An Coimisiún Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501539-DN-26

Development	1. Sub-division of existing site. 2. Erection of a new two storey (attached) 1 bedroomed dwelling (57 sq. m.). 3. Minor modifications to existing dwelling layout including removal of 2.4 sq. m. bay window and re-incorporation of existing rear family flat. 4. Drainage and other associated works
Location	16 Conquer Hill Avenue, Dublin D03 RX60
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council North
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1700/26
Applicant	Brian Nolan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	To refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant	Brian Nolan
Observers	Joyce Mylod and Others Breffni Greene An Taisce
Date of Site Inspection	29th September 2026
Inspector	Trevor Rue

Table of Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description 3

2.0 Proposed Development 3

3.0 Planning Authority Decision 4

4.0 Planning History 11

5.0 Policy Context 12

6.0 EIA Screening 16

7.0 The Appeal 16

8.0 Assessment 21

9.0 AA Screening 28

10.0 Water Framework Directive 28

11.0 Recommendation 29

12.0 Reasons and Considerations 29

Appendix A: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening 31

Appendix B: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination 32

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The application site is in Clontarf, on the southern side of a mainly residential street known as Conquer Hill Avenue, about 4.7 kilometres to the north east of Dublin City Centre. It has a stated area of 0.014 hectares and comprises the curtilage of a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling, which has a gross floor space of 86.9 square metres.

1.2. The main part of the dwelling is L-shaped in plan with a cross-gable pitched roof. One gable faces northwards to the street while the other faces eastwards towards a driveway and off-street parking space that serves the dwelling. There is a single-storey bay window with a floor area of 2.4 square metres in the eastern gable. The gable walls and bay window are of brick construction, finished in red paint. A single-storey, mainly glazed, porch with a mono-pitch roof is situated at the back of the footpath in the angle between the intersecting gables.

1.3. A single-storey L-shaped flat-roofed self-contained unit of accommodation, No. 16A, described in the application as a family flat, adjoins the main dwelling to the south. It is accessed independently through an open yard, which is approached via the driveway. To the east of the yard and to the south of the parking space, there is a single-storey shed. No. 16A and the shed have white rendered walls. The eastern site boundary is marked by a low wall surmounted by a wooden fence.

1.4. Conquer Hill Avenue is a narrow U-shaped street with single-storey dwellings bookended by two-storey dwellings. Nos. 27 and 28 lie directly to the south of the application site. Clontarf Bus Garage is located immediately to the east of the site and of No. 28. Its large parking area extends to the south of Conquer Hill Avenue. The walking distance from the site to the seafront at Clontarf is about 170 metres.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development comprises:

- subdivision of the site to form two plots fronting Conquer Hill Avenue;
- erection of a new two-storey attached one-bedroom dwelling with a floor area of 57 square metres and removal of the shed to provide private open space;
- modifications to the layout of the existing dwelling, including removal of the bay window and incorporation of the porch area and No. 16A; and

- drainage and other works, including a new connection to the public sewer, a separate surface-water drain, rainwater planters and permeable paving.

2.2. The proposed dwelling would have a gable fronting the street with a ridge height of 5.946 metres. The new front gable would match the north-facing gable of the existing dwelling in shape, height and materials. The new dwelling would have an open-plan kitchen/dinning/living area, as well as storage areas and a toilet at ground-floor level. The aggregate area noted on the proposed ground-floor plan is 28 square metres. At first-floor level the dwelling would have one bedroom of 12.2 square metres, a toilet and shower room, and a study/office of 7.1 square metres. Private open space of 18.7 square metres would be provided to the rear of the dwelling, accessed via the kitchen.

2.3. The extended ground floor of the existing dwelling would comprise a lounge/ family room and a living area as well as a kitchen/dining area and retained toilet/shower facilities in the repurposed family flat. A private open space of 8.4 square metres in part of the former yard area would be accessed from the lounge via a new glazed patio door. The existing two bedrooms and bathroom on the first floor would be retained. Following the removal of the east-facing bay window, Bedroom 1 would be lit by a new north-facing window over the flat roof of the former porch area. Bedroom 2 would continue to be lit by an existing north-facing window.

3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. **Decision**

3.1.1. On 20th May 2026, Dublin City Council decided to refuse permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in negative impacts on the quality and quantum of private open space available to the host dwelling 16 Conquer Hill Avenue; including a reduction in private open space to 8.4sqm. The proposed development would seriously injure the residential amenity of the parent dwelling 16 Conquer Hill Avenue and is contrary to the requirements for Side Garden Development under Section 15.13.3 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and to the minimum floor areas and standards contained within 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities' (2007) and the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), the Planning Authority note that the proposal does not achieve the minimum standards for aggregate living area, aggregate bedroom area, living room width, storage and the proposed private open space does not provide the required minimum 30sqm. The cumulative impact of these matters would result in a substandard residential amenity for future occupants and therefore considered to be contrary to the Ministerial guidance issued under Section 28 and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. A **planning officer's report** provided the reasoning for the authority's decision. The main points were as follows:

- The proposal is residential in nature and the development is therefore acceptable in principle.
- While not in an Architectural Conservation Area or subject to a Z2 zoning, Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas), the dwellings on Conquer Hill Avenue have historic architectural merit. The cottages were originally built in about 1874 for tram workers. The site abuts the boundary of the Dublin Bus Clontarf Garage tram shed depot, which is a Protected Structure.
- The new dwelling would affect the character of the terrace due to loss of the characteristic gable end with bay window. This feature is seen at the bookend of both terraces on Conquer Hill Avenue. Given the gable design of the proposal, the use of high-quality materials could mitigate the impact on the terrace. Details of the proposed materials and finishes are not shown on the drawings. Further information would be required to assess this aspect of the application and could be requested in the event of the planning authority being minded to grant permission.
- Both bedrooms of the existing dwelling would have a north-facing aspect but this does not constitute a reason for refusal in in own right. The site is in an

urban area and there are public open spaces in the locality. However, the quantum of private open space left to the existing dwelling, 8.4 square metres, would be seriously substandard for a two-bedroom dwelling. Despite its south-facing orientation, the minimal garden area remaining would be excessively overshadowed on all sides. The proposed development would seriously injure the residential amenities of the existing dwelling.

