



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501315-DS-26

Development	Extension and renovation of house (protected structure)
Location	34 Belgrave Square West, Rathmines, Dublin 6
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB2948/25
Applicants	Finola Gallagher and Barry Quill
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission subject to conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party v. decision
Appellants	Michelle Foster
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	10 August 2026
Inspector	B. Wyse

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. No.34 Belgrave Square West is an end of terrace three storey Victorian house on the west side of Belgrave Square in Rathmines. The house is mostly brick fronted with granite quoins and a flight of granite steps leading to the main entrance at first floor level. It has a stated floor area of approx.215sqm. The house includes an original four storey rear return and a non-habitable attic conversion. It is currently used as single residence. There are front and back gardens and a pedestrian side entrance. There is vehicular access from a rear lane off nearby Cambridge Road.
- 1.2. The appellants house, No.35, is the adjoining terraced house to the north. No.33 is adjacent to the south, one of a pair of semi-detached houses and separated from No.34 by side passages.
- 1.3. Belgrave Square is characterised by a mix of similarly proportioned houses of varying styles. The central park is public.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises:
 - A new rear extension, part single storey and part three storey, including a double height space at lower ground floor level.
 - New opes to the rear external wall of the return.
 - New door ope to the side elevation.
 - Removal of non-original internal walls and stairs.
 - Replacement of non-original stairs at lower ground floor level.
 - New internal partitions.
 - New shower room at attic level.
 - New rooflights to rear of main roof.
 - Associated works.

2.2. The application documentation includes:

- Cover Letter
- Design Report
- Conservation Report and Method Statement
- Photographic Survey

2.3. Further information submitted on 20/03/2026 includes:

- The removal of the double height space (over the proposed dining area) at lower ground floor level in order to reduce the height of the wall along the boundary with the adjacent No.35 and a reduction in the projection of the extension by 395mm in order to address concerns in relation to impacts to that property. Revised drawings included.
- An Engineers report providing details and a method statement for a revised foundation design to address concerns about the impact on historic boundary walls.
- Revised drawings and supplementary photographs to show that the proposed removal and replacement of the stairs refers to modern (non-original) parts only.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The decision to grant permission is subject to 10 standard conditions.

Condition 1 provides that the development be carried out as modified at further information stage.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports (dated 08/10/2025 and 08/04/2026)

Basis for decision. Include:

- Height and length of originally proposed ground floor extension considered excessive relative to adjoining property.
- The proposed modifications submitted at further information stage deemed to address concerns raised.
- No requirement for appropriate assessment or environmental impact assessment.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Conservation Officer (dated 01/10/2025 and 07/04/2026)

- Apart from recommending further information in relation to the foundation design and impact on the boundary wall and the proposed works to the lower ground floor level stairs, it is indicated that the proposed extension would provide for the sympathetic enlargement of the existing full-height rear return and that the proposed development would be sensitive to the special character of the protected structure.
- Indicates that the proposed modifications and additional detail submitted at further information stage, subject to conditions, adequately addresses concerns raised.

Drainage Division – recommends standard conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

All relevant Article 28 bodies notified – no responses received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

Three submissions lodged from local residents. While not opposing the principle of the proposed development concerns raised include; impacts on No.35; excessive scale; character of terrace; and access via rear lane during construction.

4.0 **Planning History**

None relevant.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

Zoning: Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) – *To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.*

Section 14.7.2, states that Z2 zoned locations require special care in dealing with development proposals which affect structures in such areas, both protected and non-protected. The general objective for such areas is to protect them from unsuitable new developments or works that would have a negative impact on the amenity or architectural quality of the area.

No.34 is a Protected Structure - RPS Ref. 588. All the properties around Belgrave Square are also protected structures.

Policy BHA2 Development of Protected Structures

Includes:

That development will conserve and enhance protected structures and their curtilage and will:

(a) Ensure that any development proposals to protected structures, their curtilage and setting shall have regard to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) published by the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.

(b) Protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.

(c) Ensure that works are carried out in line with best conservation practice as advised by a suitably qualified person with expertise in architectural conservation.

