Inspector's Report

PL501564-SD-26

Development	Construction of a new detached two storey flat roofed dwelling house to the rear of existing dwelling, to include new storm water percolation area and the removal of rear garden wall to facilitate new vehicular access from Ballyowen Lane, Lucan and associated site works
Location	7 Hermitage Way, Ballydowd, Lucan, Dublin K78 NR59
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD26A/0087W
Applicant(s)	James Lawlor
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	James Lawlor
Observer(s)	
Date of Site Inspection	28th September 2026
Inspector	Andrew Hersey

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1 The appeal site comprises part of the rear garden of No. 7 Hermitage Way, Ballydowd, Lucan. No. 7 is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling that fronts onto Hermitage Way. The application site has a stated area of 0.018 hectares.

1.2 The rear boundary adjoins Ballyowen Lane to the east. The site lies below the level of the lane, which rises towards its junction with the N4 approximately 25 metres to the northeast. A grass verge with trees runs alongside Ballyowen Lane at the rear of the site

1.3 The surrounding area is predominantly residential. Houses along Hermitage Way are generally two-storey, while development along Ballyowen Lane includes dwellings of varying designs, backland development and apartments.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1 Permission is sought to construct a detached, two-storey dwelling with a flat roof in the rear garden of No. 7 Hermitage Way. The proposed dwelling has a stated internal floor area of 125 sq m and a maximum height of approximately 6.6 metres.

2.2 The proposal includes a new vehicular entrance from Ballyowen Lane and one parking space within the site. The submitted streetscape elevation shows a vehicular opening approximately 3.6 metres wide, together with the removal of a further section of the existing rear boundary wall to provide a lower railed boundary and pedestrian gate.

2.3 The development also includes a stormwater percolation area and associated site works. No. 7 Hermitage Way would remain as a separate dwelling.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision – Refuse Permission on the 27th May 2026 for the following reason:

1. *Having regard to the provisions of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 and particulars of the subject proposal, the development as proposed would not accord with Council policy in relation to access and egress arrangements, by reason of inadequate visibility at the site entrance arising from level differences between the site and Ballyowen Lane, the excessive height of the boundary wall to the right when exiting, and the proximity of the access to the N4 junction, with apparent reversing manoeuvres onto Ballyowen Lane required in order to access or egress the subject site. In addition, the proposal fails to accord with the provisions of the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012), which seek to prevent the creation of traffic hazards and to protect the safety and operational efficiency of the national road network. Therefore, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed development would not create an obstruction of road users both within the development site and on the adjacent public roadway, at a junction located on a steep incline between Ballyowen Lane and the N4 national road, thereby endangering public safety by reason of a traffic hazard, thus the proposal cannot be favourable considered by the Planning Authority.*

3.2 Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1 The planner's report considered that a dwelling on the site was acceptable in principle under the 'RES' zoning objective and the Development Plan provisions for infill and backland development. It found the contemporary design acceptable in the varied streetscape along Ballyowen Lane and did not identify significant overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing effects on adjoining properties.

3.2.2 The report noted that the stated internal floor area of 125 sq m exceeded the Development Plan minimum for a two-bedroom house. It sought clarification as to whether the proposed bedroom sizes were intended to serve a three-person or four-person dwelling. It also found that the submitted plans did not clearly show the amount or boundary treatment of the private open space to serve either the proposed dwelling or the existing house. Revised drawings would have been required had permission otherwise been under consideration.

3.2.3 The case planner adopted the Roads Department's objection to the proposed access from Ballyowen Lane. In particular, the report identified inadequate visibility, the difference in level between the site and the road, the boundary wall and the proximity of the N4 junction. The case planner recommended refusal on traffic safety grounds.

3.3 Other Technical Reports

3.3.1 *Roads Department* objected to the proposed access. Its report identified restricted visibility, the difference in level between the site and Ballyowen Lane, the height of the boundary wall to the right when exiting, and the proximity of the entrance to the N4 junction. It also noted that the layout showed one parking space and that the proposed entrance was approximately 3.6 metres wide.

