



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501256-DS-26

Development	Alterations to existing dwelling comprising of the demolition of sections to the side and rear and construction of a new extension, demolish sheds and construct 3 no. 3 storey dwellings and associated works.
Location	169A, Strand Road, Dublin 4, D04 E1T6
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB5405/25
Applicant(s)	P. Lonergan & Sons Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Helen Lambert and John Murray Daniel Collins and Marie O'Neill
Observer(s)	Nicholas Jones and Grace Dempsey

Date of Site Inspection

29 July 2026

Inspector

Claire McVeigh

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1. Decision	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	7
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	9
3.4. Third Party Observations	9
4.0 Planning History	11
5.0 Policy Context	12
6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening	14
7.0 The Appeal	14
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	14
7.2. Applicant Response	16
7.3. Planning Authority Response	19
7.4. Observations	19
8.0 Assessment	21
9.0 Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening	27
10.0 Water Framework Directive	28
11.0 Recommendation	28
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	29
13.0 Conditions	29
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	35
Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination	37
Appendix 3: Standard AA Screening Determination	40

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site, stated site area 0.142ha, is located at 169A Strand Road one half of a semi-detached pair fronting onto Strand Road (R131) in South Dublin City (Dublin 4). The semi-detached pair, 169A and 169 Strand Road, are as stated in observation received, to have previously been built as a single structure (originally a convent).
- 1.2. The site also has frontage onto St. Alban's Park a through road which leads to both Sydney Parade Avenue and Ailesbury Gardens leading on to Ailesbury Road. The site is bounded to the east by a granite plinth wall with cast iron railings along Strand Road, the southern boundary extends to side along St Alban's Park and to the west with no. 92 St. Alban's Park.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development consists of:
 - a) alterations to an existing semi-detached dwelling (house no.1) comprising of the demolition of existing two storey flat roofed sections to the side and rear of the existing two storey dwelling and build a new two storey rear extension and front entrance door together with a new vehicular entrance from Strand Road
 - b) demolition of sheds on the south of the site and construct a semi-detached building comprising of 2no. 3 storey dwellings (house no. 2 & 3) with balcony structures to the front looking onto the Strand, a balcony to the side of house no. 3 and a balcony to the rear of house no.2 and a new vehicular entrance on St. Albans Park for house no.3.
 - c) construction of a new 3 storey detached dwelling with rear dormer window (house no. 4) at the south / west corner of the rear of the site, with a new vehicular entrance on St. Albans Park.
 - d) new boundary walls on the Strand Road and on St. Albans Park and in the gardens between the 4 houses.
 - Site coverage proposed 28.5% and a plot ratio of 0.62 to 1.
 - Proposed density 28 dph.

Revised plans and particulars submitted in response to further information request by the planning authority include:

- Revisions to the front elevation of proposed houses 2 & 3 including raising the main parapet of the two storey high façade to match the existing house no. 1 (169A Strand Road) and replacing the proposed full height glazing with more traditional solid to void proportions to reflect the proportions of the existing house (169A Strand Road) and a reduction in the section of glazed guarding at second floor level as a result of the increase in the height of the main parapet.
- Revised entrance proposals to provide a shared vehicular entrance for houses no. 1 & 2 and a new pedestrian gateway serving house no. 1.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The planning authority granted planning permission on the 2 April 2026 subject to 15 no. conditions.

3.1.2. Conditions

Condition no. 4. Prior to the erection of external materials, the developer shall submit detailed drawings of the final proposed materials and finishes to the building, for the written approval of the planning authority. Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

Condition no. 5. The attic space hereby approved shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with the current building regulations. Reason: To provide for an adequate standard of development.

Condition no. 8. Any windows serving bathrooms shall be in opaque glazing. Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and privacy.

Condition no. 9. The Developer shall comply with the following transport requirements of the Planning Authority: a) The driveway entrance along Strand Road shall be maximum 4m in width and the driveway entrances along St. Alban's Park shall be maximum 3m in width. None of the entrances shall have outward opening gates. b) Footpath and kerb to be dished and new entrance provided to the requirements of the Area Engineer, Roads Maintenance Division. c) All costs

incurred by Dublin City Council, including any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development, shall be at the expense of the developer.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and traffic safety.

Conditions 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 apply site and construction related conditions to safeguard the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers.

Condition no. 15. Drainage requirements.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- Initial report (28 November 2025) – sets out that residential use is permissible under the Z2 zoning objective and the proposed dwellings accord with the minimum standards required however, further information is sought in respect the design of proposed house no. 2 and 3, revised entrance proposals and bicycle parking details, and a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken.

Requests that the applicant submit a screening for Appropriate Assessment.

Considers that the need for environmental impact assessment can be excluded at preliminary examination, and a screening determination is not required.

- Second planner's report (24 March 2026) – Revised elevation drawings of proposed houses 2 and 3 to omit the proposed large, glazed window openings with window opening similar in size to the existing house and revised parapet detailing is considered acceptable in terms of integration with the existing streetscape on Strand Road. A shared vehicular access is now proposed to serve house no. 1 and proposed house no. 2, and each respective house shall have a bike store/shed which is acceptable to the planning authority. The submitted FRA is acceptable to the planning authority subject to conditions.

The Appropriate Assessment Screening carried out by the Applicant concludes that it has been determined that it is possible to rule out likely significant impacts on any Natura 2000 sites. It is the view of the Applicant that it is not necessary to undertake any further stage of the Appropriate

Assessment process. The Planning Authority concur with the findings of the applicant, and an Appropriate Assessment is not required.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Initial report from Drainage Division (report dated 28 October 2025) requests further information in respect to a Flood Risk Assessment given the area is located in an area susceptible to flooding.

