



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501127-WW-26

Development

Demolition of rear extension and new 2 storey rear extension and decks and all associated site works

Location

15 Dunbur Road, Wicklow Town, Co. Wicklow

Planning Authority

Wicklow County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2560977

Applicant(s)

Fergus Finlayson and Maurice O'Reilly

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission + Conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party Normal Planning Appeal

Appellant(s)

Vitoria Dand

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

10th June 2026

Inspector

Elaine Sullivan

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0	Planning History.....	5
5.0	Policy Context.....	5
6.0	EIA Screening.....	6
7.0	The Appeal	7
8.0	Assessment	10
9.0	AA Screening.....	18
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	18
11.0	Recommendation.....	19
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	19
13.0	Conditions.....	19
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	23

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site has a stated area of 0.070ha and is within the settlement boundary of Wicklow Town. It is approximately 700m to the east of the Town Centre, on the eastern side of Dunbur Road (R750-3). The site is bound to the immediate north/north-east by the course of the Wicklow Golf Club. There are neighbouring dwellings to the east, west and south (opposite side of Regional Road). The site consists of a large two-storey semi-detached dwelling, with a large rear garden.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for the demolition of existing single storey extension and decks to the rear and the construction of a two-storey extension to the rear with elevated deck and storage below the deck, with new rooflights and all associated works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority (PA) granted permission for the development subject to 6 no. conditions which are standard in nature.

Condition No. 4 relates to the decking area to the rear and states the following;

- a) The privacy louvre to the decking area shall be maintained permanently in place.*
- b) The privacy louvre and decking area are to be constructed at least 0.5 metres away from the shared boundary wall on the side of the application site and the privacy louvre is to be extended at least 1 metre beyond the outer edge of the terrace. Prior to the commencement of development drawings and details showing these modifications shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority.*
- c) Prior to the commencement of development and for the written agreement of the planning authority, details, including photographic samples of the design and finish of the privacy louvres shall be submitted. The privacy louvres are to be constructed*

from a robust, long lasting and low maintenance material noting their permanency and location in an exposed coastal area.

REASON: To protect the privacy and amenity of the property to the southeast.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The decision of the PA was informed by two reports from the Planning Officer (PO).

In the first report of the PO, the scale of the extension was considered to be acceptable for the site and the surrounding context. However, concerns were raised regarding the potential for overlooking of the adjoining property from the raised deck to the rear. The PO recommended that further information (FI) was requested to submit revised plans to address the concerns about overlooking.

In the second report, the PO assessed the applicant's proposal to provide privacy louvres to the side of the raised deck and considered this to be acceptable. A recommendation to grant permission was issued.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- None on file.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- No reports on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One third party observation received by the PA. Issues raised in the submission relate to the following;

- Concerns about loss of privacy from overlooking.
- Impact on daylight and sunlight of adjoining properties.
- Excessive scale and height.
- Disturbance and potential damage from construction.

- Loss of trees.
- Impact on residential amenity.

4.0 Planning History

- **08/623269**: Planning permission granted in 2008 for new entrance to townhouse at 15 Dunbur Road.
- **07/623168**: Planning permission granted for revisions to previously granted townhouse (ref. no. 06/3101).
- **06/623066**: Planning permission refused for two storey extension comprising two one-bedroom self-contained apartments and rear single storey extension to existing dwelling.
- **06/623101**: Planning permission granted for two storey townhouse with connection to services and rear single storey extension to existing dwelling.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028

The **Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028, (WCDP)** is the operative development plan for the site.

The subject site is within the boundary of the **Wicklow Town – Rathnew Local Area Plan 2025**, which came into effect on the 23rd June 2025. Variation No. 2 to the County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 integrated the Local Area Plan land use zoning map and key development objectives from the Local Area Plan into the County Development Plan.

Zoning – The site is zoned objective ‘RE – Existing Residential’, which seeks ‘*To protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas*’. The description given for the RE zoning objective is, ‘*To provide for house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in*

accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity...'

Appendix 1: Development and Design Standards.

