



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501258-GC-26

Development	Permission for development to partially demolish a rear ground-floor utility and replace it with the construction of an extension.
Location	No 15 Gleann Na Coille, Barna Road, Galway
Planning Authority	Galway City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560275
Applicant(s)	Noelle and Des Hogan Chambers
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Noelle and Des Hogan Chambers
Observer(s)	Eugene O'Connor & Jacqui McGovern Sean and Jean Purtill Martin & Maeve Commins Brian & Kirstian Alpin Greaney

Date of Site Inspection

13th July 2026

Inspector

Emma Gosnell

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
4.0 Planning History.....	9
5.0 Policy Context.....	10
6.0 Natural Heritage Designations	12
7.0 EIA Screening.....	13
8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening	13
9.0 The Appeal	13
10.0 Assessment.....	17
11.0 Recommendation	30
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	30
13.0 Conditions	31
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening and Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination	
Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.043ha appeal site is located at No. 15 Gleann Na Coille, Barna Way and forms part of a residential estate located in the outer western suburbs of Galway city, c. 5km from the city centre.
- 1.2. The site forms part of the Gleann Na Coille estate (which is characterised by detached dwellings of uniform design) which is accessed from the Barna Road (R336) to its south. The site is adjoined to the north-west by No. 16 Gleann Na Coille and to the south-east by No. 14 Gleann Na Coille. The rear garden of No. 51 Gleann Na Coille abuts the site to its north-east and there is a linear public green area lying to its west on the opposite side of the cul-de-sac.
- 1.3. The site comprises of a detached dormer 4-bed dwelling (c. 182 sq.m) in an L-shaped arrangement with front and rear gardens and in-curtilage parking. The architectural style of the dwelling is mock tudor and it has a hipped roof (with max. ridge height of c. 7.5m) featuring a projecting front apex element (with oriel-type window) and a front dormer window with pitched roof. There is a small single storey extension with pitched roof to the rear (north-west side of dwelling), with the rear garden being enclosed by blockwork boundary walls, with mature trees and planting along its rear boundary. There is also a detached standalone shed and oil tank positioned on the north-west side of the rear garden. The front garden is relatively enclosed by a boundary wall and vegetation which obscure views of the dwelling from the public road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development for which permission is sought comprises:
 - (i) the partial demolition of an original rear ground-floor utility extension (c. 9.3 sq.m) and the demolition of the existing shed (c. 9.4sq.m);
 - (ii) the construction of a single storey rear extension (c. 42.7 sq.m) which would extend c. 7m from the rear building line and feature an undulating pitched roof, with rooflight, rising to a maximum of c. 5m in height;
 - (iii) front elevation modifications to the first-floor bedroom and ground-floor family room comprising of creation of a double-height bay window;

(iv) provision of a porch extension;

(v) alterations to existing rear dormer windows increasing their size and extent of projection; and,

(vi) all related modifications to the internal layout of the house and grounds, incl. provision of storage (c. 4.85sq.m) along rear garden wall.

2.2. Further Information (FI) stage changes comprised of the following design modifications:

- Replacement of proposed double height front bay window extension with a larger single storey front extension to family room featuring a rooflight (with this and porch extension reading as one element) and replacement of existing front dormer window to bedroom 3 with a larger box dormer.
- Slight c. 2sq.m reduction in scale/ footprint of proposed rear extension and change in the height and massing of its roof profile (max. height reduced by c. 0.6m to c. 4.4m).
- Provision of a c. 19sq.m patio area to front of house to act as part of proposed private amenity space.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission refused on 01/04/2026 for 3 no. reasons as follows:

1. *The proposed rear extension to the dwelling, would be contrary to the Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029, Section 11.3.1 (I) Residential Extensions, which requires that “The design and layout of extensions to houses should complement the character and form of the existing building, having regard to its context and adjacent residential amenities”, as the scale, height and length of the extension would cast a significant shadow over the adjacent rear garden and property to the north, would be an overbearing and obtrusive feature which would adversely impact upon the residential amenities of adjacent properties abutting this rear garden.*

2. *The proposed front dormer window located in this established mature housing development dwelling would be a prominent negative visual feature within an*

established housing estate area and would be considered to be out of character with the established residential area, adversely impact upon the residential amenities of the area and contrary to the policies of the Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029, Section 11.3.1 (1).

3. The Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023, Section 11.3.1(c) requires the provision of an adequate area of private amenity space for such developments, taking consideration the size, scale and overall extent of the extension proposed it is considered that there would be insufficient useable functional private amenity open space retained on site, due to the size and scale of the extension, and would be contrary to the requirements of the development plan standards, and if permitted would seriously injure residential amenities.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

2 no. planning reports formed the basis of the planning authority's assessment:

Planner's Report (dated 09/10/2025) - Initial Application Stage

Points of note in the report include:

- **Demolition** – no objection to demolition of existing utility/ rear extension.
- **Rear Extension Design** – its scale/ height and proximity to boundaries have potential to give rise to negative impacts on neighbouring properties. **Further Information Recommended.**
- **Front Extension Design** – contemporary design and double height extension of existing front dormer window (to provide a bay window) would be out of character with existing dwelling and character of estate. **Further Information Recommended.**
- **Porch Extension** – proposal for a single storey porch extension is acceptable.
- **Rear Dormer Modifications** – replacement of existing dormer windows with larger box dormer windows would be acceptable in design terms however PA concerned that they may give rise to unacceptable overlooking. **Further Information Recommended.**

- **Private Open Space** – proposal would leave 78sq.m of private open space which is below development plan standard of 50% of the GFA (191.4 sq.m) of existing house. **Further Information Recommended.**
- **EIA and AA Screening** – due to its limited nature and scale and location in an established property within an existing residential estate and in a built-up, serviced area which is not environmentally sensitive, the proposal not likely to have a significant effect on European site. For the same reasons the need for environmental impact assessment can be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

A request for Further Information (FI) issued on 28/10/2025 in relation to 3 no. items.

