



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL-501459-DN-26

|                                     |                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Development</b>                  | Construction of an extension with alterations to existing dwelling and new vehicular entrance and all associated site works. |
| <b>Location</b>                     | 67 Bargo Road, East Wall, Dublin 3                                                                                           |
| <b>Planning Authority</b>           | Dublin City Council North                                                                                                    |
| <b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b> | 5067/26                                                                                                                      |
| <b>Applicant(s)</b>                 | Barry Higgins                                                                                                                |
| <b>Type of Application</b>          | Permission                                                                                                                   |
| <b>Planning Authority Decision</b>  | Grant Permission + Conditions                                                                                                |
| <b>Type of Appeal</b>               | Third Party Planning Appeal                                                                                                  |
| <b>Appellant(s)</b>                 | Elizabeth & Noeleen Higgins                                                                                                  |
| <b>Observer(s)</b>                  | None                                                                                                                         |
| <b>Date of Site Inspection</b>      | 22/09/26                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Inspector</b>                    | Donal Farrelly                                                                                                               |

## Contents

|                                                               |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.0 Site Location and Description .....                       | 3  |
| 2.0 Proposed Development .....                                | 3  |
| 3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....                         | 4  |
| 3.1. Decision .....                                           | 4  |
| 3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....                         | 4  |
| 3.3. Prescribed Bodies .....                                  | 4  |
| 3.4. Third Party Observations to the Planning Authority ..... | 4  |
| 4.0 Planning History .....                                    | 5  |
| 5.0 Policy Context .....                                      | 5  |
| 6.0 EIA Screening .....                                       | 9  |
| 7.0 The Appeal .....                                          | 9  |
| 7.1. Grounds of Appeal .....                                  | 9  |
| 7.2. Applicant Response .....                                 | 10 |
| 7.3. Planning Authority Response .....                        | 10 |
| 7.4. Observations .....                                       | 11 |
| 7.5. Further Responses .....                                  | 11 |
| 8.0 Assessment .....                                          | 11 |
| 9.0 AA Screening .....                                        | 15 |
| 10.0 Water Framework Directive .....                          | 16 |
| 11.0 Recommendation .....                                     | 16 |
| 12.0 Reasons and Considerations .....                         | 16 |
| 13.0 Conditions .....                                         | 17 |
| Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening .....                    | 21 |

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at no. 67 Bargy Road, East Wall, Dublin 3 and approximately 53m southeast of East Wall Road. The surrounding lands uses are predominantly residential with some commercial uses located within the wider area.
- 1.2. The dwelling is an end of terrace unit, in a housing estate of former local authority housing. There is evidence of two storey rear extensions on properties on Bargy Road and within the wider area.
- 1.3. The appeal site is 250m<sup>2</sup> and represents a rear extension to an existing dwelling.
- 1.4. The proposed vehicular entrance will enable in curtilage parking and will result in the loss of on street parking, but this is in line with the existing pattern of development in the area.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the following.
  - A circa 50m<sup>2</sup> two storey flat roof rear extension 5.81m in height, approximately 5m in depth and 4.965m wide to include alternations to the existing rear roof at the junction of the existing and the proposed flat roof.
  - Extension to the rear ground floor to include a larger kitchen dining area. The existing first floor includes 2 no. bedrooms. The proposed first floor extension to include 3 no. bedrooms and a bathroom.
  - A new 3m wide vehicular entrance and a 900mm-1000mm front boundary wall.
  - Rainwater discharge to 2 no. rear rainwater planters.
  - The separation distance of the proposed first floor from the rear boundary to the northeast is 27.1m. The Commission should note that the separation distance of the proposed design from the adjacent boundary of no. 66 is shown as 900mm, which increases to 1.5m when Condition no. 3 of planning reference no. **5067/26** is considered, which requires that the extension at ground and first floor shall be set back 1.51m at the northwestern elevation in line with the existing house and the first floor shall be a maximum depth of 4m

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

- 3.1.1. Planning permission was granted by Decision Order dated 08/05/2026 subject to 10 no. conditions. Condition no. 3 is of note and requires that the extension at ground and first floor shall be set back at the northwestern elevation in line with the existing house and the first floor shall be a maximum depth of 4m.

#### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

##### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

- The report of the planner dated 11/05/26 recommends a grant of permission subject to 10 no. conditions. Condition no. 3 is of note and requires that the extension at ground and first floor shall be set back at the northwestern elevation by 1.51m in line with the existing house and the first floor shall be a maximum depth of 4m.

##### **3.2.2. Other Technical Reports**

- Drainage Division. No objection subject to conditions regarding drainage and surface water management.
- Transportation Planning Division. No objection subject to conditions regarding the entrance and gates.

#### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

Uisce Eireann. No response received.

Transport Infrastructure Ireland. Requests that the Planning Authority has regard for the appropriate policies for rail and roads.

#### **3.4. Third Party Observations to the Planning Authority**

A third party submission was received from the residents of no. 66 Bargy Road, who are also the third party appellants. The issues and concerns raised in this

submission are similar to the issues raised in the appeal submission, which is summarised under section 7.1 of this report

## 4.0 Planning History

There are no known historic planning submissions associated with the appeal site. I consider the following planning permissions to be relevant to the appeal site.

### Number 68 Bargy Road

Planning reference no. **4393/18**. Permission is sought to demolish existing rear single storey extension & shed & construct new rear part single storey part two storey extension and convert existing attic to storage with new rear dormer extension. Permission granted on 17/01/19. The ground floor extension extends 9.0m in depth and the first floor extends 3.23m in depth.

### Number 70 Bargy Road

Planning reference no. **3613/19**. Permission is sought to demolish existing rear single storey extension & construct new rear part single storey part two storey extension and convert existing attic to storage with new rear dormer extension and form new porch to front. Permission granted 20/09/19. The ground floor extension extends 13.0m in depth and the first floor extends 3.23m in depth.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1 Development Plan

The appeal site is located on Z1 zoned lands 'Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' as per the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2022-2028 (Development Plan). 'Residential' is permitted in principle on Z1 zoned lands. The properties to the rear on East Wall Road are located on Z2 lands 'Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas)'.

S14.6 Transitional Zone Areas states 'The land-use zoning objectives and control standards show the boundaries between zones. While zoning objectives and development management standards indicate the different uses permitted in each zone, it is important to avoid abrupt transitions in scale and land-use between zones.'

In dealing with development proposals in these contiguous transitional zone areas, it is necessary to avoid developments that would be detrimental to the amenities of the more environmentally sensitive zones. For instance, in zones abutting residential areas or abutting residential development within predominately mixed-use zones, particular attention must be paid to the use, scale, density and design of development proposals, and to landscaping and screening proposals, in order to protect the amenities of residential properties’.

I consider the following objectives and policies of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 to be most relevant to the appeal.

#### Chapter 15 Development Standards

S15.5.3 Alterations, Extensions and Retrofitting of Existing Non – Domestic Buildings. ‘ensure that alterations and extensions will be sensitively designed and detailed to respect the character of the existing building, its context and the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

#### Chapter 9 Sustainable Environmental Infrastructure and Flood Risk

Policy S124 Control of Paving of Private Driveways / Vehicular Entrances / Grassed Areas. To require that all surface water run-off from new/ extended domestic driveways, repaired/ replacement driveways, and vehicular entrances (where such development is not exempted from the requirement to obtain planning permission), is managed through the use of SuDS, ensuring no increase in surface water discharges to the public drainage network (for further guidance, please refer to Appendices 5 and 12).

#### Appendix 18 Ancillary Residential Accommodation

Appendix 18 sets out a number of general principles that should be addressed in all cases in assessing applications for permission.

