Inspector's Report

PL501552-SD-26

Development	Construction of a single storey 1 bedroomed house (approx.. 52sq.m.) with associated private open space and private car parking for social/older persons use on undeveloped lands of 0.192ha located off Old Bawn Way, Tallaght, D24. The development will also provide for all associated site service connections and site works above and below ground
Location	Old Bawn Way, Tallaght
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD26A/0079W
Applicant(s)	Kenny Estates
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Kenny Estates
Observer(s)	
Date of Site Inspection	28th September 2026
Inspector	Andrew Hersey

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1 The appeal site is located on the northern side of Old Bawn Way, Tallaght, Dublin 24. It comprises approximately 0.0192 hectares (192 sq m) of grassed open space adjoining an established residential area. Two mature trees are located along the edge of the site.

1.2 A two-storey semi-detached house, with a single-storey side extension, adjoins the site to the west. The remaining open space lies to the north and east and includes a pedestrian route running generally north–south. Old Bawn Way forms the southern frontage of the site.

1.3 The surrounding area is predominantly residential, comprising mainly two-storey detached and semi-detached houses.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1 Permission is sought for a single-storey, one-bedroom dwelling of approximately 52 sq m on a 0.0192 ha (192 sq m) site off Old Bawn Way. The application describes the dwelling as being for social housing or older persons' use. It includes private open space, one on-site car parking space, a vehicular entrance from Old Bawn Way, service connections and associated site works.

2.2 The proposed dwelling would occupy part of the existing grassed area beside No. 22 Old Bawn Way. The submitted layout shows the adjoining open space retained outside the application boundary. It also proposes a front wall and piers to match those at No. 22.

2.3 The first-party appeal includes an alternative two-storey design for the proposed dwelling. This differs from the single-storey proposal considered by the Planning Authority and is addressed separately in the assessment below.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision – Refuse Permission on the 21st May 2026 for the following reason:

1. *The proposed development is located on land that is zoned objective 'OS - Open Space' under the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 where residential development is only open for consideration where it fully accords with Policy H3 Objective 4 of the County Development Plan, which states: 'To support community led housing developments for older persons and social and Council affordable housing in established areas on lands designated with Zoning Objective 'OS' (To preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities), only where the quality and quantum of remaining public open space is deemed to be adequate and the amenities of the area are preserved'. The proposed development is not community led, does not fall into the categories referred to in Policy H3 Objective 4 and would negatively impact on the quality and quantum of remaining public open space and the amenities of the area. Therefore, the proposed development would materially contravene the zoning objective for the subject lands, would set a highly undesirable precedent for other similar developments which would, in itself and cumulatively, be harmful to the open space and recreational amenities of the area and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2 Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1 The Case Planner recommended refusal on the basis that the proposed dwelling would contravene the Objective OS zoning of the site, which seeks to preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities. The report considered that it had not been demonstrated that the proposal qualified for consideration under Policy H3 Objective 4, or that the quality and quantity of the remaining public open space and the amenities of the area would be maintained. It further considered that permission would set an undesirable precedent for development on similarly zoned lands.

3.3 Other Technical Reports

3.3.1 *Roads Department* (23rd April 2026) sought further information because the drainage drawing showed the driveway on the eastern side of the site, while the other drawings showed it on the western side. It also requested details of the entrance width, boundary walls and pillars, gates, and entrance apron. The report noted that one car parking space and rear bicycle storage were proposed.

3.3.2 *Water Services* (1st May 2026) sought further information on the distance between the proposed foundations and an existing 225 mm surface water sewer, provision for a six-metre sewer wayleave, and additional sustainable drainage measures. It raised no objection on flood risk grounds.

3.3.3 *Environmental Health* (7th April 2026, endorsed 10 April 2026) raised no objection, subject to conditions controlling construction noise and dust

3.4 Prescribed Bodies

3.4.1 *None received*

3.5 Third Party Submissions

3.5.1 The Planning Authority received 40 third-party submissions concerning the application. The principal issues raised may be summarised as follows:

- The proposed dwelling would result in the loss of part of an established estate green used for informal recreation and would conflict with the Objective OS zoning.
- The remaining open space and pedestrian route would be diminished in their amenity and function. Submitters also raised concerns about precedent for development on other estate greens.
- The dwelling's siting and design would be out of character with the surrounding houses and could affect the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- The proposal could affect mature trees, planting and local biodiversity.
- The new vehicular entrance and parking arrangement could create traffic and pedestrian safety concerns on Old Bawn Way.