The applicant's response to the FI request was received on 23/12/2025 and consisted of revised plans.

The response was determined to be significant and was readvertised.

Planner's Report (dated 24/03/2026) – Significant Further Information Stage

Points of note in the report include:

- **FI Item 1 (Private Open Space)** – size, scale and mass of rear extension still excessive and has the potential to adversely impact on neighbouring properties. **Refusal Recommended.**
- **FI Item 2 (First Floor Front Extension)** – replacement contemporary dormer window design is out of character with adjoining properties. **Refusal Recommended.**
- **FI Item 3 (Rear Dormer Windows)** – distances between proposed rear dormer windows and opposing boundaries and windows is acceptable.

Report concluded by recommending that permission be refused as per Section 3.1.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Department (06/10/2025) – no objection subject to standard conditions in respect to the management of surface water on site.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Initial Application Stage

6 no. third party submissions were received from neighbouring residents: Sean Ryan, Gene O'Connor and Jacqui McGovern, Jean and Sean Purthill, Maeve and Martin Commins, Kirstian Alpin and Brian Greaney, and Liam Quirke.

These raised the following issues:

- Design
- Overdevelopment
- Visual Impact and Incongruity
- Overbearance
- Overshadowing/ Loss of Light
- Privacy
- Impact on Shared Boundaries
- Light and Noise Pollution
- Procedural Issues
- Drawing Inaccuracies and Omissions
- Inadequate Private Open Space
- Precedent
- Planning History
- Property Values

Significant Further Information Stage

5 no. third party submissions were received from neighbouring residents: Sean and Yvette Ryan, Gene O'Connor and Jacqui McGovern, Jean and Sean Purthill, Maeve and Martin Commins, Kirstian Alpin and Brian Greaney.

These raised the same issues as raised at application stage in addition to new matters relating to right to light and materials and finishes.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

P.A. Ref. 22/148 – application by Des Chambers & Noelle Hogan Chambers for permission for development which will consist of construction of a single storey extension to the rear of existing dwelling house, and also modifications to the front elevation and an extension to the front of dwelling house, FI request (re: excessive scale of rear extension, rear dormer modifications and drawing omissions) not responded to in time. Application deemed **withdrawn** on 10/02/2023.

P.A. Ref. 08/140 – application by Des & Noelle Chambers for development to consist of renovations to the existing house on the site, comprising: (1) Alterations to gables and roofline removing hipped elements. (2) to front the replacement and enlargement of dormer window and first floor bedroom window, addition of rooflight, bay window, balcony and canopy and rendering of existing brick finish (3) At rear the demolition of existing utility room and shed and construction of 2 storey extension and replacement shed (4) Erection of 1.9m high timber clad gates to driveway entrance. **Refused** permission on 24/04/2008 for 4 no. reasons relating to: design of front facade, height & design of front gate, unacceptable separation distance to rear giving rise to overlooking, and inadequate private amenity space remaining.

4.2. Neighbouring Sites

No. 16 Gleann Na Coille

P.A. Ref. 20/121 – application to construct a single storey extension to the front of house and to use part of this house as a self-contained unit, **granted** permission on 01/07/2020 subject to 4 no. standard conditions.

No. 9 Gleann Na Coille

P.A. Ref. 12/45 – application for 1) Demolition of the existing rear utility and garden shed. 2) Alteration and additions to the existing dwelling house comprising of the provision of a new flat roof garden shed to the rear 2.9m high and a storey and a half rear extension (projects c. 4m from rear elevation and is not full width) ridge height 6.4m with 4 no velux roof windows to the south-east, alterations include the provision of a bin store and 2 No. velux roof windows to the front, **granted** permission on 01/05/2012 subject to 6 no. standard conditions.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 National Policy

Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (First Revision, April 2025)

- NPO44 (support the provision of lifetime adaptable homes that can accommodate the changing needs of a household over time).
- NPO45 (increase residential density through infill development, increased height and more compact forms of development).

Climate Action Plan (2024 & 2025) and National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2023-2030 – Outcome 2A protection of designated areas and protected species.

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

SPPR2 and Table 5.1 (Minimum Private Open Space Standards for Houses): 50sq.m in respect of a 4+ bed house.

Section 5.3.1 and SPPR 1 (Separation Distances): When considering a planning application for residential development, a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units and apartment units, above ground floor level shall be maintained.

Section 5.3.7 (Daylight): In drawing conclusions in relation to daylight performance, planning authorities must weigh up the overall quality of the design and layout of the scheme and the measures proposed to maximise daylight provision, against the location of the site and the general presumption in favour of increased scales of urban residential development. Poor performance may arise due to design constraints associated with the site or location and there is a need to balance that assessment against the desirability of achieving wider planning objectives. Such objectives might include securing comprehensive urban regeneration and or an effective urban design and streetscape solution.

Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (BRE, 2022).

Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007) – Section 7.9 (Conditions requiring matters to be agreed).

5.2 Regional Policy

5.3 Development Plan

The Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029 (GCDP) is the operative plan for the area.

The site is zoned 'R-Residential' with the objective 'to provide for residential development and for associated support development, which will ensure the protection of existing residential amenity and will contribute to sustainable residential neighbourhoods'.

The site on account of its location comes within the 'Outer Suburbs' of Galway City for development management purposes and is governed by Section 11.3.1 of the GCDP.

Policy 3.4 Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Outer Suburbs – facilitate consolidation of existing residential development and densification where appropriate. Ensure design and layout of residential development has regard to adjoining developments.

Extensions

Section 11.3.1(l) Residential Extensions: The design and layout of extensions to houses should complement the character and form of the existing building, having regard to its context and adjacent residential amenities.

