



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501311-DR-26

Development

The proposed development will consist of the refurbishment of the existing two-storey coach house building, including the raising of the roof level, three new rooflights to the front roofscape, modifications to window opens & new fenestration throughout, installation of solar panels to the rear (south facing) roofscape, formation of new rear patio space with stepped access from a new proposed pedestrian entrance gate addressing Cunningham Drive, internal modification works to accommodate a one-bed dwelling and all associated site works.

Location

The Coach House, Cunningham Road,
Dalkey, Co. Dublin, A96A9TV

Planning Authority

Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D26A/0139/WEB

Applicant(s)

Katy & Johny Janssens

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Enderly OMC Ltd.

Ian & Rosemary French

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

14th July 2026

Inspector

Conor Hughes

Table of 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	EIA Screening.....	14
7.0	The Appeal	14
8.0	Assessment	18
9.0	AA Screening.....	27
10.0	Water Framework Directive	28
11.0	Recommendation.....	29
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	29
13.0	Conditions.....	29
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening.....	34

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is comprised of an ancillary outbuilding (former coach house) and part of the curtilage and boundary wall of a large detached Victorian villa known as Arranmore, which is located on the corner of Cunningham Road and Cunningham Drive, Dalkey.
- 1.2. The building which is of brick and rubble stone construction has a tiled roof, uPVC windows, timber doors and uPVC guttering sits at the end of a driveway approximately 32 metres back from Cunningham Road.
- 1.3. The rear wall of the building retains the land behind and there is approximately 2.5 metres difference in the level between the access on the lower level in the front elevation and the one in the upper level to the rear.
- 1.4. A flight of steps between the adjacent villa and the outbuilding that provide external access to the rear of the building are not included within the site boundary. The gable elevation next to Cunningham Drive is also part of the western boundary wall of Arranmore.
- 1.5. The land to the rear forming part of the site comprises an area of hardstanding and gardens which extend back from the rear elevation by approximately 3 metres and is just under 22 square metre in size.
- 1.6. There is no boundary at the south eastern corner of the site and the hardstanding and gardens appear on the ground to be part of the larger curtilage of Arranmore.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the refurbishment of the existing two-storey coach house as a one-bedroom dwelling by raising of the roof level; inserting three new rooflights; modifying the window openings; providing new fenestration throughout; installing solar panels; carrying out internal modification works; and construction of rear patio space, stepped access and new pedestrian gate onto Cunningham Road.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- On 17th April 2026 the Planning Authority issued notification of their decision to grant planning permission as this infill development would not detract from the residential and visual amenities of the area consistent with the provisions of the current Development Plan, and in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- The decision to grant planning permission was subject to nine conditions:
 - Condition 1 related to the proposed development as described in the application form and drawings being carried out as approved.
 - Conditions 2 required the applicant to submit an updated site layout plan extending the red line boundary so external access to the building could be incorporated into the site.
 - Condition 3 removed any exempted development rights.
 - Condition 4 required the lower ground floor WC to have opaque glazing.
 - Condition 5 limited the demolition and alterations to the application site and that any removed/demolished materials be reused where feasible.
 - Condition 6 required measure to be taken during the construction phase to prevent damage to the public road or conflict with pedestrians or other road users.
 - Condition 7 required any surface water associated with the proposed development to be retained within the curtilage of the site and disposed of within an existing soak pit.
 - Condition 8 required all external finishes, including roof tiles/slates, and façade and boundary walls, to harmonise in material, colour and texture with the existing building.
 - Condition 9 required the applicant to enter into a Part V agreement under section 96(4) of the Planning & Development Act 2000 as amended prior to the commencement of development.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The planning report noted that the proposed development is within an Objective A zoning where the conversion of an existing building as infill development to a dwelling will be acceptable in principle. This is subject to meeting the relevant policies and objectives of the Development Plan.
- The report further noted no climate change implications arising from the proposed development subject to any construction materials improving the thermal efficiency of the building and where feasible materials are re-used in accordance with policy objective CA07 of the Development Plan.
- The associated planning history DA26/0135/WEB to alter and extend the adjacent dwelling at Arranmore was described in the report and the officer commented that this proposal was not linked to that application or contingent on the access arrangements.
- It was also noted in the report that there was a history of retrospective planning permission for the conversion of an outbuilding to a separate dwelling in the neighbouring property known as Santa Maria. A more recent planning permission was subsequently granted to incorporate the separate dwelling back into the main dwellinghouse.
- The site was identified in the report as infill development increasing housing supply and density in accordance with the Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024.
- The general layout of the proposed development in the context of neighbouring houses in the surrounding area was considered to be in general accordance with Sections 11.4.3.2, 11.4.3.3 and 12.3.7.7 of the Development Plan.
- The quantum of private open space calculated at approximately 18 square metres was considered by the Planning Authority to be less than the minimum requirement in the Compact Settlement Guidelines and should be increased by 14 square metres as this would not impact adversely on the remaining available private open space for Arranmore.

