



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501081-DF-26

Development

Redevelopment of terraced cottage, extension of ground floor by 11.3sq.m and internal revisions to layout; enlarge first floor within extended and raised pitched roof, to include 3 bedrooms and bathroom (56.5sq.m and associated site works. Site is located, within Architectural Conservation Area (ACA)

Location

19 New Street, Skerries, Co Dublin

Planning Authority

Fingal County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

F25A/0564E

Applicant(s)

Selina Keogan.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse permission

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Selina Keogan.

Observer(s)

None.

Date of Site Inspection

22nd May 2026.

Inspector

Ann Bogan

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	4
2.0	Proposed Development.....	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History	6
5.0	Policy Context	7
6.0	EIA Screening	11
7.0	The Appeal	11
8.0	Assessment.....	14
9.0	AA Screening	19
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	19
11.0	Recommendation	20
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	20
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening		22

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located, at 19 New Street, a mixed residential and commercial street in Skerries town centre. The subject site comprises a terraced, single storey, pitched roofed dwelling with two small attic bedrooms, a single storey rear extension, taking up approximately 50% of the site width, and a garden to the rear.
- 1.2. A takeaway outlet and a pub border the subject site to the east, while a creche is located in the building immediately to the west and a vacant site and recently completed dwelling are to the south.
- 1.3. The street contains a mixture of single storey and two storey structures with a predominance of three bay single storey pitched roof 19th century terraced buildings on either side of the street, with more variation and two storey structures at either end, particularly the eastern end. Despite some changes to some rooflines the street, in particular the central part, has retained its historic character with many buildings retaining their original form and features.
- 1.4. No. 19 is part of a terrace of 8 single storey cottages with mixed uses. The adjoining building, No 20 New Street, has a raised roof ridge line and rear extension.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Proposed development consists of:
 - Alteration and extension of single storey terraced cottage
 - Ground floor extension of 11.3sq.m and internal revisions to layout
 - Extend and raise pitched roof to include 3 bedrooms and bathroom (56.5sq.m) at first floor level, and all associated site works
 - Following further information request, proposed roof lights to northwest facing roof pitch were omitted.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Planning Authority refused permission for the following reason:

The proposed development by virtue of its inappropriate and insensitive roof design would result in a visually incongruous form of development which would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Skerries ACA. The proposed development is not of a scale or proportion that respects the roof of the original building, neither is the proposed extension subservient to the principal dwelling. By virtue of its poor design, the development would be contrary to Sections 14.10.2 and 14.19.3.3; Objectives DMSO186 and HCAO24; and Policy HCAP15 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- Proposed development by reason of scale would not unduly impact amenity of neighbouring properties. However, concerns raised in relation to the increase in ridge height and design and proposed rooflights in elevation fronting onto New Street, taking into account the location in an ACA. Further information was requested seeking omission of the rooflights, clarification re retention of sash windows and door in front elevation and redesign of the roof to retain the existing roof profile
- In response to further information request rooflights were omitted, front door and windows to be retained, but roof design remained unaltered
- Concluded that proposed roof amendments have not demonstrated integration with the existing architectural character and historic features of the dwelling and “It is considered that the proposed development would detract from the character and appearance of the ACA” and refusal of permission was recommended
- Appropriate Assessment screening concluded having regard to the nature, scale and location of the proposed development it is considered there is no likelihood of significant effect on European sites

- EIA screening concluded no EIA is required as the proposed development does not equal or exceed a threshold in Schedule 5 of Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Conservation Officer (first report): site is within ACA. No objection to internal changes, requests redesign of roof to retain existing front pitch of roof and any additional roof to be below existing ridge line, Velux windows be omitted from front roof pitch, and clarification sought re retention of existing windows and doors in front elevation.
- Conservation Officer (report post receipt of FI): Applicant has not amended proposals to show retention of existing roof pitch in front elevation therefore proposed design is not appropriate and not supported by Fingal County Development Plan policies.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- 3.4. Having regard to the location of the proposed development within an ACA, the Commission circulated this appeal case to The Heritage Council, Failte Ireland, DAU of the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, An Taisce and An Chomhairle Ealaíon, with no responses received.