The report from Drainage Division (report dated 18/03/2026) states no objection submit to conditions with respect to (i) compliance with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Version 6.0, (ii) the drainage for the proposed development shall be designed on a completely separate foul and surface water system. No surface water shall be allowed to discharge to foul water system or vice versa, (iii) the development shall incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems in the management of surface water. Full details of the surface water management proposal shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of the development and the design and construction of soakaways must comply with the requirements of BRE Digest 365 and CIRIA C753 and (iv) all private drainage such as, downpipes, gullies, manholes, armstrong junctions, etc. are to be located within the final site boundary.

- Report from the Transportation Planning Division (report dated 18 November 2025) notes that there is existing controlled formal on-street parking on St Alban's Park across the road adjacent to the application site. There are double yellow lines, surrounding the entirety of the site boundary. There is a speed ramp on St Alban's Road, southwest of the site, and a signalised pedestrian crossing northeast of the site. The application site is situated in Zone 2, Map J of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.

The division objects to the proposed vehicular entrance 1. Requests further information in respect to the proposed access arrangements, specifically Entrance no. 1 on Strand Road and requests details of proposed cycle parking.

Second report following receipt of further information (report dated 18 March 2026) the applicant has submitted drawing No, 1757 - 104 which is a revised site plan, omitting the proposed 3-meter-wide vehicular entrance for House 1

and proposing a pedestrian entrance of 1.2m in width. The existing vehicular entrance which previous was proposed to serve only House 2 will now serve both Houses 1 and 2 and has been widened to c.4 meters. This is agreeable to this division as the existing entrance proposed to be widened is safe and sufficiently removed from the signalised crossing.

In relation to Item 2 (b), which pertains to cycle parking, the applicant has referenced in their Cover Letter and shown in drawings No. 1757-104 that they will provide a 3m x 2m single storey garden shed for cycle parking in the garden of each dwelling which will be secure, sheltered and well-lit. This is agreeable to this division.

Recommends conditions in the event of a grant of permission.

- Environmental Health Officer (EHO) (report dated 06/11/2025) recommends conditions be attached in respect to noise control and air quality control for the construction phase.
- Section 48 Levy calculation of €87,995.70

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Referral to Irish Rail and Uisce Eireann no response received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

A total of eight third-party submissions were received from the following: Hugh Nolan & Caoimhe O'Connor, Helen Lamert and John Murray, Fergal Rhatigan, Daniel Collins and Marie O'Neill, Michael Gaffney, Myra Farrell, Philip O'Reilly, Nicholas Jones and Grace Dempsey in summary the following issues were raised:

- Residential amenity concerns regarding impact on privacy and increased overlooking, particular concerns regarding proposed balcony of proposed house no. 2 and the side balcony of house no. 3 should be omitted or altered to shield the western end with opaque glass 2 metre high screen to reduce overlooking issues.
- Error in depicting the boundary wall with no. 92 St. Alban's Park.

- Concerns regarding structural stability of the existing adjoining house no. 169 Strand Road (one side of the semi-detached pair) and the boundary wall of no. 169 Strand Road and No. 92 St. Alban's Park during site construction.
- Concerns that the substantial alteration of the existing building would adversely impact a structure of local heritage value and would erode the established streetscape.
- Proximity of proposed house no. 4 to no. 92 St. Alban's Park and the separation distance should be increased to a minimum 3 metre gap.
- The design and height of the proposed houses at three storeys would be out of scale and character with the rest of the terrace on St. Alban's Park and does not have sufficient regard to the setting and historical characteristics of the houses on Strand Road as designated as Z2 'Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Area)'. Visually incongruous and overbearing impacts due to the different site levels and ridge height proposed. Concerns about the density of development proposed. The proposed house no. 4 is significantly out of proportion with and its proximity to no. 92 St. Alban's Park is such to be outsized and overbearing, concerns also raised about overshadowing.
- Parking proposed is insufficient resulting reversing of vehicles onto Strand Road and St. Alban's Park and in increased pressure on on-street parking. Installation of car turntables should be an obligatory condition for houses no. 1 and no. 2.
- Proposed driveway appears to interfere with traffic crossing and concerns about traffic hazards along St. Alban's Park.
- No information has been provided on proposed heating systems. No drawings for mechanical and electrical installations whilst on the elevation drawing for house no. 4 the specification indicates that there are drawings for M & E.
- Concerns about the proposed foul sewer connection, a combined one for each of the four no. houses, into the public foul pipe running along St. Alban's Park. Concerns about storm water management and potential for increased flooding within an area already prone to coastal flooding.
- Site management should ensure that access is limited to Strand Road during the construction period as St. Alban's Park has a 3.5 tonne limit on vehicular

access and this should be upheld. Site hoarding should be provided along St. Alban's park to prevent access. If piling is necessary, it should be 'bored' piling as opposed to 'driven piles.

- No site notice posted on St. Alban's Park boundary.
- Various mature trees on the site have been felled in recent years.

4.0 Planning History

0436/25: Social Housing Certificate Exemption granted by DCC for the provision of 3 no. new dwellings.

1218/99: Grant permission for the construction of sheltered car parking to the side of existing house and planting in forecourt.

1820/98: Retention permission refused for garage / car port to the side of house

1831/98: Permission granted for two storey conservatory replacing a single storey conservatory to the front

0370/93 ABP Ref: PL 29S.091285 : Permission refused for 9 apartments in a 3-storey block on lands adjoining with access from St. Alban's Park and re-locate entrance to 169A Strand Road.

2374/92: Permission refused for 9 apartments in a 3-storey block on lands adjoining with access from St. Alban's Park and re-location of entrance to 169A Strand Road.

