



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501590-DR-26

Development	Demolition of shed, construction of ground floor extension, porch and bike shed, alteration to the existing roof over garage conversion and extension and all associated internal alterations, drainage and ancillary works.
Location	19 Trimleston Avenue, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, A94XD42
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D26B/0209/WEB
Applicant	Sue Howley
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant	Miriam Dillon
Observers	None

Date of Site Inspection

15/08/2026

Inspector

Siobhan Carroll

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.3. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
6.0 EIA Screening.....	8
7.0 The Appeal	8
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
7.2. Applicant Response	11
7.3. Planning Authority Response.....	14
7.4. Observations.....	14
7.5. Further Responses	14
8.0 Assessment.....	15
8.1. Principle of Development	15
8.2. Design and impact upon residential amenity.....	16
8.3. Other matters	18
9.0 AA Screening.....	18
10.0 Water Framework Directive	19
11.0 Recommendation	20
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	20

13.0	Conditions	20
Appendix 1:	Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	22

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.035 hectares, is located to the north-west of Booterstown, Co. Dublin. The site is located on the northern side of Trimleston Avenue a cul de sac containing twenty-two dwellings. It is occupied by no. 19 Trimleston Avenue a two-storey semi-detached dwelling.
- 1.2. The dwelling has a hipped roof profile. The original garage of the property has been previously converted. The property is served by a front garden which is paved and relatively large, mature rear garden which is grassed has a length of 23m.
- 1.3. The eastern boundary of the site adjoins the no. 20 Trimleston Avenue which is the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. No.18 Trimleston Avenue adjoins the appeal site to the west. The northern site boundary adjoins the grounds of the Bellevue Court Apartments.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the demolition of shed, construction of ground floor extension, porch and bike shed, alteration to the existing roof over garage conversion and extension and all associated internal alterations, drainage and ancillary works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. On the 28th of May 2026 the Planning Authority issued a decision to grant planning permission subject to 6 no. conditions.
- 3.1.2. Condition no. 2 specified that the proposed front curtilage bike store shall be located 0.5m from the northeast side boundary with no. 20 Trimleston Avenue.
- 3.1.3. Condition no. 5 stated that the disposal of surface water shall be in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Authority. Specifically, it set out that the surface

water runoff generated by the development shall not be discharged to the public sewer but shall be infiltrated locally to a soakaway.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.2. Planners Report dated 28/05/2026 – It was concluded that having regard to the residential zoning objective of the site and the massing, scale and form of the proposed extension and changes in elements of the existing dwelling that the proposed development would not adversely impact the residential amenity of adjacent properties by reason of overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing appearance.

3.2.3. Other Technical Reports

3.2.4. Drainage Planning Section: Report dated 11/05/2026 – No objection subject to the attachment of a condition referring to the provision of SuDs measures on site.

3.3. Third Party Observations

3.3.1. The Planning Authority received one submission/observation in relation to the application the main issues raised are similar to those set out in the appeal.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. None on site

Adjacent sites

4.2. Reg. Ref D24A/101 – Permission was granted for extensions and alterations to no. 16 Trimleston Avenue comprising two-storey flat roof extension to the rear and side, single storey flat roof extension to the rear and front, bike store to the side, attic conversion with dormer window to the rear, change of roof profile from hip to gable and all related works.

4.3. Reg. Ref D16B/0252 – Permission was granted for a single storey extension with a pitched roof to 17 Trimleston Avenue.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028

5.1.1. The appeal site at no. 19 Trimleston Avenue, Blackrock, Co. Dublin is zoned 'A' with the objective to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities. Residential development, including alterations to existing dwellings, is permitted in principle under this zoning.

5.1.2. Chapter 3 refers to Climate Action

5.1.3. Section 3.4 refers to Achieving Sustainable Planning Outcomes

5.1.4. Section 3.4.1.3 refers to Policy Objective CA7: Construction Materials.

5.1.5. Chapter 12 refers to Development Management

5.1.6. Section 12.3.7.1 – Extensions to Dwellings

(i) Extensions to the Front:

Porch extensions, other than those deemed to be exempted development, should be of appropriate design and scale relative to the design of the original house. The scale, height, and projection from the front building line of the dwelling should not be excessive so as to dominate the front elevation of the dwelling. The porch should complement the existing dwelling, and a more contemporary design approach can be considered. Front extensions, at both ground and first level will be considered acceptable in principle subject to scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities.

