



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501432-DF-26

Development

Retention of change of use of previously permitted "granny flat extension" to independent one-bedroom residential unit and permission for alterations and all associated site works.

Location

26, Offington Park, Sutton, Dublin 13.

Planning Authority

Fingal County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

F26A/0163E.

Applicant(s)

Bob Fagan.

Type of Application

Retention Permission and Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse.

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Bob Fagan.

Observer(s)

None on file relating to appeal.

Date of Site Inspection

29th July 2026.

Inspector

Des Johnson.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on the western side of Offington Park within the existing curtilage of No.26, which is a dormer style dwelling to front and two-storey to the rear.
- 1.2. The site is located roughly midpoint along Offington Park and equidistant from its junction with Carrickbrack Road to the south and Howth Road to the north. It is bounded to the east by Offington Park, to the south by No.26, to the west by school grounds and to the north by No.24.
- 1.3. The front building line of No.26 is set back c.14.5m and is at an oblique angle to the adjoining carriageway, as are other houses on Offington Park. The established pattern of development in the area is one of single storey and 1.5 storey dwellings of varying designs on large sites.
- 1.4. There is a low wall along the site frontage. This adjoins a footpath and grass verge. There is a mature deciduous tree and telegraph pole in the grass verge outside No.26.
- 1.5. The subject building is single storey with glass frontage. It has a pitched roof on its front section with ridge at right angles to the site frontage. The building is attached to No.26 and has a separate front door.
- 1.6. No.26 has a large rear garden part of which is laid out as a golf putting surface.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposal is for the retention of:

1. change of use of existing single-storey “granny flat extension” to the side and rear of existing house (granted permission under An Bord Pleanála Reference No. PL06F.249118) to an independent one-bedroom residential unit,
2. the front door to the independent residential unit which has replaced a window in the front elevation,
3. the closure of the connecting doorway between the “extension” and the main house,
4. the omission of a bedroom window set back in the front elevation of the “extension” along the passageway to the front door,

5. the existing flat roof in-lieu of a pitched roof to the rear of the “extension, and planning permission for the development of:
6. a new vehicular entrance and the front driveway to serve the independent residential unit,
7. the erection of boundary fences to the proposed front and rear gardens which will serve the independent residential unit,
8. the development of secure bin storage and bicycle parking facilities to serve the independent residential unit and
9. all associated site works.

2.2. The submitted drawings show the following accommodation:

Kitchen/dining	23sqm
Store (x2)	1.8sqm and 2.1sqm
Bathroom	4.9sqm
Corridor	8.3sqm
Bedroom	19.0sqm

2.3. The gross floor area of the existing building is stated to be 60sqm and the site area is 0.0387ha. It is proposed to connect to public services.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority decided to refuse permission for 2 reasons, summarised as follows:

1. Ad hoc overdevelopment of the site, incongruous with the existing pattern of development, contrary to Objectives 94 and DMSO32. Undesirable precedent when considered cumulatively would be contrary to the ‘RS’ zoning objective.
2. Material contravention of a condition of an existing permission (Condition 4 of Reg Ref: ABP PL-06F.249118), contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- No submissions were received in relation to the proposed development. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to relevant planning criteria. The application is made in response to an Enforcement Notice. The proposed unit does not meet the criteria set out for Garden Rooms or Family Flats and the proposal is assessed as an independent residential unit. In principle the development seeking retention is not acceptable within the 'RS' zoning objective. The external works seeking retention would not unduly detract from the visual amenities of the streetscape if they related to the extension of the existing dwelling. The character of this area is formed by detached dwellings on large plots, and the development of an independent dwelling would be incongruous with the established pattern of development in the surrounding area and contrary to Objective DMSO32 of the Development Plan. The proposal is for an ad hoc and haphazard overdevelopment of the site. The development would be contrary to Local Objective 49. The development to be retained would be contrary to the permission granted under Ref: PL.06F.249118 and set an undesirable precedent in the area.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- The Transport Planning Section has no objection subject to conditions.
- Water Services Department have no objection subject to conditions

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None on file.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. Reference PL 06F.249118 – Permission granted at 26, Offington Park for a single-storey, one bedroom family unit to the side and rear of the existing house, and all associated site works.

Condition 4 – The proposed granny flat extension shall be used solely for that purpose and shall revert to use as part of the main dwelling on the cessation of such use.

Reason – To protect the amenities of property in the vicinity.