Reasons for refusal included:

- The proposed 3 storey flat roofed building, would, by reason of its height and design be out of keeping with adjacent buildings and would therefore seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity by reason of visual intrusion.
- The density of the proposed development is excessive because the required car parking prevents the provision of the minimum amount of private amenity open space as required by the 1991 Dublin City Development Plan.
- The location of the car parking area close to the boundaries of the site at the rear would seriously injure the amenities of adjoining properties by reason of noise and movement close to the rear gardens of those properties.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

Variations:

Variations no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11 have been adopted. Variation no. 11 relates to incorporating the housing growth requirements set out in the first revision to the National Planning Framework has been adopted NB: Proposed variations no. 10 - Kylemore Masterplan and Proposed material alterations to proposed variation no. 10 was subject to a consultation which ended 28 April 2026.

- Map H - Zoning Objective Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas)
- 2.7.2 Active Land Management – Brownfield and Infill Lands
- CSO7 It is an objective of Dublin City Council: Promote Delivery of Residential Development and Compact Growth - To promote the delivery of residential development and compact growth through active land management measures and a co-ordinated approach to developing appropriately zoned lands aligned with key public transport infrastructure, including the SDRAs, vacant sites and underutilised areas.
- 4.4 Strategic Approach ...the creation of a consolidated city, whereby infill and brownfield sites are sustainably developed, regenerated and new urban environmental are created, and where underutilised sites and buildings are actively repurposed and intensified.
- SC8 It is the policy of Dublin City Council Development of the Inner Suburbs
To support the development of the inner suburbs and outer city in accordance with the strategic development areas and corridors set out under the Dublin Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan and fully maximise opportunities for intensification of infill, brownfield and underutilised land where it aligns with existing and pipeline public transport services and enhanced walking and cycling infrastructure.
- SC11 Compact Growth ...consolidation and intensification of infill and brownfield lands, particularly on public transport corridors....

- It is the policy of Dublin City Council QHSN6 Urban consolidation To promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification through the consideration of applications for infill development, backland development, mews development, re-use/adaption of existing housing stock and use of upper floors, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.
- 1.5.3 Z2 and Z8 Zonings and Red-Hatched Conservation Areas
- The Z8 Georgian Conservation Areas, Z2 Residential Conservation Areas and red-lined Conservation Areas are extensive throughout the city. Whilst these areas do not have a statutory basis in the same manner as protected structures or ACAs, they are recognised as areas that have conservation merit and importance and warrant protection through zoning and policy application...The City Council will encourage development which enhances the setting and character of Conservation Areas.
- BHA9 Conservation Areas
- 14.7.2 Residential neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) – Zone Z2 To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.
- 15.5.2 Infill Development
- 15.8.6 Public Open Space
- Table 15-4 Public Open Space requirements for residential development Z2 10% requirement (minimum)
- 15.8.7 Financial Contributions in Lieu of Open Space, applicable only in schemes of 9 or more units.
- 15.11 House Developments
- 15.15.2.2 Conservation areas.

5.2 National Guidance

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)

Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities: Design Guidelines' (2007)

5.3 Natural Heritage Designations

The site is located in close proximity to Dublin Bay (approximately 40m) which contains both the South Dublin Bay Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) [Site Code 000210], and the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Areas (SPA) [Site Code 004024].

South Dublin Bay is also designated as a proposed Natural Heritage Areas: South Dublin Bay [Site Code 00210].

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (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

Two third party appeals have been made from (i) Helen Lambert and Mr John Murray, prepared by Jim Brogan Planning and Development Consultant and (ii) Daniel Collins and Marie O'Neill, prepared by Hughes Planning and Development Consultants. The key issues are summarised below:

Helen Lambert and John Murray (home immediately to the west of the proposed development site).

- Discrepancies in submitted plans with respect to the delineation of the boundary on the site location map and site layout plan. The boundary line is straight, without an indentation, and therefore the separation between the proposed (house no. 4) and existing is less than indicated on the drawings.
- The proposed development, even in its modified form as per further information submitted on 5 March 2026, would cause serious injury to the residential amenities of their home.

- Eastern gable of existing house is c 0.9m from the shared boundary of the site, concerns about proposed house no. 4 separation distance between gables.
- Specific concerns in respect to siting, design and height of proposed house no. 4 with respect to proximity to their property.
- Serious injury to the visual amenities of the area and would be in conflict with the conservation objectives for the residential conservation area (Z2 zoning).
- Overlooking concerns from proposed balconies.
- Would endanger public safety through the generation of a traffic hazard as a result of cars having to reverse into or out of the proposed entrances due to the restricted depth of the dedicated car parking area. The operational width of the carriageway reduces to 3.3m at the parking bay area and there is a traffic calming hump in vicinity of the proposed entrances.
- Concerns about adverse impacts as a result of demolition/construction activities.
- Request that planning permission is refused.

Daniel Collins and Marie O'Neill (immediately adjoining property owners forming one half of the semi-detached pair)

- Do not object in principle to the appropriate redevelopment of the site.
- Concerns relating to the potential impact of the proposed works on the structural integrity, fabric, and amenity of their property.
- Discrepancies with the submitted red line application boundary have come to light post decision by the planning authority (please refer to letter attached as Appendix B from the Applicant/Design team confirming inaccuracy in red line boundary letter dated 24th April 2026). It is stated that the applicant has confirmed that the red line boundary as shown on the submitted planning drawings is incorrect and extends into the appellant's property, it is not clear that the planning authority were in a position to fully or properly assess the impacts of the development.

- Absence of critical structural and construction related detail at applications stage, including an absence of structural analysis of the existing building, an assessment of load paths and the implications of removing structural elements, a demolition methodology or sequencing plan and any details of temporary works or structural support measures during construction. Reference is made to the Building Control Acts 1990-2014 and Building regulations (Part A – Structure).
- Concerns relating to the absence of necessary protective measures and improper reliance on conditions given the sensitivity of the older structures. As such, the proposed development does not fully accord with the Z2 zoning objective, which seeks “*to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas*”.
- Request that planning permission is refused.