(d) Ensure that any development, modification, alteration, or extension affecting a protected structure and/or its setting is sensitively sited and designed, and is appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, layout and materials.

(c) Ensure that the form and structural integrity of the protected structure is retained in any redevelopment and ensure that new development does not adversely impact the curtilage or the special character of the protected structure.

(d) Respect the historic fabric and the special interest of the interior, including its plan form, hierarchy of spaces, structure and architectural detail, fixtures and fittings and materials.

(e) Ensure that new and adapted uses are compatible with the architectural character and special interest(s) of the protected structure.

(f) Protect and retain important elements of built heritage including historic gardens, stone walls, entrance gates and piers and any other associated curtilage features.

Policy BHA9 Conservation Areas

Includes:

To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas – identified under Z8 and Z2 zoning objectives and denoted by red line conservation hatching on the zoning maps. Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.

Enhancement opportunities may include:

- 4. Contemporary architecture of exceptional design quality, which is in harmony with the Conservation Area.*
- 6. Retention of buildings and features that contribute to the overall character and integrity of the Conservation Area.*
- 7. The return of buildings to residential use.*

Appendix 18 Ancillary Residential Accommodation

Includes:

1.1 General Design Principles

It is acknowledged that the development of residential extensions plays an important role in promoting a compact city in line with the core strategy as well as providing for sustainable neighbourhoods and areas where a wide range of families can live.

The design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular, the need for light and privacy. In addition, the form of the existing building should be respected, and the development should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar or contrasting materials and finishes.

Innovative, contemporary design will be encouraged. A contemporary or modern approach, providing unique designs, can offer a more imaginative solution. However, such proposals are still required to take account of the design issues outlined in this document.

Applications for extensions to existing residential units should:

- *Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling*
- *Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight*
- *Achieve a high quality of design*
- *Make a positive contribution to the streetscape (front extensions)*

1.2 Extensions to Rear

Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining. The extension should match or complement the main house.

First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the planning authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:

- *Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries*
- *Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability*
- *Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries*
- *External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing*

1.6 Daylight and Sunlight

Large single or two-storey rear extensions to semi-detached or terraced dwellings can, if they project too far from the main rear elevation, result in a loss of daylight to neighbouring houses. Furthermore, depending on orientation, such extensions can have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight received by adjoining properties. On the other hand, it is also recognised that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable. Consideration should be given to the proportion of extensions, height and design of roofs as well as taking account of the position of windows including rooms they serve to adjacent or adjoining dwellings.

5.2. Relevant Ministerial Guidelines

5.2.1. Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities – Department of Arts, Heritage and Gaeltacht, 2011

Chapter 6 Development Control

Includes:

Paragraph 6.8.1

It will often be necessary to permit appropriate new extensions to protected structures in order to make them fit for modern living and to keep them in viable economic use.

Paragraph 6.8.2

If planning permission is to be granted for an extension, the new work should involve the smallest possible loss of historic fabric and ensure that important features are not obscured, damaged or destroyed. In general, principal elevations of a protected structure (not necessarily just the façade) should not be adversely affected by new extensions.

Paragraph 6.8.3

The architectural style of additions does not necessarily need to imitate historical styles or replicate the detailing of the original building in order to be considered acceptable..... Extensions should complement the original structure in terms of scale, materials and detailed design while reflecting the values of the present time.

Chapter 7 Conservation Principles

Section 7.7 – Promotes minimum intervention.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