- Overall, the proposed increase in the height of the building with the alterations to the roof; installation of rooflights and solar panels; and alterations to the window openings was accepted not to impact on the visual amenity or the streetscape.
- It was also accepted that the extended roof would remain visually subordinate to Arranmore and not impact on the setting of the Protected Structure at Santa Maria.
- It was highlighted that the external finishes were not specified but could be addressed by a planning condition requiring them to match the existing and the demolition works to take place as indicated.
- The removal of an embankment and construction of a hardstanding on Cunningham Drive in front of the boundary wall at the proposed pedestrian gate was considered not to harm the visual amenity of the street. Nor was it considered necessary to extend the hardstanding to meet the public footpath to the south towards Enderly.
- The Planning Authority accepted that the minimum floorspace requirements for a one-bedroom dwelling would be met in terms of its gross floor area and for individual rooms within the building.
- However, given the size of the site, the general layout and arrangement of the rooms and the need to protect the historic character of the building the Planning Authority acknowledged that it was necessary for the exempted development rights be removed.
- The Planning Authority did not identify any adverse impacts on the residential amenity of the adjacent property or other properties in the street subject to the window in the lower ground floor WC and shower room having opaque glazing.
- The Planning Authority noted that there was no boundary with the driveway with Arranmore to allow the rear elevation of the proposed building to be maintained. They recommended a condition be attached to the planning permission to extend the redline to bring in a maximum of one-metre of land within the curtilage of the proposed dwelling.

- The Planning Authority also accepted having regard to the advice of the Transport Division and the proximity of the site to a Dart station that there was no requirement for the proposed development to have in-curtilage parking.
- The Planning Authority identified no Part V exemption certificate had been submitted and that this can be conditioned as part of any grant of planning permission.
- In respect of the proposed pedestrian access onto Cunningham Drive the Planning Authority observed was that this was a party wall and noted having regards to Section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines for Planning 2007 that the objection was not a material consideration and the grant of planning permission would not supersede any legal ownership rights.
- The Planning Authority concluded that the proposed development would not impact adversely on residential or visual amenity and that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Municipal Services Department - Drainage Planning: No objection subject to a condition requiring the submission of a SuDS drainage proposal for any storm water generated by the proposal.
- Transportation Planning - No objection to the proposed development subject to a condition requiring all necessary measures be taken to prevent any mud, dirt, debris or building material being carried onto or placed on the public road or adjoining properties during the construction phase; any damage to the public road arising the works being repaired; and conflict between the construction activities and pedestrian/vehicular movements being avoided.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

3.4. Third Party Observations

- Three observations were submitted in objection to the proposed development from two residents at Nos. 1 and 5 Enderly and the management company for Enderly.

- The third parties observed that the insertion of a pedestrian access through the boundary wall on Cunningham Drive relies on land which is owned by the residents of Enderly.
- A map is submitted in support of the objection by the management company was based on two land registry folios DN209121F and DN220939F which include the boundary wall and the land in front between the wall and the edge of Cunningham Drive.
- All the third parties observed that no permission was sought or given to traverse the land in front of the wall or to make an opening for the proposed the pedestrian gate. It should not have formed part of the application.
- Two of the objectors at 5 Enderly and on behalf of the management company observed the pedestrian access onto Cunningham Drive was not suitable as there is no footpath and it would be dangerous to pedestrians leaving/entering the site and traffic on Cunningham Drive.
- The objectors at 5 Enderly observed the proposed pedestrian access was inappropriate development as there was no existing access and the proposed gate would alter the character of the boundary. It would also result in intensification of pedestrian use next to Enderly.
- The same party also observed the proposed development would negatively impact on residential amenity due to increase pedestrian movement, noise and disturbance and servicing for bin collections.
- The party representing the management company observed the use of two different addresses to be obscure and confusing. Two separate Eircode references exist but were not included in the public or site notices.

4.0 Planning History

Concurrent appeal – Adjacent dwelling Arranmore (owned by the applicant)

- 4.1. PL-501312-DR-26 (DA26/0135/WEB) - Permission granted for the proposed development of a new single-storey front-facing side extension in replacement of an existing extension; a new single-storey side extension behind the existing entrance

lobby for level access; a new single storey rear extension in replacement of existing sun room; two new sash windows in the front elevation; demolition of two existing chimney stacks; the formation of a new recessed vehicular entrance gate in place of the existing vehicular access gates on Cunningham Road; hard and soft landscaping of front garden; formation of improved parking facilities; new pedestrian access gate to the rear onto Cunningham Drive; three new roof-lights to the roof of the existing dwelling; modification of some existing openings to the perimeter of the property to accommodate new windows and door; outbuildings to the rear garden and all associated site works.

Neighbouring Dwelling – Santa Maria (to the east)

- 4.2. D24A/0446/WEB - Permission granted for the reunification of the main house (Santa Maria) and its attendant coach House into a single dwelling requiring omission of condition 5 of D07A/1259; the removal and replacement of non-original single storey kitchen extension to the rear; the removal of timber floor boards, tiled floor finishes, sanitaryware on ground and first floor; internal alterations including new wall opening between the existing kitchen and dining rooms; new internal lightweight partitions; new external doors to the coach house; general refurbishment of the existing house including essential repairs to walls, floors, windows, facades and roofs; associated conservation and ancillary works.