7.2. Applicant Response

- The issue with respect to the exact details and locations of the red line boundary arises from discrepancies between the landownership folio mapping, survey information and the on-the-ground reality of what is on site in terms of structures and boundaries. The deviations are considered to be minor, and they do not alter the principal details of the proposed development not any associated assessment of it. Noting Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as revised) and states that should the need arise with either of the appellants the applicant shall secure their consent.
- No. 92 St. Alban’s Park is an end of terrace dwelling and bounded to its side already. It is unreasonable and inconsistent to contend that a new detached walling on its east side would result in overbearing impacts. It is stated that no. 92 is not an architecturally unique detached dwelling that defines its own context or sphere of development influence.
- The proposed house no. 4 is approximately 1.1 m from the party boundary will be similar to the existing separation distance of no. 92 St. Alban’s Park from the boundary. It is put forward that this mirroring approach ensures that an equal and respectful approach to sharing the boundary is pursued.

- House no. 4 has been intentionally designed to avoid the risk of overbearance and overlooking. At first floor level the proposed dwelling is set back to align with no. 92 St Albans Park, and no fenestration is proposed to the side (western) elevation of the house to prevent overlooking.
- The proposed development would result in an increase of 3 no. dwellings, each with the space for just one car and the resulting increase in vehicular movements will ultimately be insignificant. The depth of the car parking space is at least 6m which is in excess of the standard minimum car. It is noted that the appellant's own driveway is of a shape and depth that only allows for reversing in or reversing out. This is a widely adopted design approach and can be utilised in a safe manner.
- Proposed house no. 4 would act as a privacy screen/buffer to any views into the amenity space of no. 92 St. Albans Park from the proposed balconies to house no. 2 and no. 3. The separation is indicated as 30.3m which is a substantial distance that would prevent overlooking or diminution of privacy. Reference is made to SPPR 1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).
- The design of the proposed balcony to house no. 2 has been designed as an enclosed or internalised 'recessed' balcony and consequently its rear most appearance is defined by the rear elevation of the dwelling making its effectively no different to a window serving a habitable room at that location.
- The area to the front of no. 169B Strand Road is not an amenity space in a "true sense" that requires privacy and protection from overlooking and overbearance. This space to the front is primarily a car parking area serving the house.
- The design approach is cognisant of and the respectful to the Z2 zoned area. The heights are limited to 2/3 storeys, and this aligns with heights along much of Strand Road and St Albans Park. No single approach to the range of materials is evident in the area and it is contended that the use of render and brick is in keeping with the established use of materials.
- The applicant acknowledged that the demolition and construction stages may cause disruption and in respect they make the following points:

- The subject site is located in an established urban area and to prohibit works would effectively sterilise the site.
 - The applicant is happy to accept similarly worded conditions as the 5-no. assigned by Dublin City Council (conditions nos. 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14) in relation to the construction management and associated impacts prevention and mitigation.
 - The applicant is willing subject to the consent of and agreement with the owners of the adjoining no. 169A Strand Road to undertaken pre and post construction condition surveys of that property. The surveyor can be appointed as an independent party agreed by the applicant and appellant of no. 169 Strand Road, with the cost covered by the former. Where material demolition or construction related impacts arise the applicant would bear the cost of remedying the matter.
 - The applicant is willing to accept a condition requiring the preparation of a Construction Methodology report for agreement with the planning authority. This report would specifically detail the methodology and process involved in carrying out the demolition and construction works, including demolition (by hand), foundations, excavations and underpinnings as examples. Its purpose would be to maximise the safety and minimise disruption, whilst ultimately protecting the structure integrity of both the subject property and no. 169B Strand Road.
 - It is expected that the construction works would be completed within 18 months and any disruption or inconvenience would be short-term and temporary in nature.
- The applicant recognises and accepts the need to comply with various non-planning requirements and intends to do so as appropriate at the right stages of the development process. Matters of compliance with building control and building regulations is dealt with under a separate legal code.
 - The proposed development response to and accords with planning policy prioritisation of infill development and densification supporting efforts to more efficiently and sustainably use scarce urban land resources.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- None received.

7.4. Observations

Nicholas Jones and Grace Dempsey (southwest of the subject site in St. Alban's Park)

- The proposed development is located on the corner of Strand Road and St. Alban's Park with significant road frontage on both roads. The two roads are very different in terms of house types and their nature i.e. Strand Road accommodating large houses and St. Alban's Park having more modest two storey houses on both sides of the road in both semi-detached and terraced format.
- The development would create significant difficulties for in-situ neighbours either directly attached to or adjoining the site where structural damage, including to boundary walls, may be caused by the development.
- Overbearing height and bulk of house no. 4 would result in overshadowing and negative impacts on privacy to no. 92 St. Alban's Park.
- The nature of this part of St. Alban's Park would be destroyed because of the height and bulk of house no. 4 and the proposed three storey house (no. 3) with its high-level balcony resulting in overlooking.
- The ground conditions that prevail in the area regularly contains extreme pockets of sand due its marine and tidal proximity. There is a serious likelihood of the necessity of piling for some of the foundations of the houses. Example provided of piling at no. 86 St. Alban's Park [Reg. Ref. 4557/05]. Concerns about impact of noise/disruption by piling related work during construction.
- Concerns about safety of pedestrians and traffic movement taking into account the narrow road (incl. permit parking) and footpath of St. Alban's park coming from Strand Road. The site entrance should be limited to the Strand Road to control conflicts between pedestrians / cars and construction activities. It is requested that permanent hoarding inside the site line to St.

Alban's Park boundary with no access to protect the narrow footpath and narrow one carriage way road at the subject site.