Section 3.1.8 – House Extensions - The construction of extensions to existing houses will be encouraged generally as it usually provides a less resource intensive method of expanding living space than building a new structure. The basic principles to be applied include the following,

- The use of sensitive design,
- No overlooking of adjacent private areas,
- No increased overlooking of adjoining areas,
- No overshadowing or significant loss of daylight or sunlight to adjoining areas,
- The form size and appearance of the extension should complement the area.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- No natural heritage designations apply to the site.
- The closest proposed Natural Heritage Areas (pNHA) to the site are the Wicklow Head pNHA (SC 000734), which is approximately 0.5km to the south-east, and the Wicklow Town Sites pNHA (SC001929), which is approx. 0.5km to the north.
- The Wicklow Head SPA (SC 004127) is approx. 0.5km to the southeast of the site and The Murrough SPA (SC004186) is approx. 1km to the northwest.

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. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal are summarised as follows.

The siting, design, bulk and massing of the proposed extension –

- The appellant considers that the impact of the proposal is extenuated by the change in levels from the rear of the house to the garden which slopes downwards. The change in levels would result in the two-storey structure appearing more like a three-storey extension when viewed from the appellants garden.
- The length and height of the proposal would result in an overbearing impact on the appellants property. A raised deck or terrace is proposed over a lower ground floor area to retain the existing internal floor levels. This results in an additional 3 -4.4m extension to the rear of the extension. Louvers of 2.25m in height are proposed along the boundary to prevent overlooking. However, this will increase the bulk and mass of the overall proposal. The proximity of the terrace to the boundary would exacerbate the overbearing impact of the development.

The design is out of character with the semi-detached houses –

- The appellant is of the opinion that the proposal would be contrary to the policies and objectives of the Wicklow County Development Plan and the Wicklow Town - Rathnew Local Area Plan 2025 that seek to ensure the established character of the built environment. It is put forward that the poor design of the proposal would detract from the views of Wicklow Town from the coast and from the golf club to the east of the site. (Policies and objectives from both plans are listed in the appeal).
- The appellant considers the design of the extension to be inappropriate and out of character with the existing forms of development on either side of the proposal. Windows are excessive in scale and the terraces are inappropriate. The impact of the extension and the rear elevation of the townhouse to the west should be considered in their totality.

- The pitched roof profile and gable wall would increase the height and scale of the rear elevation and would be excessive when viewed from the neighbouring back gardens. The appellant requests that the internal floor to ceiling height is reduced to 2.4m which would also reduce the height of the roof, or to replace the pitched roof with a flat roof.

Concerns regarding the internal layout of the proposal –

- The appellant questions the logic of the internal layout of the proposal and questions whether it is proposed to divide the house into two apartments rather than provide a two-storey extension. Moving the kitchen to the front of the house could result in additional noise and odours for the appellant.

Adverse impacts on residential amenity –

- In addition to concerns about overbearing impact, the appellant contends that their property will experience overshadowing from the proposal. They have submitted a series of images from www.suncalc.org, which is website and application that shows sun movement and sunlight phases during the day at a given location.
- The appellant is concerned that the raised terrace at ground floor level and the first-floor terrace will result in overlooking of their property. The louvres proposal at ground floor level would be ineffective as they would still allow views through them.
- The appellant is of the opinion that a visual impact assessment should have been undertaken for the development. In the absence of the applicant's visual impact assessment and CGIs, the grounds of appeal include a visual impact assessment, which concludes that the proposed development would have a 'Moderate Adverse Impact'.
- Concerns about additional light, noise and disturbance from the residential extension during the construction works and the operational phase.

The proposed development would represent overdevelopment of the site –

- The appellant submits that the proposed development is not at an appropriate density, height or scale for the modest site which is restricted and sloping. To

support this argument the grounds of appeal refer to policies and objectives contained in the NPF, the RSES for the Eastern & Midlands Region, the Compact Settlements Guidelines and the Urban Design Manual (2007).

- In terms of local policy, the appellant contends that the proposal is not in accordance with Appendix 1, Section 3.1.8 of the WCDP, which contains guidance on House Extensions.

