential communities which contain a wide variety of housing and apartment types, sizes, tenures and typologies in accordance with the Fingal Housing Strategy, the HNDA with supporting community facilities, amenities and services.*

Objective SPQHO35 – Private Open Space - *Require that all private open spaces for houses and apartments/duplexes including balconies, patios, roof gardens and rear gardens are designed in accordance with the qualitative and quantitative standards set out set out in Chapter 14 Development Management Standards.*

Objective SPQHO37- Residential Consolidation and Sustainable Intensification - *Promote residential consolidation and sustainable intensification at appropriate locations, through the consolidation and rejuvenation of infill/brown-field development opportunities in line with the principles of compact growth and consolidation to meet the future housing needs of Fingal.*

Objective SPQHO39 – New Infill Development - *New infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units. Infill development shall retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings.*

Objective SPQHO40 – Development of Corner or Wide Garden Sites - *Favourably consider proposals providing for the development of corner or wide garden sites*

within the curtilage of existing dwellings in established residential areas subject to the achievement of prescribed standards and safeguards set out in Chapter 14 Development Management Standards.

Objective SPQHO42 – Development of Underutilised Infill, Corner and Backland Sites - *Encourage and promote the development of underutilised infill, corner and backland sites in existing residential areas subject to the character of the area and environment being protected.*

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.*

Development Management Standards

Development Management Standards are set out within Chapter 14 of the Development Plan, with Section 14.10 addressing infill housing. Relevant sections of the Plan are set out below.

14.6.2 Mix of Dwellings - *The Council will support the provision of a mix of housing within Fingal, creating a range of tenure and typology options and will discourage undue segregation and the over provision of a single tenure type....On smaller infill sites, a mix of dwellings which contribute to the overall dwelling mix in the locality.*

Also relevant with regard to design is the following guidance for infill housing in existing areas:

14.10.1. *The development of infill housing on underutilised infill and corner sites in established residential areas will be encouraged where proposals for development are cognisant of the prevailing pattern of development character of the area and where all development standards are observed.. Contemporary design is encouraged and all new dwellings shall comply with Development Plan standards..”*

Objective DMSO19 – New Residential Development - *Require that applications for residential developments comply with all design and floor area requirements set out in:*

- *Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines 2007,*

- *Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas 2009, the companion Urban Design Manual – A Best Practice Guide, DEHLG 2009,*
- *Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments 2020.*

DMSO27 – Minimum Private Open Space Provision- *Ensure a minimum open space provision for dwelling houses (exclusive of car parking area) as follows:*

- *3 bedroom houses or less to have a minimum of 60 sq. m. of private open space located behind the front building line of the house.*
- *Houses with 4 or more bedrooms to have a minimum of 75 sq. m. of private open space located behind the front building line of the house.*

Narrow strips of open space to the side of houses shall not be included in the private open space calculations.

Objective DMSO31- Infill Development - *New infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units. Infill development shall retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings.*

Objective DMSO32 – Infill Development on Corner / Side Garden Sites- *Applications for residential infill development on corner/side garden sites will be assessed against the following criteria:*

- *Compatibility with adjoining structures in terms of overall design, scale and massing. This includes adherence to established building lines, proportions, heights, parapet levels, roof profile and finishing materials.*
- *Consistency with the character and form of development in the surrounding area.*
- *Provision of satisfactory levels of private open space to serve existing and proposed dwelling units.*
- *Ability to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residential units.*
- *Ability to maximise surveillance of the public domain, including the use of dual frontage in site specific circumstances.*
- *Provision of side/gable and rear access arrangements, including for maintenance.*

- *Compatibility of boundary treatment to the proposed site and between the existing and proposed dwellings. Existing boundary treatments should be retained/ reinstated where possible.*
- *Impact on street trees in road-side verges and proposals to safeguard these features.*
- *Ability to provide a safe means of access and egress to serve the existing and proposed dwellings.*
- *Provision of secure bin storage areas for both existing and proposed dwellings.*

DMSO23 – Separation Distance - A separation distance of a minimum of 22 metres between directly opposing rear first floor windows shall generally be observed unless alternative provision has been designed to ensure privacy. In residential developments over three-storeys in height, minimum separation distances shall be increased in instances where overlooking or overshadowing occurs

Objective DMSO27 – Minimum Private Open Space Provision - Ensure a minimum open space provision for dwelling houses (exclusive of car parking area) as follows:

- 3 bedroom houses or less to have a minimum of 60 sq. m. of private open space located behind the front building line of the house.
- Houses with 4 or more bedrooms to have a minimum of 75 sq. m. of private open space located behind the front building line of the house.