- As the floor area of the first-floor study in the proposed dwelling is the minimum size required for a single bedroom (7.1 square metres), the dwelling should be assessed against the standards applicable to a two-bed, three-person house. The area of the main bedroom should be at least 13 square metres in a dwelling designed to accommodate three or more persons. The proposed master bedroom, measuring 12.2 square metres, would be substandard in size.
- The proposal falls short of the target gross floor area for such a dwelling (about 56.9 square metres instead of 70 square metres). It does not meet the target floor area for aggregate living spaces (22.7 square metres, excluding storage and circulation area, instead of 28 square metres). It falls slightly short of the target floor areas for aggregate bedroom area (19.3 square metres instead of 20 square metres) and storage (2.6 square metres instead of 3 square metres). Additionally, the proposal falls short of the standard for living-room widths (the living area is 3.1 metres wide instead of 3.6 metres). The proposed dwelling would have 18.7 square metres of private open space to the rear, whereas the minimum standard for a two-bed, three-person house is 30 square metres. In conclusion, the development would result in an unacceptably low level of residential amenity for future occupants.
- No new rear/south-facing first-floor windows are proposed. A window, to be set about 1.87 metres from the eastern property boundary (with the bus depot), is proposed to serve the room indicated as a study. Due to the use of the adjacent site, that window would not result in undue overlooking. The proposed front-facing windows at first-floor level would have some perceived overlooking and overbearing impacts on the opposing single-storey terrace but, as they would not directly oppose existing windows on that terrace, they are acceptable.

- Due to its height and the 6.3-metre separation distance from the opposing terrace, the proposed dwelling may result in additional overshadowing of Nos. 6, 7 and 8 Conquer Hill Avenue. However as those dwellings face the street and the proposed dwelling would be no taller than the existing dwelling, any overshadowing would not be excessive.
- The proposed development would result in the removal of an in-curtilage parking space and service area for bin storage. It would put further pressure on the limited on-street parking available in the locality. There is no rear access or laneway to the rear of the terrace and bins are kept on the public footpath.

3.2.2. The Council's **Transportation Planning Department** made the following comments:

- Conquer Hill Avenue is a narrow two-way street with car parking predominantly on the northern side. The car parking is uncontrolled with no pay-and-display and permit parking in place. Car-parking occupancy is high. Due to the sub-standard carriageway width, traffic management measures are in place.
- The proposal will result in zero parking provision for both the existing dwelling and the new proposed dwelling. The maximum car-parking standard is one space per dwelling. The site is about 2.5 kilometres (30 minutes' walk) from the nearest railway station in Killester. It is within four minutes' walking distance of bus services on Clontarf Road where the peak-hour frequency is one bus every 11 minutes. In regard to accessibility, the site is an intermediate location. There is an onus on the applicant to demonstrate how the proposed units would function in terms of servicing, delivery and waste collection and how visitors would be managed with zero on-site car parking.
- No cycle parking has been illustrated on the submitted plans. Secure private open space is noted in the form of rear garden areas, however dedicated covered and sheltered cycle storage should be provided in support of car-free development at this location. This matter could be addressed by condition in the event of a grant of permission.
- Revised drawings should be provided demonstrating that each dwelling would provide adequate space within its curtilage to accommodate refuse storage. Bins must not intrude on the public footpath.

- Given the site constraints, it would be reasonable in the event of a grant of permission to seek a Construction Management Plan.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. No report was received from Uisce Éireann.

3.4. Third Party Submissions

3.4.1. The Council received a submission from the occupants of 7 Conquer Hill Road, which may be summarised as follows:

- The proposed development includes first-floor front windows which would directly face their dwelling. The house is situated on a narrow road. Due to the height difference and the separation distance between the proposed two-storey structure and their single-storey bungalow, these windows would enable direct and elevated views into their property, including the living room.
- As the living room is located at the front of the house and faces south, it currently benefits from high levels of natural daylight and direct sunlight throughout the day. This contrasts with the rear of the house, which faces north, and therefore receives limited daylight. The proposed development, by virtue of its height and positioning, would obstruct sunlight from the south, particularly during midday and winter months when the sun is at a lower angle. This would result in an increased reliance on artificial light sources. It is reasonable to expect that a detailed daylight and sunlight assessment would be submitted in accordance with best practice (including Building Research Establishment guidelines). No such robust assessment has been provided to demonstrate that the development would not adversely impact neighbouring properties.
- The development would create an overbearing relationship, resulting in a sense of enclosure and visual dominance and a significant reduction in the quality of their living environment. It would diminish the residential amenity of their property, contrary to policies of the Development Plan which seek to protect the quality of living conditions of existing residents.