Other issues –

- Public notices were inadequate and did not describe the proposal fully and ambiguity exists regarding the red line boundary.
- The development would set a poor planning precedent and would depreciate adjoining property/land values.
- The grounds of appeal note that the application did not include the following documents, Appropriate Assessment Screening Report, Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA), Arborist Report, Visual Impact Assessment, Daylight and Sunlight Assessment or Conservation Report. These documents are considered necessary to determine the full impact of the proposal.
- Should permission be granted, the appellant suggests that construction hours should be restricted from 8am to 5pm due to the quiet residential nature of the area.
- Measures to minimise disruption to the appellants property during construction should be included in any grant of permission, along with an established independent complaints process should issues arise.

7.2. Applicant Response in the case of a 3rd Party Appeal

- No comments received within the statutory time frame.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- No response received.

7.4. Observations

- No observations received.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report/s of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant planning policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal can be addressed under the following headings:

- Principle of Development
- Design, Bulk & Massing
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Other Issues.

8.2. Principle of Development

- 8.2.1. The proposed development is for a two-storey extension to the rear of an existing house on a site which is zoned objective *'RE – Existing Residential'*. The objective of the RE zoning is *'To protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas'*, and the accompanying description is, *'To provide for house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity.'* On this basis, I am satisfied that the principle of the development has been established on the site and the proposal is acceptable subject to the policies and objectives of the WCDP.
- 8.2.2. Notwithstanding the appellants reference to national and regional policy, the relevant planning guidance framework for residential extensions is Appendix 1, Section 3.1.8 of the Wicklow County Development Plan which gives design guidance and direction on extensions to existing housing. The appellant also contends that the proposal is not in accordance with Section 3.1.8 of the WCDP, which will be assessed in the following report.

8.2.3. Development plan policies CPO 6.21 and CPO 6.22 are of particular relevance to the subject appeal. CPO 6.21 states that 'In areas zoned 'Existing Residential' house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development...' will normally be permissible subject to appropriate design and encourages the use of contemporary architecture. CPO 6.22 states that small infill development should be at appropriate density that respects the established character of the area, and the protection of the residential amenity of adjoining properties. Both objectives support infill development and extensions to existing properties whilst reinforcing the importance of existing residential amenity for adjoining properties.

8.3. **Design, Bulk & Massing**

- 8.3.1. The grounds of appeal argue that the design of the proposal is out of character with the surrounding development and that the scale of the proposed development is excessive and would result in a negative visual impact on the appellants property which adjoins the site to the south.
- 8.3.2. I do not agree that the design of the extension is out of character with the existing buildings. Dunbur Road has a mix of newer and older housing types and is not subject to any specific architectural or conservation designations. The subject property was originally part of a semi-detached pair of houses. However, a third, infill house was constructed to the side of No. 15 which now forms a terrace with the original houses. No. 16 has also been altered and a large single and two-storey extension was constructed to the front and side of the house. The proposed extension is contemporary in style with architectural details that are standard in nature. It would not be seen from the front of the house and as such I am satisfied that it would not be out of character with the existing pattern of development in the immediate, and wider area.
- 8.3.3. The proposed two storey extension would extend from the original rear wall of the house by approximately 4m and would be constructed to the boundary with the adjoining houses at No's 14 and 16. The topography of the subject site, and the adjoining site, slopes steeply to the east which results in an elevated 'ground floor' to the rear. To counteract the sloping gardens, No's 14, 15 and 16 have constructed elevated decks or terraces, directly adjoining the ground floor living spaces to the rear with steps to the rear gardens below. In addition to the two-storey extension, a raised deck of approx. 3m in length is also

proposed. The appeal argues that the topography of the site exacerbates the scale of the proposal and would result in a visual impact on the wider area.