3.3.2 *Public Realm* (dated 28th April 2026), requested further information comprising a detailed landscape and green infrastructure plan, a tree survey, an arboricultural impact assessment and a tree protection plan.

3.3.3 *Water Services,* (dated 5th May 2026), requested further information on the proposed sustainable drainage measures and the separation from an existing surface water sewer to the east of the site. It raised no flood risk objection, subject to requirements concerning drainage.

3.3.4 Environmental Health Officer, (dated 6th May 2026), requested a noise impact assessment addressing the effect of road traffic noise on the proposed dwelling.

3.4 Prescribed Bodies

3.4.1 *Transport Infrastructure Ireland* (22nd April 2026) advised the Planning Authority to apply the *Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities* (2012).

3.4.2 *Uisce Éireann*, (dated 5th May 2026) set out its requirements concerning connections to the public network and the protection of its infrastructure

3.4.3 *Dublin Airport Authority*, (dated 22nd April 2026), raised matters concerning aircraft noise and sought a noise impact assessment and related measures if permission were to be granted.

3.5 Third Party Submissions

3.5.1 No third-party submissions were received by the Planning Authority in respect of the application.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 Subject Site

4.1.1 Planning Reg. Ref. SD04A/0838, permission was sought for a detached two-storey house in the rear garden of No. 7 Hermitage Way, with a driveway and lowered rear boundary wall fronting Ballyowen Lane. South Dublin County Council refused permission, and the refusal was upheld on appeal under Ref. PL 06S.210727. Reasons for refusal are as follows:

1. *Having regard to the size of the overall site, and to the difference in level between the existing and proposed houses, and the difference in level between the site and the road, and to the scale and design of the development proposed, it is considered that the proposed development would, due to its proximity to the existing house, result in a substandard level of residential amenity and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
2. *The traffic turning movements generated by the proposed development, which necessitates reversing movements into or out of the site in close proximity to a major road junction would result in traffic hazard*

4.2 Adjoining Site

4.2.1 Planning Reg. Ref. SD04A/0898, a detached two-storey house with a driveway and lowered rear boundary wall fronting Ballyowen Lane was proposed in the rear garden of No. 6 Hermitage Way. Permission was refused by the Planning Authority and on appeal under Ref. PL 06S.211071.

4.2.2 Planning Reg. Ref. SD03B/0421, permission was granted for a vehicular entrance to the rear of No. 6 Hermitage Way.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 South Dublin County Development Plan 2022–2028

5.1.1 The South Dublin County Development Plan 2022–2028 is the relevant statutory development plan. The appeal site is zoned 'RES', with the objective *'to protect and/or improve residential amenity'.* A dwelling is considered acceptable in principle under this zoning objective, subject to the applicable development standards.

5.1.2 Policy H13 of the Plan supports residential consolidation. H13 Objective 2 encourages infill and backland development on suitable sites in established areas, subject to the safeguards and standards in Chapter 12. Section 12.6.8 addresses residential consolidation, including infill and backland sites, and requires proposals to respond appropriately to their context and the amenities of existing and future residents.

5.1.3 Section 12.6.7 and Table 12.20 set out minimum standards for houses. Table 12.20 specifies a minimum house size of 80 sq m and private open space of 55 sq m for a two-bedroom house.

5.1.4 Policy SM5 of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022–2028 addresses street and road design and seeks to balance the needs of road users while promoting road safety. Policy SM6 addresses traffic and transport management, including the management of traffic impacts on shared road space. These policies are relevant to the safety of the proposed entrance onto Ballyowen Lane.

5.1.6 Section 12.6.8 of the Development Plan requires pedestrian and vehicular access to backland development to be clearly legible. Section 12.7.6 sets out standards for car parking design and layout. The proposed entrance and parking arrangement must be considered against these provisions, having regard to the site levels, visibility, vehicle movements and proximity to the N4 junction. The *Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets* and the *Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities* (2012) are also relevant to the assessment of road safety.