3.4.2. The Council received a submission from residents in Conquer Hill Avenue, some of which was repeated in their observations at appeal stage. Additional points are summarised below:

- Conquer Hill Avenue was previously named Tram Terrace and is located within the original curtilage of the tram sheds, now a Protected Structure. Conquer Hill Avenue should be considered as a candidate for an Architectural Conservation Area, while any development that would damage its substantially intact historic streetscape and period building detail should be avoided.
- The proposed development would be larger than the original bookend house and would overwhelm it. It would destroy its legibility, its period features such as the bay window, the remains of the decorative gable end, and the window and door arrangement that tie in with the adjoining contemporaneous houses.
- The existing lightweight lean-to porch at No. 16 was built on the public footway without planning permission. This space should not be permanently built over.
- The applicant has not made clear the materials to be used on the elevations. Brick is implied by the hatching but not specified.
- The Z1 zoning objective indicates that provision of an additional dwelling cannot be at the cost of significantly dis-improving existing residential amenities.
- The appellant has not produced a daylight/sunlight assessment or shadow analysis. He has not produced an eastern elevation or section showing the proposed new two-storey house in the context of its single-storey neighbours just 6.4 metres to the north. Despite the density of development, the predominant scale of the street is single-storey. The six bookend dwellings cause only short-term localised overshadowing. The proposed dwelling would have an overbearing effect and would overshadow Nos. 6, 7 and 8, causing a significant reduction in light reaching their south-facing front windows.
- No privacy strip is proposed between the proposed new house and the narrow footpath, instead passers-by would be able to look in the front window.
- The removal of the in-curtilage parking space would result in two dwellings with no space, putting more pressure on on-street parking in an area which is already saturated.

- It is unclear how a two-storey building could be constructed safely without causing major disruption to existing residents and services such as bin collections and postal and parcel deliveries.
- The proposed drainage solution would not work in the proposed substandard rear yard, as soak pits are required to be a minimum of 5 metres from a building and 3 metres from a boundary. Water percolating from the proposed soak pit would undermine the lime-mortar boundary wall as well as the proposed house.

3.4.3. The Council also received a submission from Mr Breffni Greene, an architect writing from an address in Clontarf, much of which was repeated in his observations at appeal stage. Additional points are summarised below:

- His objection relates not to the principle of residential development on this site, but to this specific proposal, which represents overdevelopment. The development would not create a bookend. Rather, it would insert an additional two-storey structure that would fragment the established rhythm of the terrace.
- The proposed development requires the loss of four significant east-facing windows on the gable of the existing dwelling at No.16. These windows currently provide significant daylight to the interior of the house, and their removal would diminish the quality of light within the unit.
- No Construction Management Plan has been submitted. The road is narrow and below standard width, and the footpaths fall significantly below the 2-metre minimum with the narrowest point of the pedestrian path on the road interfacing with the corner of the site. Children, elderly residents and parents with prams routinely must use the roadway as a shared surface due to obstructions on the paths. There is no turning area for larger construction vehicles. Residents' cars make use of the smaller section of roadway towards the western end of the road to turn about, although this is quite challenging due to tight constraints.
- [Construction] vehicles would need to either mount the narrow footpaths or reverse the full length of the road, blocking all access and creating a serious safety hazard. Due to the demolition works involved, frequent use of skip hire for removal of waste can be anticipated. This, along with the delivery and storage of building materials will require the use of the public roadway for the duration of construction, likely impacting the neighbours opposite the property

where the parking is situated, removing the already constrained capacity for parking on the road and also safe navigation to and from the residential homes. The absence of any plan suggests that safe construction access cannot be demonstrated, raising a matter of public safety.

- The deficiencies in this application are not isolated omissions. They demonstrate a lack of consideration for the impact of the proposed development on its surroundings. The application is weak in a number of critical areas and these shortcomings cannot be addressed piecemeal through conditions. They go to the fundamental question of whether this site can accommodate the proposed development without unacceptable harm.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Application Site

4.1.1. The planning officer's report states that a planning history search was undertaken and no evidence of planning permission for a granny flat or ancillary family accommodation was found. From a review of the Council's available aerial footage, it was not clear when the structure with independent entrance was constructed.

4.1.2. **0121/26**: On 24th April 2026, the Council certified that the provisions of Section 96 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) do not apply to the present application site in so far as it relates to the proposal for the erection of a new two-storey (attached) one-bedroom dwelling.

4.2. Adjacent Site

4.2.1. **4405/03:** On 3rd November 2003, the Council decided to refuse permission for demolition of a single-storey rear extension at 15 Conquer Hill Avenue, renovation of the existing terraced house and construction of a new two-storey single-family terraced house fronting Conquer Hill Road. On 2nd April 2004, following a first-party appeal **(205208)**, An Bord Pleanála refused permission because it considered that the development would (1) result in overdevelopment of a relatively restricted site, injure the residential amenities and setting of the adjoining house, No. 9, and detract from the existing house on the site; and that it would (2) detract from the visual integrity of

the unique terrace of historic buildings on Conquer Hill Avenue and be out of character with the pattern of development in the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. Map F of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 indicates that the application site is within Primary Land Use Category Z1, Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods, where the zoning objective is to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. Map F denotes Clontarf Bus Garage as a Protected Structure. Both the garage and its associated lands are included in the Z1 zoning.

5.1.2. Policy QHSN6 of the Development Plan is to promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification through the consideration of applications for infill development, backland development, mews development, re-use/adaption of existing housing stock and use of upper floors, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation. Policy QHSN37 is to ensure that new houses and apartments provide for the needs of family accommodation with a satisfactory level of residential amenity in accordance with the standards for residential accommodation.

5.1.3. Policy BHA2 of the Plan is that development will conserve and enhance Protected Structures and their curtilage and will:
(b) Protect structures included on the [Record of Protected Structures] from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.
(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.

5.1.4. Section 15.11.3 of the Plan states that private open space for houses is usually provided by way of private gardens to the rear of a house. A minimum standard of 10 square metres of private open space per bed space will normally be applied. A single bedroom represents one bed space and a double bedroom represents two bed spaces. Generally, up to 60 to 70 square metres of rear garden area is considered sufficient for houses in the city. In relation to proposals for house(s) within the inner

city, a standard of 5 to 8 square metres of private open space per bed space will normally be applied. These standards may be relaxed on a case-by-case basis subject to a qualitative analysis of the development.