Neighbouring Development – Enderly (to the south)

- 4.3. D14A/0260 - Permission granted on appeal for a residential development comprising 5 two-bedroom, 3 three-bedroom and 10 four-bedroom terraced houses; a basement car-park with 8 private and 4 visitor parking spaces and a shared bin store, a public open space area of 589 square metres including an external platform lift; 28 private and 2 visitor surface car-parking spaces; and all associated and ancillary site and landscaping works.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- The Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 (the Development Plan) is the relevant plan for the area and the site is zoned as Zoning

Objective A to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.

- Section 4.3.1.1 PHP18 Residential Density states it is a policy objective to increase housing supply, promote compact urban growth through the consolidation and re-intensification provided that proposals provide for high-quality sustainable residential development and the protection of existing residential amenities and the established character of the surrounding area.
- Section 4.3.1.2 PHP19 Existing Housing Stock states it is a policy objective to conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption of homes consistent with NPO 43 of the NPF.
- Section 11.4.3.2 HER20 Buildings of Vernacular and Heritage Interest states it is a policy objective to retain and where appropriate encourage the rehabilitation and suitable reuse of existing older buildings/structures/features which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and streetscape.
- Section 11.4.3.3 HER21 Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Buildings, Estates and Features states it is a policy objective to encourage the appropriate development of exemplar nineteenth and twentieth century buildings, and ensure the design of developments on lands located immediately adjacent to such groupings of buildings addresses the visual impact on any established setting.
- Section 12.3.1.1 Design Criteria states it is an objective that high standards of design and layout to create liveable neighbourhoods and details the criteria to be taken account of when assessing applications which includes reference to compliance with all relevant National and Regional policy objectives.
- Section 12.3.7.7 Infill states the adaptation of existing buildings shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units and retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/ gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings.
- Section 12.3.4.2 requires the minimum size of habitable rooms to conform with 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities: Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities' (2007).

- Section 12.4.5.6 states that parking requirement will be assessed having regard to their impact on place making as well as providing residents with adequate and safe access to their private vehicle. The parking requirement is set out in Table 12.5 and any deviation from the maximum standard must be justified in the context of Section 12.4.5.2 (i).
- Section 12.4.6.1 states for cycle parking for new residential developments of less than 5 units shall include a Cycle Statement, setting out how it meets the requirements of Council's 'Standards for Cycle Parking and Associated Cycling Facilities for New Developments' (2018).
- Section 12.8.3.3 (i) sets out at table 12.10 the private open space requirement for new houses. For a one-bedroom house the guidance states that 48 square metres of good quality usable private open space shall be provided behind the front of the building.
- Section 12.8.7.1 Separation Distances states that a minimum standard of 22 metres separation between directly opposing rear first floor windows should usually be observed, for new developments. This normally results in a minimum rear garden depth of 11 metres.
- Section 12.8.7.2 Boundaries states that in all cases, suitable boundary treatments both around the side and between proposed dwellings shall be provided. Details of all existing and proposed boundary treatments, including vehicular entrance details, should be submitted as part of any planning application. These shall include details in relation to proposed materials, finishes, and, in the case of planted boundaries, details in respect of species together with a planting schedule

5.2. **Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines**

- Section 5.3 of the DEHLG 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities' (2007) sets out the internal layout and space provision for new dwellings. The room sizes for a one-bedroom dwelling is specified at Table 5.1.
- Section 5.0 of the 'Development Standards for Houses' contained in the 'Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for

Planning Authorities (2024)' provide the general principles and standards for houses. In respect of this proposal:

- Policy SPPR 1 sets for residential development, a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, above ground floor level shall be maintained.
 - Policy SPPR2 set a minimum private open space standard for one-bedroom houses of 20 square metres.
 - Policy SPPR3 sets a parking requirement of 1.5 spaces for dwellings in accessible locations for example within one-kilometre of a rail/DART station.
 - The guidelines for considering the impact of daylight performance are set out at paragraph 5.3.7.
- It is stated in the second paragraph of Section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2007 that:

The planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land; these are ultimately matters for resolution in the Courts. In this regard, it should be noted that, as section 34(13) of the Planning Act states, a person is not be entitled solely by reason of a permission to carry out any development. Where appropriate, an advisory note to this effect should be added at the end of the planning decision. Accordingly, where in making an application, a person asserts that he/she is the owner of the land or structure in question, and there is nothing to cast doubt on the bona fides of that assertion, the planning authority is not required to inquire further into the matter. If, however, the terms of the application itself, or a submission made by a third party, or information which may otherwise reach the authority, raise doubts as to the sufficiency of the legal interest, further information may have to be sought under Article 33 of the Regulations. Only where it is clear from the response that the applicant does not have sufficient legal interest should permission be refused on that basis. If notwithstanding the further information, some doubt still remains, the planning authority may decide to grant permission. However, such a grant of permission is subject to the provisions of section 34(13) of the Act, referred to

above. In other words the developer must be certain under civil law that he/she has all rights in the land to execute the grant of permission.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- The site is approximately 1.15 kilometres west of the Rockabill to Dalkey Island Special Area of Conservation (SAC:03000) and Dalkey Special Protection Area (SPA: 004172).