- Concerns were raised about surface water drainage, existing underground services and local flooding.
- Some submissions questioned the ownership and maintenance of the green space and the basis on which the dwelling was described as social or older persons' housing

4.0 Planning History

4.1 None on the subject site

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 South Dublin County Development Plan 2022–2028

5.1.1 The appeal site is zoned Objective OS, "To preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities". Under the Plan's land-use zoning provisions, residential development and housing for older people are *open for consideration* on OS-zoned lands only where they accord with Policy H3 Objective 4.

5.1.2 Policy H3 Objective 4 supports community-led housing developments for older people and social and Council affordable housing in established areas on OS-zoned lands, only where the quality and quantity of the remaining public open space are adequate and the amenities of the area are preserved. The policy therefore requires consideration both of the proposed housing use and of the function of the open space that would remain.

5.2 National Guidance/S28 Guidance

5.2.1 *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024)*

5.2.1.1 The guidelines support compact residential development within existing settlements. They also place emphasis on the availability and quality of public open space as part of a liveable residential environment. In this case, the potential for an additional dwelling must be considered alongside the site's OS zoning and its existing open-space function.

5.3 Natural Heritage Designations

- Glenasmole Valley SAC (Site Code 001209) which is located 2.5km to the south of the site
- Wicklow Mountains SAC (Site Code 002122) which is located 4km to the south of the site.
- Wicklow Mountains SPA (Site Code 004040) which is located 4km to the south of the site
- River Dodder Valley pNHA (Site Code 000991) which is located 0.66km to the south of the site

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1 See completed Form 1 & 2 on file. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1 Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1 A first-party appeal was lodged on 16th June 2026 on behalf of Kenny Estates against the Planning Authority's decision to refuse permission. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- The proposed accommodation for older persons and social housing is open for consideration on Objective OS lands under Policy H3 Objective 4. Discussions have taken place with Approved Housing Bodies, but the appellant submits that an agreement with a housing provider would ordinarily be finalised after permission is granted.
- The site is described as a small, underused part of the green. The appellant contends that sufficient public open space would remain, the pedestrian

connection would be retained, and recreational amenity would not be materially affected.

- Other Council-approved housing schemes for older persons on OS-zoned lands are cited. The appellant submits that the proposal should be assessed on its own merits and would not establish an undesirable precedent.
- The appellant considers the single-storey dwelling compatible with the surrounding residential area and disputes the Planning Authority's concern about its design and character.
- A landscape report and arboricultural assessment propose revised boundary treatment and construction measures to retain and protect the two adjoining mature trees.
- Revised access information identifies the driveway position, a 3.5 m entrance, limits on wall and pillar heights, and no entrance gates.
- Additional engineering information addresses the existing surface water sewer, its six-metre wayleave and proposed sustainable drainage measures.

6.1.2 The appeal also includes an alternative two-storey scheme comprising two one-bedroom apartments, one on each floor. The appellant presents this as an option if the Commission considers a two-storey form more compatible with the surrounding houses. The single-storey dwelling remains the appellant's preferred proposal.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

7.3.1 A response was received on the 15th July 2026 and the county council confirms its decision and that the issues raised in the appeal have been addressed in the Chief Executive's Order.

7.5 Observations

7.5.1 Four observations were received and are summarised below.

7.5.1.1 Concerned residents of Old Bawn (dated 13th July 2026) The observation requests that the refusal of permission is upheld. The residents disputes the appellant's

description of the site as residual or underused land and describes its role as an area for informal recreation, neighbourhood character, biodiversity and surface water absorption. The observation also raises traffic and parking concerns and argues that the loss of small estate greens could have a cumulative effect.

7.5.1.2 Zita Markey (dated 13th July 2026) states that the green has been maintained by the Council and local residents and used for children's play. She considers that permission would create a precedent for building on estate open space.

7.5.1.3 Philip Callan (9th July 2026) argues that the site forms part of the estate's planned open-space structure, notwithstanding the private folio ownership identified by the observer. It refers to earlier estate permissions and conditions requiring open space. The observer questions whether the proposed use as social or older persons' housing has been demonstrated, and distinguishes the Council-led housing schemes cited in the appeal. It also raises concerns about precedent, character, access and the alternative two-apartment scheme submitted at appeal stage. Extracts from a Land Registry folio are identified as an annex to the observation.

7.5.1.4 Joseph Scully (dated 6th July 2026) considers that the dwelling would contravene the OS zoning and be out of character with nearby houses. He states that the land has long been maintained as recreational open space and refers specifically to a condition attached to an earlier estate permission, Ref. A1625, dated 5th March 1970

8.0 Assessment

8.1 I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file, inspected the site, and had regard to the relevant development plan policies and national guidance.

