Inspector's Report
PL-501593-DR-26

Development	Retention of the non-provision of obscure glazing and external fins, approved under Reg. Ref. D19A/0692.
Location	Altamont, Knocknacree Road, Dalkey, Co. Dublin, A96YP60
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D26A/0274/WEB
Applicants	Christophe Passuello and Anne Dolan
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellants	Daniel J & Bridget Curtin
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	21st August 2026
Inspector	Siobhan Carroll

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description 3

2.0 Proposed Development 3

3.0 Planning Authority Decision 3

3.1. Decision 3

3.2. Planning Authority Reports 3

3.3. Prescribed Bodies 4

3.4. Third Party Observations 4

4.0 Planning History 4

5.0 Policy Context 5

6.0 EIA Screening 6

7.0 The Appeal 7

7.1. Grounds of Appeal 7

7.2. Applicant Response 9

7.3. Planning Authority Response 13

8.0 Assessment 13

9.0 AA Screening 15

10.0 Water Framework Directive 16

11.0 Recommendation 17

12.0 Reasons and Considerations 17

13.0 Conditions 17

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening 19

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.227ha. It is located on an elevated area to the north of Knocknacree Road and Ardbrugh Road in Dalkey, Co. Dublin. It lies to the north-east of Dalkey Hill.

1.2. The site contains the property 'Altamont' a large detached two-storey dwelling with a floor area of 382sq m. Access to the property is via a gated vehicular access from Knocknacree Road. The eastern boundary of the site is defined by a stonewall and mature hedge. There are wide views to the north over Dublin Bay.

1.3. The property to the west of the site 'Ard Na Mara' is a large, detached two-storey dwelling. The neighbouring property to the east 'Sraithin', is a large detached two-storey dwelling.

1.4. The general area is characterised by large houses on detached sites.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought for the retention of the non-provision of obscure glazing and external fins, approved under Reg. Ref. D19A/0692.

2.2. Retention is sought for (i) the non-provision of obscure glazing on 1 no. east elevation window at upper ground floor level and 1 no. eastern elevation window at lower ground floor level; and (ii) the non-provision of external fins on the southern and eastern courtyard windows at lower and upper ground floor levels.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Dún Laoghaire Rathdown Co. Council in an order dated 28th of May 2026 granted retention subject to 3 no. conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.2. Planning Officer report – It was concluded that the proposed development would not adversely impact the residential amenity of adjacent properties by reason of overlooking. It was recommended that permission be granted for retention.

3.2.3. Other Technical Reports

3.2.4. Drainage Department – No objections

3.2.5. Transportation Planning – No objections

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

3.4. Third Party Observations

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

4.0 Planning History

4.1.1. Reg. Ref. D24A/0642 – Permission was granted for the retention of a new vehicular access gate from Ardbrugh Road. The development will consist of a new single storey three bedroom dwelling that will be located adjacent to and accessed from the gateway that is subject of retention under this application, on Ardbrugh Road. The development also includes all associated hard and soft landscaping as well as all associated ancillary site development works at Altamont, Knocknacree Road, Dalkey, Co. Dublin.

4.1.2. Reg. Ref. D24A/0574 – Permission and retention permission was granted for an amendment and modifications to the permission granted under Reg. Ref. D19A/062, Reg. Ref. D20A/0718 and Reg. Ref. D20A/0978 that will include; omission of the single storey house permitted under Reg. Ref. D19A/0692 adjacent to Ardbrugh Road, retention of a new side window to the west elevation and relocation of window to the southern elevation both at lower ground floor of the Lower House originally permitted under Reg. Ref. D19A/0692; retention of various internal alterations to the permitted Lower House; and retention of the alterations of the driveway to the

permitted Lower House and the Upper House that is being omitted under this application.

4.1.3. Reg. Ref. D20A/0978– Permission was granted for external fins to courtyard of previously proposed two-storey dwelling (as outlined in planning Reference nos. D19A/0692 and D20A/0718) which has frontage onto Ardbrugh Road.

4.1.4. Reg. Ref. D20A/0718 – Permission was granted for amendments to Planning Permission Reference no. D19A/0692 including amendments to the location of the dwelling on site, to the fenestration of both dwellings and all hard and soft landscaping including external steps, planters and paving. Proposed amendment to driveway to two-storey dwelling and proposed lowering of retaining wall between dwellings. To the two-storey dwelling proposed enclosing of lower ground level terrace and reconfiguration of dining area, proposed drop in floor level of bedrooms, proposed new windows and door to east elevation and proposed new rooflights, proposed plant room and storage under driveway and amendment to external stairs and landscaping to lower courtyard. To the single-storey dwelling proposed drop in first floor level by 150mm and increase in parapet height by 100mm, proposed new chimney and new rooflight, proposed removal of 2 no. windows and relocation of 1 no. window to west elevation , proposed amendments to edge of driveway and increase in height of driveway by 250mm with proposed storage and plant-room under.