3.5. Third Party Observations

None

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. None on site.

- 4.2. Adjacent

- No. 20 New Street:FO3A/0858 Permission granted to E&C McCarthy 29/09/2003 for change use of house to creche with dormer extension (involving raising the ridge line) and outdoor laundry room.
- No. 3 New Street F00A/0407 Permission granted to W. Hartford on 15/06/2000 for demolition of existing house with ground floor and attic accommodation and construct new house with single storey to street and two storey [with pitched roof] to rear.

- No 1A New Street F16A/0230 Permission granted on 18/07/2016 to Rory O'Connell and Deborah Wiseman to change existing dwelling from single storey to three storey bedroom dwelling.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029

Zoning Objective: TC Town and District Centre Objective: Protect and enhance the special physical and social character of town and district centres and provide and /or improve urban facilities.

Vision: aims to maintain and build on the accessibility, vitality and viability of the existing Urban Centres in the County. Develop and consolidate these centres with an appropriate mix of commercial, recreational, cultural, leisure and residential uses, and to enhance and develop the urban fabric of these centres in accordance with the principles of urban design, conservation and sustainable development....

3.5.13 Compact Growth, Consolidation and Regeneration

Objective SPQHO44 – Retention, Retrofitting and Retention of Existing Dwellings

The Council will encourage the retention and retrofitting of structurally sound, habitable dwellings in good condition as opposed to demolition and replacement and will also encourage the retention of existing houses, such as cottages, that, while not Protected Structures or located within an ACA, do have their own merit and/or contribute beneficially to the area in terms of visual amenity, character or accommodation type.

Policy HCAP8 – Protection of Architectural Heritage

Ensure the conservation, management, protection and enhancement of the architectural heritage of Fingal through the designation of Protected Structures and Architectural Conservation Areas, the safeguarding of designed landscapes and historic gardens, and the recognition of structures and elements with no specific statutory designation that contribute positively to the vernacular, industrial, maritime or 20th century heritage of the County. Policy

Policy HCAP9 – Re-use of Architectural Heritage

Champion the maintenance, repair, re-use and sensitive retro-fitting of the architectural heritage and older building stock of the County as a cornerstone of its sustainable development policy and will require that adaptative re-use and regeneration adheres to best conservation practice. Policy

Policy HCAP10 – Retention

Continue to support and encourage the sympathetic and appropriate reuse, rehabilitation and retention of protected structures and historic buildings ensuring the special interest, character and setting of the building or structure is preserved.

Policy HCAP14 – Architectural Conservation Areas

Protect the special interest and character of all areas which have been designated as an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). Development within or affecting an ACA must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting wherever possible. Development shall not harm buildings, spaces, original street patterns, archaeological sites, historic boundaries or features, which contribute positively to the ACA.

Policy HCAP15 – Character of Architectural Conservation Areas

Support and encourage the sympathetic and appropriate adaptive reuse, refurbishment, and upgrading of protected structures and buildings or structures that contribute to the character of an Architectural Conservation Area ensuring that their special interest, character and setting is retained. Prohibit development that seeks the demolition of a Protected Structure or buildings that contribute to the character of an ACA in almost all circumstances.

Objective HCAO24 – Alteration and Development of Protected Structures and ACAs

Require proposals for any development, modification, alteration, extension or energy retrofitting affecting a Protected Structure and/or its setting or a building that contributes to the character of an ACA are sensitively sited and designed, are compatible with the special character, and are appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height,

density, architectural treatment, layout, materials, impact on architectural or historic features.

Policy HCAP25 – Retention of Historic Fabric

Encourage the retention of the original or historic fabric such as windows, doors, wall renders, roof coverings, shopfronts, pub fronts and other significant features of older or historic buildings, whether protected or not.

Policy HCAP26 – Historic Townscapes

Recognise the importance of historic townscapes or streetscapes in creating a sense of place when the urban fabric or groups of buildings are read together and how the gradual attrition of historic fabric or detailing, or the demolition and replacement of individual modest buildings can fundamentally alter the character of the place.