(ii) Extensions to the Rear:

Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining. The extension should match or complement the main house.

5.1.7. Section 12.8.3.3 refers to - Private Open Space

5.1.8. Section 12.4.8.1 refers to – General Specifications

5.1.9. Section 12.4.8.3 refers to – Driveways/Hardstanding Areas.

5.1.10. Section 12.8.7 refers to – Private Amenity Standards – Quality Standards.

5.1.11. Section 12.8.7.1 refers to – Separation Distances.

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

5.1.12. South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) is located 180m to the east of the appeal site.

5.1.13. South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) is located 303km to the east of the appeal site.

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations).

6.2. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal was submitted by Reid Associates Planning and Development Consultants on behalf of the appellant Miriam Dillon. The issues raised are as follows;

- It is submitted that the plans provided with the application are inadequate as they do not show the foundations and they do not provide all the principal dimensions of the structure proposed.
- The appeal raises concern in relation to the proposed extension to the rear of the dwelling. It is submitted that the Planning Authority failed to adequately assess the impacts of the proposed extension on the neighbouring dwelling no. 20 Trimleston Avenue.

- There was no daylight and sunlight assessment undertaken by the applicant. It is contended that that the Planning Authority failed to consider or quantify the extent of this impact.
- The appellant commissioned a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment which was undertaken by Solearth.
- It is concluded in the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment that “The proposed development has noticeable adverse impacts on the daylight access and sunlight access of the main window to the principal living space (the kitchen dining living room) of no. 20 Trimleston Avenue and causes a noticeable impact to the external amenity space of no. 20 associated with its main living space, when assessed under the methodologies, provisions and recommendations of BRE 209(2022).
- It is stated in the cover letter submitted with the application that “the proposed ground floor extension will have limited impact on the residential amenity of any of the surrounding properties due to its modest size and distance to boundaries.”
- This description is stated as incorrect. The proposed extension is located directly alongside the boundary wall with no. 20 Trimleston Avenue.
- In relation to the site context the proposed extension to the rear would be located to the south/south-west of the appellant’s main living area.
- The appeal refers to an appeal Ref: ABP 06D 230007 where permission was refused for an extension at no. 23 Trimleston Avenue for reasons referring to visual obtrusion, that it would be out of character with the pattern of development in the area and that it would seriously injure the residential amenities of property in the vicinity, due to loss of light and outlook and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- It is stated that while the extension was two-storey the principles established apply to the subject development.
- It is highlighted that the existing rear extension to no. 19 Trimleston Avenue is setback 3.18m at the closest point with no. 20 Trimleston Avenue. It is stated that there is an established layout methodology for extending the semi-

detached dwellings by locating the extensions as far as possible from the common boundary wall in order to protect established residential amenity.

- It is submitted that the location of no. 19 Trimleston Avenue to the south of the appellant's property means that any proposed development along the common boundary wall will have an adverse impact. It is stated that the daylight and sunlight assessment by Solearth ratifies this principle and quantifies the extent of the impact.
- The proposed extension would extend 5.5m along the appellant's boundary wall. The height of the proposed extension is given as 3.4m on the rear contiguous elevation. The proposed extension would form a relatively massive block of 5.5m long and projecting 1.75m over the existing boundary wall.
- It is submitted that the proposed development negatively impacts on the daylight and sunlight access on windows to key habitable rooms of no. 20 Trimleston Avenue.
- In relation to the matter of VSC if it is less than 27% and less than 80% of its former value, occupants notice the reduction in skylight. The area will appear gloomier and electric lighting will be needed more of the time.
- The glazed door which serves the main living space a kitchen and living room of the dwelling is noticeably impacted for daylight access with the proposed development causing the vertical sky component to be lower from 22.14% to 16.03%. This lowers the VSC to below the threshold of 28% from the current situation.
- In relation to sunlight access the glazed door which serves the main living space (kitchen and living room) of the dwelling is noticeably impacted for sunlight access both annual and winter probable sunlight hours (APSH and WPSH) and due to its net annual reduction in APSH also.
- It is stated that APSH are lowered from 28.44% to 18.34%.
- It is submitted that the height of the proposed extension is a minimum of 1.75m over the boundary wall of 1.6m forming a wall of 3.4m which would result in the existing sunny courtyard and patio becoming a dark tunnel.