5.1.5. Section 15.13.3 states that the development of a dwelling or dwellings in the side garden of an existing house is a means of making the most efficient use of serviced residential lands. Such developments, when undertaken on suitable sites and to a high standard of design, can constitute valuable additions to the residential building stock of an area and will generally be allowed for by the planning authority on suitable large sites. The planning authority will favourably consider the development of infill housing on appropriate sites, to facilitate the most sustainable use of land and existing urban infrastructure. In general, infill housing should comply with … internal amenity standards and open space requirements. In certain limited circumstances, the planning authority may relax the normal planning standards in the interest of ensuring that vacant, derelict and under-utilised land is developed.

5.1.6. Section 15.13.3 goes on to say that the planning authority will have regard to various criteria in assessing proposals for the development of corner/side garden sites, including the following:

- The character of the street.
- Compatibility of design and scale with adjoining dwellings, paying attention to the established building line, proportion, heights, parapet levels and materials of adjoining buildings.
- Accommodation standards for occupiers.
- Impact on the residential amenities of adjoining sites.
- Open-space standards and refuse standards for both existing and proposed dwellings.
- The provision of landscaping and boundary treatments which are in keeping with other properties in the area.
- Level of visual harmony, including external finishes and colours.

5.1.7. Map J of the Development Plan shows the application site in Parking Zone 3. Table 2 in Appendix 5 to the Plan indicates that the maximum car-parking standard for houses in Zone 3 is one space per dwelling.

5.2. **National Guidelines**

5.2.1. The design guidelines **"Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities"** were published by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in 2007. Section 5.3.2 considers space requirements and room sizes. It states that the area of a single bedroom should be at least 7.1 square metres and that of a double bedroom at least 11.4 square metres. The area of the main bedroom should be at least 13 square metres in a dwelling designed to accommodate three or more persons. The recommended minimum unobstructed living room widths are 3.3 metres for one-bedroom dwellings and 3.6 metres for two-bedroom dwellings.

5.2.2. Table 5.1 sets out dimensions for typical dwellings, including the following:

Dwelling Type	Target Gross Floor Area	Aggregate Living Area	Aggregate Bedroom Area	Storage
Two-bed, three-person house (two storey)	70 square metres	28 square metres	20 square metres	3 square metres
One-bed, two-person house (one storey)	44 square metres	23 square metres	11 square metres	2 square metres

5.2.3. **"Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements"**, published in 2024, constitute Ministerial Guidelines under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000.

5.2.4. Chapter 5 of the Guidelines sets out policy and guidance in relation to the design of housing and standards to be applied in support of greater innovation within the housing sector and to facilitate more compact forms of residential development. It is a specific planning policy requirement (SPPR 2) that proposals for new houses meet the following minimum private open space standards:

One-bed house 20 square metres

Two-bed house 30 square metres

For urban infill schemes on smaller sites (for example, sites of up to 0.25 hectares) the private open space standard may be relaxed in part or whole, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality and proximity to public open space. In all cases, the obligation will be on the project proposer to demonstrate that residents will enjoy a high standard of amenity.

5.2.5. Table 3.8 of the Guidelines sets out definitions for terms used to define accessibility to allow for consistent application. The characteristics detailed in Table 3.8 are not exhaustive and a local assessment will be required. Four levels of accessibility are identified – high-capacity public transport node or interchange; accessible location; intermediate location; and peripheral. Intermediate locations are defined as:

- lands within 500 to 1,000 metres (10- to 12-minute walk) of existing or planned high frequency (10-minute peak hour frequency) urban bus services; and
- lands within 500 metres (6-minute walk) of a reasonably frequent (minimum 15-minute peak hour frequency) urban bus service.

5.2.6. SPPR 3 states that in intermediate locations, the maximum rate of car-parking provision for residential development, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be two spaces per dwelling. Applicants should be required to provide a rationale and justification for the number of car-parking spaces proposed and to satisfy the planning authority that the parking levels are necessary and appropriate, particularly when they are close to the maximum provision.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1 The application site is not in any Natura 2000 site of European nature conservation importance. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are:

- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area for birds (SPA), about 145 metres to the south;
- North Bull Island SPA, about 620 metres to the east;
- North Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC), about 620 metres to the east, designated for tidal mudflats and sandflats, annual vegetation of drift lines, annuals colonising sand and mud, salt meadows, shifting and fixed dunes, dune slacks and petalwort; and
- South Dublin Bay SAC, about 2 kilometres to the south, designated for mudflats and sandflats, annual vegetation of drift lines, annuals colonising sand and mud and embryonic shifting dunes.

5.3.2. There are no National Heritage Areas (NHAs) in Dublin City. Proposed NHAs are identified in Table 10 and Figure 4 of the Natura Impact Report for the Development

Plan. The closest of those pNHAS to the application site are North Dublin Bay, South Dublin Bay, Dolphins Dublin Docks, Grand Canal and Royal Canal.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment Screening

6.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment; refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendix 1 to this report. Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, I am satisfied that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development does not trigger a requirement for EIA screening and that an EIA report is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- While the current house has an east-facing bay window, it has no south-facing windows in the primary ground-floor rooms. The new layout proposes a private urban courtyard which would provide a high-quality, bright, sunny aspect not only through the new south-facing patio doors but also via the [east-facing] doors to the dining area. While this courtyard area is minimal at 8.4 square metres, its impact on the amenity of the house would be very positive.
- The area is characterised by houses with relatively small private courtyards, with many neighbouring ones smaller or non-existent. Furthermore, and very importantly, the expansive public greenway amenity of the Clontarf seafront is only a few steps away. Accordingly, the Commission is requested to deem the provision of private open space for the existing dwelling adequate.
- If, however, it deems the proposed space insufficient, the Commission is invited to consider a revised ground-floor plan, attached to the appeal statement, which shows the non-original return [No. 16A] omitted, thus providing an extensive area of 30.6 square metres of private open space for the existing dwelling.