Narrow strips of open space to the side of houses shall not be included in the private open space calculations.

DMSO28- Minimum Private Open Space Provision for Townhouses - Allow a reduced standard of private open space for one and two bedroom townhouses only in circumstances where a particular design solution is required such as to develop small infill/ corner sites. In no instance will the provision of less than 48 sq. m. of private open space be accepted per house

Section 14.17.7 addresses car parking. The Plan divided the County into two Zones (1 and 2), based on connectivity to public transportation, with Zone 1 applying to locations well served by public transport. Table 14.19 allocated a standard of 0.5 spaces for a 1-2 bedroom residential unit for Zone 1 locations.

5.2. Relevant Ministerial Guidelines

1. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines

The key sections relevant to this application is Chapter 3- 'Settlement, Place and Density' (with regard to defining accessibility to public transport) and Chapter 5 'Development Standards for Housing' which sets out policy and guidance in relation to the design of housing and standards (including parking and private open space) to be applied in support of greater innovation within the housing sector and to facilitate more compact forms of residential development.

Chapter 3

Below is an extract of Section 3.4.1 defining Intermediate Location

Lands within 500-1,000 metres (i.e. 10-12 minute walk) of existing or planned high frequency (i.e. 10 minute peak hour frequency) urban bus services; and

Lands within 500 metres (i.e. 6 minute walk) of a reasonably frequent (minimum 15 minute peak hour frequency) urban bus service.

Chapter 5- Development Standards for Housing

Key elements of this chapter are:

SPPR 1 - Separation Distances

It is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that statutory development plans shall not include an objective in respect of minimum separation distances that exceed 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units and apartment units, above ground floor level shall be maintained. Separation distances below 16 metres may be considered acceptable in circumstances where there are no opposing windows serving habitable rooms and where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme to prevent undue overlooking of habitable rooms and private amenity spaces.

There shall be no specified minimum separation distance at ground level or to the front of houses, duplex units and 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 2 - Minimum Private Open Space Standards for Houses

It is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that proposals for new houses meet the following minimum private open space standards:

- 1 bed house 20 sq.m
- 2 bed house 30 sq.m
- 3 bed house 40 sq.m
- 4 bed + house 50 sq.m

Private open space must form part of the curtilage of the house and be designed to provide a high standard of external amenity space in one or more usable areas.

Open spaces may take the form of traditional gardens or patio areas at ground level, and / or well designed and integrated terraces and/or balconies at upper level. The open space must be directly accessible from the unit it serves and a principal area of open space should be directly accessible from a living space.

SPPR 3 - Car Parking

It is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that:

(i) In city centres and urban neighbourhoods of the five 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.

(ii) In accessible locations, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.8) car- parking provision should be substantially reduced. The maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 1.5 no. spaces per dwelling.

(iii) In intermediate and peripheral locations, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.8) the maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 2 no. spaces per dwelling

5.3. 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 0.82km to the south- the Royal Canal proposed NHA (0002103).

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal has been submitted by the owners of the subject property, through their architect. The following provides a summary of the grounds of appeal

- The Commission is requested to grant permission in recognition that the house type will fit into the existing environment without disrupting the existing architecture and amenities and providing additional housing in a low-density suburban location; offers an alternative housing form suitable for smaller/mature family types and the refusal reasons are a flawed interpretation of the objectives referenced in the decision.
- In response to the reasons for refusal the appeal outlines the following:

Reason 1:

They refute that a detached house is at odds with the built form and point out that there are a number of detached houses in the area;

They state that the open space provided does meet SPPR2 in providing 35 sq. m of space, of which 22 is to the rear and 13 to the front.