- 4.2. Reference 394626-19 – Permission refused at 26, Offington Park for alterations to previously approved development including change of use from a family living unit to a pre-school childcare facility etc. The single reason for refusal was as follows:

Having regard to the overall capacity of and intensity of use of the proposed sessional childcare facility, it is considered that the scale of operation and intensity of use would be contrary to the requirements of Appendix 4 of the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 which requires that the use of a sessional childcare facility be subordinate to the use of the dwelling as a main residence. The proposed development would seriously injure the residential amenities of the area and property in the vicinity and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

- 4.3. Enforcement Notice ENF: 19/318B – issued in July 2025 relating to the non-compliance with Condition 4 of F17A/318B (PL.06F.249118).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 is the statutory plan for the area.

The site is in an area zoned 'RS' with the objective *to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity.*

The site is within Noise Zone D relating to Dublin Airport.

There is a Local Objective (94) applying to the Offington area – to ensure that development is in keeping with the layout, scale, design, and character of existing development.

Objective SPQHO40 – Development of Corner or Wide Garden Sites. It is an objective to favourably consider proposals providing for the development of corner or wide garden sites within the curtilage of existing dwellings in established residential areas subject to the achievement of prescribed standards and safeguards set out in Chapter 14 Development Management Standards.

Objective SPQHO42 – Development of Underutilised Infill, Corner and Backland Sites. It is an objective to encourage and promote the development of underutilised infill, corner and backland sites in existing residential areas subject to the character of the area and environment being protected.

Objective DMSO27 – Minimum Private Open Space Provision. It is an objective to ensure a minimum open space provision for dwelling houses (exclusive of car parking area) as follows: -3 bedroom houses or less to have a minimum of 60 sq. m. of private open space located behind the front building line of the house.

Objective DMSO31 – Infill Development. It is an objective that new infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units. Infill development shall retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings.

Objective DMSO32 – Infill Development on Corner / Side Garden Sites. It is an objective that applications for residential infill development on corner/side garden sites will be assessed against the following criteria:

- Compatibility with adjoining structures in terms of overall design, scale and massing. This includes adherence to established building lines, proportions, heights, parapet levels, roof profile and finishing materials.
- Consistency with the character and form of development in the surrounding area.
- Provision of satisfactory levels of private open space to serve existing and proposed dwelling units.
- Ability to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residential units. "
- Ability to maximise surveillance of the public domain, including the use of dual frontage in site specific circumstances.
- Provision of side/gable and rear access arrangements, including for maintenance.

- Compatibility of boundary treatment to the proposed site and between the existing and proposed dwellings. Existing boundary treatments should be retained/ reinstated where possible.
- Impact on street trees in road-side verges and proposals to safeguard these features.
- Ability to provide a safe means of access and egress to serve the existing and proposed dwellings.
- Provision of secure bin storage areas for both existing and proposed dwellings.

Table 14.4: relates to Infill Development It states that Infill Development presents unique opportunities to provide bespoke architectural solutions to gap sites and plays a key role in achieving sustainable consolidation and enhancing public realms. Proposals for infill development will be required at a minimum to:

- Provide a high-quality design response to the context of the infill site, taking cognisance of architectural form, site coverage, building heights, building line, grain, and plot width.
- Examine and address within the overall design response issues in relation to overbearance, overlooking and overshadowing.
- Respect and compliment the character of the surrounding area having due regard to the prevailing scale, mass, and architectural form of buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site.
- Provide a positive contribution to the streetscape including active frontage, ensuring that the impacts of ancillary services such as waste management, parking and services are minimised.
- Promote active street frontages having regard to the design and relationship between the public realm and shopfronts of adjacent properties.

Section 14.8.1 refers to Floor Areas The minimum size of habitable rooms for houses shall conform with dimensions as set out in Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities: Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities 2007 or the appropriate National Guidelines standards in operation at the date of lodging the application for planning permission.

5.2. Relevant National Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

The National Planning Framework – 1st Revision April 2025.

National Policy Objective 42 - to target the delivery of housing to accommodate approximately 50,000 additional homes per annum to 2040.

National Policy Objective 43 - prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.

National Policy Objective 45 - increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration, increased building height and more compact forms of development.

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement – Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024.

Section 1.3.2 refers to Compact Growth. It states that in order to achieve compact growth, we will need to support more intensive use of existing buildings and properties, including the re-use of existing buildings that are vacant and more intensive use of previously developed land and infill sites, in addition to the development of sites in locations served by existing facilities and public transport.