- The Commission is also invited to consider a slightly revised first-floor plan. The bedroom is enlarged to 13.1 square metres and the study/office is reduced to 6.3 square metres. This smaller room could not realistically be classified as a bedroom. As a result, the proposals are compliant with the standards:
  Unit size: 57 square metres
  Aggregate living/kitchen/dining area: 28 square metres
  Bedroom size: 13.1 square metres
  Storage: There would be ample space in the office/study and the attic.
  Bins and bikes could be comfortably accommodated in the rear open area.
- The proposal is in line with the policies and objectives of the Development Plan and with Government strategies to provide more, much needed, housing.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

7.2.1. None

7.3. Observations

7.3.1. The observations made by a group of nine residents of Conquer Hill Avenue may be summarised as follows:

- A screen grab from the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage relating to Dublin Bus Clontarf Garage shows the Protected Structure of the former tram sheds, the former tram workers' cottages along the northern side of Conquer Hill Avenue and the bookend supervisor's house at No. 16. This illustrates the important architectural and social relationship between the tram sheds and the workers' houses and how the whole ensemble reads together as a built understanding of Dublin's transport and industrial heritage.
- The appellant has not clarified how a modern cement-based house would be married into an historic lime-based house constructed from imperial-sized bricks, which has granite window sills and the remains of the original decorative eaves. The proposed development is less well designed but otherwise nearly identical to the development proposal for the bookend building at No. 15, which was refused permission by An Bord Pleanála in 2004 (205208).

- Positioning a toilet hard to the public footpath would compromise privacy and require obscured glazing, further detracting from the original street elevation.
- While there is a pressing need for housing in Dublin, the developer is required to comply with basic standards to ensure the amenity of future residents.
- It is wishful thinking to suggest that the proposed 8.4-square-metre courtyard would provide a sunny aspect for the existing dwelling, as it would be overshadowed. There is a two-storey house [No. 28] just 5 metres due south. All houses in Conquer Hill Avenue have back yards. Existing back yards in neighbouring properties, developed over 120 years ago, well before the adoption of the Building Regulations, do not justify the appellant's proposals. The proximity of the site to Clontarf Promenade does not support stripping the existing house of its amenity space to provide a second sub-standard dwelling.
- The appellant has submitted unsolicited revised drawings to An Coimisiún Pleanála, which were not put out to public consultation as part of the planning application. This proposal deviates so substantially from the original that a new application, on which the wider public would be able to comment, is required.
- The proposed kitchen/dining area shown in the revised layout for the modified existing dwelling measures 9.2 square metres and the proposed living area measures 15.8 square metres. The proposed aggregate living area of 25 square metres falls short of the 28-square-metre standard for a two-bed, three-person, two-storey house. It is also less than the 27.2 square metres of living area currently available in the existing dwelling.
- The revised kitchen/ dining room would have a substandard and deficient width of just 2 metres. A new patio door on the northern elevation of the room, shown as 2 metres wide, would clash with what appears to be shallow built-in kitchen units in an alcove in the western wall. The kitchen would have inadequate space for white goods, cupboards and a counter top. No sink is indicated. The three-person table shown is too cramped to be usable. The revised ground- and first-floor plans make no provision for storage in the modified existing dwelling, although the requirement is for 3 square metres.
- The need for a study/office in the proposed new house with inadequate living and storage space is queried. The 6.3-square-metre room shown in the revised

layout would be large enough to be fitted with a single bed or bunk beds. The appellant has for many years rented out separately the substandard unit to the rear of the existing house (the so-called “family flat”) and the study/office would certainly be used as a bedroom. The occupants would have to rely on a window situated less than 1.8 metres from a chemical store in the bus depot. This overlooking would prejudice the future development of the bus garage lands.

- In calculating the aggregate living/kitchen/dining area in the proposed new dwelling, the storage areas, toilet and stairs must be deducted. The area left is 23.1 square metres, which does not comply with the standard for a two-bed, three-person, two-storey house. The maximum width of the kitchen would be 3.193 metres, which is substandard for either a one- or two-bedroom house.
- Storage provision in the proposed new dwelling is deficient. The 6.3-square-metre room cannot be counted both as an office/study and as storage space. Attic space cannot be counted as storage, as the first-floor accommodation would extend into the attic by 0.4 metres and the maximum height is only 0.6 metres. The water tank would take up most of the available space. The dwelling would be reliant on two 1.3-square-metre cupboard storage areas accessed off the kitchen and a 1.1-square-metre storage area over the stair box in the double bedroom, which the appellant has counted when calculating the size of the bedroom as 13.1 square metres. There is no entrance lobby and no provision inside the front door for storage of boots, coats or a buggy.
- Requiring future occupants to drag bicycles and bins through their living rooms and kitchens would not be acceptable. Accommodating these items in the yards would be compromise their use as amenity spaces.

7.3.2. The observations of Mr Breffni Greene MRIAI may be summarised as follows:

- The revised plans submitted with the appeal are not a clarification of the application but propose a materially different development. The statutory notices referred to the re-incorporation of the existing family flat into the dwelling. The appeal now proposes its demolition. The revisions were not advertised, assessed by the planning authority or open to public participation. The appellant now seeks to trade away a structure of unestablished planning status as compensatory amenity. The appeal should be determined on the

basis of the application as made. The submission of revised plans at appeal stage is an acknowledgement that the scheme applied for cannot be defended.