Private Open Space

Section 11.3.1(c) Amenity Open Space: Provision in Residential Developments - Private Open Space: Private open space (areas generally not overlooked from a public road) exclusive of car spaces shall be provided at a rate of not less than 50% of the gross floor area of the residential unit... The scale of proposed extensions shall ensure that an adequate level of private open space is retained on site... Consideration can be given to domestic extensions that result in less than the development plan standard of 50% of the GFA of the residential unit, where adequate level of private open space is retained on site, or on very constrained sites such as those located in the city centre.

Residential Amenity

Section 11.3.1(d) Overlooking – Residential units shall generally not directly overlook private open space or land with development potential from above ground floor level

by less than 11 metres minimum. In the case of developments exceeding 2 storeys in height a greater distance than 11 metres may be required, depending on the specific site characteristics.

Section 11.3.1(e) Daylight – All buildings should receive adequate daylight and sunlight. All habitable rooms must be naturally ventilated and lit and living rooms and bedrooms shall not be lit solely by roof lights. Daylight sunlight and/or overshadowing assessment, utilising best practice tools, may be required to assess the impact of development on the amenity of adjoining properties. The requirement for such assessments will be agreed with the planning authority prior to planning application. In this regard, development shall be guided by the quantitative performance approaches and recommendations under the ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight’ (2nd edition): A Guideline to Good Practice (BRE 2011) and BS 8206-2: 2008 – ‘Lighting for Buildings – Part 2: Code of Practice for Daylighting’ or any updated guidance.

Section 11.3.1(f) Distance Between Dwellings for New Residential Development – distance between side gables and site boundaries shall generally be a minimum of 1.5m.

Other

Policy 8.7 Urban Design and Placemaking – 4. Encourage innovation in architecture and promote energy efficiency and green design.

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within or adjoining a European Site.

The following European sites are located within proximity to the site:

European Site	Site Code	Distance
Galway Bay Complex SAC	000268	c. 130m
Inner Galway Bay SPA	004301	c. 350m
The Lough Corrib SPA	004042	c. 5km
Lough Corrib SAC	000297	c. 5km

The following proposed Natural Heritage Area is also located in proximity to site:

- Galway Bay Complex pNHA (Site Code 000268) – c. 200m away.

7.0 EIA Screening

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

8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

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.

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.

9.0 The Appeal

9.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal submission was received on 27/04/2026 and seeks to address the PA's reasons for refusal. The grounds of appeal (GOA) are as follows:

General

- *Principle* – proposed extensions and modifications are in keeping with residential character of existing dwelling/ estate and the residential zoning & servicing of area.
- *Local Precedent* – rear & front extensions and elevational modifications permitted at other properties within same estate or erected as exempted development. Attention is drawn to scale and siting of rear extension at No. 13 Gleann Na Coille.
- *Character* – introduction of modern residential building designs and finishes in same estate has given rise to a mixed-visual character – accommodates proposal.
- *Design* – No.15 already differs from No's 16 & 17 in terms of its front façade design and materiality and in the size and design of its first-floor front window (oriel type).
- *Constraints* – no heritage or environmental constraints apply to the development.

Refusal Reason No. 1 – Design and Impact of Rear Extension

- Proposed extension is of high-quality design and complements main dwelling.
- Scale, height and length of extension reduced at FI stage.
- 4.4m roof height is significantly below roof height permitted at No. 9 Gleann Na Coille (6.4m) and the bulk/ massing of the extension is modulated (height drops to 3.5m).
- Floor area is in keeping with other rear extensions in estate and is smaller than rear extension at No. 13 Gleann Na Coille.
- Extension is setback further from its site boundaries than the existing rear extensions at No's 13 and 25 Gleann Na Coille.
- Side-to-side separation distances under Section 11.3.1(f) relate to new development and not to existing residential development.
- Siting of single storey extension relative to property boundaries is appropriate.
- Siting of extension accords with standards and is in-keeping with existing pattern of development in Gleann Na Coille estate.
- Proposed design is not overbearing or visually obtrusive and would not adversely affect amenities of neighbouring properties.
- Shadows studies submitted with the GOA illustrate that proposal only gives rise to minimal additional overshadowing of No's 14 and 16 Gleann Na Coille with its

impact being less than that of a traditional 40sq.m extension or the existing larger/taller rear extensions at No's 6 and 13 Gleann Na Coille.

- Sufficient private amenity and circulation space will remain to rear of house.

Refusal Reason No. 2 – Design of Front Dormer Window

- Modifications at front of house are not overly dominant and existing front gable and dormer roof of house remain primary visual elements on the front elevation.
- Proposed revisions (ground floor extensions to porch and living room and first floor dormer) are in-keeping with existing front elevational character of house & estate.
- Recent modifications to front elevations undertaken at No's 6, 12 and 16 Gleann Na Coille providing for front and side conservatories and box-type single storey front extension with plastered finish.
- Estate exhibits range of window types, material finishes and added building elements – proposed front box dormer would not be out of character with same.
- Box former will complement proposed and No. 16's ground floor front extension.
- Proposed box dormer will provide additional daylight and floorspace to bedroom.
- Appellant willing to redesign box dormer by condition.

Refusal Reason No. 3 – Private Open Space

- 122.5sq.m of private open space proposed at FI stage comprising 97sq.m in rear garden and 25.5sq.m front patio area in front garden
- Private amenity space accounts for 57% of house GFA – complies with 11.3.1(c) and exceeds minimum 50sq.m private open space requirement under SPPR2.
- Front garden has a more favourable aspect than rear garden and is well screened.

Other

- Rear dormer windows setback c. 12.4m from rear property boundary with a separation distance of over 22m between them and rear elevation of No. 51 Gleann Na Coille – complies with requirements of SPPR1 and 11.3.1(d). Level difference (c. 0.56m) between the properties reduces potential for overlooking.

- Commission's attention is draw to letter of support from resident of No. 16 Gleann Na Coille and related correspondence from GCC (all provided as part of GOA).