Section 14.10.2.5 Roof Alterations including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions

Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles, for example, changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/‘A’ frame end or ‘half-hip’, will be assessed against a number of criteria including: “

- Consideration and regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
- Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
- Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
- Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures and prominence.

Section 14.19.3.3 and Table 14.24 address Direction for Proposed Development within Architectural Conservation Areas. The most relevant extract is below:

- Extensions to buildings in ACAs that are visible from public places should be of a scale and proportion that respects that of the original building. In general extensions should be subservient in size with materials, finishes and roof profiles that complement the principal structure.

Objective DMSO186 – Retention of Existing Building Stock within an ACA

Retain the existing building stock within an ACA where possible and ensure that any new development or alteration of a building within or adjoining an ACA positively enhances the character of the area and is appropriate in terms of the proposed design, including: scale, mass, height, proportions, density, layout, materials, plot ratio, and building lines.

Appendix 5 Architectural Conservation Areas

DF-ACA-29 Skerries Architectural Conservation Area (ACA)

The Skerries ACA is focused on the historic Town Centre and the following Brief Description is provided:

A number of interrelated elements contribute to the special character of Skerries ACA. These include the flat nature of the terrain in the town and the vistas and glimpses of the sea and off-shore islands. The juxtaposition of formal planning on Church Street and Strand Street with more informal plot boundaries and house groupings around The Square and The Cross and the west end of Quay Street are a defining characteristic. Another feature is the numerous winding laneways linking various streets. Even in the more formally planned streets there is an enlivening mixture, peculiar to Skerries, of two storey houses having formal features such as doorcases, quoins, railings and steps interspersed with formerly thatched vernacular houses, generally single-storey, many of them retaining traditional windbreak porches. This mixture of house types and the formal and informal plot lines constitutes an essential defining feature the special character of the Skerries ACA.

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2011

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

Site is west of:

- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (3km)
- Rockabill SPA (3.7km)
- North-West Irish Sea cSPA (0.3km)
- Skerries Islands SPA (1.2km)

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- The dwelling is single storey with a dormer attic and is deficit in space for a family, particularly bedrooms, and does not comply with current Building Control Standards
- All properties on southeastern side of New Street are commercial apart from subject site and street is a mixture of two storey structures interspersed with single storey structures
- Development provides for all external elements including windows, doors, chimney, render and slate finish to be retained
- The development is needed to meet needs of family, to improve sound insulation improve energy efficiency and minimise new build to keep costs within applicant's budget

Ground 1 Skerries ACA

- Planning Authority reason for refusal states "proposed development would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Skerries ACA"
- Appendix 5 of the Development Plan includes a map outlining the geographical boundary and a brief description of each ACA. The Brief description is vague and ambiguous and does not clearly identify any features and special interest that defines the character of Skerries ACA. No reference to subject dwelling or New Street as being a feature of special interest

- No reference in current Development Plan or in public consultation for Plan to the Statement of Character which supported the initial incorporation of Skerries ACA in the Development Plan in 2008
- Absence of concise description in current development Plan of features of interest and architectural patterns and details to be found in Skerries ACA is contrary to recommendations contained in the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and renders the decision by the Planning Authority in this instance 'ultra vires'

Ground 2 Development Plan Objectives

Reason for refusal states proposed development would be contrary to a number of Development Plan objectives

- Section 4.10.2 Residential extensions: Reason for refusal states proposed extension is not subservient to the principal dwelling. Increase in floor area from c88sq.m to c130sq.m is considered modest and marginally in excess of exempt floor area for domestic extensions
- Para 14.10.2.5 Roof alteration criteria: Increase in ridge height proposed replicates dormer extension to adjoining property, No 20 (a creche). Commercial properties at Nos 15-18 were comprehensively redeveloped some years ago for commercial purposes and have 100% site coverage.
- There are roof variations in many of the buildings on both sides of New Street (images provided in Appendix to appeal)
- There have been extensive variations in streetscape particularly along south eastern end of New Street, close to subject site, in recent years, and character of street has not suffered
- Subject site bounded by two storey structure at No 17 and existing dormer structure to west at No 20, which will screen proposed extension when viewed along New Street.
- Section 14.19.3.3 ACAs and Table 14.24 Proposed Development in ACAs: Proposal meets requirement that extensions visible from public place should be of scale and proportion to respect original building and subservient in terms of materials,

finishes and roof profiles to principal structure, due to its modest scale, retention of roof profile and retention of existing exterior features.