- It is within the observer's local knowledge that the property at No. 16 is not owner-occupied and is currently in use as rental accommodation with multiple tenancies. A scheme that sacrifices existing occupied accommodation to deliver two substandard units represents no meaningful housing gain.
- No details have been submitted on the treatment of the boundary with the bus depot site and no assessment has been provided of the impact of the development on the setting of the Protected Structure.
- No shadow study or daylight or sunlight assessment has been provided to demonstrate the proposed private open space left to the existing dwelling, in either the original or revised layout, would receive adequate sunlight.
- The proposal was assessed as side garden development under Section 15.13.3 of the Development Plan. The appellant now seeks to re-characterise it as an urban infill scheme in order to invoke the provision in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines which permits open-space standards to be relaxed on a case-by-case basis. That provision places the onus on the project proposer to demonstrate that residents would enjoy a high standard of amenity. The Clontarf greenway does not appear on any submitted drawing; no walking distance or accessibility analysis and no qualitative assessment of the retained private spaces has been provided.
- The fact that a Victorian terrace does not meet modern amenity standards is not a justification for creating new substandard dwellings in 2026. The Ministerial Guidelines already represent a significant relaxation of previous private open space standards to enable compact development. A proposal that fails to meet these newly relaxed standards demonstrates a site without the capacity to accommodate subdivision.
- A 6.3-square-metre room at first-floor level, adjacent to a bathroom, would in practice be readily usable as a bedroom and the new dwelling would function as a substandard two-bedroom unit.

7.3.3. An Taisce made the following observations. It supported the planning authority's decision to refuse permission for the reasons given. The addition of an extra dwelling would be damaging to the substantially intact planned street of terraced former tram workers' houses as it would unsatisfactorily enlarge one of the taller end houses, replicating its street-facing gable. To protect this unique enclave, part of the former tram depot complex, the planning authority's decision should be upheld.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Issues

8.1.1. Having inspected the site and considered in detail the documentation on file for this first-party appeal, it seems to me that the main planning issues are:

- the admissibility of the revised drawings;
- the acceptability in principle of a new dwelling at this location;
- the effect of the proposed development on the character of the area;
- the provision of private open space for the existing and proposed new dwelling;
- the standard of accommodation for prospective occupants of the dwellings;
- the effect of the development on the amenity of neighbouring properties; and
- the provision for parking, bin storage and drainage.

8.2. Admissibility of the Revised Drawings

8.2.1. The revised drawings submitted at appeal stage show a less intense development than those submitted with the application. They provide for a somewhat different layout on the first floor of the proposed new dwelling. They also provide for the removal of the self-contained unit of accommodation to the rear of the existing dwelling, which would extinguish any unauthorised use being made of that unit. While the revised proposal does not involve re-incorporation of the unit into the dwelling, it also does not involve any works additional to those mentioned in the statutory notices. There is no change to the street-facing elevation. The planning authority was afforded an opportunity to comment on the appeal, including the revised drawings. Third parties have made observations about the drawings. It seems to me that no one would be substantially prejudiced if the Commission were to consider the revised drawings.

8.3. **Acceptability in Principle**

8.3.1. Judging by what I saw during my inspection, there appear to be two residential units on the site at present. The existing floor plans show a total of three bedrooms, including one in the rear unit. The original proposed floor plans and the revised floor plans both show three bedrooms in two dwellings. It follows that the proposed development, in either form, would not produce a net increase in the number of residential units or in the number of bedrooms. It would, however, occupy more street frontage than the existing dwelling.

8.3.2. The Ministerial Guidelines on Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements seek to facilitate compact forms of residential development. Policy QHSN6 of the Development Plan is to promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification with specific reference to infill development. In my opinion, the proposal can legitimately be described both as side-garden development and as infill development.

8.3.3. It seems to me that the development is acceptable in general principle but must be assessed in the context of the Z1 zoning objective which is to protect and improve, as well as to provide, residential amenities; and also having regard to the criteria relating to proposals for the development of corner/side garden sites set out in Section 15.13.3 of the Development Plan.

8.4. **Character of the Area**

8.4.1. Section 57(10) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 requires the Commission, in considering any application for permission in relation to a Protected Structure, to have regard to the protected status of the structure. The application site adjoins the curtilage of Clontarf Bus Garage, which is a Protected Structure. Visual linkage between the site and the bus garage building is weak. The part of the Protected Structure's curtilage which the application site adjoins is bounded by a wooden fence and a concrete wall, behind and above which industrial paraphernalia can be seen. In my judgement, that adjoining area is unattractive and unsightly. Taking account of the existing visual relationship between the site and the bus garage, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have a negative impact on the special character and appearance of the Protected Structure.

8.4.2. The appeal property is not itself a Protected Structure. It is not in an Architectural Conservation Area nor is it subject to any other Conservation Area designation. The planning policies that apply specifically to such structures and areas do not apply to the application site. However, when visiting the area I was able to appreciate that the property is an integral part of a planned layout of local historical significance as described in the evidence. Its importance lies primarily in the fact that it contains one of a number of two-storey bookend dwellings with side bay windows.

8.4.3. The parking space to the side of the dwelling constitutes a gap in the otherwise continuous built-up street frontage, while the existing porch is an anomalous and jarring addition. It seems to me that the elimination of that gap and the incorporation of the porch area into the fabric of the existing dwelling would offer some visual benefits. However, the removal of the feature bay window and the construction of a side extension to create a wider two-storey building would in my opinion unacceptably disrupt the visual harmony and mar the legibility of the original layout.

8.4.4. While the drawings showing proposed elevations appear to indicate a continuity of finishes between the existing and proposed dwellings, they are insufficiently detailed to demonstrate persuasively that the new development would fit seamlessly into the existing street scene. Crucial questions about continuity of materials and construction methods remain. I find it difficult to be confident that the development would be executed with appropriate regard to the provenance of the existing architecture. Should permission be granted, it would be necessary in my view to attach a condition requiring samples of materials and specifications of colours and textures to be submitted to the planning authority for agreement prior to construction.