The appeal is accompanied by the following enclosures:

- Letter from Mary Broderick dated 14/10/2025 (neighbouring resident).
- Undated Council Response to Mary Broderick letter of 14/10/2025.
- Copies of the architectural drawings submitted in response to FI request.
- Comparative Daylight and Shadow Study of Proposal (April 2026).

9.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

9.3. Observations

4 no. observations on the appeal were received from neighbouring residents: Eugene O'Connor & Jacqui McGovern (17/05/2026), Sean and Jean Purtill (19/05/2026), Martin & Maeve Commins (20/05/2026) and Brian & Kirstian Alpin Greaney (24/05/2026). These raised the following issues:

- Procedural issue – appeal does not address refusal reasons.
- Inaccuracies/ omissions in submitted information re: site area, levels, existing boundaries, representation of neighbouring properties (no's 14 and 17) and drawing dimensions and calculations.
- Adverse impacts on residential amenity by way of overlooking, overshadowing, overberance, visual obtrusion light and noise pollution.
- Shortfall in private amenity space and inclusion of garden to front onto public road.
- Material contravention of development plan policy on residential extensions and private amenity space – Sections 11.3.1(c) and 11.3.1(l).
- Unsuitable scale, visual character and materials and finishes – not in keeping with architectural character of estate.
- Site specific planning history and local planning precedent.
- Lack of engagement with neighbours.

Brian & Kirstian Alpin Greaney, in their observation received 24/05/2026, raise specific concerns regarding the height and proximity of the proposed rear extension to their property and seek to highlight likely impacts with regard to overlooking, noise and light pollution.

Martin & Maeve Commins, in their observation of 20/05/2026, raise a specific concern regarding the increase in size and scale of glazing to the existing rear dormer windows – with regard to overlooking of adjoining properties, in addition to raising concerns as to the planning status of the existing rear dormer windows. They also outline specific concerns regarding overshadowing study submitted with the GOA on the basis that it does not take into account site levels relative to No. 14. The observers also seek to draw the Commission's attention to likely internal daylight impacts (to kitchen & dining room) and light pollution arising from the height and proximity of the proposed rear extension. They also raise a further issue with regard to the proposed side bathroom window facing No.14's kitchen.

Sean and Jean Purtill, in their observation of 19/05/2026, raise a specific concern regarding the lack of information on the proposed wall storage element of the proposal and the impact of this structure on remaining garden space. The observer's also question the accuracy of the submitted shadow study as it relates to their property on June 21st – arguing that it is normally fully sunlit.

Eugene O'Connor & Jacqui McGovern, in their observation received 17/05/2026, outline concerns regarding loss of sunlight to their rear garden and related impacts on their enjoyment of same.

9.4. Further Responses

None received.

10.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, having inspected the site and, having regard to the relevant local, regional

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

- Principle of Development
- Front Modifications
- Rear Extension
- Private Amenity Space
- Other

10.1. Principle of Development

- 10.1.1. The appeal site is subject to zoning objective 'R-Residential' with an objective 'to provide for residential development and for associated support development, which will ensure the protection of existing residential amenity and will contribute to sustainable residential neighbourhoods'. 'Residential' is identified as a use which is compatible with and contributes to the 'R' zoning objective.
- 10.1.2. The site is also located in the outer suburbs of Galway city where Policy 3.4 (Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Outer Suburbs) seeks to facilitate consolidation and densification of existing residential development.
- 10.1.3. Therefore, having regard to the specific zoning objective which applies to the lands, I consider the proposal for extensions and modifications to an existing residential dwelling to be acceptable in principle under the aforementioned terms of the development plan subject to the detailed considerations below.

10.2. Front Modifications

- 10.2.1. The subject dwelling currently features a gabled dormer window on the east side of its roof plane, with the design and scale of this feature being in-keeping with that of neighbouring properties on the road (with the exception of the colour of the panelling on its gable).
- 10.2.2. The appellant proposes to replace the existing front dormer with a much larger aluminium frame flat-roofed, box-type dormer window and to provide for a new rooflight to its immediate west in order to increase floorspace and daylight to bedroom no. 4.

- 10.2.3. Refusal reason no. 2 relates to the contemporary design and visual prominence of the proposed front dormer window and its non-compliance with Section 11.3.1(l) of the development plan.
- 10.2.4. The grounds of appeal contend that the proposed dormer is not overly dominant and that it is in-keeping with the character of the dwelling's front elevation and with the varied architectural character evident in the wider estate. This view is strongly disputed by observers to the appeal.
- 10.2.5. Having regard to my site inspection, whilst I do not have an issue in principle with the proposal to increase the size of the existing dormer, I consider that its design, scale and extent of projection, cumulatively, renders it out of character with adjoining properties. I am also of the opinion that its siting in the front roof plane and resulting high visibility is likely to exacerbate its visual incongruity.
- 10.2.6. However, I do note the rationale for the provision of a revised dormer window at this location, the fact that bedroom 4 is not daylit by any other means and the fact that the appellant has stated that they are willing to revise the design of the dormer by condition. Therefore, in this specific instance I consider a refusal of permission for a revised dormer is not warranted and I consider that the matter of its context appropriate design is capable of being dealt with by amending condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

10.3. Rear Extension

- 10.3.1. The subject property currently features a relatively small single storey rear extension with a pitched roof on its north-west side together with a single storey shed of solid construction to the immediate north of same. It is proposed that these structures be demolished to make way for a single storey rear extension of c. 40.7sq.m. whose general form, materials and finishes would be in-keeping with that of the main house.
- 10.3.2. The PA's first reason for refusal related to the design and scale of the proposed rear extension and its potential to give rise to adverse impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property to the north (No. 51) by way of overshadowing, overbearance and visual intrusion. These concerns were also at the centre of the observations received on the appeal from neighbouring residents on all sides, with

these also raising the additional issues of overlooking, daylight impact, noise and light pollution and impact on property values.