Table 3.1 refers to Areas and Density Ranges for Dublin and Suburbs. Suburban areas are the lower density car-orientated residential suburbs constructed at the edge of cities in the latter half of the 20th and early 21st century, while urban extension refers to the greenfield lands at the edge of the existing built up footprint that are zoned for residential or mixed-use (including residential) development. It is a policy and objective of these Guidelines that residential densities in the range 40 dph to 80 dph (net) shall generally be applied at suburban and urban extension locations in Dublin and Cork, and that densities of up to 150 dph (net) shall be open for consideration at 'accessible' suburban / urban extension locations (as defined in Table 3.8

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

North Dublin Bay SAC – c.360m to the southwest

North Bull Island SPA & pNHA – c.360m to the southwest

Baldoyle Bay SAC & pNHA – c.440m to the north

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

These may be summarised as follows:

- The site is occupied by a single storey building (60sqm) which accommodates an independent residential unit, featuring a bedroom, kitchen/living/dining room, bathroom and store. In granting permission under Ref: 17A/0198, the Board determined that a single-storey, one-bedroom family unit on this appeal site (granny flat) would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the adjoining properties
- There is an identified need for accommodation for single and two person households within established suburban residential areas such as Sutton
- The National Planning Framework First Revision 2025 includes a Policy Objective (42) targeting the delivery of approximately 50,000 additional homes per annum to 2040, with the new homes sited at locations that can support sustainable development at an appropriate scale of provision relative to their location (Policy Objective 43). Residential densities are to be achieved by measures which include infill development and more compact forms of development.
- The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities endorse the application of a range of densities and promote far greater flexibility in facilitating a greater range of house types and the development of more compact “own door” form of housing.
- Local Objective 94 appears to be to ensure that new development respects the distinctive character of the area. There are no Protected Structures on the site or in its environs and Offington is not designated as an Architectural Conservation Area.

- The site density is below the lower limit of the density range recommended for residential development for suburbs such as Offington in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities. The Commission should have regard to the Guidelines in the determination of the appeal.
- The minimum area of private amenity open space required for a one-bedroom house under the Guidelines is 20sqm. An area of 190sqm is proposed. There is provision for 2 on-site parking spaces and an independent vehicular access is proposed without compromising the arrangements for No.26.
- The design and location of the unit is subordinate to No.26, is well integrated into the streetscape and is consistent in architectural form, design, height and scale with the established character of the area.
- Assessment under this Local Objective 94 should have regard to National Policies. Should the Commission determine that the development is in conflict with this Local Objective, it should in any event grant permission for an independent one-bedroom residential unit (semi-detached house) which complies with relevant standards relating to the provision of private amenity open space, car and cycle on-site parking, and waste storage facilities.
- Objective DMSO32 sets criteria for the assessment of residential infill developments in corner/side garden sites. The subject development largely complies with the Objectives requirements with regard to overall design, scale, massing and its compatibility with the existing house
- This is an area that the Guidelines classifies as suburban – low density car orientated residential suburb. It is an Objective of the Guidelines that residential densities of 40dph to 80dph should be applied to such areas. The achievement of this Objective requires a focus on the delivery of innovative house types facilitating compact growth. The subject development represents a density of c.25dph
- The proposed alterations would have no material impact on the visual or residential amenities or neighbouring properties in the area.
- The development is consistent with the zoning objective

- The floor areas of rooms in the subject unit are generally well in excess of the ‘Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities; Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes – Sustaining Communities 2007’. The development complies with key quantitative requirements of the Development Plan and relevant Guidelines.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

Having reviewed the grounds of appeal, the Planning Authority considers that retention as an independent residential unit detracts from the character, visual and residential amenity of existing development in the area and would set an undesirable future precedent. It is ad hoc overdevelopment of the site in an established residential area and should be refused. Reasons for refusal contained in the Planning report are repeated in the response.

In the event of the appeal being successful, provision should be made for a financial contribution and/or any Special Development Contributions required, and also a tree bond.

7.3. Observations

None on file relating to appeal.

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. There are two distinct elements to this proposed development. Permission is being sought to retain the change of use of the existing single storey “granny flat extension” to the side and rear of the existing house at No.26 Offington Park to an independent residential unit, and alterations to the front door to the unit which has replaced a window in the front elevation of the extension, the closure of a connecting doorway between the extension and the main dwelling, the omission of a bedroom window set back in the front elevation of the extension, and the existing flat roof in-lieu of a pitched roof to the rear of the extension. Planning permission is also being sought for a new vehicular entrance and front driveway to serve the “independent residential unit”, the erection of boundary fences to the front and rear gardens which will serve the “independent residential unit”, the development of secure bin storage and bicycle parking facilities, and all associated site works.