4.1.5. Reg. Ref. D19A/0692 – Permission was granted for the demolition of existing two-storey detached dwelling and construction of two detached dwellings comprising a single storey three-bedroom dwelling of 194sq m and a two-storey four-bedroom dwelling of 312sq m with new vehicular access and all associated works including hard and soft landscaping.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028 (As varied)

5.1.1. The appeal site at Altamont, Knocknaree Road, Dalkey, 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 12 refers to Development Management

5.1.3. Section 12.2.1 – refers to Built Environment

5.1.4. The Planning Authority will encourage and promote the repair, retrofitting and reuse of buildings in preference to their demolition and reconstruction where possible.

5.1.5. Section 12.3 – refers to Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place

5.1.6. Section 12.3.1 – refers to Quality Design

5.1.7. Section 12.3.7 – refers to Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas

5.1.8. Section 12.3.7.1 – refers to Extensions to Dwellings

5.1.9. Section 12.8.7.1 – refers to Separation Distances

5.2 Natural Heritage Designations

5.1.10. Dalkey Island SPA (Site Code 004172) is located 790m to the east of the appeal site.

5.1.11. Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 0030000) is located 833m to the east of the appeal site.

5.1.12. South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) is located 4km to the north-west of the appeal site.

5.1.13. South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) is located 4.24km to the north-west 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 Daniel J & Bridget Curtin. The issues raised are as follows;

- The appellants request that the decision of the Planning Authority be set aside on the basis that their assessment of the development proposed to be retained did not adequately address a number of material planning considerations.
- It is set out in the appeal that the Planning Authority should have provided a reasoned planning assessment as to why the mitigation measures previously considered necessary to protect adjoining residential amenity are not required.
- Under the original permission granted Reg. Ref. D19A/0692 external architectural fins were incorporate into the design which was approved. This addressed the matter of privacy. Under Reg. Ref. D20A/0718 additional east facing windows were proposed. The report of the Planning Officer identified the potential for overlooking. The external fins were removed and replaced with internal horizontal fins and fixed obscure glazing were required to the east facing windows this was specified under condition no. 2 of the permission.
- Under Reg. Ref. D20A/0978 amendments to the design were granted with external horizontal fins to the south proposed and angled fins to the east elevations. Under Reg. Ref. D24A/0574/WEB further amendments to the design were approved which included that the previously approved mitigation measures were retained.
- Under the current proposal retention is sought for the omission of previously approved mitigation measures. Internal horizontal decorative privacy fins with wide spacing have been erected with privacy film. These measures are proposed in lieu of obscure glazing and external fins.

- It is stated that the topography and orientation of the two dwellings have not changed, however the Planning Authority's assessment of the mitigation has changed.
- In relation to the report of the Planning Officer, it did not compare the effectiveness of the agreed and permitted mitigation measures with the measures proposed to be retained.
- It is highlighted that the relationship between the application site and the appellant's property is influenced by a number of factors including the elevated forward position of the new Lower House, the orientation of the east facing elevation and the location of the appellant's private amenity areas. The appellant's first floor living room/dining room and associated first-floor rear balcony serves as the principal private indoor/outdoor amenity spaces of their home. These amenity areas fall within the principal view of the east facing windows in the Lower House. The balcony also falls within the principal field of view from the east facing elevation of the Lower House. The three bedrooms of the appellant's home are also impacted with intrusive overviews from the applicant's property.
- The appellants submit that the Planning Authority did not demonstrate through a reasoned planning assessment that the proposed internal privacy fins and applied privacy film provided an equivalent level of protection to adjoining residential amenity as the mitigation measures previously incorporated into the permitted development.
- It is highlighted that the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028 places significant emphasis on safeguarding the residential amenities of existing communities. The Plan encourages appropriate development within established urban areas it also requires that new development respects the amenity, privacy and reasonable enjoyment of adjoining residential properties.
- In relation to the matter of separation distances the retained development exceeds the generally applicable separation distances. As set out in Sections 6.2 and 6.3 the elevated relationship between the dwelling and the location of the appellants' principle private amenity space required a site specific assessment.