- The foul drainage as currently proposed assumes access to a pipeline on St. Alban's Park that is not adjacent to the site. Local access to foul drainage for 57, 59, 61 and 63 is via a manhole on private property.
- The daily commencement time of work for any approved development on the site should be 8am and not 7am, and weekend work should not be allowed.
- Request that permission be refused or at the very least to omit house no. 4 completely and apply specific technical conditions including public safety and impact on neighbours on each of the remaining elements and in particular to 169 Strand Road and its occupants in relation to the risks that the proposed development exposes their property and home to.

Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage Development Applications Unit (DAU):

The Department is of the view that this development has the potential to disturb the roosting habitat of a population of bat species listed under Annex IV of the EU Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC).

This potential impact would be caused by:

- Demolition of the existing two-storey flat roofed sections to the side and rear of the existing two-storey dwelling.
- Demolition of the sheds on the south of the site.

To mitigate this potential impact, it is recommended that the following conditions be attached to the grant of permission:

A bat survey of existing buildings requiring demolition on site is carried out by suitability qualified bat ecologist and according to Best Practice guidelines, prior to the commencement of any site works. If any potential bat roosts are identified, the Developer must apply for a Derogation License in accordance with Regulation 54(2) of the European Communities (Birds and Natural Habitats) Regulations, 2011.

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 local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Validity of application – discrepancies in submitted drawings
- Proposed site layout and impacts on adjoining residential properties
- Vehicular access and traffic safety
- Impacts on designated Z2 Conservation Area
- Structural concerns relating to 169 Strand Road and boundaries to both it and no. 92 St. Alban's Park.
- Demolition and construction impacts

8.2. *Principle of development*

The proposed development comprises the partial demolitions of existing flat roofed extensions to the side and rear of no. 169A Strand Road, demolish sheds to the south of the site with the construction of a new two storey rear extension to no. 169A Strand Road (one half of a semi-detached pair) and the construction of three new houses on the site. I consider that the proposed development meets with the strategic approach of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (herein referred to as the development plan) to create a consolidated city...where underutilised sites and buildings are actively repurposed and intensified (see section 5.0 of my report for further detail). I highlight to the Commission that the subject site is zoned Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Area) in the development plan, in which residential use is a permitted in principle use, and in this respect I am of the view that the considerations of character and amenity warrants a refinement of the appropriate density range for the site.

8.2.1. Policy BHA9 Conservation Areas of the development plan sets out that development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and

appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible. I shall address the appellant's concerns with respect to impact on the character and appearance of the area in section 8.6 of my report below.

8.2.2. Having regard to the planner's assessment of the submitted floor plans and my review of same I am of the view that the residential development accords with the minimum residential standards. The observation received from Nicholas Jones and Grace Dempsey raises concerns in respect to the actual layout of foul drainage for St. Alban's Park noting that foul drainage for houses 57, 59, 61 and 63 St. Alban's Park is via a manhole on private property. The foul drainage is proposed to connect to the existing 450mm diameter public combined sewer on the side road namely St. Albans Park, percolation areas for surface water in the rear gardens of each house, subject to percolation tests, and hard landscaped areas would be designed to achieve the standards set out for SUDS. I note that the Drainage Division of Dublin City Council have stated no objection to the development subject to conditions. Having regard to the above the principle of development is therefore acceptable, subject to the detailed considerations below.

8.2.3. Separately I note the submission received from the Development Applications Unit (DAU) of the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage in respect to the proposed development's potential to disturb roosting habitat of a population of bat species listed under Annex IV of the EU Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC). A bat survey condition is recommended in the event the Commission is minded to grant permission.

8.3. *Validity of application – discrepancies in submitted drawings*

8.3.1. The applicant is in agreement with both appellants that there are discrepancies in terms of the exact details and location of the red line boundaries as submitted in the application, as confirmed in the submitted First-Party Response to Third Party Appeal document and in respect to property 169 Strand Road specifically the letter from Colgan O'Reilly Architects to Daniel Collins and Maire O'Neill (appellants) attached as Appendix B to appeal by same.

8.3.2. Firstly, in respect to the discrepancies in the red line boundary between No. 169 and 169A Strand Road I am of the opinion that the scope of engagement with this issue is limited in this instance as the determination of title is not a matter for the Commission. Notwithstanding, having regard to the applicant's response and

drawing Figure 2.1 which indicates the submitted red line and the “potential ‘true’ property boundary line” in green I would concur that the discrepancy in the red line boundary would not alter the principal details of the proposed development as no works are proposed to the northern boundary or elevation at its interface with no. 169 Strand Road. In addition, no works are shown to the existing internal sub-division between no. 169 and 169A Strand Road. In addition, I highlight Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act further provides that if the applicant lacks title or owner’s consent to do works permitted by a planning permission, the permission does not give rise to an entitlement to carry out the development.

8.3.3. I note that previously these buildings formed one structure (a former convent building) and given the extent of proposed demolition the appellants concerns about the structural stability of the adjoining structure No. 169 Strand Road are reasonable. I shall address the structural concerns separately in section 8.7 of my report.

8.3.4. Secondly, in respect to the discrepancies referred to by the appellants in the delineation of the western rear boundary of the site, shared with no. 92 St. Alban’s Park, from my site visit I noted that this boundary has become heavily overgrown and it was unclear whether the line is straight or is not. I note the submitted site location map indicates that the western boundary is straight whilst the existing site plan drawing indicates a setback section ‘indentation’. Notwithstanding this discrepancy between the site location and existing site plan drawing I am of the view that this discrepancy is minor and would not alter the principal details of the proposed development. Furthermore, I am of the view that notwithstanding the indicated difference in separation of the proposed house no. 4 from the shared boundary I would agree with the applicants view that a mirroring approach with respect to set back from the boundary is acceptable. These minor discrepancies would in my view not be material to the outcome, please refer to section 8.4 and 8.7 of my report which addresses the proposed development proximity to the existing dwelling and boundary at no. 92 St. Alban’s Park.