5.2 National Guidance/S28 Guidance

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

5.2.1.1 Section 5.3.2 and Specific Planning Policy Requirement 2 (SPPR 2) set a minimum of 30 sq m of private open space for a new two-bedroom house. Private open space should be usable, directly accessible from the dwelling, and designed to provide a high standard of outdoor amenity. A principal area should be accessible directly from a living space.

5.2.1.2 SPPR 2 also provides that, for an urban infill scheme on a smaller site, the private open space standard may be relaxed in part or in whole on a case-by-case basis, having regard to the overall design quality and proximity to public open space. The applicant must nevertheless demonstrate that future residents would enjoy a high standard of amenity.

5.3 Natural Heritage Designations

- Rye Water Valley/Carton SAC (Site Code 001398) which is located 6.4km to the east 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 by James Lawlor Limited on the 18th June 2026. The appellant requests that the decision be overturned and permission granted. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- The proposed dwelling is consistent with the 'RES' zoning objective and national and local policy supporting residential consolidation. The Planning Authority accepted a dwelling on the site in principle and did not refuse permission on residential or visual amenity grounds.
- The proposal would generate limited traffic, as it comprises one dwelling with one parking space. The appellant submits that proximity to the N4 junction should be assessed in terms of the safety of this particular entrance, rather than treated as a reason for refusal in itself.
- The concerns about visibility, boundary wall height and the difference in level between the site and Ballyowen Lane could, in the appellant's view, be addressed through revised entrance and boundary details, a suitable driveway profile and planning conditions.
- The refusal refers to 'apparent' reversing movements. The appellant contends that unsafe reversing has not been established and that the internal parking and entrance arrangement could be controlled by condition.
- The earlier refusal under Planning Reg. Ref. SD04A/0838 / PL 06S.210727 is acknowledged, but the appellant submits that the present proposal should be assessed on its own merits in the current road and planning context. Reference is made to residential permissions along Ballyowen Lane and to permission for a rear vehicular entrance at No. 6 Hermitage Way.
- The appellant considers that the dwelling would integrate with the varied building forms along Ballyowen Lane without unacceptable overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing effects. It is also submitted that permission would not establish a general precedent for rear garden dwellings elsewhere in Hermitage Way, given the particular frontage and size of this site.
- The matters raised by Water Services, Public Realm, Environmental Health and other consultees did not form part of the refusal reason. The appellant submits that any remaining technical matters could be addressed by conditions.

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 None received

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:

- Principle of development
- Access and traffic safety;
- Residential amenity and design; and
- Other technical matters.

8.3 Principle of Development

8.2.1 The site is zoned 'RES' in South Dublin County Development Plan 2022–2028 the objective of which is to *'protect and/or improve residential amenity'*. Policy H13 of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022–2028 supports residential consolidation, including infill and backland development on suitable sites. The 2024 Compact Settlements Guidelines also support the efficient use of land within existing settlements. I am therefore satisfied that an additional dwelling is acceptable in principle. That conclusion is subject to the proposal providing safe access and an appropriate standard of accommodation and residential amenity.

8.2.2 The refusal of a dwelling on this site under Reg. Ref. SD04A/0838 / PL 06S.210727 is relevant. The then Board's reasons for refusal related to the standard of residential

amenity proposed and traffic hazard associated with reversing movements near the junction. The current proposal differs in its design and layout and therefore is assessed on its own merits. The earlier decision nevertheless draws attention to the constraints of this particular site.

8.3 Access & Traffic Safety

8.3.1 The proposed dwelling would be served by one parking space and a new vehicular entrance from Ballyowen Lane, close to its junction with the N4. I accept that one dwelling would generate a limited number of vehicle movements. The issue is whether those movements could be accommodated safely at this particular location.

8.3.2 The Roads Department identified restricted visibility to the left of a driver exiting the site, notwithstanding the 45-metre visibility splay indicated on the drawings. It also raised concerns about the height of the boundary wall to the right, the difference in level between the site and Ballyowen Lane, and the proximity of the N4 junction. Lowering the boundary wall could improve visibility to the right, but would not, of itself, resolve the restricted view to the left or demonstrate that an acceptable driveway gradient can be achieved.