8.2 I am satisfied that the substantive issues arising from the grounds of this first-party appeal relate to the following matters:

- The principle of the proposed dwelling on lands zoned Objective OS;
- The effect on public open space;

- Design, neighbouring residential amenity and trees;
- Access and drainage; and
- The alternative scheme submitted with the appeal.
- Material Contravention

8.3 Principle of Development and Public Open Space

8.3.1 The site is zoned Objective OS, which seeks to preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities. Residential development is open for consideration on these lands only where it accords with Policy H3 Objective 4. That objective supports community-led housing developments for older persons and social and Council affordable housing in established areas, provided that the quality and quantity of remaining public open space are adequate and the amenities of the area are preserved.

8.3.2 The proposed dwelling is described in the application as being for social housing or older persons' use. The appeal states that the applicant intends to provide social housing accommodation for an older person and that discussions have taken place with Approved Housing Bodies interested in managing the dwelling, subject to permission. The appellant offers to accept a condition requiring its use as social housing and its management by an Approved Housing Body, the local authority or another approved provider. I accept that a final agreement with a provider may depend on the outcome of the planning process.

8.3.3 However, the appeal identifies no provider that has agreed to take the dwelling and sets out no sufficiently defined arrangement for its delivery or allocation as social housing. Nor has it demonstrated a community-led housing proposal for older persons or a Council affordable housing scheme. The accessible, one-bedroom design may be suitable for an older person, but suitability for occupation does not establish that the dwelling would be provided as a form of housing contemplated by Policy H3 Objective 4. While a final agreement with a housing provider may reasonably depend on obtaining permission, sufficient evidence of the proposed delivery arrangement is required to establish compliance with the objective. In its absence, the suggested condition would be relied upon to establish a central element of the proposal rather than to regulate its implementation.

8.3.4 I have considered the Old Bawn housing scheme cited in the appeal (Part 8 Ref. SD198/0011). This was a Council-led scheme comprising 12 social housing units for independent living for older persons on OS-zoned lands. It demonstrates that the zoning can accommodate housing of the type supported by Policy H3 Objective 4. However, the present proposal has no confirmed arrangement with the Council or an approved housing body for its delivery, allocation or management. Accordingly, the earlier scheme does not, in itself, establish that the current proposal satisfies the requirements of that objective.

8.3.5 The appeal site comprises approximately 192 sq m of the grassed area adjoining the pedestrian route between the houses on Old Bawn Way. The appellant describes it as a small, underused portion of a wider open-space network and states that the route and the main recreational function of the green would remain. The observers dispute that description. They describe longstanding use of the green for informal play, walking and local amenity, and raise concern about the cumulative loss of open spaces within the estate.

8.3.6 I accept that the green contributes to the character and amenity of the estate and provides space for informal recreation, as described by the observers. The proposal would enclose approximately 192 sq m for a dwelling, parking and private open space. In assessing this loss, I have considered both the extent and function of the remaining green and its relationship with the proposed development. The site occupies the southern part of the green beside the existing residential frontage, with the remaining open space extending to the north and east. The pedestrian route would be retained, and the proposal would not divide the remaining green into separate areas. Having regard to this relationship and the limited extent of the proposed development, I consider that the remaining space would continue to provide a usable area for informal recreation and local amenity.

8.3.7 The proposed dwelling would introduce a residential boundary alongside the retained green and pedestrian route. The treatment of this interface is relevant to the openness, visibility and perceived security of the public space, as well as the privacy of future occupants. High or visually impermeable boundaries could restrict views and create a more enclosed edge to the pedestrian route. Conversely,

appropriately designed boundaries and windows addressing the green could contribute to passive surveillance. The single-storey scale of the dwelling would limit its enclosure of the public space, while retention of the two mature trees would assist in maintaining the established landscape character. On balance, I do not consider that the introduction of a dwelling in this position would render the remaining green unattractive or unsuitable for continued public use. If permission were otherwise warranted, the boundary treatment adjoining the green and pedestrian route would require specific control to preserve visibility and an appropriate distinction between public and private space.

8.3.8 Some observers refer to earlier estate permissions and submit that the site was required to remain as recreational open space. The full terms and approved drawings for those permissions have not been established in the material before me. I have assessed the proposal by reference to the existing site, the submitted plans and the current Development Plan. The reported private ownership of the land does not alter the application of the OS zoning.