They refute the description of the house as cramped, and note that all rooms exceed minimum standards.

They consider the use of the phrase “contrived” undermines the architectural input given in designing this house.

They raise concern in relation to the “fails to take cognisance” in that it is not valid or appropriate for all new development within the area to reproduce older forms.

They refute that the site is “backland”, as it fronts onto a public road.

They point out that the use of “undesirable precedent” in the refusal is in contrast to the ambition of the County Development Plan as described in Section 14.6.2- Mix of Dwellings.

Reason 2:

With regard to parking requirement and provision, they point out that the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines seek for parking provision to be minimised, and that in intermediate and peripheral locations that the maximum is 2 spaces. They make the point that, taking into account the size of the dwelling and it’s location within a 5 min walk of the no.39 bus service, and is within 6 mins to Blanchardstown Shopping Centre, which has a very large retail and service offering.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority made no further points in response to the appeal, and requests of permission is granted that appropriate conditions regarding contributions are included.

7.3. Observations

1. Deirdre & Alan Murphy. Their submission notes the Refusal reason in part due to the lack of parking provided for the new dwelling. They express their support of the decision and emphasise their concerns regarding on-street

parking in the area and footpath parking which will result in conflict for pedestrians. They point to an existing unit at 1A Woodbrook Grove where they have observed regular on footpath parking adjacent to the dwelling. They point out that the road is a busy location and close to a primary school. They also point out their son is a wheelchair user and they believe their part of the Roselawn road will be impacted by footpath parking obstructing pedestrians; and submit that the refusal on the absence of parking is consistent with national planning policy and should be 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:

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Private Open Space Provision
- Parking
- Precedent
- Material Contravention.

8.2 Principle of Development

The zoning objective RS “*provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity*” and Policy SPQHO9 – Consolidated Residential Development - *Consolidate within the existing urban footprint, by ensuring of 50% of all new homes within or contiguous to the built-up area of Dublin City and Suburbs and 30% of all new homes are targeted within the existing built-up areas to achieve compact growth of urban settlements, as advocated by the RSES*, are important to the context of establishing the principle of development in the assessment of the application.

The Development Plan expands on this policy of encouraging and supporting consolidation through Objective SPQHO40 -Development of Corner or Wide Garden Sites, and Objective SPQHO42 Development of Underutilised Infill, Corner and Backland Sites; which respectively state:

SPQHO40- Favourably consider proposals providing for the development of corner or wide garden sites within the curtilage of existing dwellings in established residential areas subject to the achievement of prescribed standards and safeguards set out in Chapter 14 Development Management Standards; and

SPQHO41 Encourage and promote the development of underutilised infill, corner and backland sites in existing residential areas subject to the character of the area and environment being protected.

It is clear from the zoning objective, the policies and related objectives for this type of development that the principle of building a house in a side garden, corner site or backland site within existing residential areas is supported and to be encouraged, subject to the amenity and environment of the area being protected.

8.3 Design

The Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029 contain a number of statements and Objectives supporting contemporary design, including within existing housing areas.

*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.*

Also of consideration with regard to design is the following guidance for infill housing in existing areas:

For infill housing the Development Management chapter states *“the development of infill housing on underutilised infill and corner sites in established residential areas will be encouraged where proposals for development are cognisant of the prevailing pattern of development character of the area and where all development standards are observed.. Contemporary design is encouraged and all new dwellings shall comply with Development Plan standards..”*