8.4. *Proposed site layout and impacts on adjoining residential properties*

8.4.1. The proposed development to provide for a total of four dwelling units on the site (including the existing dwelling at 169A Strand Road). The density range is significantly less than what is supported in the outer suburbs (Table 1: Density

Ranges: Height Strategy Appendix 3 of the development plan), however, I am of the opinion that a reduced density is acceptable at this location taking into account the refinement provisions set out in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (herein referred to as Compact Settlement Guidelines) to appropriately respond to the designated Z2 Conservation Area and the constraints of this relatively small corner site onto the smaller scaled St. Alban's Park .

- 8.4.2. Noting that the stated site coverage proposed is 28.5% and a plot ratio of 0.62 to 1 is proposed I highlight that these are both below the indicative ranges contained in Table 2: Indicative Plot Ratio and Site Coverage for Conservation Areas (Density Ranges: Height Strategy Appendix 3 of the development plan). As such I do not agree that the proposed development represents overdevelopment of the subject site such that would result in a significant impact on the adjoining residential properties.

In this regard, following my site inspection and having reviewed the submitted site layout drawings which include:

- (i) a mirroring approach to that of No. 92 St. Alban's Park's set back from the western boundary allowing for a separation of between 2.2 and 2.3m gable to gable,
- (ii) separation distances of over 30m between the rear elevations which include a recessed balcony of the proposed new semi-detached pair (houses 2 & 3) to the western boundary and rear amenity space of no. 92 St. Alban's Park,
- (iii) the proposed house no. 4 rear elevation aligns with that of No. 92 at first floor level and the second-floor level is contained within the roof pitch with appropriately scaled rear dormer window which serves an ensuite bathroom,
- (iv) the proposed balcony at 2nd floor level to the side onto St. Alban's Park is positioned facing the blank side gable of 169B Strand Road and principally its front garden area which from my site visit whilst is an attractively landscaped area it is largely a car parking forecourt serving the house.

I am of the view that the proposed development would not result in significant increased overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing such that would detrimentally impact on the established residential amenities.

8.5. *Vehicular access and traffic safety*

- 8.5.1. From my site visit I note that the terraced properties along the northern side of St. Alban's Park have a car parking area to the front which would be similar to that currently proposed. The Transportation Planning Division have reported that each of the proposed driveways have sufficient space for a 3m by 5m parked car as per section 4.3.1 of Appendix 5 of the development plan. I consider that the proposed driveways, as revised by further information submitted on the 6 March 2026 would not result in a traffic hazards and danger to pedestrians.
- 8.5.2. In agreement with the appellants, I also note that the traffic calming hump is located in line with the proposed shared pedestrian and vehicular entrance to house no. 4 and opposite the gated entrance to the rear of 169B Strand Road. Dublin City Council's Transportation Planning Division have stated no objection to the proposed entrances to house no. 3 and 4. I am therefore of the opinion, taking into account the report from the Transportation Planning Division and given that the existing entrance at 169B Strand Road already provides egress/exit across the traffic calming hump, that it is acceptable to permit an additional access on the opposite side of St. Alban's Park and same would not result in a detrimental impact in terms of pedestrian/traffic safety.

8.6. *Impacts on designated Z2 Conservation Area*

- 8.6.1. As already set out the density, plot ratio and site coverage of the proposed development is less than what can be considered within conservation areas. As set out in section 8.4 I consider that in this instance such a reduced density, plot ratio and site coverage is acceptable in response to the constraints of the corner site turning onto the much smaller scaled St. Alban's Park and also retaining an appropriately sized garden to the existing dwelling 169A Strand Road to ensure the character of same is not detrimentally impacted upon.
- 8.6.2. The applicant in response to the appeal have submitted a compliance statement (please see Table 2.2) to evidence how the proposed development meets with the specific guidance/requirements for new development within a designated conservation area. I would generally agree with the assessment provided within

Table 2.2. I note that in terms of scale, height and massing the applicant states that the heights have been limited to two to three storeys to align with heights in the area. It is put forward by the applicant that the proposed house no. 4 whilst higher than the terraced dwellings on the northern side of St. Alban's Park, its location warrants a gradual increase of height from west to east due to the position of the site at the junction of Strand Road and St. Alban's Park. It is acknowledged by the applicant in Table 2.2 that the development would require the removal of several established trees, however, that this is balanced against the policy objective to make more efficient and effective use of zoned land and that compensatory planting can be provided as part of a landscape plan to be agreed with the planning authority.

- 8.6.3. On balance, I would agree with the applicant that the proposed development has been designed to be cognisant of the existing scale, building heights and massing of the surrounding context of both Strand Road and St. Alban's Park. As such the proposed development is consistent with the Z2 zoning objective. In the event the Commission is minded to grant permission a condition could be attached to require a landscape plan be provided with compensatory planting for the written agreement of the planning authority.

8.7. *Structural concerns relating to 169 Strand Road and boundaries to both it and no. 92 St. Alban's Park.*

- 8.7.1. As above it is accepted that the structural stability concerns of the property owners no. 169 Strand Road are entirely understandable given their interdependency on 169A Strand Road (originally constructed as one structure). Whilst usually the issue of compliance with Building Regulations would be evaluated under a separate legal code and thus need not generally concern the Commission for the purposes of this appeal, I note that the applicant and appellants Daniel Collins and Marie O'Neill have engaged directly on this matter (please refer to Architects letter in Appendix B of submitted appeal Daniel Collins and Marie O'Neill and first party appeal response).