- 10.3.3. In seeking to justify the design and scale of the proposed extension, the GOA draw attention to the scale and siting of an existing rear extension at No. 13 Gleann Na Coille. A record of planning permission for this extension could not be located on the Council's planning register and it is not therefore clear whether it has the benefit of same.

Overbearance/ Visual Intrusion

- 10.3.4. Observers consider that the extension constitutes the overdevelopment of the rear of the property and they raise concerns regarding its visual intrusion and overbearance on neighbouring properties. I note that the scale and the height of the extension was somewhat reduced at FI stage as detailed in Section 2.2 of this report.
- 10.3.5. The siting of the proposed extension relative to adjoining properties is an important consideration and in this regard I draw the Commission's attention to my discussion of in Section 10.3.11 of this Inspector's Report.
- 10.3.6. I acknowledge that the proposed extension, which extends c. 7m from the main rear elevation, will be partially visible from and will give rise to a change in the visual character to the rear of neighbouring properties. For example, the proposed extension would be c. 3.5m in height where it adjoins No. 16 and would rise to a max. height of c. 4.4m where it adjoins No. 14.
- 10.3.7. I consider that, given its close proximity to the north-west boundary, a reasonable effort has been made to step the extension down in height at this location and to modulate its roof profile to further reduce its massing. Whilst I would have some concerns about the overbearance on No. 16 arising from its extent of projection when coupled with its height and proximity to the shared boundary, I would also note that, theoretically, a single storey extension of 40sq.m (rear extension of 40.7sq.m is proposed) is allowable under exempted development provisions, a sufficient rear gardens remains, adequate side to side separation is provided for and, also that there are letters of support for the proposal on file from the residents of No. 16. Therefore, on balance, I consider its relationship with the property to the north-west acceptable in this instance.

10.3.8. The extension would rise to a maximum height of c. 4.4m on its south-east elevation with the design of same featuring recessed glazing and an overhanging rendered canopy-type structure which projects c. 2m from the main elevation. The edge of this structure would be just c. 4.5m from the boundary shared with No. 14 and this bulky design, which I consider exaggerates the massing of the extension, together with its scale and height would be likely to give rise to exacerbate its visibility and visual impact and give rise to unacceptable visual intrusion and potentially overbearance on that property and also, to a lesser extent, on No. 51 to the rear. However, I do not consider that this would warrant a refusal of permission for the single storey rear extension, and I recommend to the Commission that the design of the south-east elevation of the rear extension is altered by condition in order to reduce its overall massing.

Overlooking

- 10.3.9. The design of the proposed rear extension features extensive glazing on its south-east elevation (c. 3m in height) which is oriented toward No. 14, together with a bank of high-level windows (c. 1.8m off the ground) on its north-west elevation to No. 16. A c. 3m high linear window is also provided on its rear elevation to No. 51 (I draw the Commission's attention to an apparent discrepancy between the proposed floor plans and elevations in relation to second window on the rear elevation). Large rooflights are also proposed with further apparent discrepancies on the plans in relation to the existence of a proposed lightwell at roof level.
- 10.3.10. Third parties have raised concerns regarding overlooking arising from the design of the proposed extension and related privacy impacts on account of its height relative to the height of existing shared boundaries.
- 10.3.11. The Site Layout Plan provided illustrates that a separation distance of over 1m is provided between the extension's north-west and the c. 1.8m high boundary wall shared with No. 16, with larger setbacks of c. 3.5m and c. 6m provided from the solid boundaries to No's. 51 and 14 - which are c. 2m and c. 1.8m high respectively.
- 10.3.12. Section 11.3.1(d) of the development plan which relates to 'Overlooking', states that Residential units shall generally not directly overlook private open space from above ground floor level by less than 11 metres minimum, with no such separation requirement in the case of single storey development. The policy guidance provided

under Section 5.3.1 and SPPR 1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines similarly concerns separation distances above ground floor only.

- 10.3.13. Section 11.3.1(f) requires a minimum separation of 1.5m to be provided between development and site boundaries. However, I note that this relates specifically to new residential dwellings and not to extensions to existing properties. Therefore, I consider that condition and limitation 6(a) attaching to exempted development Class 1 of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations (2001) as amended, which requires that *“Any window proposed at ground level in any such extension shall not be less than 1 metre from the boundary it faces”*, provides some helpful guidance in this context.
- 10.3.14. Having considered the aforementioned guidance together with the design and siting of the proposed rear extension and having regard specifically to my observations during the site inspection, notwithstanding the height and extent of glazing proposed and the positioning of same, I consider that there is no potential for the proposal to give rise to overlooking of neighbouring properties on account of its siting, single-storey nature and the nature and make-up of the intermediate shared boundaries between the subject property and the properties adjoining it.

Overshadowing

- 10.3.15. Multiple observers raise issues regarding the loss of sunlight to their rear gardens, with some questioning the accuracy of the submitted shadow study in this regard.
- 10.3.16. The GOA argue that the shadow studies submitted illustrate that proposal only gives rise to minimal additional overshadowing of No's 14 and 16 Gleann Na Coille with its impact being less than that of a traditional 40sq.m extension or the existing larger/taller rear extensions at No's 6 and 13 Gleann Na Coille.
- 10.3.17. I note that the PA did not raise any specific concerns regarding the submitted shadow study but did highlight a likely issue with the extension's overshadowing of the adjacent rear garden to the north and property to the north as part of their first reason for refusal.
- 10.3.18. Section 11.3.1(e) of the development plan which concerns 'Daylight', states that *“Daylight sunlight and/or overshadowing assessment, utilising best practice tools, may be required to assess the impact of development on the amenity of adjoining properties”* and that, in this regard, development shall be guided by, inter alia, the

quantitative performance approaches and recommendations under the 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' (2nd edition): A Guideline to Good Practice (BRE 2011). I note that this has been updated by Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice (BRE, 2022). The BRE 209 Guidelines (2022 edition) recommend that at least half of a garden or amenity area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on March 21st (the equinox) to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year.