8.5. **Private Open Space**

8.5.1. SPPR 2 of “Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements” requires new two-bed houses to have as a minimum 30 square metres of private open space. While it could be argued that this standard does not apply to the reconfiguration of an existing dwelling, it nevertheless seems to me that the proposal in the originally submitted drawings to reduce the provision of private open space for the existing dwelling to 8.4 square metres is not acceptable. As well as being far too small, it is evident that the proposed open space would for much of the time be in the shade of

adjoining structures. The relative proximity of the site to the seafront does not make up for these deficiencies, in my opinion.

8.5.2. I am persuaded that the appellant's revised ground-floor plan, introduced at appeal stage, is capable of overcoming the first reason for refusal by providing 30.6 square metres of private open space for the existing dwelling. While the space would be in shade and would have to accommodate bicycle and bin storage, it could be attractively landscaped to provide an inviting amenity for the prospective occupants. Should permission be granted, it would be necessary in my view to require the submission of a detailed layout for this space.

8.5.3. SPPR 2 establishes a standard of 20 square metres of private open space to serve new one-bed houses. The guidance allows for the standard to be relaxed for urban infill schemes such as this one, on sites of up to 0.25 hectares, subject to overall design quality and proximity to public open space. The private open space of 18.7 square metres for the new dwelling (shown in both versions of the plans) is substandard in size and its effective area would be reduced by bicycle and bin storage. It would also be in shade. However, it seems to me that a relaxation in the size standard would be permissible provided the quality of this space were enhanced by well-designed landscaping. If permission is granted, the appellant should in my view be required to submit a detailed layout for this space.

8.6. Standard of Accommodation

8.6.1. The planning authority made the assumption that the proposed study/office in the new dwelling depicted on the original first-floor plan could be used as a bedroom. It assessed the accommodation requirements of the house accordingly. In an endeavour to overcome the Council's second reason for refusal, a revised first-floor plan was submitted with the appeal showing the study/office reduced in size from 7.1 square metres to 6.3 square metres. While a condition could be attached to any grant of permission prohibiting the use of the study/office as a bedroom, enforcement of such a condition would place an unreasonable surveillance burden on the planning authority. There is a significant likelihood in my opinion that, regardless of what is shown on the floor plan, the space would be used as a bedroom. It follows that the new dwelling must be assessed as a two-bedroom house.

8.6.2. It is apparent from both the original and the revised floor plans that the proposed new dwelling would fall short of the recommended dimensions for a two-bed, three- person, two-storey house in respect of gross floor area, aggregate living spaces, aggregate bedroom area, living-room widths and storage. The appellant did not attempt to argue otherwise. I agree with the planning authority that the proposed new dwelling would not provide an acceptable standard of residential accommodation.

8.6.3. For the sake of completeness, I now consider whether under the revised layout, the proposed new dwelling would meet the recommended space requirements for a one-bedroom dwelling. I am satisfied that it would be compliant in respect of unit size and bedroom size. The space marked Bedroom 1 would comprise about 12 square metres excluding the stairs, thereby exceeding the standard size for a double bedroom, which is 11.4 square metres.

8.6.4. The planning authority calculated the aggregate living/kitchen/dining area as 22.7 square metres compared with the standard 23 square metres but I consider that the difference is not significant. It is not ideal to have a ground-floor toilet opening into the dining/kitchen space, but neither is it unacceptable in my opinion. The living room width of about 3.1 metres is less than the standard 3.3 metres but I do not regard that shortfall as fatal. Storage space, calculated as 2.6 square metres by the planning authority, although consisting of two kitchen presses and a stair box adjacent to the bedroom, well exceeds the required standard of 2 square metres.

8.6.5. If, contrary to my approach, the Commission were to take the view that the new dwelling should be assessed as a one-bed, two-person house, then in my opinion it would be reasonable to conclude that overall it would provide adequate accommodation for its occupants.

8.6.6. The local residents did an analysis of the impact of the proposed development on the truncated layout for the existing dwelling presented in the revised plan. With the removal of the bay window and the self-contained unit at the back, the aggregate kitchen/dining/living area (discounting the stairs) would be 25 square metres as against the new-build standard of 28 square metres. Space in the kitchen/dining area would be extremely tight and the plan makes no provision for a sink. The bedrooms are already substandard in size. The store at the end of the driveway would be demolished and no alternative storage space is shown on the plans.

8.6.7. While some of these deficiencies could be regarded as marginal, I consider that the revised plan must be looked at holistically. It seems to me that it does not provide enough room overall to allow a reasonable standard of accommodation for the occupants of the modified dwelling. Reversion to the original ground-floor plan would not assist the applicant since that plan does not provide adequate private open space.

8.7. Effect on Neighbouring Properties

8.7.1. Of all the properties on the northern side of Conquer Hill Road, the single-storey dwelling at No. 7 would be most affected by the proposed development. Its occupants are concerned about overlooking, overshadowing and overbearance.

8.7.2. There is an oblique view towards No. 7 across the narrow street from the existing first-floor window in the appeal property. The proposed new window over the porch area would be more directly in line with the front windows of No. 7. There would be a more oblique view in that direction from the proposed first-floor window in the area currently used as a parking space. Close-up views of No. 7's front windows are available to passers-by at street level and I noticed that the curtains were drawn at the time of my site inspection. A degree of overlooking is inevitable in an urban area, especially in older, denser development. Given the extent of existing overlooking, I am not persuaded that the additional impact on No. 7 would be unacceptable.