8.3.3 The proposed entrance would cross the public verge adjoining Ballyowen Lane. The Planning Authority's report identifies street trees and traffic signs in the area of the proposed access, outside the application boundary and the applicant's indicated landholding. The Public Realm report dated 28 April 2026 requested a tree survey, arboricultural impact assessment and tree protection plan. While the appellant suggests that a tree protection plan could be required by condition, the appeal does not provide a survey or revised layout demonstrating whether the entrance can be constructed while retaining the trees and accommodating the traffic signs.

8.3.4 The submitted layout shows one parking space but does not demonstrate that a vehicle could turn within the proposed plot and enter and leave in forward gear. The appellant notes that the refusal reason describes reversing movements as "apparent". I agree that the precise vehicle movements have not been established by a swept-path drawing. In the absence of such a drawing or a revised layout,

however, I am not satisfied that reversing onto or from Ballyowen Lane can be avoided.

8.3.5 The appellant submits that visibility, boundary treatment, the driveway profile and vehicle movements could be addressed by conditions. No revised access drawing, levelled driveway section or swept-path analysis has been submitted to demonstrate how a safe entrance, suitable approach gradient and usable parking arrangement would be accommodated within the available space. The potential effects of the works on trees and signs in the public verge have likewise not been resolved.

8.3.6 I have considered the permission for a rear vehicular entrance at No. 6 Hermitage Way and the other residential permissions cited in the appeal. Each access must be assessed having regard to its own location, levels and visibility. Those permissions do not demonstrate that the access now proposed can operate safely.

8.3.7 Transport Infrastructure Ireland, in its submission dated 22nd April 2026, advised the Planning Authority to apply the *Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities* (2012), including their provisions concerning traffic safety and the operation of national roads. The submission does not contain a site-specific assessment of the proposed entrance or a separate objection to it. I have had regard to the guidance, while reaching my conclusion on the access on the basis of the submitted drawings and the particular conditions at this location

8.3.8 The outstanding matters concern the location, construction and operation of the proposed access. The entrance would require works across the adjoining public verge, outside the application boundary and the applicant's indicated landholding. No consent for those works has been demonstrated, and their extent, including any implications for trees, traffic signs and changes in level, remains unclear. These uncertainties, together with the absence of satisfactory access sections and swept-path analysis, militate against resolving the matter by condition. Having regard to the restricted visibility, site levels and unresolved vehicle movements near the N4 junction, I am not satisfied that a safe and deliverable access arrangement has been demonstrated. I therefore consider that the Planning Authority's reason for refusal should be upheld.

8.4 Residential Amenity and Design

8.4.1 The proposed dwelling has a stated internal floor area of 125 sq m, exceeding the Development Plan minimum of 80 sq m for a two-bedroom house. The Planning Authority noted that clarification of the intended occupancy would be needed in assessing the individual bedroom sizes. This matter could be addressed through a clearly specified internal layout if the access issue were resolved.

8.4.2 The submitted site layout indicates sufficient space to provide the proposed two-bedroom dwelling with the minimum 30 sq m of private open space specified under SPPR 2 of the Compact Settlements Guidelines. The layout also indicates that No. 7 Hermitage Way would retain a substantial rear garden. Having regard to its extent, configuration and relationship to the existing dwelling, I am satisfied that adequate usable private open space could be retained for that property. The detailed treatment of the boundary separating the two plots could be secured by condition, ensuring privacy, clear allocation of the respective gardens and satisfactory access.