- 6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. See Form 1 in Appendix below.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appeal is lodged on behalf of Michelle Foster, resident at the adjoining no.35 Belgrave Square West. The main grounds can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed extension to the return is in effect a three and a half storey extension of approx. 10.9m in height over ground immediately adjoining the appellants dwelling. It would extend an additional 2.7m from the original 1.3m long return resulting in a 4m intrusion along the boundary.
- The reduction in height of the proposed single storey extension still results in a built form of approx. 3.3m with the tallest point, comprising the end ridge, reaching 3.7m. It does not alter the appellants concern that the extension will outreach the height of the party wall while extending 8m along that boundary.
- Without prejudice to the appellants argument that the proposed extension should be refused in its entirety, if permission is granted then it should only permit the single-storey element rather than the double-height element.
- The scale of the extension is inconsistent with the development plan guidelines for domestic extensions and would appear over dominant when viewed from the appellants property.
- The proposal is not consistent with the established pattern of development along the terrace and does not respect the protected status of the terrace by maintaining the integrity of both house and gardens.
- The proposal would give rise to a significant loss of residential amenity at No.35 through; overshadowing – the extension being to the south would significantly increase overshadowing to the rear facing rooms, particularly during afternoons, and result in reduced daylight to habitable rooms at ground and first floor levels, contrary to the principles/standards referenced in the development plan; overbearance – being immediately adjacent to the 2m high party wall the proposal would create an unwelcome sense of enclosure and visual dominance. At a wider level it would undermine the integrity of the terrace.

- The proposal would be inconsistent with relevant development plan policies in relation to extensions/alterations to dwellings, residential amenity standards and built heritage and conservation policies.
- The roof of the proposed single storey extension could be used as an elevated outdoor south facing amenity space with consequent potential for overlooking and noise nuisance. Such potential use needs to be explicitly prohibited or eliminated through design.
- The second planning authority planners report incorrectly refers to the property as being subject to zoning objective Z1 and which may have given rise to an undervaluation of the conservation importance of the terrace.
- The proposed extension would be inconsistent with the purpose of the Z2 zoning.

7.2. Applicant Response

Includes:

- By reference to Section 14.7.2 of the development plan the proposal seeks and achieves a reasonable balance in protecting the protected structure from unsuitable development that might have a negative impact on the amenity or architectural quality of the area. The design also had regard to Policies BHA2 and BHA9 as well as Appendix 18 of the plan.
- The three storey extension would only extend 2.69m from the existing return. It is misleading to characterise it as a 4m intrusion.
- The modified single storey extension would have a consistent height of 3.4m, with 3.68m at the parapet.
- An attached Sunlight, Daylight and Shadow Assessment includes the following:
 - Both the appellants garden, and that of No.33 (adjacent to the south), remain compliant for sunlight levels on 21 March by reference to BRE 209 (2022).
 - While not all rear facing windows at the appellants house relate to living rooms all windows were assessed for Vertical Sky Component (VSC). All except one passed the test (BRE target). A basement window (

described in the main report as a doorwell) adjacent to the party boundary and an extension to the rear of the appellants house falls marginally below the BRE test measure of 0.8. The results are similar for a sunlight into living spaces assessment.

- The BRE guidelines are advisory rather than mandatory and expressly permit the exercise of judgement. One marginal shortfall does not warrant a refusal of permission. Overall it is reasonable to conclude that the proposed development complies with the guidelines.
- In relation to the issue of overbearance the proposed extensions would sit behind the shared 2m high boundary wall. The extension is modest and reasonably scaled for these houses which also have substantial rear gardens.
- By reference to the relevant development plan provisions the proposed development: has had regard to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines; will not negatively impact on the special character or appearance of No.34; will be carried out in line with best conservation practice as advised by a suitably qualified person; as modified, is sensitively sited and designed and is appropriate in terms of scale, mass, height, density, layout and materials; retains the structural integrity of the protected structure and adjoining structures and retains important associated curtilage features; will not adversely impact the curtilage or special character of the protected structure; and involves internal works that respect the historic fabric of the protected structure.
- The setting of the residential conservation area will not change. The change to the rear is so small that there is no case to answer.
- There is no intention to use the roof of the ground floor extension for any purpose other than as a roof. There are no proposed external doors. Should the Commission deem it necessary there is no objection to a condition precluding any amenity use.
- The proposal is in compliance with the Z2 zoning.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority decision should be upheld and a Section 48 development contribution condition should be attached to any grant of permission.