Having regard to the applicant's commitment to undertake at their own cost, subject to the consent of and in agreement with the owners of No. 169 Strand Road, pre and post construction surveys and that they would bear the cost of remedying any material demolition or construction related impacts that in the event the Commission is minded to grant permission a conditions could be attached for these details to be formalised and agreed in writing with the planning authority.

I note that appellants Helen Lambert and John Murray have requested the inclusion of adequate measures to secure the structural stability of the boundary wall within a demolition and construction management plan to be agreed with the planning authority. I highlight that drawing 'Site plan and ground floor plan of the proposed houses Rev. A Drawing no. 1757-104' confirms in its annotation that the existing boundary walls along the western boundary are to be retained and protected for the duration of the construction phase and repaired as required in agreement with the owners of no. 92 St. Alban's Park. In the event the Commission is minded to grant permission this matter can be addressed by way of condition.

8.8. *Demolition and construction impacts.*

- 8.8.1. Concerns with respect to demolition and construction stages include noise impacts, dust and increased traffic movements are raised. In response the applicant highlights the five no. conditions attached by the planning authority which addresses the appellants concerns with respect to hours of work, delivery and collection protocols, traffic management, waste management and health and safety. The observation/submission received in respect to the appeal from Nicholas Jones and Grace Dempsey highlight that the ground conditions that prevail in the area may require piling for some or all of the foundations of the houses. The observers raised concerns in respect to structural damage from same to adjoining walls. Section 8.7 of my report addresses this issue. I note that the observers have concerns regarding noise impacts from potential piling and the demolition/construction works and request that the daily commencement time of work should be restricted to 8am.
- 8.8.2. I note that the construction period is planned to be 18 months in duration and consider that to restrict the site commencement to 8am may potentially extend the project timeline. I am of the view that subject to similar conditions to that of the planning authority being attached the proposed development would not result in significant impacts with respect to noise, dust and increased traffic movements to warrant a refusal of permission.

9.0 **Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening**

- 9.1. Please also refer to Appendix 3. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information

considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) and South Dublin Bay SAC (000210) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

9.2. This determination is based on:

- Nature of works.
- Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.
- The planning authority's screening for appropriate assessment.

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.

10.2. 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.

10.3. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive.

10.4. 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 should be granted, subject to conditions, for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the subject site's inner suburb location within Dublin City South and the nature and scale of existing structures proposed to be demolished the proposed development, subject to condition, would not adversely impact on the adjoining residential amenities, would not adversely impact on the established character and visual amenities of the Z2 zoned Residential Neighbourhood (Conservation Area), would not give rise to traffic hazard and in accordance with policy SC8 of the Dublin City Development Plan makes effective use of underutilised land. The proposed development, is therefore, in accordance 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 6 day of March 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 existing front boundary railings and granite plinth shall be retained with exception for the section required to be removed to accommodate the proposed new pedestrian entrance gate (proposed entrance no. 1 as shown on drawing '*Site plan & ground floor plan of proposed houses*' Rev A) at 169A Strand Road.

Reason: In the interest of the protection of architectural heritage and character.

3. Prior to the commencement of any site works a bat survey of existing buildings requiring demolition on site shall be carried out by suitability

qualified bat ecologist and according to best practice guidelines. The bat survey shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the planning authority. If any potential bat roosts are identified, the developer must apply for a Derogation License in accordance with Regulation 54(2) of the European Communities (Birds and Natural Habitats) Regulations, 2011.

Reason: For the protection of bats, a protected species.

4. (a) Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall undertake pre-construction condition surveys of no. 169 Strand Road and the boundaries to the north with no. 169 Strand Road and to the west with No. 92 St. Alban's Park by a suitably qualified structural engineer were consented to by the owners/occupiers.

(b) Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall, taking into account the condition surveys as per (a) above, submit a Construction Methodology Report with the planning authority for their written agreement.

(c) Upon completion of construction a similar survey shall be carried out and where material demolition or construction related impacts arise the developer shall bear the cost of remedying the matter. The planning authority shall be furnished with a copy of the post construction survey.

Reason: In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

5. The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This scheme shall include the following:

a) A plan to scale of not less than [1:500] showing –

(i) Existing trees, shrubs, specifying which are proposed for retention as features of the site landscaping,

(ii) The measures to be put in place for the protection of these landscape features during the construction period,

(iii) The species, variety, number, size and locations of all proposed compensatory additional trees and shrubs which shall comprise predominantly native species such as mountain ash, birch, willow, sycamore,

pine, oak, hawthorn, holly, hazel, beech or alder [which shall not include prunus species],

(iv) Details of screen planting which shall not include cupressocyparis x leylandii.

(b) Specifications for mounding, levelling, cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment.

(c) A timescale for implementation including details of phasing.

All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

6. The developer shall comply with the following transport requirements of the planning authority:

a) The driveway entrance along Strand Road shall be a maximum 4m in width and the driveway entrances onto St. Alban's Park shall be a maximum of 3 m in width. None of the entrances shall have outward opening gates.

b) Footpath and kerb to be dished and new entrance provided to the requirements of the Area Engineer, Roads Maintenance Division.

c) All costs incurred by Dublin City Council, including any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development, shall be at the expense of the developer.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and traffic safety.

7. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health

8. 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.

9. Proposals for a naming and numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all house numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. The proposed name(s) shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority. No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name(s) of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name(s).

Reason: In the interest of urban legibility and to ensure the use of locally appropriate placenames for new residential areas.

10. A Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The CEMP shall include but not be limited to details of site security fencing and hoardings, construction phase controls for dust, noise and vibration, waste management, protection of soils, groundwaters, and surface waters, site housekeeping, emergency response planning, site environmental policy, and project roles and responsibilities.

Reason: In the interest of environmental protection, residential amenities, public health and safety.

11. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1800 Mondays to Friday 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.