- 10.3.19. However, I note that the subject proposal does not relate to a greenfield site and that the property is located in a built-up suburban context and is enclosed to the rear by tall, solid boundary walls of heights varying between c. 1.8m – c. 2m, with some degree of overshadowing being inevitable and unavoidable in such a context. This reality is recognised by Section 5.3.7 (Daylight) of the 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines.
- 10.3.20. The appeal site and the properties at No's 14 and 16 have a north-easterly aspect with resulting potential for the proposal to cast a shadow on the property to its north-west in the earlier part of the day, on the property to its north in the middle of the day and on the property to its south-east in the latter part of the day on account of same.
- 10.3.21. The submitted Sketchup shadow study provides an indicative comparison of the impact of three different development scenarios (the existing dwelling as is, a 40sq.m exempt rear extension and the proposed rear extension), for morning, noon, afternoon and evening times during all four seasons. The study indicates that the proposed extension would give rise to a very minor level of additional morning time overshadowing within the rear garden of No. 16 during spring, and to a similarly minor level of afternoon and evening time overshadowing within the rear garden of No. 14 during autumn time. It illustrates that there would be no material change to the existing levels of overshadowing experienced by No. 51 and I consider that this is likely on account of height and siting of the proposed extension and the existence of a substantial intervening boundary wall in addition to further natural screening. Based on the information on file and having regard to the existing levels of shadowing likely to be evident in the gardens during the different seasons, on account of their aspect, orientation and the existing built context, I am satisfied that the impact of the proposed extension is acceptable.

Loss of Daylight

- 10.3.22. The residents of No. 14 highlight what they consider to be likely internal daylight impacts and loss of light to their kitchen and dining room arising from the height and proximity of the proposed rear extension. Whilst an undated photograph stated to be taken from their kitchen and dining room window is provided, no other details are provided in respect to the internal layout of that property.
- 10.3.23. Having regard to my observations of the as-built arrangements and to the placement of the ground floor side window shown in the photograph which looks onto the shared blockwork boundary wall (which I note is reinforced by taller wooden fencing on the neighbour's side) and the side gable of the main house at No. 15, I consider that it is not likely that the proposed extension, which would be offset over 4.5m from this boundary at its closest, would impact existing levels of internal daylighting.

Noise and Light Pollution

- 10.3.24. Third parties raise concerns regarding the proposed extension giving rise to noise and light pollution.
- 10.3.25. The proposal does not involve an increase in the occupancy of the house, and I consider that the extension to an existing house is in line with the site's residential zoning and is appropriate to its location within an established residential estate. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable noise disturbance to neighbouring properties and that the resulting use of the proposed extension and the adjoining garden would be in-keeping with existing use arrangements and with the owner's entitlement to enjoy their property.
- 10.3.26. In respect to the general matter of light pollution, I consider that the light that will emanate from the proposed rear extension would be in keeping with the internal illumination already visible to the rear of the properties at this location at nighttime.
- 10.3.27. A specific issue has also been raised regarding the impact of light pollution on No. 14. In this respect, I note that extensive glazing is proposed on the elevation facing this property and would be setback c. 6m from the shared boundary (1.8m block wall). Whilst, ordinarily, this separation would go some way to mitigate the impacts of the light emanating from within the extension, I am of the view that the expanse of glazing proposed coupled with its c. 3m height would be likely to give rise to negative impacts on the property to the south-west by way of light pollution and I consider that the height of the proposed glazing on this side elevation be reduced by condition.

Material Contravention

- 10.3.28. Third parties raise the issue of the proposed extension giving rise to a material contravention of development plan policy on residential extensions (Section 11.3.1(l)). I draw the Commission's attention to the fact that the wording of this policy is high-level and generalised in nature and states that "*The design and layout of extensions to houses should complement the character and form of the existing building, having regard to its context and adjacent residential amenities*".
- 10.3.29. Having regard to what I consider to be the aspirational and high-level wording of the aforementioned policy in addition totality of my assessment under Section 10.3 of this report, I am satisfied that no material contravention of this policy arises in this specific instance.

10.4. Private Amenity Space

- 10.4.1. The PA's refusal reason No. 3 cites Section 11.3.1(c) of the development plan which requires that residential private open space be provided at a rate of not less than 50% of the gross floor area (GFA) of the residential unit, with non-compliance with this quantitative requirement being allowed in circumstances where an adequate level of private open space is retained on site. I note from the planning reports on file that the PA were dissatisfied with the applicant's private open space proposals at both application and FI stages.
- 10.4.2. The appellant argues that, under their FI proposal, 122.5sq.m of private open space is proposed on site equating to 57% the GFA of the existing dwelling, with this comprising of a c. 97sq.m rear garden together with a 25.5sq.m patio area within the front garden which it is stated enjoys a favourable southerly aspect. It is also argued in the GOA that the proposed rate of provision exceeds the requirements of SPPR2 of the 2024 Compact Settlements Guidelines.
- 10.4.3. The potential of the proposal to give rise to a shortfall of private open space (POS) on the site was raised as an issue by observers at both application and FI stages, with the observers to the appeal reiterating the issue and also raising a concern regarding the appellants' reliance on part of their front garden in the POS calculation, given its proximity to and frontage onto, what they consider to constitute, a busy public road. The proposal's material contravention of Section 11.3.1(c) of the development plan is raised as an issue by the appeal observers in this context.