- It is submitted that the applicant has failed to consider the residential amenity impacts on the appellant's property as they are obliged to do in accordance with zoning objective which seeks to "provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting existing residential amenity".
- It is submitted that the proposed development would negatively and adversely impact the appellant's residential amenity and that it would undermine the established level of residential amenity already enjoyed by the existing established dwelling at 20 Trimleston Avenue.
- It is requested that the Commission refuse permission on the basis that the proposed development would negatively and adversely impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring no. 20 Trimleston Avenue and would undermine the established level of residential amenity already enjoyed by the existing dwelling.

7.2. Applicant Response

A response to the third party appeal was received from Bright Design Architects on behalf of the applicant Sue Howley. The issues raised are as follows:

- The Planning Authority undertook a detailed assessment of the proposal including consideration of the observations received from neighbouring properties. Following that assessment, it was concluded that the proposed development would not result in any significant adverse impacts on the amenities of neighbouring properties and would be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- The grounds of appeal suggest that the Planning Authority failed to adequately assess the impact of the proposed development on no. 20 Trimleston Avenue. The report of the Planning Officer specifically considered the relationship between the proposed extension and adjoining property no. 20 including the orientation of the site, the depth and height of the extension, the existing pattern of development and potential impact on residential amenity. The Planning Authority concluded that the proposal would not result

in a significant adverse impact on neighbouring properties by reason of overshadowing, overlooking impact or loss of amenity.

- The principal planning issues raised in the appeal relates to the alleged impact of the proposed development on the residential amenity of no. 20 Trimleston Avenue with particular emphasis on daylight and sunlight.
- The applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the appellant; however, they respectfully submit that the Planning Authority correctly assessed these issues.
- The appeal largely reflects a disagreement with the planning judgement rather than identifying any failure by the Planning Authority to consider the relevant issues.
- The appellant places significant reliance on the Daylight and Sunlight Analysis prepared by Solearth.
- In response the applicant commissioned an independent review by Chris Shackleton, a recognised specialist in Daylight and Sunlight assessment.
- The review prepared by Mr. Shackleton concludes that the Solearth assessment does not consistently apply the methodology contained in BRE 209 and in several respects presents the assessment in a manner which materially overstates the likely impact of the proposed development.
- The Vertical Sky Component (VSC) assessment considers only one element of glazing serving the kitchen/dining room. BRE methodology requires consideration of the cumulative daylight contribution from all relevant windows and glazed doors serving the room. It is submitted that when assessed correctly the proposal satisfies the relevant daylight criteria.
- The APSH assessment has been applied to glazing serving what is fundamentally a kitchen/dining room, as evident from the photograph provided with the appeal.
- It is stated that BRE guidance applies the sunlight assessment to principal living rooms, not kitchens. It is submitted that the principal living accommodation within no. 20 is not material affected by the proposed

development and that the appellant's assessment applies the BRE methodology beyond its intended scope.

- It is submitted that principal living accommodation within no. 20 is not materially affected by the proposed development and that the appellant's assessment applies the BRE methodology beyond its intended scope.
- It is submitted that the assessment of sunlight in the private rear garden similarly departs from BRE guidance by assessing only a limited patio area immediately adjacent to the proposed extension rather than the principal rear garden as a whole. It is stated that BRE 209 requires the assessment of the main amenity space and does not support the selective analysis of isolated areas that produce the most adverse result. The independent review concludes that the appellant's analysis materially overstates the effect of the proposal on external amenity.
- It is highlighted that BRE 209 is a technical guidance document rather than a statutory planning standard.
- The assessment of the Commission must consider the particular circumstances of the site, the orientation of the properties the established pattern of development, the modest scale of the proposal and the Planning Authority's reasoned assessment of residential amenity.
- The applicant respectfully submits that when the technical evidence is considered alongside the Planning Authority's planning assessment there is no reasonable basis for concluding that the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of residential amenity or justification for the overturning of the decision to grant permission.
- The appeal raises concerns regarding residential amenity in general. No additional overlooking opportunities are created and there is no material change to existing privacy relationships between neighbouring properties.
- The appeal raised concerns regarding foundations, ownership, boundaries and matters concerning construction. It is submitted that these matters do not constitute grounds for refusing permission. The Planning Authority accepted

the application as valid and proceeded to determine the application on its planning merits.