- 8.3.4. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns of the appellant regarding the scale of the two-storey extension in combination with the elevated deck, I am satisfied that the proposal is not excessive in scale when reviewed in context. The depth of the extension would match that of the adjoining, infill house to the north (No. 14) and would not impact on this property. The appellant's house to the south has a single storey extension to the rear and along the southern side of their property. This extension is set back from the boundary with the subject site by approximately 4m. An elevated deck wraps around the extension and extends to a length that would be commensurate to that proposed on the adjoining site. Although the deck at No. 16 wraps around the extension, the main amenity area of the deck is along the southern site boundary and adjoining the living space. As the appellant is restricted to the use of this area for amenity purposes, I consider the impact from this location to warrant the most consideration.
- 8.3.5. The subject proposal would extend past the rear wall of the appellants extension by approximately 1m. As the appellants extension has a blank wall facing onto the subject site, the visual impact of the proposal would be most acute from the deck to the rear. Although the proposed extension would extend past the rear wall of the appellants single storey extension by c. 1m, the length of the existing deck would be commensurate in scale to the proposed deck. As the appellants deck area is set-back from the site boundary by c. 4m, I am satisfied that the separation distance between both amenity areas is sufficient to prevent an overbearing impact from the proposed development. I note that Condition No. 4(b) of the PA's decision requires that the deck is set back by at least 0.5m from the site boundary. This would help to increase the separation distance between amenity areas and is considered to be acceptable.
- 8.3.6. There is currently a natural screen of mature trees in place along the boundaries of both properties, which ensures privacy for both parties and softens the boundary. The planting on the applicant's side would be removed to accommodate the extension, and the removal of these trees will result in a more formal site boundary. This could be offset through planting or soft landscaping if required. I do not agree with the assertion in the appeal that the trees to be removed are 'specimen trees'. They form part of a planted domestic boundary and do not fit the generally understood definition of a 'specimen tree' as used in

arboriculture or landscape architecture. Whilst the removal of any mature trees or planting will have an impact on wildlife and biodiversity, the tree proposed for removal are not of any particular significance in terms of protection and do not warrant any additional surveys or reports as suggested in the appeal.

- 8.3.7. In terms of the design, the appellant submits that the pitched roof profile, gable elevation and sloping nature of the site would exacerbate the overall visual impact of the proposal, which would result in a form of development that is more akin to a three-storey structure rather than a two-storey extension. Whilst the house would be at a higher level than the rear garden, I do not consider the overall visual impact to be substantially different to the current situation where the existing two storey houses are constructed at a height above the garden. As noted previously, I consider the impact of the proposal from the amenity space to the rear of the adjoining house to be the most pertinent. This area would be at the same level as the adjoining deck and ground floor level of the subject site. I do not agree that the storage area under the deck qualifies as an additional storey. The applicant is merely utilising the additional space underneath the raised deck as storage, which is what currently happens, and which would also be available to the appellant.
- 8.3.8. The grounds of appeal suggest that the visual impact of the proposal would be reduced if the pitched roof was replaced with a flat roof profile and if the internal floor to ceiling height was reduced to a standard 2.4m throughout. I consider the pitched roof profile to be acceptable and in keeping with the adjoining roof profiles to the north and south. The proposed design retains the existing eaves level to match the houses on either side and the ridge height proposed is lower than the existing ridge height of the house. The pitched roof profile is standard in design and reduces the massing of the overall structure. I am satisfied that the design of the rear elevation has been well considered. If the gable end was removed and/or lowered in height, there is a potential for the design to be compromised or for the roof profile to become overly complicated. I consider the scale and design to be acceptable for the context of the site. I am satisfied that, due to the existing context and form of development, that the proposal would not result in an overbearing or negative visual impact on existing or adjoining properties.

8.4. Impact on Residential Amenity

- 8.4.1. In terms of impact on residential amenity, the most relevant considerations for the subject appeal relate to overlooking/ loss of privacy and overshadowing. Regarding the potential for overlooking, the grounds of appeal argue that this could occur from the first-floor terrace and the raised deck at ground floor level.

Overlooking

- 8.4.2. The development proposal includes a recessed terrace (referenced as a 'deck' on the drawings) at first floor level adjoining the bedroom. The recessed terrace is set back from the main elevation by c. 1.3m and is framed with the rear elevational wall. As such it would appear as a large window opening rather than a balcony. As the area is recessed, with solid edges, the level of overlooking would be no more than that of a standard first floor window, which currently exist.
- 8.4.3. The PA raised a concern that the elevated deck at ground floor level could result in overlooking of the appellants property at No. 16 and requested FI to address the issue. To prevent overlooking the applicant proposed to install louvres to a height of c. 2.85m along the southern side of the raised deck, which was accepted by the PA. Although the appellant argues that overlooking would still be possible, I am satisfied that the installation of the louvres as proposed would prevent overlooking of the amenity space at the adjoining property. Condition No. 4 of the PA's decision requires the louvres to be set back from the boundary by a minimum of 0.5m and for the detailed design to be agreed in writing prior to installation. I am satisfied that the installation of appropriate louvres would prevent overlooking of adjoining properties and that the requirement to position the screening back from the boundary would reduce the visual impact of the proposal.
- 8.4.4. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in any additional conditions that would result in loss of privacy through overlooking. Whilst, a terrace is proposed at first floor level, it would be recessed and enclosed by solid walls, which would restrict oblique views. This would result in no more potential for overlooking than that from a standard first floor window. The proposed louvres along the southern side of the raised deck would be sufficient to prevent overlooking.