8.4.3 The proposed dwelling would provide a separation of approximately 20.8 metres between its rear first-floor windows and those of No. 7 Hermitage Way. This exceeds the minimum separation of 16 metres specified under SPPR 1 of the Compact Settlements Guidelines. While below the traditional 22-metre benchmark, I consider the separation acceptable having regard to the proposed two-storey scale, the absence of side-facing windows and the relationship between the buildings. Any difference in level must also be considered in assessing overlooking; however, on balance, I am satisfied that the proposed arrangement would maintain an acceptable degree of privacy for existing and future occupants and would accord with the Development Plan's objectives concerning residential amenity. The discrepancy between the first-floor plan and rear elevation should be reconciled, with the agreed drawings maintaining the window arrangement and separation assessed above

8.4.4 The dwelling would be set back approximately 20.8 metres from the rear building line of No. 7. There are no proposed windows on its side elevations. Having regard to its height, orientation and relationship to neighbouring houses, I do not consider that it would give rise to unacceptable overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing effects. Its flat-roofed contemporary form would be visible from Ballyowen Lane, but

I agree with the Planning Authority that it could be accommodated within the varied built form along that road.

8.4.5 Under Reg. Ref. SD04A/0838 / PL06S.210727, An Bord Pleanála refused permission partly on residential amenity grounds, having regard to the proximity of the proposed dwelling to the existing house, its scale and differences in level. The current proposal differs in design and layout and must be assessed on its own merits. The submitted layout indicates scope to provide adequate private open space for both dwellings, with the detailed boundary treatment capable of being secured by condition. These matters do not alter my recommendation to refuse permission on traffic safety grounds, but would require resolution if the Commission were minded to grant permission.

8.5 Other Technical Matters

8.5.1 Water Services sought further details of sustainable drainage measures and separation from an existing surface water sewer. Public Realm sought landscape and tree information, while the Environmental Health Officer requested a noise impact assessment. These matters would require resolution if permission were otherwise under consideration. They do not alter my conclusion on the proposed access.

8.5.2 I note the Dublin Airport Authority's submission concerning aircraft noise and the Environmental Health Officer's request for an assessment of road traffic noise. I consider that these matters can be satisfactorily addressed by a condition requiring details of appropriate noise insulation and mitigation measures to be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. These measures should include acoustic glazing and suitable ventilation, as necessary, to achieve appropriate internal noise levels within habitable rooms. The agreed measures should be installed before occupation and maintained thereafter. Subject to such a condition, I do not consider that noise exposure warrants a separate reason for refusal.

8.6 Conclusion

8.6.1 I consider that a dwelling on this 'RES' zoned site would be acceptable in principle and would accord with the Development Plan's support for residential consolidation, subject to appropriate safeguards. The design of the proposed dwelling and its relationship with neighbouring properties do not warrant refusal. However, the appellant has not demonstrated that the proposed access from Ballyowen Lane would provide adequate visibility, a suitable approach gradient or safe vehicle movements. The apparent conflict between the entrance and trees and traffic signs in the public verge also remains unresolved. These are fundamental matters at a location close to the N4 junction and cannot appropriately be left to agreement by condition. I therefore recommend that permission be refused on traffic safety grounds.

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

- 6.4km to the west of the Rye Water Valley/Carton SAC (Site Code 001398)

9.3 The proposed development comprises of permission for a new house on a backland 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 over 15km from Dublin Bay.

10.2 The proposed development consists of permission for a new house on a rear garden 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, Dublin Bay 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. Having regard to Section 12.6.8 and Policies SM5 and SM6 of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022–2028, the proximity of the proposed vehicular entrance to the N4 junction, the restricted visibility at the entrance, the height of the adjoining boundary wall and the difference in level between the site and Ballyowen Lane, it has not been demonstrated that safe access to and egress from the site can be achieved. In particular, the submitted plans do not demonstrate an acceptable driveway gradient or show that vehicles could use the entrance without reversing onto or from Ballyowen Lane. The apparent conflict between the entrance and trees and traffic signs in the adjoining public verge also remains unresolved. The proposed development would, therefore, be likely to endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Andrew Hersey
Planning Inspector

5th October 2026

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL501564-SD-26
Proposed Development Summary	House in rear garden
Development Address	7 Hermitage Way, Ballydowd, Lucan, Dublin K78 NR59
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 dwelling units

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference Number	PL501564-SD-26
Proposed Development Summary	House in rear garden
Development Address	7 Hermitage Way, Ballydowd, Lucan, Dublin K78 NR59
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 in the rear garden 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: 5th October 2026

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)