It is noted that the Planners Report refers to DMSO31 and DMSO32 in considering the design of the building; which require that *“new development shall respect the height and massing of the existing”* and that new dwellings *“will be assessed against.. compatibility with adjoining structures”*. The Report considers that *“given the single-storey scale, the dwelling does not respect the height and massing of the existing”* surrounding housing. In my opinion this is a misinterpretation of these objectives; and would, if interpreted as per the Planners Report, would contradict other parts of the Plan (listed within this section above). Protecting the character of an area is not the same as requiring all new development to match in form the existing low-density mid-twentieth century suburban housing; but is about ensuring that the design form taken does not impose negatively on its surroundings. Given the small scale, single storey form and unobtrusive modern design of the proposed development, I fail to see how this house could be considered create a negative impact from a design perspective. The location and setting of the building is only slightly visible from the public street. The intent of DMSO31 is not to require all new buildings to match exactly what was built in these areas previously, but ensure that they respect it- i.e. do not propose, for example, higher overbearing buildings that are in significant contrast to the existing typology of the areas. A single storey bungalow beside two storey housing is not matching; but it is respectful of the adjoining housing by the nature of its unimposing form, lack of overlooking or high bulky gables. In looking outside the immediate environs of the site, Clonsilla Road has a wide variety of housing types, including a number of bungalows. The wider suburb of Blanchardstown village has traditionally had a noticeable number of early 20th century and older single storey “cottages”. Small infill apartments at two storey height are in place on the opposite side of the road. It is the character of this area to have some variety of housing types. It is also clear from the County Development Plan in Chapter 14 that encouraging infill opportunities to provide greater housing choice is accepted; *“The Council will support the provision of a mix of housing within Fingal, creating a range of tenure and typology options and will discourage undue segregation and the over provision of a single tenure type....On smaller infill sites, a mix of dwellings ..contribute to the overall dwelling mix in the locality”*. In an area dominated by 3-bed two-storey semi-detached housing, the provision of smaller units on infill sites will assist in delivering this mix.

With regards to the comments regarding the front boundary and passive supervision, the comments fail to take into account the current environment of 2.4m high solid metal vehicular entrance gates to the site and walls on the boundary. The creation of a new gate with visibility through is an improvement on the current environment both visually and from a passive supervision perspective; whilst providing an adequate amount of privacy to the courtyard to the front of the house.

I conclude that, in my opinion the house type provided in the application is not incompatible with the objectives of the Development Plan, and is supported by Development Plan Policy and Objectives.

8.4 Private Open Space Provision

The issue of site layout and open space provision also needs to be considered in the context of the Ministerial issued Sustainable Residential Development & Compact Settlement Guidelines. Section 5.3.2 states with regard to open space housing standards that *“a more graduated and flexible approach that supports the development of compact housing and takes account of the value of well-designed private and semi-private open space should be applied”*. It defines private open space as *“Private open space must form part of the curtilage of the house and be designed to provide a high standard of external amenity space in one or more usable areas. Open spaces may take the form of traditional gardens or patio areas at ground level, and / or well designed and integrated terraces and/or balconies at upper level. The open space must be directly accessible from the unit it serves and a principal area of open space should be directly accessible from a living space.”* The Guidelines require that in seeking to deliver more compact development, that Planning Authorities move away from traditional low density driven standards and recognise that the provisions of private open space can take a number of forms and not only be delivered in one form only at the rear of the dwelling. In looking at what has been provided in the application for private open space; the planners report has rejected the inclusion of the open space to the front of the house in the calculation of open space provision, and concluded that the open space provision therefore fell short of the required standard as the rear garden is 22 sq. m, discounting the 13 sq. m. front courtyard. (The SPPR 2 standard of 30 sq. m. is applied as the minimum and referenced in the planners report rather than the 48 sq. m. DMSO28 objective in the Development Plan).

The planners report describes the front courtyard as “semi-private open space”, however this space is wholly for the use of the residents of the house only, and is not a shared space with another residential development. It does not meet the definition of semi-private open space set out in the Guidelines in Section 5.3.2. Whilst DMSO27 does require for private open space to be provided behind the front building line of the house; DMSO28 does not,, allowing the 13 sq. m. be considered in the calculation. In looking at the Guidelines; considering the privacy given to this space due to the gate and wall, I would consider that this is “non-standard” private open space; shaped by the infill form of the house type provided, and not less in value and residential amenity for its position. For this reason I have counted the space is counted as private open space in this report; and consider that is, in form and location, compliant with DMSO28 and SPPR 2.

As regards the discounting of the front space due to it containing bicycle parking in the planners report; this I consider to be unreasonable; such a standard is not generally applied for private rear gardens - they are not expected to exclude from calculations a space that in the future would be occupied by a bike shed. Bicycle storage and garden sheds etc. are uses that private open space is for, and there is no basis for this exclusion in the Development Plan.