- 10.4.4. Section 11.3.1(c) – Private Open Space requires that “*Private open space (areas generally not overlooked from a public road) exclusive of car spaces shall be provided at a rate of not less than 50% of the gross floor area of the residential unit*” and goes on to state that “*The scale of proposed extensions shall ensure that an adequate level of private open space is retained on site*”. The current GFA of the unit is given as being c. 182sq.m and I note that this figure is not disputed by the observers to the appeal. Compliance with S. 11.3.1(c) would therefore give rise to a private open space requirement of at least 91sq.m.
- 10.4.5. The Site Layout Plan provided at FI stage (and resubmitted as part of appeal) illustrates that private open space amounting to c. 97sq.m is provided to the rear of the dwelling. The majority of this open space is to the east and north/ north-east of the proposed extension and I am satisfied that it will be functional and provide for an adequate standard of residential amenity in line with the qualitative requirements of S. 11.3.1(c). However, I do note that a small proportion is indicated as being located to the west/ north-west side of the proposed extension (between it and the property at No. 14). Whilst this area would not normally count toward POS calculations on account of its incidental nature, I note that the aforementioned policy requires that such outdoor amenity space be multi-functional and “*allow space for ancillary domestic uses such as outside dining, clothes drying, reasonable circulation and landscaping*”. I note that this linear section provides access to the extension and will facilitate circulation and as such, in this instance, I am satisfied as to its inclusion as part of the POS calculation and I consider the proposed amenity area that would remain to the rear of the house complies with S. 11.3.1(c).
- 10.4.6. Notwithstanding, were the Commission to take a different view on this matter, I draw their attention a latter sub-section of S. 11.3.1(c) which provides for circumstances in which the provision of POS levels which do not meet the development plan standard of 50% is allowed for. This subsection specifically states that “*Consideration can be given to domestic extensions that result in less than the development plan standard of 50% of the GFA of the residential unit, where adequate level of private open space is retained on site*”.
- 10.4.7. I note that no alternative private amenity space standard forms part of the development plan and as such, I consider SPPR2 and Table 5.1 (Minimum Private Open Space Standards for Houses) of the 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines to be the relevant

policy guidance in this context. The 2024 guidelines require a minimum of 50sq.m of public open space in respect of a 4-bed house. The proposal greatly exceeds this quantitative requirement.

Material Contravention

10.4.8. In light of the foregoing, and specifically the flexible nature of the wording inherent to the policy guidance set out under S. 11.3.1(c) of the development plan and the 'exceptional circumstances' in relation to providing less than the development plan standard outlined therein, I am of the opinion that the rear garden proposed constitutes an adequate level of private open space would and that the proposal is not therefore in material contravention of same.

10.5. Other

Single Storey Front Extension

10.5.1. Whilst not constituting a refusal reason, I note that the design of the proposed front recessed frame porch and living room extension (c. 2.95m high, c. 6m wide and c.900mm deep) is raised as an issue by third parties.

10.5.2. Whilst the development plan provides no specific policy guidance in respect to front extensions, S. 11.3.1(l) does provide that the design and layout of house extensions should complement the character and form of the existing building, having regard to its context and adjacent residential amenities.

10.5.3. The appellant is of the view that this element of their proposal is in keeping with recent modifications to front elevations undertaken at No's 6, 12 and 16 Gleann Na Coille and will not detract from the house's primary visual elements (front gable & dormer roof).

10.5.4. I note from my site inspection that the adjoining property at No. 16 Bearna Na Coille features a large single storey flat-roof extension on its front elevation (east side) which was permitted under P.A. Ref. 20/121. I consider that the design, siting and materiality of the proposed single storey front extension is generally in-keeping with this neighbouring front extension and I am satisfied that it would not detract from the character or form of the existing dwelling. For this reason, and on account of the screening and enclosure provided by the existing landscaping arrangements to the

front of the subject property, I am satisfied that this element of the proposal will satisfactory visually integrate into its context, with no potential to negatively impact on adjacent visual and residential amenities.

Revised Rear Dormer Windows

- 10.5.5. Permission is sought to replace the existing 2 no. gabled dormer windows to the rear of the property with 2 no. flat-roofed, box type dormers which, whilst sited in the same location, would be larger than those existing and also feature a greater extent of glazing.
- 10.5.6. Observers to the appeal raise concerns regarding the increase in size and scale of glazing to the existing rear dormer windows and potential for overlooking of adjoining properties. In this respect, I note they are oriented northwards towards the house located to rear of the subject property (No. 51 Gleann Na Coille).
- 10.5.7. Whilst dormers already exist in the rear roof plane, I acknowledge the extent of glazing is proposed to increase from that existing and as such, the proposal's compliance with Section 11.3.1(d), which relates to overlooking, is a relevant consideration. This requires residential units to provide a separation of 11m from adjoining property whose private open space could be overlooked. In this respect, I note that the existing dormers are offset c. 11m from the rear boundary.
- 10.5.8. The PA addressed the potential of the proposed redesigned rear dormer windows to impact on the neighbouring amenity of the house to rear (No. 51 Gleann Na Coille) at FI Stage and were satisfied that the distances (c. 22m) that would be provided between the proposed rear dormer windows and opposing boundaries and windows was acceptable.
- 10.5.9. Having reviewed the Site Layout Plan submitted in response to the FI request, I am also satisfied that the required separation of 11m (to the shared boundary) would still be provided for and that an overall separation of over 20m between the façade of the dormers and opposing windows serving habitable rooms would be achieved in compliance with Section 5.3.1 and SPPR 1 (Separation Distances) of the 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines which require a separation distance of at least 16m.

10.5.10. In respect to the design of the proposed dormers, I consider it acceptable in this instance on account of their siting to the rear of the dwelling and due to the fact that they are not located in a visually prominent location.

Rear Garden Storage Wall

10.5.11. Observers to the appeal seek to draw the Commission's attention to the lack of information provided on the proposed wall storage element to the rear of the back garden and raise concerns regarding the impact of this element of the proposal on the structural integrity of the shared boundary at this location.