7.4. Appellant Further Response

Includes:

- The substantive concern relates to the proposed ground floor extension which, even as modified, should properly be characterised as 1.5 storey extension.
- Contests that the results of the applicants Sunlight, Daylight and Shadow assessment are accurately characterised and points to a number of failures, relative to BRE thresholds.
- The references by the applicants to the ground floor basement doorwell (and to the basement being a separate rental apartment) at No.35 are not grounds for dismissal of effects as per the BRE guidelines.
- The winter probable sunlight hours (WPSH) failures for the first and second floor windows of No.35 nearest the common boundary rely on speculation as to the use of these rooms and, in any event, bedrooms are not excluded from assessment under BRE.
- By reference to one particular part of the amenity space (garden areas) of No.33, the neighbouring house to the south of No.34, cited as the kitchen and main living area, the assessment for sunlight on 21st March indicates a significant fail as per the BRE threshold. A pass is only recorded because the residual sunlit area satisfies the 2 hour threshold across the combined amenity space or garden.
- The BRE caveat that the guidelines are not mandatory and should be interpreted flexibly has been applied selectively in the assessment.
- The cumulative impact across the various tests, relating to a number of failures to a particular window or amenity space, is not analysed or quantified.

7.5. Observations

None received.

8.0 **Assessment**

- 8.1. The main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal and I am satisfied no other substantive issues arise. The issues focus on the impact of the proposed rear extension on the residential amenities of the adjoining No.35 Belgrave Square West. There are also concerns raised about the potential impact on the character of the wider terrace.
- 8.2. In the interests of clarity the following assessment refers to the proposed development as modified in the further information submission to the planning authority, and which is the subject of the planning authority decision to grant permission, unless otherwise stated.
- 8.3. Looking at the proposed ground floor extension first, the modified design is for a flat roofed structure substantively about 3.4m in height, with a short parapet at the outer extremity of about 3.68m in height. The structure would extend (externally) approximately 7.8m from the original rear wall of the return. The structure would be set inside the existing c.2m high party wall with the adjoining No.35. I do not consider that the proposed extension would be disproportionately large relative to the size of these houses nor do I consider that it would have any unduly adverse impact on No.35 either in terms of overshadowing or overbearance. Its characterisation by the appellant as an effective 1.5 storey extension does not alter this conclusion.
- 8.4. Looking at the proposed extension to the rear return, the existing return is unusually shallow – extending just 1.35m (externally) from the main rear elevation of the house. The proposal is to extend this by a further 2.69m (externally). Following the line of the ground floor extension the extended return would be set inside the party wall with the adjoining No.35. In my view this represents a relatively modest extension and is unlikely to give rise to any unduly adverse effects on No.35 either in terms of overshadowing or overbearance.
- 8.5. In response to the concerns raised by the appellant in relation to possible overshadowing the applicants have submitted a Sunlight, Daylight and Shadow Assessment prepared by specialist consultants. It should be noted that the development plan does not require such assessments for small domestic development proposals or even advise that they be prepared – they are required/advised for larger

developments. Not surprisingly, in my view, the assessment, and which is stated to be in accordance with *Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice, BRE 209 (2022)*, and which is the standard guidance, where relevant, cited by Dublin City Council and others, indicates results that are generally in line with the conclusions drawn above, namely that the proposed development would not have any unduly adverse effects on the adjoining No.35. Noting that the guidance is advisory and is designed to be interpreted flexibly, the results indicate substantive compliance with the guidelines across all factors assessed, including skylight (VSC) and sunlight to habitable rooms and sunlight to ground.