Also relevant is the size of gardens provided for the houses 54 and 54a Clonsilla Road, and whether the loss of the end of each garden allows these houses retain adequate private open space. Both gardens remaining in the site layout show a provision that well exceeds the sizes within the Guidelines, with no. 54 having 52 sq. m. and no.54a having 64 sq. m., (the standard in SPPR 2 being 40 sq. m. for a 3-bed house and 50 sq. m. for a 4-bedroom.) They do however fall below the standard of 60 sq. m. as set out in DMSO27 (which requires 60 sq.m.).

As per Section 27 (2) of the 2024 Planning and Development Act; the Guidelines are now deemed to be National Planning Policy Guidance and the SPPRs now NPPMs (National Policies and Measures), for which the Development Plan is required to be “materially consistent with”. DMSO27 and DMSO28 (for smaller 1-2 bed infill, requiring 48 sq.m.) have not yet been amended to address this current objective gap between national and local standards.

This leaves the current proposal at odds with the existing Fingal County Development Plan private open space standards, and the resulting conclusion that the application is a material contravention of Development Plan, despite this not

being directly referenced in the reason 1 for refusal. However, in light of the above examination of the difference in private open space standards between the Development Plan and the Section 28 issued Guidelines; it is my opinion, having regard to the Guidelines; that permission should be granted despite this material contravention, as, if SPPR 2 of the Guidelines was appropriately incorporated into the Development Plan, the application would be compliant with the County Development Plan.

The planners report also raises concerns about the depth of the gardens, averaging 7 metres deep; that this reduced depth is “*inconsistent with the character of the area and is not appropriate*”. However the Guidelines and the relevant policies and objectives of the Development Plan both make clear that to achieve compact urban development, applying undefined “12 to the acre” type development standards in assessing applications is no longer appropriate. There is no requirement or measure in the Development Plan defining minimum depth to private open space. The Guidelines make clear that provision can be “non-standard”; and considering that the development itself is single storey; the issue of separation distances for first floor windows does not arise.

The refusal reason did not cite DMSO27 or DMSO28, which gave quantitative figures for defining “adequate” provision of space. However, both as regards positioning and size, the private open space for all three properties is materially contrary to Objective DMSO27 and DMSO28 of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029.

Therefore, taking the above into account, I consider that the provision of private open space for the existing two houses at 54 and 54a Clonsilla Road and the proposed house within the two gardens are all provided with an adequate provision of private open space when considered under SPPR 2 and the proposal is therefore not contrary to DMSO32 (which requires *the provision of satisfactory levels of private open space to serve existing and proposed dwelling units*) and SPPR2 as quoted in Reason 1 of the refusal of permission.

8.5 Parking

The second reason for refusal is the lack of parking provision, describing the area as “intermediate-peripheral” and therefore contrary to the requirements under SPPR3 of the Sustainable Residential Development & Compact Settlement Guidelines. However the Guidelines in SPPR3 set maximum standards, not minimum standards. It is open to the Planning Authority to define what their minimum standards are, within the requirements of SPPR3.

In assessing the level of accessibility of this location, the planner and transport engineer report describe the area as “intermediate-peripheral”. However this is not an accurate reflection of SPPR3 and associated Table 3.8 as *intermediate* and *peripheral* are two distinct, separate zones with different standards. (An extract of the table is posted below)

Intermediate Location

- *within 500-1,000 metres (i.e. 10-12 minute walk) of existing or planned high frequency (i.e. 10 minute peak hour frequency) urban bus services; and*
- *Lands within 500 metres (i.e. 6 minute walk) of a reasonably frequent (minimum 15 minute peak hour frequency) urban bus service.*

Peripheral

- *Lands that do not meet the proximity or accessibility criteria detailed above. This includes all lands in Small and Medium Sized Towns and in Rural Towns and Villages.*

The planners report notes that the development is within 12 minutes walk of a high frequency bus service (Bus Connects). Therefore the area qualifies as Intermediate, not peripheral.