12. The attic space hereby approved shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with the current building regulations.

Reason: To provide for an adequate standard of development.

13. 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.

14. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion of any part of the development. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion of the development.

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.

Claire McVeigh
Planning Inspector

31 July 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501256-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	Alterations to existing dwelling comprising of the demolition of sections to the side and rear and construction of a new extension, demolish sheds and construct 3 no. 3 storey dwellings and associated works.
Development Address	169A, Strand Road, Dublin 4, D04 E1T6
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	Not applicable
☒ 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	
☒ 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)	Class 10. Infrastructure projects (b) (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.
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: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501256-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	Alterations to existing dwelling comprising of the demolition of sections to the side and rear and construction of a new extension, demolish sheds and construct 3 no. 3 storey dwellings and associated works.
Development Address	169A, Strand Road, Dublin 4, D04 E1T6
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 (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, requires minor 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 environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature	The subject site is located within the inner suburbs of Dublin City and comprises an already developed and serviced site. The subject site is not located in or immediately adjacent to ecologically sensitive sites. It is considered that, having regard to the nature and scale of the development, there is no real likelihood of significant effect on other significant environmental sensitivities in the area.

reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	The size of the proposed development is notably below the mandatory thresholds in respect of a Class 10 Infrastructure Projects of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 as amended. There is no real likelihood of significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects in the adjoining area. 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	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	N/A
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	N/A

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 3: Standard AA Screening Determination

Test for likely significant effects

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Case Reference Number: PL-501256-DS-26	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	Alterations to existing dwelling comprising of the demolition of sections to the side and rear and construction of a new extension, demolish sheds and construct 3 no. 3 storey dwellings and associated works. Please refer to section 2.0 of my report.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	The subject site, stated site area 0.142ha, is located at 169A, Strand Road, Dublin 4, D04 E1T6. The nearest surface water body is the Elm Park stream (IE_EA_09B130400) located 643m south of the site. The stream flows in an easterly direction for 90m before discharging in the Irish Sea at Merrion Strand. The site is located in close proximity to Dublin Bay (approximately 40m) which contains both the South Dublin Bay Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) [Site Code 000210], and the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Areas (SPA) [Site Code 004024].
Screening report	Y/ N
Natura Impact Statement	Y/ N

Relevant submissions	None relevant to the designated SAC/SPA			
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
A source-pathway-receptor model has been used to screen the potential effects on European Sites in the submitted Screening for Appropriate Assessment report as prepared by <i>O'Connor Sutton Cronin & Associates</i> . I would concur with their determination of the Zone of Influence for the project due to the relatively small scale of the project and the distance to the nearest hydrological feature.				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³ Y/N
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024)	South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA National Parks & Wildlife Service (9 March 2015) Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046] Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130] Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) [A137] Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141] Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143] Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144] Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149] Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157] Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162] Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179]	40m	Indirect disturbance due to noise/vibrations and surface water run-off.	Y

	Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) [A192] Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193] Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]			
South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 00210)	https://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/sac/000210 (24 April 2026) Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]	40m	Indirect surface water run off	Y

¹ Summary description / **cross reference to NPWS website** is acceptable at this stage in the report

² Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species

³ if no connections: N

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

[From the AA Screening Report or the Inspector's own assessment if no Screening Report submitted, complete the following table where European sites need further consideration taking the following into account:

- (a) Identify potential direct or indirect impacts (if any) arising from the project alone that could have an effect on the European Site(s) taking into account the size and scale of the proposed development and all relevant stages of the project (See Appendix 9 in Advice note 1A).
- (b) Are there any design or standard practice measures proposed that would reduce the risk of impacts to surface water, wastewater etc. that would be implemented regardless of proximity to a European Site?

- (c) Identify possible significant effects on the European sites in view of the conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other plans and projects)

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 1: South Dubin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024)	Direct: There would be no direct effects as the project footprint is located entirely outside the designated site. Indirect Negative impacts (temporary) on surface water/water quality due to construction related emissions including increased sedimentary and construction related pollution.	None Indirect The submitted Screening for Appropriate Assessment Report notes that “<i>given the intervening distance and the nature and scale of the proposed development, no potential pathway for indirect effects on the terrestrial SCI habitats of the SPA exists. The proposed site is located outside the hydrological sub-catchment of the SPA and no hydrological connectivity exists between the SPA and the proposed development works. There is therefore no potential pathway for significant effects on the aquatic dependent SCI habitat and species of the SPA. No other potential pathway for significant effect on this SPA exists</i>”. I would concur with this consideration

		of potential for significant effects.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y/N	
	If no, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 2: South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210)	Direct: No direct effects as the project footprint is located entirely outside the designated site. There will be no land take or possibility of encroachment into the SAC as part of the construction or operational phases of the project. Indirect: Negative impacts (temporary) on surface water/water quality due to construction related emissions including increased sedimentary and construction related pollution.	None Indirect: As stated in the Screening for Appropriate Assessment Report “<i>Given the intervening distance and the nature and scale of the proposed development, no potential pathway for indirect effects on the terrestrial QI habitats of the SAC exists. The proposed site is located outside the hydrological sub-catchment of the SAC and no hydrological connectivity exists between the SAC and the proposed development works</i>”.

		I would concur with the finding of the Screening for AA that there is, therefore, no potential pathway for significant effects on the aquatic dependent QI habitat and species of the SAC. No other potential pathway for significant effect on this SAC exists.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y/N	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
*Where a restore objective applies it is necessary to consider whether the project might compromise the objective of restoration or make restoration more difficult.		
Step 4: Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site		
I conclude that the proposed development alone would not result in likely significant effects on South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) and South Dublin Bay SAC (000210). The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project. No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.		

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) and South Dublin Bay SAC (000210) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- Nature of works
- Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections
- The planning authority's screening for appropriate assessment.