- 8.6. The ground floor French doors (referred to in the applicants response submission as a doorwell and identified as window 1.0.1 in the assessment) of No.35 located close to the existing party wall record a marginal fail for VSC and a substantial fail in relation to summer and winter sunlight. The first and second floor windows immediately above the French doors (windows 1.1.1 and 1.2.1 in the assessment) record a substantial fail, indicated in the assessment as marginal, in relation to winter sunlight. Otherwise all windows pass all the relevant tests. The sunlight to ground test results indicate an overall pass for the rear garden of No.35. The fail result cited in the appellants appeal response submission refers to the rear garden of No.33 (identified as areas 2.A1 and 2.A2 in the assessment), the adjacent house to the south of No.34. The result for the area to the rear of this garden (area 2.A2) indicates a substantial fail which is difficult to understand given that this property is due south of No.34 and, therefore, could not possibly be affected by the proposed development in terms of access to sunlight..
- 8.7. In relation to the appellants further response submission that includes a critique of the applicants assessment I would comment as follows. I do not agree that the caveat that the BRE guidelines are not mandatory and should be interpreted flexibly has been applied selectively. By definition the document is for guidance purposes only and it is important, in my view, that some flexibility is allowed for and this will inevitably focus on situations where the recommended thresholds are not met. I agree that the most significant likely effect from the proposed extension would be on the ground floor room accessed by the French doors of No.35, as described, with a lesser effect on the rooms above. However, and assuming that all these areas are used as habitable space, I do not consider that the effects identified are of such significance as to warrant a refusal of permission. It must be recognised that almost any extension of a

reasonable size would likely have some effect on neighbouring properties and this is explicitly acknowledged in the daylight and sunlight guidance in the development plan (Section 5.1 above). The identified negative effect on garden areas relates to the adjacent No.33 to the south of No.34 and are most likely in error. Taken cumulatively I do not consider the potential negative effects to be so adverse as to undermine the proposed development.

- 8.8. In relation to the impact of the development on the wider terrace I agree with the planning authority Conservation Officer that the proposal represents a sympathetic enlargement of the protected structure and that it is sensitive to its special character. It follows that I do not consider that it would have any negative consequences for the terrace as a whole. In this, I would particularly note the advice of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines that it will often be necessary to permit extensions to protected structures in order to make them fit for modern living and to ensure that they remain economically viable.
- 8.9. I do not consider that there is any basis to the concern raised by the appellant in relation to the possible use of the roof of the ground floor extension for amenity purposes.
- 8.10. I am satisfied, therefore, that the proposed extension as a whole is reasonably proportionate and that it would not have any unduly adverse effects on the adjoining No.35 or on the terrace. I consider that the development has been well considered and that it is in compliance with the development plan Z2 zoning objective, Policies BHA2 and 9 and Appendix 18 and the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 9.1. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project within an established and serviced urban area, and taking account of the screening determination of the planning authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.2. 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. Appropriate Assessment, therefore, is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. I have assessed the 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 & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status) and to prevent deterioration.
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project in a serviced urban area, 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.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that permission be granted subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

It is considered that the proposed development, subject to compliance with the conditions below, would be in compliance with the Z2 zoning objective for the area and with Policies BHA2 and BHA9 and Appendix 18 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and that it would not seriously injure the residential amenities of property in the vicinity. Furthermore, it is considered that the design of the development has had due regard to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, DHLGH (2011) and that it would not adversely affect the special character or integrity of the protected structure or that of the wider terrace. The proposed development 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 plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 3rd day of February 2026, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Prior to the commencement of the development the developer shall submit, for the written agreement of the planning authority, confirmation that the development will be monitored and supervised by a suitably qualified architect or other professional with conservation expertise and accreditation.

Reason: In the interest of the protection of architectural heritage of the protected structure.

3. Prior to the commencement of the development the developer shall submit, for the written agreement of the planning authority, a detailed method statement covering all works proposed to be carried out, including: (a) a full specification, including details of materials and methods, to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with *Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines, Department of Arts, Heritage & the Gaeltacht, 2011* (b) a methodology for the recording and/or retention of concealed features or fabric exposed during the works, (c) details of features to be temporarily removed/relocated during construction works and their final re-instatement and (d) details of materials/features of architectural interest to be salvaged.

Reason: In the interest of the protection of the architectural heritage of the protected structure.

4. The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles/slates) shall harmonise with those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

5. The disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 and 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

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

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.

B. Wyse
Planning Inspector

18 August 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501315-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	Domestic extension and renovations (protected structure).
Development Address	34 Belgrave Square West, Rathmines, Dublin 6
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2
	☐ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	

3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☐ 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)	
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ B. Wyse

Date: _____ 18 August 2026