- The proposed development complies with the objectives of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 relating to residential extensions and protection of residential amenity.
- In conclusion, it is submitted that the proposal represents a modest and appropriate residential extension. The concerns raised by the appellant were considered during the original assessment and the Planning Authority concluded that the development would not result in any unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.
- The applicant respectfully requests that the Commission uphold the decision of the Planning Authority and grant permission for the proposed development.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- 7.3.1. The Coimisiún is referred to the previous Planner's Report. It is considered that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the Planning Authority, would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

7.4. Observations

- 7.4.1. None received.

7.5. Further Responses

A further response was received from Reid Associates Planning and Development Consultants on behalf of the appellant Miriam Dillon. The issues raised are as follows;

- The submission reiterates the matters raised in the third party appeal.
- It is stated that the Solearth modelling assessment is the only technical assessment of the impact of the proposed development. The submission from Chris Shakleton is considered to be a commentary.

- The submission includes a response from Solearth which rejects the criticism in the appeal response.
- It is stated that the orientation of the appellant's window towards the proposed development should not mean that impacts to natural light should be accepted.
- It is stated that the BRE methodology in terms of daylight assessment has been correctly applied.
- It is stated that the original findings on impacts on sunlight access (APSH/WPSH) to the living space are fully valid.
- It is stated that the patio area between the kitchen and the boundary to no.19 Trimleston Avenue is an appropriate area to assess for amenity sunlight under BRE 209 (2022).

8.0 **Assessment**

Having examined the application details and all other documents on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered is as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Impact upon residential amenity
- Other matters

8.1. **Principle of Development**

- 8.1.1. The site is located on lands which are subject to 'Existing Residential (A)' under the Development Plan, the objective of which is "to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities." I also note that the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 is supportive of residential extensions. In this regard Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to

Dwellings supports applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend existing dwellings subject to specific safeguards. Accordingly, I consider that the principle of a residential extension is acceptable subject to issues of design, neighbouring amenity and other relevant factors.

8.2. Design and impact upon residential amenity

- 8.2.1. The grounds of the third party appeal primarily refer to negative impact to residential amenity specifically loss of daylight and sunlight.
- 8.2.2. The proposed extension to the rear of the dwelling has a length of 5.5m and a height of 3.4m. The rear extension is proposed to extend across the width of the site c.8.8m. It would adjoin the eastern site boundary with the appellant's property no. 20. The existing boundary is formed by a wall of circa 1.6m in height.
- 8.2.3. The submissions from the agent on behalf of the third-party appellant at No. 20 include an analysis of the impact of the proposal having regard to the BRE guidelines. This analysis includes an assessment of the impact of the proposed ground floor extension to the rear of no. 19. It was concluded that "The proposed development has noticeable adverse impacts on the daylight access and sunlight access of the main window to the principal living space (the kitchen dining living room) of no. 20 Trimleston Avenue and causes a noticeable impact to the external amenity space of no. 20 associated with its main living space, when assessed under the methodologies, provisions and recommendations of BRE 209(2022).
- 8.2.4. The assessment prepared by Solearth in respect of daylight to the appellant's kitchen/dining room refers to the Vertical Sky Component to the glazed door which is south-west facing towards the location of the proposed extension. It is set out in the appeal that the glazed door which serves the main living space a kitchen/dining room is noticeably impacted for daylight access with the proposed development causing the vertical sky component to be lower from 22.14% to 16.03%. This lowers the VSC to below the threshold of 28% from the current situation.
- 8.2.5. The agent on behalf of the first party has rebutted these assertions on the basis that the analysis in respect of the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) focuses on just one element of glazing serving the kitchen/dining room. BRE methodology requires consideration of the cumulative daylight contribution from all relevant windows and

glazed doors serving the room. The first party submitted that when assessed correctly the proposal satisfies the relevant daylight criteria. In relation to this point I note that the appellant's kitchen/dining room is served by additional glazing which faces north-west into the garden of their property. In this regard, I note the response to the assessment from Solearth which was prepared by Chris Shackleton, a specialist in Daylight and Sunlight assessment which highlights that the kitchen/dining room is served by an additional window and the glazed door and that while there is an impact on the south-west facing door when the impacts are examined in terms of the weighted average based on the open size include the window light to the room, then the room does comply with the BRE requirements.