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. 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

- Grounds of appeal are submitted by the residents of 5 Enderly and the management company for the Enderly development.
- Both appellants argue that the insertion of a pedestrian access through the boundary wall on Cunningham Drive relies on land which is owned by the residents of Enderly and which is managed on their behalf by Enderly OMC Ltd. No permission has been sought or given from the residents or the managing company and planning permission should not be granted.
- The appellant for the management company observes that Article 22(d) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) requires an applicant who is not the legal owner of the lands to include written consent with the planning application. They argue that the Planning Authority should have addressed this issue prior to the grant of planning permission.

- Both appellants observe there is no footpath where the pedestrian access is proposed on Cunningham Drive and would be dangerous to pedestrians and vehicular traffic using this road. One of the appellants state the danger is further amplified by the steep gradient.
- Both appellants observe that the cumulative effect of this proposal should have been considered alongside the application to alter and extend Arranmore in terms of the impact on the heritage character of adjoining properties.
- The appellant for the management company describes the proposed development being located in a sensitive context comprised of a group of large nineteenth century villas of substantial architectural significance.
- They argue the Planning Authority assessment of the heritage implications of subdividing Arranmore and forming a separate residential unit is limited. They state that Chapter 12 of the Development Plan emphasises the protection of architectural heritage extends beyond individual structures and includes setting, attendant grounds, boundary features and the wider historic character of the area.
- In this respect the appellant also expresses concern that no architectural heritage assessment or conservation report is submitted which deals with the subdivision of the site into two separate plots which is a material consideration which should have been assessed.
- The appellant for the management company argues that there will be a loss of residential amenity for the residents of Enderly and that the Planning Authority did not take adequate account of the intensification of use arising from the additional residential occupation; intensified use of external amenity areas; increase pedestrian movements; servicing and deliveries; parking demand; refuse storage; construction activity; and multiple access points in an historic boundary wall.
- The appellant at 5 Enderly refers to a separate access further along the boundary wall which is part of the D26A/0135/WEB application and maintains this access (which does not form part of this application) is wider than a pedestrian access and will be used for another purpose and/or to facilitate future development. The appellant further states the impact of the construction of a second access in the same boundary wall should have been assessed cumulatively.

- In this respect this appellant also asserts more generally that the proposed development cumulatively impacts on residential amenity; on the historic boundary wall with multiple pedestrian accesses; intensified residential occupation; increased construction activity; subdivision of the curtilage; parking demand and impacts on adjoining residents.
- The appellant for the management company argues that the proximity of the site to a DART station is not sufficient justification for zero parking provision for the proposed development. They state that the future occupant is likely to own or regularly use a private vehicle as car ownership levels in Dalkey remain high notwithstanding public transport provision.
- The same appellant also argues there is ample space within the curtilage of Arranmore to meet the parking requirement. They state if a car is parked on the opposite side of Cunningham Drive it will exacerbate an existing long term on-street parking problem by reducing sections of the carriageway to a single lane creating difficulties for traffic movement, servicing and emergency access.
- Both appellants conclude by stating the application should be refused as includes property not owned by the planning applicant and is not implementable. It also would adversely impact on residential amenity, public safety and the historic character of the area. It would create an undesirable precedent for further subdivision of the site.
- Alternatively, conditions should be attached omitting the pedestrian access or requesting it to be redesigned. Parking should also be a requirement with the access taken through Arranmore onto Cunningham Road.

7.2. **Applicant Response**

- The applicant in response to the grounds of appeal sets out that the proposed development is submitted in accordance with the residential zoning in the Development Plan.
- They describe the site; the nature and extent submit proposals; related planning history and submit in response that the assessment by the Planning Authority dealt with the application in a coherent and consistent manner and that the assessment was balanced.

- They comment that the planning officer concluded that the proposed development can be considered independently and that the two concurrent applications are not contingent on one another as there is no conflict between them.
- The applicant describes that much consideration was given to the amount of private open space for the proposed development and that the wording of the condition in respect of the boundary treatment and additional space requirements was not clear and should be amended if the Commission is minded to grant planning permission.
- None of the other conditions of the grant of planning permission are disputed by the applicant in their response.
- They argue that the alterations to the coach House would not adversely impact on the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties including Arranmore.
- The boundary wall with Enderly is 32 metres from the coach house and there is no basis for the third-party objection as the proposal is small in scale and does not represent significant intensification.
- The applicant also argues that the proposed development would not individually or in combination with the concurrent appeal to alter and extend Arranmore harm the visual amenity or character of the area which is not a conservation area or ACA. The Protected Structures to the north do not form part of any historical grouping as they sit on much lower ground and are of a different architectural form.
- They argue that Planning Authority considered the impact of the proposed development having regard to the impact on Arranmore and the adjoining streetscape including any building forming part of the architectural or historic context.
- The applicant considers there to be no parking issue relating to the coach house. They cite the proximity of the proposed development to the DART station in Dalkey and on-street parking available on Cunningham Drive as reasons for no in-curtilage parking and argue it does not set an inappropriate precedent or result in overflow parking detriment to local amenity.
- The applicant advises that they have sufficient legal interest to undertake the works to the pedestrian entrance in the western boundary wall. They describe part of the

western boundary wall being rebuilt to accommodate the access and visibility splays for the Enderly development but the place where the proposed opening is made is part of the original wall.