- Objective DMSO186 Retention of existing building stock within ACA: Proposed development will retain existing features and character of the area as described in Appendix 5 of the Development Plan will not be adversely impacted, will contribute to diversity, mirror building to west
- Objective HCAO24: Proposed development does not affect a Protected Structure or the character or special character of Skerries ACA. External features are to be retained and increase in ridge height is to ensure continuity with adjoining structure and neither will adversely affect character of street.
- Policy HCAP15 Character of ACAs: Proposal will enable applicant and family to continue to reside in town centre and does not involve demolition, retains external features
- PA report deems proposal to be visually intrusive and to materially contravene policies and objectives regarding sensitive development within an ACA. Level of intrusion is limited by existing same roof profile to west and two storey structure to east.

Ground 3 Precedent

- Since ACA introduced in 2008, numerous examples of permission granted to alter roofs of existing structures (list supplied), demonstrating precedent for raising ridge height within ACA.
- Vacancy in the town centre is low and people want to live there.
- Biggest threat to heritage is vacancy. Overly restrictive policy in relation to refurbishment could be counter-productive and make town centre properties less attractive for future home owners
- Since adoption of current Development Plan permission granted for redevelopment of Nos 49 and 51 Quay Street, transforming what was in 2008 a row of terraced houses into large two storey dwellings
- Proposed development is modest in comparison to these developments and is in keeping with pattern of recent developments within ACA.

- Refers to terrace of houses in Pigeon House Road in Dublin city which have been extended by raising ridge height similar to proposal for No 19 New Street. Although not in an ACA, have benefit of Residential Conservation Zoning in Dublin City Development Plan.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- States no further response to make, but requests the Commission to uphold the decision of the Planning Authority
- If the event appeal is successful, requests provision to be made for financial contribution under Fingal County Council's Development Contribution Scheme

7.3. Observations

- None

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the appeal documentation, the report of the local authority, having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant national and local policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues to be considered in this appeal are as set out below:

- Principle of the development
- Impact on amenity of adjacent properties
- Impact on character of the ACA and visual amenity

8.2. Principle of the development

- 8.2.1. The site is located within the TC/Town Centre zoning, where a mix of uses including residential use and rear extensions to dwellings are considered acceptable in principle. Furthermore, Fingal Development Plan Objectives SPQHO41 and SPQHO44 promote the reuse and refurbishment of existing buildings and dwellings.
- 8.2.2. I am satisfied therefore that the proposal to refurbish and extend an existing dwelling is acceptable in principle subject to the detailed considerations below.

8.3. Impact on amenity of adjacent properties

- 8.3.1. The proposed development comprises refurbishment and extension of an existing single storey cottage, involving re-organisation and extension of the ground floor by 11.3sq.m and extending and raising the roof from c4.9m to 6.9m to accommodate a three-bedroom first floor extension of 56sq.m with dormer windows. This results in a net increase in floor area of 42sq.m, from 88sq.m to 130sq.m. The appeal states the extension is required to meet the needs of the of the occupant's family and meet modern standards of construction including sound insulation and energy efficiency. There is adequate space to the rear of the site to accommodate the proposed extension, while leaving a rear garden which is indicated as almost 100sq.m in area.
- 8.3.2. The adjoining structure to the west, No. 20, operates as a creche and already has a raised roof and a two-storey rear extension, which extends back almost as far as the proposed rear extension. A takeaway restaurant is located immediately to the east, and it retains a single storey roof pitch to the street. Part of the public house at No 17 New Street also abuts the eastern boundary of the subject site. There is a vacant site to the rear of the site which appears to be in separate ownership which fronts onto Tennis Court Lane and a recently built two storey dwelling adjoins the vacant site.
- 8.3.3. I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have any negative impact on the general amenity of the adjacent properties and would provide a high standard of residential amenity for the subject property.