- 8.2. The Planning Authority decided to refuse permission for 2 reasons relating to 'ad hoc' development which would be incongruous with the existing pattern of development contrary to the zoning objective and Local Objective 94 and Objective DMSO32 setting an undesirable precedent, and material contravention of a condition of permission granted under Ref: ABP PL.06F.249118.
- 8.3. The grounds of appeal include the contention that the Board previously determined that the unit permitted would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of property in the vicinity and the proposed alterations would have no material impact on the visual or residential amenities on neighbouring properties in the area, the proposal would be consistent with National Policy, relevant Guidelines and Development Plan provisions, development standards for an independent residential unit are satisfied, and the design is well integrated into the streetscape and consistent in architectural form, design, height and scale with the existing character of the area and the character of the existing dwelling. The grounds of appeal request that, in the event of the Commission determining that the development is in conflict with Local Objective 94, it should in any event grant permission for an independent one-bedroom residential unit (semi-detached dwelling) which complies with relevant standards.
- 8.4. This assessment considers the proposal under the following headings:
- Policy
 - Planning History
 - Reason 1 for Refusal
 - Reason 2 for Refusal
 - Other Issues
 - Appropriate Assessment

Policy

- 8.5. The site is in an established residential area, zoned 'RS' Residential with the objective *to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity*. Residential development is 'permissible in principle' within this zoning subject to compliance with other policies and objectives of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.

- 8.6. There is a Local Objective applying to the Offington area – to ensure that development is in keeping with the layout, scale, design, and character of existing development. These issues are addressed under Reason 1 for refusal later in this assessment.

Planning History

- 8.7. There is an existing permission relating to the subject structure, but not all of the conditions of the permission granted have been complied with. Under Ref: PL 06F.248118 (Planning Authority Ref: F17A/0198), permission was granted for a single-storey, one bedroom family unit to the side and rear of the existing house (No.26), and all associated site works. It is clear from the original planner's report of the local authority and the subsequent Board Direction relating to the appeal of that decision, that the permitted residential unit was to be integrated with the main dwelling. Condition 4 of the Board's decision stated that 'the proposed granny flat extension shall be used solely for that purpose and shall revert to use as part of the main dwelling on the cessation of such use'. The reason given for the insertion of this condition was 'to protect the amenities of property in the vicinity'. A similar condition (Condition 7) was included in the original planning authority decision (which was appealed) under Ref: F17A/0198
- 8.8. The permitted unit under PL 06F.248118 physically attached to the main dwelling and, on cessation of use as a "granny flat", was to revert to use of part of the main house. The submitted drawings showed access to the family flat unit through the main dwelling
- 8.9. The appellant states that the subject unit was originally occupied by a family member but was later let. The Local Authority initiated enforcement procedures relating to the non-compliance with Condition 4 of the permission granted. Enforcement proceedings are a matter for the Planning Authority and not the Commission.

Reason 1 for Refusal

- 8.10. This reason states that *'the development seeking retention permission constitutes ad hoc haphazard overdevelopment of the site which would be incongruous within the pattern of development within the surrounding area and would be contrary to Local Objective 94 and DMSO32 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. To permit the development would set an undesirable precedent which when considered cumulatively would be contrary to the RS Zoning Objective which seeks to 'Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity'.*

- 8.11. It is clear from the public notices that the subject unit, which was permitted as a “granny flat extension”, was subsequently in use as an independent one-bedroom residential unit. There is no evidence of any authorisation for such a use and, as such, no weight should be given to its stated current use. The proposal should be assessed as a semi-detached independent residential unit.
- 8.12. The appellants contend that the development achieves all the relevant standards for a semi-detached one-bedroom residential unit. The Planning Authority contends that the proposal is for ad hoc overdevelopment of the site in an established residential area. I conclude that standards are met in terms of floor areas for rooms within the unit and, together with the proposed provision of private open space and on-site parking provision, are acceptable for a semi-detached one-bedroom residential unit, but the proposal should be considered in the context of the specific location on Offington Park.
- 8.13. Significantly, the Fingal Development Plan shows a Local Objective 94 applying to the Offington area. This clearly indicates current policy for the Offington area. It is an objective to ensure that proposed development is in keeping with the layout, scale, design and character of existing development. The established pattern of development in the vicinity is one of single storey and 1.5 storey dwellings of varying designs on large sites, set back from and at oblique angles to Offington Park. I contend that the proposal for a semi-detached, one-bedroom dwelling is not in keeping with the established layout, or scale of development in the area. Furthermore, the design of the proposed semi-detached one-bedroom dwelling, including front door access at the end of a short irregular shaped passageway with the main dwelling, would not be compatible with the existing detached dwelling (no.26) or in keeping with the established character of development. As such, I conclude that the proposed development would contravene materially Local Objective 94 and Objective DMSO32.
- 8.14. The Planning Authority contends that the proposed development of a semi-detached, one-bedroom residential unit would set an undesirable precedent for further similar developments in the area. Under Ref: PL.06F.249118, and Condition 4 of that decision, the Board required the permitted “granny flat extension” to revert to use as part of the main dwelling for reason to protect the amenities of property in the vicinity. Having regard to Development Plan policy for the area, I consider that the proposed