- The applicant concludes that none of the grounds of appeal by either third party can be sustained.

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

- No new matters are raised in the grounds of appeal that would alter the position of the Planning Authority that the proposed development is refused.

7.4. **Observations**

- None

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. Having examined the application details and all the other documentation on file, including the submission received to appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regards to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered as follows:

- The principle of development
- The impact on visual amenity
- The impact on residential amenity
- The private open space requirement
- The parking requirement, road safety and traffic impact
- Cumulative Impact
- The pedestrian access to Cunningham Drive

The principle of development

8.2. I note the policy objectives at Section 4.3.1.2 PHP19 and Section 11.4.3.2 HER20 to conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption and where appropriate encourage the rehabilitation and suitable reuse of

existing older buildings/structures/features which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and streetscape.

- 8.3. The site is also subject to zoning Objective A in the Development Plan which has the purpose of improving residential amenity while protecting existing residential amenities.
- 8.4. I acknowledge that the sub-division of an existing house curtilage and conversion and adaptation of the coach house as one-bedroom dwelling would be acceptable in principle and consistent with the abovementioned policy objectives of the Development Plan. However, this is subject to the detail of the proposal being in accordance with the requirements of the policies and objectives of the zoning and consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The impact on visual amenity

- 8.5. One of the appellants assert that the application should have been accompanied by an architectural heritage assessment or conservation report addressing the subdivision of the site into two separate plots in a place where there are large detached houses in generous curtilages.
- 8.6. The grounds of appeal do not explain what unique architectural or heritage characteristic is harmed by the type of development proposed. It is not specified which policy objective or development standard is not met and I do not consider the application to be deficient because it is not accompanied by a heritage or conservation assessment.
- 8.7. I am also satisfied that the Planning Authority identified the correct policy objectives and development management standards that apply to this form of development. The proposed development is not in a conservation area or ACA and the building is not a Protected Structure and I am only required on this basis to consider how the adaptations proposed will retain those features that make a contribution to the physical character of the area.
- 8.8. In this respect it is emphasised at Section 12.3.7.7 that where rehabilitation and suitable reuse of existing older buildings for housing is proposed it should in accordance with policy objective HER20 and shall retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/ gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings.

- 8.9. Having visited the site, I observe the coach house is set approximately 32 metres back from the corner of Cunningham Road and Cunningham Drive, is part of the western boundary wall and an integral part of a continuous line of buildings extending across two large plots which have dwellings from the Victorian era.
- 8.10. I acknowledge maintaining the general appearance of the building as an ancillary outbuilding is important to the context and setting of the adjacent Victorian villa particularly as it is in a prominent and elevated position in the streetscape on approach to the site from the north.
- 8.11. I further acknowledge the land in the backdrop continues to rise and, whilst the landscaping along the western and southern boundaries provides enclosure and partly obscures views of the single storey rear elevation when approaching the site from Cunningham Road to the south, this elevation remains visible. Any adaptations should therefore be sensitive to the character of the area in terms of layout, mass and scale.
- 8.12. In examination of the submitted plans, I observe that raising the wall plate by 400mm on the upper ground floor, replacing the roof, inserting rooflights and solar panels, altering the size of the windows in the two-storey elevation and inserting new windows in single storey and gable elevations to allow the building to be used as living accommodation will not harm the character of the area.
- 8.13. The building will also remain subordinate in form, scale and mass to Arranmore and outwardly still appear as an ancillary outbuilding. I also observe while the curtilage is subdivided to facilitate access to Cunningham Drive and meet the private open space requirements these changes are largely at or below ground level and largely hidden behind the western boundary wall.
- 8.14. I accept, for the reasons set out in the preceding paragraphs, that the proposed development is designed sensitively to retain those features that are important to the physical character of the area which is consistent with the requirements of the Objective A zoning, the policy objective of Section 11.4.3.2 and the development management standards of Section 12.3.7.7 of the Development Plan.

The impact on residential amenity

- 8.15. Having examined the submitted plans, I agree with the Planning Authority that the minimum gross floor space requirements for a one-bedroom dwelling in the 2007 Best

Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities are met (albeit the guideline assumes the accommodation is all on one floor). I further acknowledge that the minimum aggregate sizes for the living, bedroom areas and storage are also met and that the accommodation standards for the future occupants are acceptable.