8.3.9 I am satisfied that the remaining public open space would be adequate and that its overall amenity function would be preserved. My concern under Policy H3 Objective 4 is that the proposed dwelling has not been demonstrated to fall within the forms of housing that are open for consideration on OS-zoned land. A dwelling delivered for an older person within the Old Bawn community could provide a local benefit, but the objective does not itself require an occupant from the immediate estate. What is required in this case is sufficient evidence of the proposed housing purpose and how it would be delivered.

8.4 Design, Residential Amenity and Trees

8.4.1 The surrounding houses are predominantly two-storey. The proposed single-storey dwelling would have a modest scale, although it would appear as a low, detached building beside the established frontage. I consider that a carefully designed two-storey building could provide a more coherent response to the scale and rhythm of development along Old Bawn Way. This design preference does not, of itself, make the single-storey proposal unacceptable.

8.4.2 The proposed dwelling would be located beside No. 22 Old Bawn Way, which has a single-storey side extension adjoining the site. I have considered the concerns raised by observers about the proximity of a new dwelling and its effect on neighbouring properties. Given the single-storey height of the proposed building, I do not consider that it would result in significant overlooking or overshadowing of No. 22 or other nearby houses. Nor would its scale be unduly overbearing. The detailed relationship between the boundary treatment and any windows in the adjoining side extension would require care, but an unacceptable impact on residential amenity has not been demonstrated.

8.4.3 The two mature trees adjoining the site contribute positively to the character of the green and the outlook from nearby houses. The landscape and arboricultural assessment submitted with the appeal identifies a silver birch and a Norway maple and proposes their retention. Revised lightweight boundary fencing on isolated foundations and construction protection measures respond to concerns about disturbance to their roots. Subject to implementation of those measures, I am satisfied that the trees could be retained.

8.5 Access and Drainage

8.5.1 The Roads Department, in their report, identified inconsistent driveway positions on the original drawings and sought further details of the entrance. The revised appeal drawing identifies the driveway position and shows a 3.5 m wide entrance, reduced wall and pillar heights, and no gates. I have also considered the observers' concerns about traffic and pedestrian safety on Old Bawn Way. Having regard to the limited vehicle movements associated with one dwelling and the revised entrance details, I do not consider that the proposal would give rise to a traffic hazard warranting refusal.

8.5.2 Water Services sought further information concerning the existing 225 mm surface water sewer, a six-metre wayleave and sustainable drainage measures. The appeal includes additional engineering information addressing these matters. I have considered the concerns expressed in observations about local drainage and flooding. The information before me does not establish that the proposed dwelling would cause a drainage impact warranting refusal, although the engineering details would require appropriate control if permission were granted.

8.6 Alternative Scheme Submitted with the Appeal

8.6.1 The appeal includes an alternative two-storey building containing two one-bedroom apartments, one on each floor. As noted above, I consider that a two-storey form could be more appropriate to the established streetscape. However, the alternative would also increase the number of residential units from one to two and change the nature and intensity of the proposal considered by the Planning Authority and those who made submissions at application stage. Observers on the appeal have specifically raised concern about this change.

8.6.2 The alternative scheme is substantially different from the single-storey dwelling for which permission was sought. It would require a full assessment of the accommodation provided, private open space, access, neighbouring amenity and the intended housing tenure. I do not consider that it would be appropriate to substitute this scheme by condition. A two-storey proposal should be brought forward through a revised planning application, with complete plans and supporting information.

8.7 Material Contravention

8.7.1 The Planning Authority refused permission expressly on the basis that the proposed development would materially contravene the OS zoning objective of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022–2028. Under section 37(2)(a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, the Commission may grant permission for development that materially contravenes the Development Plan, subject to the restrictions in section 37(2)(b). Where the Planning Authority has refused permission on this basis, a grant requires that at least one of the circumstances specified in section 37(2)(b) applies.

8.7.2 As assessed above, I consider that the remaining public open space would retain an adequate recreational and amenity function. However, the proposal has not been demonstrated to constitute a form of housing supported on OS-zoned lands under Policy H3 Objective 4. This concerns the acceptability of the residential use under the zoning framework, rather than a minor departure from a development standard. Accordingly, notwithstanding my different conclusion concerning the effect on the remaining open space, I consider that the proposed development would materially contravene the OS zoning objective, read together with Policy H3 Objective 4.