development would set an undesirable precedent for other similar type developments which, when considered cumulatively, would be contrary to the 'RS' zoning objective.

Reason 2 for Refusal

- 8.15. This reason states that *the development seeking retention planning permission would materially contravene a condition of an existing permission for development, namely, Condition no. 4 of An Bord Pleanála Ref: ABP PL06F.249118 which set out “the proposed granny flat extension shall be used solely for that purpose, and shall revert to use as part of the main dwelling on the cessation of such use and as such to grant retention planning permission would be contrary to the proposed planning and sustainable development of the area.*
- 8.16. The use authorised by ABP Ref: PL.06F.249118 was for a “granny flat extension”, and the terms of that permission included a condition that the development be used solely as a granny flat extension and that it should revert to use as part of the main dwelling upon cessation of such use. The reason for the condition was to protect the amenities of property in the vicinity.
- 8.17. There is no evidence of any other authorised use of the unit on file. Having regard to the above assessment and recommendation relating to the Planning Authority’s Reason 1 for refusal, I conclude that the proposal for retention of change of use from a “granny flat extension” to an independent semi-detached one-bedroom residential unit, would be in material contravention of Condition 4 of the existing permission granted under ABP Ref: PL.06F.249118.

Other Issues

- 8.18. The Planning Authority contends that the proposal represents ad hoc, haphazard overdevelopment of the site. The site area is stated to be 0.0387ha. The original (and existing) site for No.26 is stated to be 0.123ha (see Ref: PL.06F.249118). The proposed site is considerably smaller in area than the existing site for No.26, and the existing pattern of development on Offington Park. In these circumstances and having regard to the planning history relating to No.26, I conclude that the proposal to provide an independent semi-detached residential unit on part of the site of No.26, does represent ad hoc overdevelopment.

8.19. The appellant contends that the proposed creation of additional housing is in line with the National Planning Framework and meets a demonstrable need. The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024 support the application of a range of densities and greater range of house types in more compact developments. I consider that, while the Guidelines recommend a range of densities which may generally be applied in suburban and urban extension locations, Development Plan policy for each specific location is a fundamental consideration. In this case Development Plan policy for the Offington area is expressed through the Zoning Objective and also Local Objective 94 in addition to other provisions of the Plan. Assessed against these objectives, I consider that the proposed retention development should be refused

9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed development for retention in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located in an established residential area at Offington Park, Sutton, Dublin 15.

The proposed development comprises the retention of change of use of previously permitted “granny flat extension” to independent one-bedroom residential unit, and all associated site works.

Having considered the nature and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature of the development
- The location in an established residential area,
- The separation distance and absence of any connectivity to any European sites

I conclude that 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. The subject site is located in an established residential area in Sutton, Dublin 15. The proposed development relates to the retention of the change of use of previously permitted “granny flat extension” to independent one-bedroom residential unit, together with all associated and ancillary works. No water deterioration concerns are raised in the appeal. I have assessed the development in the context of the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. Having regard to the nature and location of the development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment as there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that planning permission for retention and permission be refused.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The development for which retention permission is sought represents ad hoc overdevelopment of the site which would be inconsistent with the existing pattern of development in the area, would contravene Local Objective 94 and Objective DMSO32 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. The development would set an undesirable precedent for similar type developments which, considered cumulatively, would conflict with the ‘RS’ Zoning Objective for the area, and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area,
2. The retention of change of use of previously permitted “granny flat extension” to an independent, one-bedroom residential unit would contravene materially Condition 4 of permission granted under Reg Ref: 06F.249118. As such, permission for retention would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

Des Johnson

Planning Inspector

September 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501432-DF-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of the change of use of previously permitted “granny flat extension” to independent one-bedroom residential unit, together with permission for alterations and all associated and ancillary works.
Development Address	26, Offington Park, Sutton, Dublin 13.
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 ☒	

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

This page is deliberately left blank.