Fingal County Council have their own categorisation of accessibility and parking zones within the Development Plan, and the planners and transportation report recognise that this location falls within “Zone 1” (areas well served, see Section 14.7.7). This definition also supports the description as “Intermediate”, as it recognises that the area is well served by public transport. In Table 14.19- Car Parking Standards, the maximum parking requirement for 1-2 bedroom units in Zone 1 is 0.5 spaces. Considering this, the planners opinion that such a location would

require a minimum of 1 space is not compliant with this Development Plan standard. As a 0.5 space is not possible, the rational application of the standard is that a space is provided in some instances for some dwellings and for others none. Therefore, non-provision of a space is compliant with the Development Plan.

The issued Section 28 Guidelines and SPP3 direct that Planning Authorities amend their *maximum* standards to ensure that compact growth is achievable and that parking provision in areas well served by high quality public transport be managed; it did not require that Planning Authorities increase their minimum provisions.

The area in question has a maximum allowable provision of parking of 2 spaces under SPPR3 and a maximum of 0.5 under the Fingal County Development Plan standards; neither of which set a minimum provision for this type of location; and the Development Plan clearly supports a low/no provision of parking in Zone 1 areas. The area is within a 50km speed zone, with a footpath on both sides of the road. The road is wide enough for two cars to pass. No traffic safety issues were raised in the Transportation Report at the application stage to Fingal County Council. To the immediate north of the pedestrian entrance on Roselawn road, the road has a solid centre white line up to the junction; where parking is not permitted. As is the case of all of the housing on Roselawn road, some parking does occur on the roadway, catering for households with more than one car, visitors etc., with some cars parked on the road in front of the existing housing noted on the day of the site visit. The reason for refusal states that *“on-street parking by its nature would lead to a conflict between pedestrian and road-user.”* On street parking is a familiar pattern of car parking in this estate and other similar twentieth century housing estates across the County, and nothing is presented in either the planners or the transport engineers report that makes clear that on-street parking in suburban housing estates is not to be tolerated for reasons of risk or that it is against Council policy.

Parking on/half over the footpath is not permitted under the Road Traffic Act and associated Traffic and Parking Regulations (Section 36, S.I. 182/1997). It is open to the Council to install bollards and/or extend the extent of the double yellow lines in locations experiencing recurring footpath parking, or if extensive parking close to junctions is creating a safety concern.

In consideration of all of the above I do not agree with the conclusion of the planners report and Reason no. 2 of the decision that the non-provision of a space is non-compliant with the Development Plan and SPPR3, nor that the possibility of on-

street (rather than over the footpath) parking will create a conflict for pedestrians and road users.

8.6 Precedent

All applications should be considered on their merits and within the policy context of the statutory plans that are in place. Whilst design approaches may be suitable for a house in one location; in another location and setting they can be inappropriate. It is therefore important to consider the impact of the proposed development of this single storey 2-bedroom house on its own merits and the impact it will have within the relevant environment context. However precedent and seeking to maintain the original planned form in this mid-century suburb has been raised in the planners report and is a reason for refusal and it is therefore examined in this report with regard to the points made.

The Planners report and the Reason 1 for refusal of permission use the phrase “*at odds with the surrounding pattern of development and will set an undesirable precedent for similar developments*”.

As set out in Section 8.3 above, the Development Plan supports the provision of infill housing, a variety of house types, modern design and the use of corner sites to support compact growth. Applying a rule over applications of “*add odds with the surrounding pattern*” and thus creating a “*precedent*” is a contradiction of the Policies and Objectives of the Development Plan in that the reason for refusal seems to be requiring the all future development in this area be a match to the existing low density two-storey housing form; despite being within a suburb well served by high quality public transport. As said above, each infill housing proposal should be assessed on its merits, compliance with standards and impact on residential amenity, and independently of its previous planning history. The proposal, which is a significant reduction in scale, height and form to the previous application refused permission by the Planning Authority and An Coimisiún Pleanála (135 sq. m. 4 bedroom two storey house, in comparison to the current application for a 74.5 sq. m single storey two bedroom dwelling), is assessed on it's own merits in this application; taking into account the properties of this design within this site.