- 8.2.6. In relation to the matter of sunlight to the kitchen/dining room the first party highlighted that the APSH assessment has been applied to glazing serving what is fundamentally a kitchen/dining room, as evident from the photograph provided with the appeal. They submit that BRE guidance applies the sunlight assessment to principal living rooms, not kitchens. It is submitted that the principal living accommodation within no. 20 is not materially affected by the proposed development and that the appellant's assessment applies the BRE methodology beyond its intended scope.
- 8.2.7. It is further noted in the first party response that the BRE guidelines are not mandatory, but advisory. It was concluded that there would be no significant impact on the amenities of the adjoining property in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight. Based on the information provided on file I would concur with this conclusion.
- 8.2.8. In relation to the patio of the appellant's property, it is submitted in the appeal that with the proposed extension built the existing sunny courtyard and patio would become a dark tunnel. I note that the assessment submitted by the third party prepared by Solearth in relation to amenity for sunlight was only assessed for this patio area. The first party in response to this highlighted that the focusing of the assessment limiting it to the patio area immediately adjacent to the proposed extension rather than the principal rear garden as a whole departs from BRE guidance. I note the first party are correct in their point that BRE 209 requires the assessment of the main amenity space and does not support the selective analysis of isolated areas that produce the most adverse result. Accordingly, I would note that context of the nature and scale of the patio and the rear garden area serving the

appellant's property and I would consider that there is no justification for concluding that there would be a significant impact in terms of loss of sunlight.

- 8.2.9. The matter of overbearing impact was raised in the appeal. I note that the proposed extension is located onto the boundary with the appellant's property and that it would extend for 5.5m. Having regard to the nature of the extension which is single storey and the context of the appellant's property no. 20 being served by a large rear garden which extends back for over 17m, I would consider that while the extension may result in some level of negative impact to the adjoining property it is not of sufficient scale or significant to warrant a refusal of permission.
- 8.2.10. In conclusion, as the proposed extension is relatively small in scale and single storey, it is considered that it would not give rise to any significant level of overshadowing, loss of sunlight or daylight or overbearing impact. The proposed development would therefore not adversely affect the residential amenities of adjoining properties.

8.3. Other matters

- 8.3.1. It is set out in the appeal that the plans provided with the planning application were inadequate on the basis that they do not show the foundations and did not show principal dimensions. In response to this matter the first party highlighted that the Planning Authority accepted the application as valid and proceeded to determine the application on its planning merits.
- 8.3.2. Having reviewed the plans and documentation submitted with the application, I would consider that they satisfy the provisions of Article 22 and Article 23 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 (as amended).

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development considering the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.
- 9.2. South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) is located 180m to the east of the appeal site. South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) is located 303m to the east of the appeal site.

- 9.3. The proposed development comprises the demolition of an existing shed, the construction of ground floor extension, porch and bike shed, alteration to the existing roof over garage conversion and extension and all associated internal alterations, drainage and ancillary works.
- 9.4. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.5. No streams/watercourses are identified on site.
- 9.6. 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 European site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small scale and nature of the development.
 - The distance to the nearest European sites, and the absence of any hydrological or other pathways
 - Considering the screening report of Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council.
- 9.7. I conclude based on 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.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive.
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.
- 10.3. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive.

10.4. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission is granted.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1.1. Having regard to the policies and objectives as set out in the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, to the scale and nature of the proposed development and to the nature and character of the surrounding environment, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be an acceptable form of development at this location and would not seriously injure the amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

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

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The proposed front curtilage bike store shall be located 0.5m from the northeast side boundary with no. 20 Trimleston Avenue.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity, control of development and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Reason: In the interests of public health.

4. The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles/slates) shall harmonise with those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

5. Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.

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.”

Siobhan Carroll
Planning Inspector

25th of August 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL 501590-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of shed, construction of ground floor extension, porch and bike shed, alteration to the existing roof over garage conversion and extension and all associated internal alterations, drainage and ancillary works.
Development Address	
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.	No, not a class for Part 1

EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____