- 8.16. I further note the fenestration on the two-storey elevation for the proposed dwelling looks down the private driveway to Arranmore. While two windows in the ground floor living accommodation and one in the lower ground floor bedroom overlook the main entrance to the adjacent dwelling, I do not consider there to be any loss of amenity to the residents of Arranmore as this is not their private open space and you would normally expect a degree of overlooking at the front of a dwelling where there is a physical relationship to the adjacent public realm.
- 8.17. The Planning Authority recommended the WC and shower room window on the lower ground floor be fitted with opaque glazing. While acknowledging this is required to protect the privacy of the proposed occupants of the coach house it would be unusual for a window serving a bathroom not to have opaque glazing. Although not annotated on the proposed plans I do not see why this needs to be protected by a condition.
- 8.18. One window is proposed on the single storey elevation that will overlook the private open space of Arranmore and I note that the boundary treatment for the proposed dwelling is a metal railing. Despite being in the same ownership, I do not consider this to be an adequate boundary treatment to protect the residential amenity of the future occupants of either dwelling.
- 8.19. That said, given the property dates from the Victorian era it is not unusual for a 'walled garden' to have been planned as part of the wider landscaped gardens. Notwithstanding what is said later in the report about the size of the private open space a 1.8 metres high masonry or brick wall will address any potential loss of residential amenity resulting from the insertion of a new window in the single storey elevation and the private open space for the proposed dwelling being located immediately adjacent to the steps into the private garden of Arranmore.
- 8.20. The use of a complementary material to those used in the western boundary wall will also assist in retaining the physical character of the area and the insertion of a gate in a wall will not in my opinion result in the loss of visual or residential amenities in a typical suburban street.

- 8.21. Increasing the height of the coach house by 400mm will not result in the existing building being overbearing on Arranmore and I consider there is adequate separation to prevent overlooking or overshadowing of the closest neighbouring properties on the opposite side of Cunningham Drive. There is more than the specified 16 metres of separation in policy SPPR1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines to prevent any loss of amenity.
- 8.22. The appellants argue that there will be a loss of residential amenity for the residents of Enderly and that the Planning Authority did not take adequate account of the intensification of use arising from the additional residential occupation; intensified use of external amenity areas; increased pedestrian movements; servicing and deliveries; parking demand; refuse storage; construction activity; and multiple access points in an historic boundary wall.
- 8.23. Having visited the site, I note this is an established residential neighbourhood and that the activities specified by the appellants in their grounds of appeal already occur on the street immediately adjacent to and opposite the entrance to Enderly. I did not observe given the scale of development proposed and the separation distance between the existing building and Enderly that a refusal of permission could be sustained on the ground of loss of residential amenities.
- 8.24. For the reasons outlined above I consider the proposed development to be consistent with Objective A zoning in the Development Plan in that the proposed development has been designed (subject to an amendment to the boundary to the patio area) to protect residential amenity and not harm the residential amenities of the area.

The private open space requirement

- 8.25. It is stated in Section 12.8.3.3 of the Development Plan that all houses shall provide an area of good quality usable private open space behind the front building unless a site-specific constraint means an innovative design approach is required. In this circumstance a relaxation in the quantum and location of the private open space may be considered.
- 8.26. In this respect the applicant specifies on the site layout plan that 20.34 square metres of private open space is provided for the proposed dwelling in the form of a patio,

hardstanding and stairs to a bin storage area and pedestrian access gate to Cunningham Drive at the lower ground floor level.

- 8.27. This amount of private open space is significantly less than the standard set out at Table 12:10 of the Development Plan and just above the minimum requirement of policy SPPR2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024). I also agree with the Planning Authority that not all of the space is usable.
- 8.28. I consider having reviewed the submitted plans that only the 10 square metre patio area is good quality private open space and that the balance is mainly for access and outdoor storage. I further note the metal railing on the boundary with Arranmore is open and there is no privacy for the future occupants of either dwelling.
- 8.29. To remedy the deficiency in provision of private open space the Planning Authority sought by means of a planning condition to extend the boundary of the site by 14 square metres.
- 8.30. I note the neighbouring garden is more than 750 square metres in size and controlled by the same owner and applicant for this application. They also advise in their response to the submitted grounds of appeal that they have no objection to the use of a planning condition and had not sought to challenge this by way of a first party appeal.
- 8.31. I agree based on the submissions by the applicant and having regard to the fact that there remains adequate open space for Arranmore that the requirements of Section 12.8.3.3 of the Development Plan can be met by condition. In this regard, as the proposed dwelling is located in a site with a large detached dwelling of generous proportions, I consider that the private open space should be 48 square metres as set out at Table 12.10 of the Development Plan. I also agree to protect the amenity of the occupants of both properties that the space should be enclosed by a 1.8-metre-high masonry or brick wall of a similar material to those used in the coach house and western boundary wall. This will address the residential amenity concern previously stated at paragraphs 8.19 and 8.20.
- 8.32. I do not consider there to be any need for a condition related to the maintenance of the property as previously specified by the Planning Authority and highlighted in the

planning applicant's response to the appeal. There is no standard for a development proposal which only has a curtilage on one side only. The applicant owns both properties and it is incumbent on them to facilitate access for maintenance purposes by agreement.