1.1 General Design Principles. 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.

1.2 Extension 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

1.4 Privacy and Amenity. Extensions should not result in any significant loss of privacy to the residents of adjoining properties. Where essential, the size of such windows should be kept as small as possible and consideration should be given to the use of high-level windows and/ or the use of obscure glazing where the window serves a bathroom or landing. It is important to make sure that any extension does not unacceptably affect the amenities of neighbouring properties.

1.5 Separation Distances. In cases where the backs of dwellings face each other or where the side of one dwelling faces the rear of a neighbouring property, a certain degree of separation is required to avoid any overbearing effect of one dwelling upon the other. With the emphasis on increased residential densities and the consequent incorporation of a variety of unit types and sizes in schemes, the requirement for 22 metre separation in such cases may no longer be applicable in certain instances. The acceptable reduction of such distances, however, requires a high standard of building design and layout particularly having regard to the height and inter-relationship between buildings, the use and aspect of rooms and relative floor levels.

The exact distances applicable in such cases will be determined on a case-by-case basis having regard to the above criteria and other relevant development plan standards.

Extensions should be designed so as not to dominate or appear unduly overbearing when viewed from adjoining properties.

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.

1.7 Appearance and Materials. The extension should not dominate the existing building and should normally be of an overall scale and size to harmonise with the existing house and adjoining buildings.

#### Appendix 5 Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements

S4.3 Parking in Front Gardens. Planning Permission is required for the alteration of a front garden in order to provide car parking by creating a new access, or by widening of an existing access.

S4.3.1 Dimensions and Surfacing. Vehicular entrances shall be designed to avoid creation of a traffic hazard for passing traffic and conflict with pedestrians

S4.3.5 Treatment of Front Boundaries.

### **Other National Guidance**

2007 Quality Homes for Sustainable Communities.

### **5.4 Natural Heritage Designations**

The appeal site is located approximately 400m southwest of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024).

#### Proposed Natural Heritage Areas

The appeal site is located approximately 250m southeast of North Dublin Bay (000206).

## **6.0 EIA Screening**

The proposed development does not come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA, that is, it does not comprise construction works, demolition or intervention in the natural surroundings. [Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report].

## **7.0 The Appeal**

### **7.1. Grounds of Appeal**

A third party appeal has been submitted by the residents of No. 66 Bargy Road. The elements of the submission I consider relevant are summarised as follows.

- The planner report outlined that the first floor extension was excessive and required it to be reduced and moved back from the shared boundary. This shows concerns regarding the size of the extension. It was not properly assessed against the impact on the appellant's house.
- No daylight or sunlight report carried out. The proposal impacts on the windows of the appellants home.
- Changes were made to the design by condition no. 3 but no evidence that it will not impact on the daylight and amenity of the appellant's home.
- Appellant requests that proper assessment be provided to show that the development will not impact home including daylight and sunlight.
- There was no opportunity to comment on the revised development proposal. The changes were material and the appellant should have been allowed to make further comments.
- Points 2-9 of original observation should be re-examined. These points are included as the same points within the appeal submission and are summarised under this section of the report.

- Permission has not been given to access the appellants property, and they are worried that the works would require access to the property, and involve repositioning or rebuilding the boundary wall. There is no agreement with the appellant regarding works to the boundary wall.
- A number of trees will be removed which will impact nesting birds.
- Works have commenced before a final decision has been made.
- The development will impact the appellant's greenhouse and garden by reduced sunlight. This will result in a loss of amenity.
- The development will result in overlooking and loss of privacy.
- The size and scale is not in keeping with the surrounding houses in the area and would set a precedent.
- Loss of natural light will impact on heating of the appellant's home.

## **7.2. Applicant Response**

Email response received on 08/06/26. The details are as follows.