Overshadowing

- 8.4.5. The application includes a shadow study illustrating the existing and proposed impact of the proposal in terms of overshadowing on the 21st September. The study shows that the appellants property will not experience any significant overshadowing from the proposed development. As the appellants property is positioned to the south of the subject site, these results would be expected and were accepted by the PA. The grounds of appeal note that the property is not directly due south but is orientated to the south-east of the subject site. Therefore, there is a potential for overshadowing from the west and northwest. The appeal argues that the shadow study does not consider the impact of the proposal after 5pm on the designated day and between the months of March and September. To support this argument, the appeal includes images from an online application that they submit shows significant overshadowing of the appellants property from 4pm onwards in March and June.
- 8.4.6. I am satisfied that shadow study submitted shows a realistic representation of the impact of the proposal. Industry guidance on the preparation of shadow studies is contained in the document, *BRE, Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight; A guide to good practice (3rd Edition)*. Section 3.3 of the guidance document states that where there are existing buildings, it may be helpful to prepare 'before' and 'after' shadow plots showing the difference that the proposed building. In terms of designated dates, the guidance states that, *'If a space is used all year round, the equinox (21 March) is the best date for which to prepare shadow plots as it gives an average level of shadowing. Lengths of shadows at the autumn equinox (21 September) will be the same as those for 21 March, so a separate set of plots for September is not required...As an optional addition, plots for summertime (for example 21 June) may be helpful as they will show the reduced shadowing then, although it should be borne in mind that 21 June represents the best case of minimum shadow, and that shadows for the rest of the year will be longer'*.
- 8.4.7. The designated date of September 21st is used in shadow studies as it is close to the autumn equinox when day and night are approximately equal in length, which provides a balanced perspective on shadow lengths and angles. Based on the guidance in the BRE document, I accept the findings of the shadow study submitted by the applicant. The results of the study from September would be similar to one carried out in March and would be representative of an equilibrium for shadow conditions. Regarding the query as

to why the study was not continued past 5pm, I note that in the existing view, the appellants property is significantly overshadowed. Therefore, the proposal would not result in any additional impact as the evening progressed.

- 8.4.8. The information submitted in the grounds of appeal was derived from an online application called 'Suncalc'. It describes itself as *'a little app that shows sun movement and sunlight phases during the given day at the given location'* and states that *'You can see sun positions at sunrise, specified time and sunset'*. The website shows the sun trajectory at a specific location and also the variation of sun trajectories during the year. The site does not claim to show shadows and from my review, it appears to lack details regarding the height and scale of existing and proposed buildings. In the absence of these details, I would question whether it could successfully predict the extent of overshadowing from the proposal. The applicant submitted a series of drawings that show predicted overshadowing of the proposal that were prepared in accordance with BRE Guidance. I note that the WCDP requires shadow studies to be carried out in accordance with BRE Guidance and as such this is accepted as the most accurate prediction model. On balance, I am satisfied that the proposed development will not result in any significant or undue overshadowing of the amenity space of the property to the south of the subject site. This is due to the location of the extension and the orientation of the appellants property to the south-east of the subject site. I note that BRE guidance also states that, *'In interpreting the impact of such differences, it must be borne in mind that nearly all structures will create areas of new shadow, and some degree of transient overshadowing of a space is to be expected'*.