(ii) Material Contravention

As outlined above in Section 8.4- Private Open Space Provision, the proposed development would materially contravene the Fingal Development Plan as set out in Objective DMSO27 and DMSO28 regarding the quantitative size of private open space. Section 37(2)(a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) allows the Commission to grant permission in the event of a material contravention.

In light of the difference in private open space standards between the Development Plan and the Section 28 issued Guidelines which is a relevant Policy of the Minister; it is my opinion that it is clear that in reading the quantitative standards of the Guidelines; that the application would be compliant with the Development Plan if SPPR 2 of the Guidelines was appropriately incorporated into the Fingal County Development Plan. As outlined above in Section 8.4; the proposed development does have adequate private open space and in my opinion will meet the needs of future occupants and complies fully with the Guidelines both in quantitative standards and in how the space has been provided. Whilst it is not conventional in how it is arranged, it will give this modest scale house two open spaces that are well screened and can be used for recreational and domestic purposes.

I therefore submit that the Commission consider granting permission under Section 37 (2) (a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) as a material contravention of the Fingal County Development Plan.

(iii) AA Screening

I have considered the proposed single storey 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 10.8km from the nearest European Site to the east at South Dublin Bay and Tolka Estuary SPA (004024).

The proposed development comprises of single storey dwelling in a rear garden (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.

(iv) 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 of the development of a single storey dwelling to the rear of 54 and 54a Clonsilla Road, (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.

(v) Recommendation

I recommend that permission be GRANTED for the proposed development subject to conditions.

(vi) Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, the Section 28 Guidelines *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities*, and to the nature and scale of the proposed development on residentially zoned land, it is considered 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; will provide a dwelling of adequate residential amenity and private open space; and adequate open space provision also for 54 and 54a Clonsilla road and will not create a new traffic hazard or obstruction to the public road. In contravening materially the private open space standards set out in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 in Objectives DMSO27 and DMSO28, the reason for this being that the standards within the Development Plan differ from SPPR 2 of the Section 28 Guidelines and if SPPR 2 was incorporated into the objectives, the application would be compliant. The proposed development is on all other aspects, in accordance with the provisions of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

(vii) Conditions

1	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 10th day of January 2026, 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. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2	The entire premises shall be used as a single dwelling unit apart from such use as may be exempted development for the purposes of the Planning and Development Regulations. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
3	Water drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Reason: In the interest of orderly development.
4	Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement (s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network. Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.
5	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. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority. Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

6	The glazing to all bathroom and en-suite windows shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable. Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.
7	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. Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.
8	The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme. Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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

8th of June 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a single storey, 2-bedroom detached house, fronting onto Roselawn Road, on a subdivision of the site of the existing house 54 Clonsilla Road and the site of approved house, 54A Clonsilla Road
Development Address	54 and 54a Clonsilla Road, Blanchardstown, D15 AXV6
	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)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. ☐ No
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ 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
☒ 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?	
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.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☒ 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)	YES- Part 2, Class 10(b)(i) Infrastructure – 500 dwelling units - proposal is for 1 no. dwelling unit. Part 2, Class 10(b)(iv) - Urban development – 2 hectares in case of business district/ 10 hectares (built-up area) – site is c. 0.017 ha.

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 ☐	
No ☒	No, Schedule 7A information not provided.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501068-DF
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a single storey, 2 bedroom detached house, fronting onto Roselawn Road, on a subdivision of the site of the existing house 54 Clonsilla Road and the site of approved house, 54A Clonsilla Road
Development Address	54 Clonsilla Road and the site of approved house, 54A Clonsilla Road
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development	The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project on an infill site within an existing built-up suburb, it does not require substantial demolition works, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development	The development is situated in the built-up suburbs of Dublin, in an established residential area and on land that is currently part of an existing rear garden of 54 Clonsilla Road, currently with a house under construction in the side garden. The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats and designated sites, and whilst is a built residential area, the scale of the construction required would not have a significant impact. The area is located within landscapes of identified as sensitive within the County Development Plan, however this particular area is dominated by suburban housing and is not visually sensitive.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for

	significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