8.4. Impact on character of the ACA and visual amenity

- 8.4.1. The Skerries Architectural Area is one of 33 ACAs included in the Fingal Development Plan and encompasses the historic core of the town. The Development Plan includes a map of each ACA and what is termed a 'Brief Description' of the ACA. The description makes specific reference to certain streets but does not specifically refer to New Street. There is reference in the description to a mixture of formal planning and informal plots and groups of buildings and it states that "this mixture of house types and the formal and informal plot lines constitutes an essential defining feature the special character of the Skerries ACA". While some examples of streets are referenced in the description, I believe it would be unreasonable to expect every street or group of buildings of interest to be mentioned in the "concise description of the features of interest and the architectural patterns and details to be found in the area"

recommended to be included in Development Plans rereferred to in Chapter 3 of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2011.

- 8.4.2. The PA Conservation Officer states that New Street is a 19th century street, developed by the Hamilton Estate, which planned much of the town. I note the Skerries ACA Statement of Character, 2008 (accessible on the Planning Authority website) references New Street and confirms it was developed by the Hamilton Estate and notes that “the slate-roofed cottages of the opposing terraces follow the style of vernacular cottages” and it also makes reference to the detailing of No 5 (now a protected structure) and its intricate window and door surrounds. Although comprised of modest domestic houses following the style of vernacular cottages, based on its planned design, New Street can be considered as part of the formally planned aspects of the Skerries ACA, referenced in the Development Plan description. While it may be desirable to have a reference in the Development Plan to the more detailed background information available for each ACA, I am satisfied that the essence of the ACA is adequately captured in the ‘Brief Description’ included in the Plan.
- 8.4.3. At present there are eight single storey cottages in a continuous terrace on the southside of street and six single storey cottages in a row on the north side of the street, reflecting the original character of the street. While there is variation at either end of the street, where some buildings are two storey structures, particularly at the eastern end, I agree with the Conservation Officer that “despite some changes to roof heights and treatment New Street has retained a cohesive historic character with most houses retaining their original form and many original features”.
- 8.4.4. The Development Plan contains numerous policies aimed at protecting architectural heritage, making it clear that there is an onus on proposed development within ACAs to take extra care to protect the character of the buildings and the area. Policy HCAP14 and HCAP15 focus on development in ACAs and highlight the need to protect the character of ACAs as well as supporting adaptive re-use and refurbishment of buildings that contribute to the character of an ACA. Objective HCAO24 refers to alteration and development of Protected Structures and buildings in ACAs and requires development to be appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, architectural treatment, layout, materials, impact on architectural or historic features.

- 8.4.5. Table 14.24 sets out direction for proposed development in ACAs and includes a requirement applying to extensions: “Extensions to buildings in ACAs that are visible from public places should be of a scale and proportion that respects that of the original building. In general extensions should be subservient in size with materials, finishes and roof profiles that complement the principal structure.”
- 8.4.6. In this case the key issue of concern relates to the proposal to extend the existing roof pitch and raise it by c2m over a new rear extension. The Planning Authority sought the redesign of the roof by way of further information to ensure the front pitch of the roof is retained and any additional roof maintains or is below the ridge height of the existing roof and thus not visible from the street. The applicant declined to modify the proposed roof pitch, stating that other construction options would not allow the first floor bedrooms to comply with current standards. The response to other items of FI confirmed that front door and windows are to be retained and rooflights in the front elevation would be omitted.
- 8.4.7. The appellant argues that the proposed roof matches that of the adjoining structure (No 20) and that there are other variations in roof profile in the street. Permissions were granted in 2003 and 2000 respectively, for alterations to the roof of No 20 and No 3 New Street, although I note these permissions were granted prior to the adoption of the Skerries ACA into the Development Plan. A more recent permission in 2016 permitted the reconstruction of No1A New Street, from a single storey structure to a two storey structure. No 1A is located at the western end of the street between two existing two storey structures, and therefore had a limited visual impact on the terraces of surviving single storey structures towards the centre of the street. A 2015 permission at No 7 referred to by the appellant, is for retention of a rear conservatory, and does not refer to raising the roof, which may have been altered at an earlier time.
- 8.4.8. The appellant refers to precedents in other parts of the ACA where alternations to structures, raising of roofs and demolition and replacement of buildings has been permitted in recent years. However, each application falls to be considered on its merits and I note that the character and pattern of development in the other streets such as Quay Street, Strand Street and Thomas Hand Street differs from that of New Street and I am satisfied that developments on these streets cannot generally be considered to act as a direct precedent for the subject development.