8.5. Other Issues

- 8.5.1. In addition to the issues assessed above, the grounds of appeal raised a number of additional issues that relate to the information submitted by the applicant, statutory requirements for the application, disturbance during construction, damage to civil property, internal layout of the proposal and access to complete the structure.
- 8.5.2. The grounds of appeal argue that the application was not in accordance with statutory requirements as the public notices did not accurately describe the development, that pre-planning and/or public consultation was not carried out and the application lacked supporting information and independent reports. I note that the PA assessed the

application and found it to be valid, and in accordance with the statutory requirements of the Planning Regulations. I have reviewed the application, and I am satisfied that the supporting information is commensurate with the nature and scale of the domestic extension, and that the plans and particulars submitted in the application are sufficient for the Commission to make an informed decision.

- 8.5.3. Disturbance during the construction phase of the development was also raised as a concern, as well as the potential for damage to property from the construction works. Damage to private property is a civil issue and is outside of the remit of this appeal. Due to the nature of the works, there will be additional noise and disturbance during the construction phase. However, the disturbance will be temporary in nature. I do not consider it necessary to restrict the working hours for the construction phase (as requested in the appeal) as this would most likely prolong the additional noise and disturbance.
- 8.5.4. An objection was raised regarding the proposed internal layout. It is suggested that positioning the kitchen to the front of the house would lead to additional disturbance and that the larger spaces within the house could lead to a subdivision of the property. All additional pipes and flues must be contained with the subject property, and I see no reason why relocating the kitchen within the house would lead to additional disturbance for neighbouring properties. The application is for a domestic extension. Any future subdivision of the house would require a separate planning application. The appeal also queried how the applicant would complete the structure as its proximity to the site boundary could necessitate access from the appellants property, which may not be possible. Access to private property is a civil matter and is outside the scope of this appeal. Should access to the adjoining site be required, it is a matter between the parties.
- 8.5.5. The appellant was also concerned that the proposal would result in the devaluation of their property. I note the concerns raised in the grounds of appeal in respect of the devaluation of neighbouring property. However, having regard to the assessment and conclusion set out above, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the value of property in the vicinity.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development for a domestic extension in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located in an urban area, on the southern side of Wicklow town, approximately 0.5km (overland) from The Wicklow Head SPA (SC 004127) and approx. 1km from The Murrough SPA (SC004186) is approx. 1km to the northwest.

- 9.2. The proposed development comprises the demolition of an existing single storey extension and the construction of a two-storey extension to the rear of a domestic dwelling.
- 9.3. No nature conservation concerns that relate to AA were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and scale of the domestic project.
 - The location of the subject site in an urban area and its lack of suitability as an ex-situ site.
 - The distance from the nearest European site and the lack of connections between the sites.
- 9.5. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 9.6. 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. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface

waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.

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

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that planning permission is granted for the development.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development for a two-storey extension to an existing dwelling in an area zoned '*RE – Existing Residential*', the objective of which is '*To protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas*', it is considered that by virtue of the design, location and context, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or property in the vicinity, and would not be detrimental to the quality of the public realm. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the policies and objectives of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 and with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 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 17th day of February 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. a) The privacy louvre to the decking area shall be maintained permanently in place.

b) The privacy louvre and decking area are to be constructed at least 0.5 metres away from the shared boundary wall on the side of the application site and the privacy louvre is to be extended at least 1 metre beyond the outer edge of the terrace. Prior to the commencement of development drawings and details showing these modifications shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority.

c) Prior to the commencement of development and for the written agreement of the planning authority, details, including photographic samples of the design and finish of the privacy louvres shall be submitted. The privacy louvres are to be constructed from a robust, long lasting and low maintenance material noting their permanency and location in an exposed coastal area.

Reason: To protect the privacy and amenity of the property to the southeast

3. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08:00 to 14:00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

4. The site development work and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the adjoining street(s) are kept clear of debris, soil and other material.

Reason: In the interests of orderly development and to ensure that the adjoining roadways are kept in a clean and safe condition.

5. The existing dwelling, extensions and proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as one single housing unit and shall not be sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: To restrict the use of the extensions and structures on the site in the interests of residential amenity.

6. 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 Bord 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.”

Elaine Sullivan

Senior Planning Inspector

10th July 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	5011127-26
Proposed Development Summary	2-storey domestic extension.
Development Address	15 Dunbur Road, Wicklow Town.
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified	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. .	

☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-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: _____ Date: _____