- Works have not commenced on site for the extension.
- The applicant is willing to change the plans to suit the Planning Authority's decision to accommodate the objection.
- The house is narrow at 4.2m so the 5m depth is to provide reasonable space and reasonable sized bedrooms for their children. The garden depth is 32m.

## **7.3. Planning Authority Response**

- Response email dated 23/06/26 includes the response from the planner which confirms that ACP to uphold the decision, and a Planning Authority letter dated 22/06/26 to request the inclusion of a s48 contribution condition in the event of grant of permission.
- Internal Drainage report received from the Planning Authority on 30/06/26.

#### **7.4. Observations**

- None

#### **7.5. Further Responses**

- A further response was received on 26/06/26 from the applicant including the payment of a fee. This response indicates that they lodged the original planning application, but no further details are provided. This fee was refunded and the submission returned as only further information can be submitted when requested by ACP.
- Another submission dated 28/06/26 was returned to the applicant for the same reason.

### **8.0 Assessment**

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

- Principle of development
- Design
- Setbacks, overlooking and daylight
- Vehicular access
- Legal boundary and access
- Other matters

#### **8.2. Principle of development**

8.3. I note that the appeal site is located approximately 27m southwest of Z2 residential conservation lands but is located on Z1 lands. Having regard to the Z1 site zoning and that residential development is permitted in principle on the zoned lands I am satisfied that the proposed rear extension is generally in accordance with the Z1

zoning objective of the Development Plan, subject to detailed consideration and that there are no significant impacts on the Z2 zoned lands.

8.4. The design and layout will be assessed under the relevant sections below. I am satisfied that the rear extension is located an appropriate distance from the Z2 lands and I do not consider s14.6 Transitional Zone Areas of the Development Plan to be relevant in this regard.

8.5. **Design**

8.6. The existing dwelling is a small one bedroom house which the applicant seeks to increase to a 3 bedroom dwelling. I note that the proposed 2 no. bedrooms would satisfy the 2.1m minimum single bedroom width requirements of the 2007 Quality Homes for Sustainable Communities. I acknowledge that the room widths will decrease as the result of Condition 3 of planning reference no. **5067/26**.

8.7. I consider the proposed extension on a long elongated site, as conditioned by the Planning Authority under Condition 3 of planning reference no. **5067/26** to represent a typical two storey urban rear extension. I also consider the extension to be similar to other rear extensions granted in the area. I do not consider the scale and design to be excessive, and I am therefore satisfied that the extension is appropriate for the site and that it will not impact on the visual amenity of the area.

8.8. **Setbacks, overlooking and daylight**

8.9. I note the third party appeal submission regarding concerns on daylight, overlooking and impact on amenity as a result of the rear extension.

8.10. I also note condition no. 3 of the Planning Authority grant of permission planning reference no. **5067/26** which requires that the northwestern elevation of the rear extension is setback in line with the existing house, and that the rear projection shall be a maximum of 4m.

8.11. As a result of Condition no. 3 the setback of the northwest elevation will result in a separation distance of 1.51m between the proposed rear extension and the boundary wall of the adjacent house at no. 66. I consider this setback distance appropriate and in accordance with section 1.5 of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan, and that it is the same setback as what currently exists on site. I am of the

opinion that this setback from the boundary line will reduce the impact of overlooking, overbearance and overshadowing of the adjacent property at no. 66.