The parking requirement, road safety and traffic impact

- 8.33. The appellants argue that the proximity of the site to a DART station is not sufficient justification for zero parking provision for the proposed development. They state that the future occupants are likely to own or regularly use a private vehicle as car ownerships levels in Dalkey remain high notwithstanding public transport provision and the absence of in-curtilage parking provision impacts on pedestrian and road safety and results in a loss of residential amenities.
- 8.34. In respect of the appellants concerns I consider the guidelines in policy SPPR3 (ii) of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) to apply and this requires 1.5 parking spaces for one-bedroom dwellings. I also note that where a site is located near public transport this requirement can be reduced to one space as set out at table 12.5 of the Development Plan.
- 8.35. Zero parking is proposed and in examination of the assessment criteria for deviation from the car parking standards at Section 12.4.5.2 (i) of the Development Plan I acknowledge the scale of development is small and accept the site is in close proximity to the DART where the objective to safeguard investment in sustainable transport by encouraging modal shift militates the need for parking. I also observe from the site visit that there is available on-street car parking on Cunningham Drive and this is better used for resident parking rather than by commuters attracted to Dalkey DART station.
- 8.36. The Transport Division do not identify any road safety or adverse traffic impact and as the street already has cars parked on it one additional car user is not in my opinion going to impact on the visual or residential amenities of the area. I do not therefore consider the third-party objection to this proposal on the grounds of zero parking provision to be sustained and that a deviation from the parking standard is justified in accordance with Section 12.4.5.2 (i) of the Development Plan.

Cumulative Impact

- 8.37. The appellants observe that the cumulative effect of this proposal should have been considered alongside the application to alter and extend Arranmore in terms of the impact on the heritage character of adjoining properties. This application is concurrently under appeal as referred to in the planning history section as PL-501312-DR-26 (DA26/0135/WEB).
- 8.38. Notwithstanding the fact that I am required to consider this proposal on its own merits I do not observe any cumulative effects arising from the proposed development which is small in scale.
- 8.39. Having already concluded for the reasons set out in the preceding paragraphs that the proposal is in accordance with the requirements of the Objective A zoning of the Development Plan I do not consider there to be any compelling evidence provided in support of the submitted grounds of appeal to sustain a refusal of planning permission on the grounds of a loss of visual or residential amenities of the area.
- 8.40. The main issue is one of whether the applicant is legally entitled to make one or more openings in the western boundary wall and whether this might give rise in the future to other development proposals on the lands to the rear of Arranmore which may in the future cumulatively impact on the visual and residential amenities of Enderly.

The pedestrian access to Cunningham Drive

- 8.41. The appellants argue that the insertion of a pedestrian access through the boundary wall on Cunningham Drive relies on land which is owned by the residents of Enderly and which is managed on their behalf by Enderly OMC Ltd.
- 8.42. They also state the name and address of the owner was not specified Article 22 (1)(d) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) nor was permission sought or given from the residents or the managing company for Enderly in accordance with Q.10 of the application form.
- 8.43. They exhibit a plan which is prepared from two land registry folios which is annotated along the Cunningham Drive section "W"- "X" which is annotated 'existing footpath' and 'grass scrubland'. The proposed gate is annotated as "A". They submit in the grounds of appeal that the boundary wall is within the area of the two folios.

- 8.44. The planning applicants certify in the application form that their legal interest in the land as 'owner'. The western boundary wall is shown both as edged red to define the extent of the application site and blue to denote ownership for the balance of the lands in Arranmore. They refute the claim by the appellants and state in their response to the grounds of appeal that they own the land where the opening and pedestrian gate is proposed.
- 8.45. They refer to a photograph which shows the original wall unaltered and distinguish this from a section of wall at the junction with Enderly that was taken down and replaced with a new rubble stone wall behind a visibility splay.
- 8.46. Whilst I understand Section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2007 clarifies that the mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land are ultimately matters for resolution in the Courts the guidelines do confirm where doubt is cast on the sufficiency of the legal interest the planning authority can seek further information.
- 8.47. The planning authority do not engage with the initial observation submitted by the appellant other than to say that it is 'normally considered that boundary issues/disputes are private party matters and civil matters. They do not seek further information under Section 33 (1) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001.
- 8.48. Having considered the evidence provided in support of the appeal, the response received from the planning applicant and following a site visit I am satisfied that part of the wall was set back by 2.4 metres from the edge of the junction with Enderly to accommodate a 78.5 metre visibility splay and pedestrian footpath which is approximately 20 metres in length.
- 8.49. The two folios are not submitted with the grounds of appeal to properly understand the nature of the Enderly interest. That said I acknowledge that the residents would have an interest in ensuring the visibility splay remains unobstructed and the footpath is not impeded.
- 8.50. Where some doubt exists on the sufficiency of the legal interest the guidelines state that planning permission can still be granted subject to the provisions of Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000.

- 8.51. I cannot however say with any degree of certainty that the wall is owned by the residents of Enderly or within the area of the folios. I note the plan submitted with the grounds of appeal is not sufficiently detailed for me to distinguish who is the owner.
- 8.52. The planning applicants assert they have sufficient interest to allow a pedestrian access to be opened onto Cunningham Drive. The hardstanding proposed between the edge of the road and associated engineering works to facilitate level access are not however included in the application description or located on land owned by the planning applicant. For this reason, a planning condition is necessary to prevent the opening being made in the wall until details of the proposed hardstanding/footpath in the verge is submitted to and agreed in writing by the Council.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located approximately 1.15 kilometres west of the Rockabill to Dalkey Island Special Area of Conservation (SAC:03000) and Dalkey Special Protection Area (SPA: 004172).

The proposal comprises the refurbishment of the existing two-storey coach house as a one-bedroom dwelling by raising of the roof level; inserting three new rooflights; modifying the window openings; providing new fenestration throughout; installing solar panels; carrying out internal modification works; and construction of rear patio space, stepped access and new pedestrian gate onto Cunningham Road.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The site in an established residential neighbourhood and the scale of the proposed development which comprises the conversion and alteration of an existing building to a one-bedroom dwelling is small.
- The distance to the identified European sites and the lack of connection.
- Taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority.