10.5.12. Whilst this matter not explicitly was dealt with by the PA or as part of the grounds of appeal, I note that the 'outdoor wall storage' detailed on the floor plans submitted at FI stage is illustrated as being a standalone structure which would abut the rear boundary wall to the back garden shared with No. 51. Notwithstanding, I do acknowledge that no further details in respect to the structure are provided and, in the interest of clarity, I consider it appropriate that its detailed design should be addressed by condition in the event of a grant of permission.

Bathroom Window

10.5.13. An issue is raised with regard to a 'proposed' side bathroom window facing no. 14's kitchen. I note from the site plans that this relates to an existing bathroom within the main house and does not form part of the proposal subject of the appeal before the Commission.

Drainage

10.5.14. The PA's Drainage Department in their report of 06/10/2025 raised no objection to the proposal subject to standard condition in respect to the management of surface water on site. I recommend such a condition can be attached where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Inaccuracies/ Omissions in Documentation

10.5.15. Third parties seek to highlight various issues with regard to the information submitted on the area of the appeal site, its levels relative to adjoining properties, the height of existing (and proposed) boundaries, the detail provided on neighbouring properties and, the dimensions and calculations provided across different documents and drawings.

- 10.5.16. Firstly, it does not appear that any party was prejudiced by any potential drawing or related discrepancies. Secondly, I have considered each issue in turn and I am satisfied that, based on the information on file together with my observations gleaned from my inspection of the site and its context, I have sufficient information before me to continue to assess the development subject of this appeal.
- 10.5.17. Notwithstanding the foregoing, where I consider a potential inaccuracy to be material, I have highlighted it to the Commission as part of my assessment.

Property Value

- 10.5.18. I note the concerns raised in the observations in respect of the devaluation of neighbouring property. However, having regard to the assessment and conclusion set out in Sections 10.2 to 10.5 above and recommendations therein, 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.

Consultation

- 10.5.19. An issue is raised regarding the appellant's failure to engage with neighbours during the planning process. I note that there is no statutory basis for such engagement and that it is at the discretion of the applicant. Notwithstanding, I am satisfied that the statutory notice procedure (timely erection of site notices and publication of a newspaper notice) which does apply was correctly followed in this case and that third parties had adequate opportunity to submit their observations during all stages the planning process. I refer the Commission to Sections 3.4 and 9.3 of the Inspector's Report in this regard.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend a GRANT of permission subject to the following conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the 'RS – Residential' zoning objective, to provide for residential development and for associated support development, which will ensure the protection of existing residential amenity and will contribute to sustainable residential neighbourhoods, to the pattern of development in the area and to the provisions of the

Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029 including Sections 11.3.1(c), (d), (e) and (l), it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the character of the area or the residential amenities of property in the vicinity and would, therefore, be 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 information received by the planning authority on the 23/12/2025 and 26/01/2026, 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.
3.	(a) External finishes shall be in accordance with the details submitted with the application unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority. (b) Prior to commencement, details are to be submitted for written agreement with the planning authority on: (i) The omission of the proposed overhanging rendered canopy-type structure which projects from the south-east elevation of the rear extension. (ii) A revised design proposal for the front dormer window which is more in-keeping with the architectural character of the property's existing front dormer window and those of immediately neighbouring properties. (iii) The exact detail of the proposed outdoor wall storage abutting the rear party boundary wall to No. 51 Gleann Na Coille. Reason: In the interest of clarity and the residential and visual amenities of the area.
4.	The existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling. Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity.

5.	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 and surface water management.
6.	Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority. Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.
7.	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, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Emma Gosnell
Planning Inspector
24th July 2026

Appendix 1

Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501258-GC-26
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for demolition, construction of rear and front extensions and related elevational and roof level changes.
Development Address	No 15 Gleann Na Coille, Barna Road, Galway
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, “Project” means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	☒ Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2. ☐ No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
☒ 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)	Part 2, Class 10(b)(iv) - Urban development – 10 hectares (built-up area). Site is c. 0.043ha and is therefore 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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501258-GC-26
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for demolition, construction of rear and front extensions and related elevational and roof level changes.
Development Address	No 15 Gleann Na Coille, Barna Road, Galway
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 proposal is for the extension of an existing house and associated external modifications and site works on a site of c. 0.043ha. Demolition works are also proposed. The development is significantly below the class threshold of 10 hectares (built-up area). The project due to its size and nature would not give rise to significant use of resources or production of waste during both the construction and operation phases. The proposed development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, and is not vulnerable to climate change.

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 reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	The site is located in an established residential estate off the Bearna Road in suburban Galway and there is a concentration of similar low-density housing in the area. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are the Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 000268), the Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site Code 004301), the Lough Corrib SPA (Site Code 004042) and the Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297). The Barna Stream (EPA Code IE_WE_31B010200) is located c. 130m to the west of the site and is separated from same by the estate access road, an existing area of public open space and by a belt of mature trees. The site is not within a designated ACA and there are no Protected Structures or other Cultural Heritage sites on or immediately adjoining the site. Having regard to the above, and to the simple nature and limited scale of the proposed development, I am satisfied that impacts on environmental sensitivities can be adequately assessed in this case without the need for EIA.
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).	Due to the nature and scale of the development, the construction stage will not be significant in terms of duration or complexity. The main operational impacts would be limited to residential and visual amenity. These elements would be subject to standard assessment/ design. Whilst I have outlined concerns about the design of the extension, I am satisfied that this can be assessed without potential for significant environmental effects that would require EIA. There would be no significant cumulative impacts with other projects.
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.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____
DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____
(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required.)

Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination

Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive)

I have considered the proposal for extensions and alterations to an existing residential dwelling at No. 15 Gleann Na Coille, Co. Galway in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located relative to:

- Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 000268) - c. 130m
- Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site Code 004301) - c. 350m
- The Lough Corrib SPA (Site Code 004042) - c. 5km
- Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297) - c. 5km

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project in an outer suburban location, 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 proposed development.
- Intervening land uses and indirect connections to the European sites.
- The lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site.

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development to be retained would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.