- 8.12. I do not consider the rear extension to be excessive or overbearing with respect to the requirements of Condition no. 3 of planning reference no. **5067/26**. I acknowledge that the proposed extension will result in a limited impact on morning sun and when the sun is lower in the sky, to the rear garden area of no. 66. However, I do not consider that a daylight/sunlight report is required in this instance as I do not consider that the extension is excessive in terms of height or massing.
- 8.13. Having regard to section 1.6 of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan I acknowledge there may be some limited degree of overshadowing and impact on daylight of the adjacent property at no. 66 due to the site position with respect to the orientation of the sun. I consider that the long rear gardens will ensure that sunlight will not be impacted for the entire garden area. I consider the development to be typical of a rear house extension in an urban context and I consider it to be acceptable in this instance.
- 8.14. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development will not significantly impact on the amenity of the adjacent property in terms of daylight and sunlight, overbearance, or overshadowing.
- 8.15. I note the proposed first floor plan includes an additional hallway window and the repositioning of the existing hallway gable end window. I am satisfied that an appropriate planning condition can ensure that these windows are of obscure glazing in the event of a grant of permission. I am satisfied that this will ensure that there is no overlooking of the adjacent property at no. 66 and that there will be no impact on privacy or residential amenity in this regard.
- 8.16. There are no other northwest facing windows. The 2 no. rear facing first floor bedroom windows face the rear garden. I acknowledge that the extension will move the existing rear facing first floor windows further into the garden thereby reducing overlooking of the area adjacent to the rear of no 66.
- 8.17. I also acknowledge that there will be a degree of overlooking of the rear garden area of no. 66 having regard to the orientation of the rear facing windows however I consider this overlooking to be typical of any rear facing windows of a house in an urban area. I therefore consider this to be acceptable.

8.18. I am therefore satisfied that the rear extension will not result in an adverse impact on the residential amenity of no. 66 and would be in accordance with section 1.4 of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan.

**8.19. Vehicular Access**

8.20. I note that vehicular access did not form part of the appeal submission. The proposed development includes for a 3m wide vehicular access which will result in the loss of on street parking. However, the majority of the properties on Bargy Road have their own vehicular entrances and in curtilage parking.

I am satisfied that the proposed vehicular entrance is reflective of existing development in the area and is in accordance with s4.3 of Appendix 5 of the Development Plan. I consider that the new entrance and in curtilage parking is acceptable.

**8.21. Legal boundary and access**

8.22. I note that the appellant makes reference to the fact that in order for the applicant to carry out works as part of the planning permission that they may require permission to access their property. I draw the Commissions attention to Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act in this regard.

8.23. Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act provides that if the applicant lacks title or owner's consent to do works permitted by a planning permission, the permission does not give rise to an entitlement to carry out the development. I consider that any legal dispute is considered a Civil matter and is outside the scope of the planning appeal. In any case, this is a matter to be resolved between the parties, having regard to the provisions of s.34(13) of the 2000 Planning and Development Act.

8.24. Having regard to the setback of the extension from the party boundary wall I am satisfied that the applicant would not require access to the appellant's site during construction.

**8.25. Other matters**

8.26. The appellant outlines concerns regarding the ability to submit an additional observation regarding the design changes. I note Article 35 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) is regarding significant additional

further information, which enables additional submissions on planning applications. No further information was requested by the Planning Authority in this instance. Condition no.3 of the grant of permission **5067/26** requests changes to the extension design. I consider that the changes requested through the planning condition to be reasonable and acceptable in this instance and I do not consider significant further information to be required to request these design changes.

- 8.27. I note that the appellant has outlined concerns at the loss of trees on site and that this will impact on birds. Having undertaken a site visit I am satisfied that the existing vegetation on site is not located within the development area of the extension and is located to the rear of the site. I do not consider that any trees will be impacted from the proposed development.
- 8.28. I note that the appellant outlines that work has commenced on site. I saw no evidence that works for the extension have commenced during my site inspection. Nonetheless I consider any unauthorised development an enforcement issue and any matter of enforcement falls under the jurisdiction of the Planning Authority.

## **9.0 AA Screening**

- 9.1. I have considered the project in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at 67 Bargy Road, East Wall, Dublin 3 approximately 400m southwest of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024).

The permission is for a rear extension of a house.

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 effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The works and scale of the development.
- Location and distance from the nearest European site and lack of hydrological connections.