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

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. There are no waterbodies adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed development comprises the refurbishment of the existing two-storey coach house as a one-bedroom dwelling by raising of the roof level; inserting three new rooflights; modifying the window openings; providing new fenestration throughout; installing solar panels; carrying out internal modification works; and construction of rear patio space, stepped access and new pedestrian gate onto Cunningham Road.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies wither qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The location of the site in an established residential neighbourhood and the scale of the proposed development which is comprised of the conversion and alteration of an existing building to a one-bedroom dwelling is small. Sustainable Urban Drainage can be used as mitigation and if properly designed reduce the impact of surface/storm water entering the drainage network.

I conclude on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters,

transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend the planning permission should be granted subject to condition for the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. The Commission is satisfied having regard to the requirements of Objective A, Section 11.4.3.2 Buildings of Vernacular and Heritage Interest, Section 12.3.7.7 Infill, Section 12.4.5.6 Residential Parking and Section 12.8.3.3 Private Open Space of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown Development Plan 2022-28 which has the purpose of improving residential amenity while protecting existing residential and visual amenities that the proposed adaptation of a former coach house as a one-bedroom dwelling is consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area subject to the following conditions.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted with the planning application except as may be otherwise required by the following conditions.

Reason: To clarify the plans and particulars for which permission is granted.

2. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:

- (a) the private open space shall have a total floor area of 48 square metres excluding the stairs, hardstanding behind the stairs, pedestrian gateway and bin storage.
- (b) the southern and eastern boundaries (as extended) enclosing the private open space shall be 1.8 metres in height and be of masonry and/or brick construction to match the existing building.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

3. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwelling shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The roof colour shall be blue-black, black or dark grey in colour only and the brick colour to be used shall be the same as that used in the existing building,

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

4. Development described in Classes 1 or 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, or any statutory provision modifying or replacing them, shall not be carried out within the curtilage of any of the proposed dwellinghouses without a prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and in order to ensure that a reasonable amount of private open space is provided for the benefit of the occupants of the proposed dwellings.

5. The footpath shown to adjoining verge shall be constructed up to the boundaries to provide access to adjoining lands with no obstruction including the erection of any structure which would otherwise constitute exempted development under the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. These areas shall be shown in a drawing which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

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

6. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement in writing with the planning authority in relation to the transfer of land in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and 96(3)(a), (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and/or the provision of

housing on the land in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and 96(3) (b), (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, unless an exemption certificate has been granted under section 97 of the Act, as amended. Where such an agreement cannot be reached between the parties, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which section 96(7) applies) shall be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement, to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and of the housing strategy in the development plan for the area.

7. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including:
 - (a) Location of the site and materials compound(s) including area(s) identified for the storage of construction refuse;
 - (b) Location of areas for construction site offices and staff facilities;
 - (c) Details of site security fencing and hoardings;
 - (d) Details of on-site car parking facilities for site workers during the course of construction;
 - (e) Measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network;
 - (f) Alternative arrangements to be put in place for pedestrians and vehicles in the case of the closure of any public road or footpath during the course of site development works;
 - (g) Details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels;

(h) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater;

(i) Off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste and details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil;

(j) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains.

(k) A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan shall be available for inspection by the planning authority;

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

8. Drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the relevant Section of the Council for such works and services.

Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit to the Planning Authority for written agreement a Stage 2 - Detailed Design Stage Storm Water Audit.

Upon completion of the development a Stage 3 Completion Stormwater Audit to demonstrate Sustainable Urban Drainage System measures have been installed, and are working as designed and that there has been no misconnections or damage to storm water drainage infrastructure during construction, shall be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement.

Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

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.

Conor Hughes
Planning Inspector

14th August 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501311-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Refurbishment of the existing two-storey coach house as a one-bedroom dwelling by raising of the roof level; inserting three new rooflights; modifying the window openings; providing new fenestration throughout; installing solar panels; carrying out internal modification works; and construction of rear patio space, stepped access and new pedestrian gate onto Cunningham Road.
Development Address	The Coach House, Cunningham Road, Dalkey, Co. Dublin, A96A9TV
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.	

EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
☒ 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.	Schedule 5 Part 2 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 ☒	

Inspector: _____

Date: 14th August 2026

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501311-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Refurbishment of the existing two-storey coach house as a one-bedroom dwelling by raising of the roof level; inserting three new rooflights; modifying the window openings; providing new fenestration throughout; installing solar panels; carrying out internal modification works; and construction of rear patio space, stepped access and new pedestrian gate onto Cunningham Road.
Development Address	The Coach House, Cunningham Road, Dalkey, Co. Dublin, A96A9TV
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 is the conversion of an outbuilding to a single dwelling with a modest footprint that comes forward as a standalone project. 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 reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic,	The development is located in an urban area within an established residential neighbourhood where existing services are available. The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan.

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).	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	
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.	No
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	No

Inspector: _____

Date: 14th August 2026