8.7.3 I have considered the circumstances specified in section 37(2)(b):

i. The provision of a single dwelling in this location is not, in my assessment, development of strategic or national importance.

ii. The OS zoning objective and Policy H3 Objective 4 operate together to identify the circumstances in which residential development may be considered on these lands. I do not consider that these provisions are conflicting or insufficiently clear insofar as this proposal is concerned.

iii. I have had regard to the national and regional policy support for housing delivery, compact growth and the efficient use of serviced urban land, including the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024). While these considerations favour appropriate infill development, I do not consider that they justify granting this proposal on OS-zoned land where compliance with the qualifying housing provisions of Policy H3 Objective 4 has not been demonstrated. I have not identified any relevant policy directive or statutory obligation of the local authority that would provide a basis for granting permission in these circumstances.

iv. The established residential character of the surrounding area does not, of itself, justify residential development on the adjoining OS-zoned green. The Council-led Old Bawn scheme cited in the appeal, Part 8 Ref. SD198/0011, predates the current Development Plan and therefore does not establish a relevant permission granted since its making. In any event, that scheme had an identified social housing purpose and delivery arrangement. No comparable pattern of development or permissions since the making of the current Plan has been demonstrated that would justify granting the present proposal.

8.7.4 I am therefore not satisfied that any of the circumstances specified in section 37(2)(b) provides a basis for granting permission for the proposed development notwithstanding its material contravention of the Development Plan. I recommend refusal.

8.8 Conclusion

8.8.1 I am satisfied that the limited development of this part of the green would leave adequate public open space and preserve its overall recreational and amenity function. I do not consider that the design of the single-storey dwelling, its effect on neighbouring residential amenity or trees, access or drainage would independently warrant refusal.

8.8.2 The site's OS zoning permits consideration of residential development where the requirements of Policy H3 Objective 4 are satisfied. While the applicant states an intention to provide social housing accommodation for an older person, the application and appeal do not establish a sufficiently defined arrangement for its delivery, allocation or management to demonstrate that it constitutes a form of housing supported by that objective. Notwithstanding my conclusion that the remaining public open space would retain an adequate recreational and amenity function, I consider that the proposed development would materially contravene the OS zoning objective, read together with Policy H3 Objective 4. Having considered the circumstances specified in section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, I am not satisfied that any provides a basis for granting permission notwithstanding that material contravention. I therefore recommend that permission be refused.

9.0 AA Screening

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

9.2 The subject site is located;

- Glenasmole Valley SAC (Site Code 001209) which is located 2.5km to the south of the site
- Wicklow Mountains SAC (Site Code 002122) which is located 4km to the south of the site.
- Wicklow Mountains SPA (Site Code 004040) which is located 4km to the south of the site

9.3 The proposed development comprises of permission for a new house on a greenfield site in an urban area. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

9.4 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, and its location in an urban area, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site

9.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The relatively small scale nature of the works proposed
- The lack thereof of any hydrological connection from the proposed development to the Natura 2000 site.
- Having regard to the screening report/determination carried out by the Planning Authority

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

9.7 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. The proposed development is located circa 600m from the River Dodder Valley.

10.2 The proposed development consists of permission for a new house on a greenfield site in an urban area

10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.4 I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. 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.

10.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The minor scope of the works and nature of the development
- The distance to the nearest water body, the River Dodder and the lack of hydrological connections to the same.

10.6 I conclude that 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 that permission for the development be refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed dwelling would be located on lands zoned Objective OS, which seeks “To preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities”, in the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022–2028. The application and appeal have not demonstrated that the development would constitute community-led housing for older persons, social housing or Council affordable housing within the terms of Policy H3 Objective 4. In particular, no confirmed arrangements for its delivery, allocation and management for such purposes have been established. The proposed development would, therefore, materially contravene the OS zoning objective and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Andrew Hersey
Planning Inspector

5th October 2026

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL501552-SD-26
Proposed Development Summary	House on greenfield site
Development Address	Old Bawn Way, Tallaght
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. ☐ No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified **in Part 1.** **EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.**	Class 10 (b) (i) Part 2 Housing Projects
☑ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	

☐No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. **No Screening required.**	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. **EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required**	
☑ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. **Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)** **OR** **If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)**	Class 10 (b) (i) Part 2 Housing Projects – 500 units

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference Number	PL501552-SD-26
Proposed Development Summary	House on greenfield site
Development Address	Old Bawn Way, Tallaght
The Board carried out a preliminary examination [ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended] of at least the nature, size or location of the proposed development, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations. **This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.**	
Characteristics of proposed development	*The proposed development comprises of permission for a dwelling and associated site works,*
Location of Proposed Development	*The development is situated in an urban area in the suburbs of West Dublin where services are present. There are no sensitive environmental receptors on site or in the vicinity of the same.*
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	*Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitat, 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 Act.*
Conclusion	

Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA	Yes or No
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.	Yes
~~There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.~~	~~Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.~~	No
~~There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.~~	~~EIAR required.~~	No

Inspector: Andrew Hersey Date:

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)