- 8.4.9. It is evident that some modifications in roof profile in the rows of single storey cottages along New Street have occurred, either within or outside the planning control process, however I believe that the cohesive historic character of the street referred to by the Conservation Officer is still present in the central part of the street, and should be protected from further alterations which would have a negative impact on the character and visual amenity of the street and of the ACA.
- 8.4.10. In my opinion the proposed alterations to the roof profile of No 19 would be out of character with the existing dwelling and with the streetscape. I believe it would have a negative visual impact on the building itself and would detract from the character of the ACA, contrary to Policy HCAP 14 (Architectural Conservation Areas), Policy HCAP 15 (Character of Architectural Areas) and Objective HCAO24 (Alteration and Development of Protected Structures and ACAs) of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. Furthermore, it would create a precedent for similar undesirable changes to other buildings. I believe that further gradual alteration of the historic fabric would result in the loss of the intrinsic historic character of the streetscape and of the ACA.
- 8.4.11. I do not accept the appellants argument that the proposed roof would not be visually obtrusive as it would be screened by the roof of No 20 and by the two storey dwelling at No 17, and consider any screening that would occur would not be significant and would not address the fact that the proposed roof design is out of character with the dwelling itself.
- 8.4.12. I recognise the importance of retaining residential uses within the town centre, however this has to be balanced with the objective of protecting the character of the ACA and I consider that alternatives to raising the roof profile, such as expansion into the rear garden, could be further explored in this case
- 8.4.13. In conclusion I am of the view that the proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the visual amenities of the streetscape and on the character of the Skerries ACA.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the development in the light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in Skerries, Co. Dublin and is 1.2km from Skerries Island SPA, 0.3km from North-West Irish Sea cSPA, 3.7m from Rockabill SPA and 3km from Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC. The development comprises alterations and ground and first floor extension to an existing dwelling.
- 9.2. No nature conservation issues were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it would not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of the works i.e. small scale and nature of the development
 - Location and distance from nearest European Site and lack of connections
- 9.4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on a 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.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The subject site is located at 19 New Street, Skerries, Co Dublin and the nearest river waterbody is Mill Stream at 500m, while the coastline is within 300m. The development comprises alterations and ground and first floor extension of an existing dwelling. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.2. I have assessed the proposed development 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 and groundwater water bodies 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.

10.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale of the development
- The distance from nearest water bodies and lack of hydrological connections

10.4. I conclude on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. Refusal of permission is recommended.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development by reason of its inappropriate roof design would result in a visually incongruous form of development which would materially affect the character of the Skerries Architectural Conservation Area, and would seriously injure the visual amenities and streetscape of the area. The proposed development would be contrary to Policy HCAP15, Policy HCAP15 and Objective HCAO24 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, and 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.

Ann Bogan
Planning Inspector

05 June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501081-DF-26
Proposed Development Summary	Ground and first floor extension of existing dwelling within an Architectural Conservation Area
Development Address	19 New Street, Skerries, Co Dublin
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.
(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)	
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.	
☐ 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 ☐	
No ☐	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: Ann Bogan Date: 05/06/2026