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the 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 (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## **10.0 Water Framework Directive**

- 10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive, together with relevant guidance published by the Environmental Protection Agency (Ireland), including applicable codes of practice for the protection of water quality. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.
- 10.2. Furthermore, the development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the maintenance or attainment of Good Ecological Status/Potential and Good Chemical Status, as required under the Directive. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4

## **11.0 Recommendation**

- 11.1. I recommend to the Commission that permission is granted for the reasons and considerations set out below.

## **12.0 Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to:

- The provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 including Appendices 5 and 18.

- The nature, scale, and location of the proposed rear extension, and the existing pattern of development in the area.
- The depth of the northeast facing first storey extension, as amended by condition by the planning authority.

It is considered that the proposed development, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, would not seriously injure the residential amenities of property in the vicinity or visual amenity of the area. Therefore, the proposed development would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

### 13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity.

2. The development hereby approved shall incorporate the following amendments for written agreement with the Planning Authority:
  - a) The extension at ground and first floor shall be set back at the northwestern elevation in line with the existing house and the first floor shall be a maximum depth of 4m. Development shall not commence until revised plans, drawings and particulars showing the above amendments have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

**Reason:** In the interests of orderly development and visual amenity.

3. The 2 no. northwest facing first floor hallway windows shall be of obscure glazing and permanently maintained as such.

**Reason:** To protect residential amenity

4. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements, in writing where necessary, of the planning authority for such works and services.

**Reason:** In the interest of public health.

5. (a) All foul sewage and soiled water shall be discharged to the public foul sewer.

(b) Only clean, uncontaminated storm water shall be discharged to the surface water drainage system.

**Reason:** In the interest of public health.

6. The external finish to the extension shall harmonise with the existing house in respect of materials and colour.

**Reason:** To protect existing visual amenities.

7. The applicant shall comply with the following.

a) The vehicular entrance shall be a maximum of 3.0m in width and shall not have outward opening gates.

b) Footpath and kerb shall be dished and entrance provided to the requirements of the Planning Authority.

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

**Reason:** In the interests of pedestrian and traffic safety

8. (a) The site and building works required to implement the development shall only be carried out between the hours of:

Mondays to Fridays - 7.00am to 6.00pm

Saturday - 8.00 a.m. to 2.00pm

Sundays and Public Holidays - No activity on site.

b) Deviation from these times will only be allowed where a written request with compelling reasons for the proposed deviation has been submitted and written approval has been issued by the Planning Authority. Any such approval may be subject to conditions pertaining to the particular circumstances being set by the Planning Authority.

**Reason:** In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers.

9. During the construction and demolition phases, the proposed development shall comply with British Standard 5228 'Noise Control on Construction and open sites Part 1. Code of practice for basic information and procedures for noise control.'

**Reason:** In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development, in the interests of residential amenity.

10. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such

agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

**Reason:** It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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.”

---

Donal Farrelly  
Planning Inspector

24/09/26

## Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Case Reference</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | PL-501459-DN-26                                                                               |
| <b>Proposed Development Summary</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Rear extension to existing dwelling, modification to existing dwelling and vehicular entrance |
| <b>Development Address</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 67 Bargo Road, East Wall, Dublin 3                                                            |
| <b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                               |
| <b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>                                                                                                                                                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.                              |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.                           |
| (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:<br>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,<br>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources) |                                                                                               |
| <b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>                                                                                                                       |                                                                                               |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                             |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.<br><b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>                                                                                                                   | <b>State the Class here</b> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3                                                                                                                                                                                             |                             |
| <b>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?</b> |                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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.<br><b>No Screening required.</b>                                             |                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.<br><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>                                                                                                                       |                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.<br><br><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b><br><b>OR</b>                                                                                                              |                             |

|                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4.<br/>(Form 3 Required)</b>                                                                                |                                                                           |
| <b>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)?</b> |                                                                           |
| <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/>                                                                                                                             |                                                                           |
| <b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                                                                                                                   | <b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b> |

**Inspector:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_