8.7.3. While no daylight and sunlight assessment was submitted, it seems inevitable that the introduction of additional two-storey development at the application site would result in some additional overshadowing of No. 7 and its immediate neighbours. However, I agree with the planning officer that as the proposed new dwelling would be no taller than the existing, the additional overshadowing would not be excessive.

8.7.4. It is not unusual for two-storey buildings to stand opposite single-storey buildings on the other side of the street. There is already such a relationship between No. 16 and No. 6 and I did not discern any sense of undue dominance. I am not persuaded that the proposed development would have an unacceptably overbearing impact on No. 7.

8.7.5. As the development would have less impact on other properties in the area than on No. 7, I have reached the view that it would not be justifiable to withhold planning permission on residential amenity grounds.

8.8. **Parking, Bin Storage and Drainage**

8.8.1. The proposed development would remove the parking space that serves the existing dwelling. No other dwelling in the terrace has the benefit of off-street parking. If the development were to proceed, the proposed dwellings would have to function without off-street parking as the neighbouring properties do at present and there would be an incremental increase in congestion.

8.8.2 The Development Plan sets out a maximum car-parking standard of one space per dwelling, whereas SPPR 3 refers to a maximum rate of two spaces per dwelling. No minimum standard is specified in either publication. There is no stated parking requirement for visitors or service vehicles. The proposed development does not conflict with current planning policy and the planning authority did not cite parking as a reason for refusing permission.

8.8.3. It seems to me that if the development proceeds, the construction process is likely to cause considerable disruption and inconvenience to local residents for the reasons set out by Mr Greene in his submissions to the planning authority. Should planning permission be granted, it would in my opinion be essential to attach a condition requiring the submission of a Construction Management Plan.

8.8.4. I agree with the Council's Transportation Planning Department that dedicated covered and sheltered cycle storage should be provided in support of car-free development at this location and adequate space should be provided for in-curtilage bin storage. These facilities would need to be detailed on the layout plans for the proposed private open spaces. It seems inevitable that bicycles and bins would have to be taken through the dwellings, although this drawback is not of determining significance.

8.8.5. I am of the opinion that the concerns the residents expressed about drainage could be dealt with by a condition requiring surface water drainage arrangements to comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works. The condition would require the developer shall submit proposals for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

9.0 **Appropriate Assessment Screening**

9.1. Having considered the nature, location and modest scale of the proposed development, the nature of the receiving environment as a built-up urban area, the nature of the foreseeable emissions therefrom, the availability of public piped services to accommodate the foul effluent arising therefrom, the distance from the nearest European site and the absence of any known hydrological link between the application site and any European site, I am content on the basis of objective information that the development is not likely to have a significant effect on any European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. I therefore conclude that the carrying out of an appropriate assessment under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

10.0 **Water Framework Directive**

10.1. The application site is located 160 metres from Tolka Estuary. The proposed development comprises the erection of a new dwelling and modifications to an existing dwelling. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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

10.3. The reasons for this conclusion are the nature and modest scale of the proposed works, the distance from nearest water body and the lack of hydrological connections.

10.4. I conclude on the basis of objective information that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 **Recommendation**

11.1. I recommend to the Commission that planning permission be refused.

12.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

12.1. Having regard to the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, and in particular to the Z1 zoning objective and the criteria set out in Section 15.13.3, it is considered that the proposed development, involving the removal of a feature bay window from a bookend dwelling and the construction of a side extension to create a wider two-storey building, would unacceptably disrupt the visual harmony and mar the legibility of the original planned layout which is of local historical significance. The development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.2 It is considered that the floor plans originally submitted with the application make wholly inadequate provision for private open space to serve the modified existing dwelling; and that the revisions proposed in the course of the appeal, involving demolition of the unit of accommodation at the back of the site as well as removal of the bay window and the free-standing store at the end of the driveway, would unacceptably impair the standard of internal accommodation for future occupants of that dwelling. In either case, the residential amenities of the existing dwelling would be seriously injured. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the Z1 zoning and Policy QHSN6 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.3. Having regard to the original and to the revised floor plans, it is considered that for the purpose of assessing compliance with internal space standards, the proposed new dwelling should be regarded as a two-bed, three-person, two-storey house. It is apparent from both sets of plans that the proposed new dwelling would fall short of the minimum dimensions for such a house recommended in “Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities” (2007). The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy QHSN37 and Section 15.13.3 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and 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.



TREVOR A RUE
Planning Inspector
7th October 2026

Appendix A: Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	*PL-501539-DN-26*
Proposed Development Summary	*Erection of new dwelling and modifications to existing dwelling*
Development Address	*16 Conquer Hill Avenue, Dublin 3*
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	☑ *Yes, it is a 'Project'.* Proceed to Q2.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☑ *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?	
☑ *Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.* Preliminary examination required (Form 2).	**State the Class and state the relevant threshold** *Class: 10(b)(i)* *Threshold: 500 dwelling units*
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
No ☑	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3).

Inspector: Trevor A Rue _____ **Date:** 7th October 2026

TREVOR A RUE

Appendix B: Form 2 – EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	*PL-501539-DN-26*
Proposed Development Summary	*Erection of new dwelling and modifications to existing dwelling*
Development Address	*16 Conquer Hill Avenue, Dublin 3*
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of the Proposed Development (in particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health)	**Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed.** *The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, and does not require the use of substantial natural resources. It does not give rise to a significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster and is not vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.*
Location of Development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance)	**Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed** *The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan.*
Types and Characteristics of Potential Impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation)	**Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.** *Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, the likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects and absence of in-combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in Section 171A of the Planning and Development Act 2000.*

Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	**Conclusion in respect of EIA**
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	*EIA is not required.*

Inspector: _____ **Date:** 7th October 2026

TREVOR A RUE