- The appellants submit that the decision under appeal has not adequately demonstrated that the revised privacy strategy would be acceptable in terms of Development Plan objectives having regard to the specific characteristics of the site.

7.2. **Applicant Response**

A response to the third party appeal has been submitted by Hughes Planning & Development Consultants on behalf of the applicants Christophe Passuello and Anne Dolan. The issues raised are as follows;

- The grounds of appeal refer to the evolution of the privacy strategy.
- It is considered that condition no. 2 of Reg. Ref. D20A/0718 was attached solely in response to the appellant's previous observation on that application. As the original application did not require these measures. It is highlighted that while condition no. 2 of Reg. Ref. D20A/0718 required obscure glazing in the 2 no. eastern elevation windows the applicant had no input in this requirement. They prefer the privacy measures which have been granted in the current retention application.
- It is noted that the external fins in the courtyard windows for which the subject application sought to remove was not conditioned or required by the Planning Authority. It was the subject of a previous application under Reg. Ref. D20A/0978 which permitted fins.
- It is noted that the appeal largely relates to whether the development as granted under Reg. Ref. D26A/0274/WEB provides an equivalent level of protection to the residential amenity of the adjoining dwelling 'Sraithin' as previous permissions on the site. The first party request that the Commission assess the application on its own merits.
- A section of the report of the Planning Officer is highlighted which states, "The third party concerns regarding privacy and overbearing are noted, however, the proposed internal fins are considered an acceptable and effective measure to mitigate overlooking between the dwelling and neighbouring properties, notwithstanding objections to their use in place of external fins.

While the retention of existing non obscure glazing with opaque film at lower ground and upper ground levels has also raised concerns, the extent of glazing, significant separation distances (c8.5m and c.14m), existing boundary treatments, absence of direct window to window alignment, separation distance with side boundary in excess of 8m and the relatively narrow side windows and inward courtyard orientation collectively ensure that no significantly negative overlooking or loss of privacy would arise."

- Therefore, it is considered that this section of the Planning Officer's report directly states how the development will protect the residential amenities of neighbouring properties which specifically includes large separation distances, existing boundary treatments no direct opposing windows and the orientation of windows.
- It is submitted that the appellants argument that privacy measures attached to a planning application six years ago under a different development plan can never be changed or amended is inconsistent with the evolving nature of the planning process.
- The main concerns of the appellants refer to the protection of their residential amenity and concerns that the dwelling at 'Altamont' gives rise to overlooking impacts.
- It is highlighted that the appellant's dwelling 'Sraithin', and the subject dwelling 'Altamont', do not have any directly opposing windows. The minimum separation distances as outline in National policy (16m) and 22m in the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028 are achieved.
- The separation distance of the nearest window to the neighbouring dwelling no. 3 Knock na Cree Road is 23.3m.
- The first party state that they agree with the appellants that the separation distances alone cannot determine if a development will injure residential amenities of neighbouring dwelling.
- There are many factors included in the relationship between 'Altamont' and the appellants dwelling which prevent overlooking impacts as assessed by the planner. These elements along with the significant separation distances

include existing boundary treatments; absence of direct window to window alignment and the narrow side windows and inward courtyard orientation all of which ensure no significant negative overlooking or loss of privacy would arise.

- It is highlighted that in the immediate area surrounding the site many dwellings are located significantly closer to each other than 'Altamont' and the appellants dwelling.
- It is considered that the appellants are essentially requesting for no windows of the subject dwelling 'Altamont', to be 'in view' of their dwelling, 'Sraithin'. It is submitted that this is not an achievable outcome, particularly within the built-up area of Dublin.
- The eastern elevational windows at 'Altamont' are slim, not directly opposing the appellants' house and have a significant separation distance from the appellants' house. As such it is not considered that any overlooking impacts have resulted from the development for which retention permission was granted by the Council.
- The proposal seeks to remove the requirement of opaque glazing on these eastern elevation windows and remove the requirement for external fins in the courtyard windows. It is highlighted that the courtyard windows are not directly visible from the appellants' property due to extensive boundary treatment. Therefore, the first party assumes that the appellants main concern is in relation to the 2 no. eastern elevation windows.
- The appellants raise concerns that the application as granted would result in a reduced level of privacy and that the current mitigation measures are not equal to the previously permitted measures. In response to this the first party submit that it is not a requirement for an equivalent level of protection to be demonstrated by the Planning Authority as the development was considered to pose no threat on the residential amenities of neighbouring dwellings and the separation distances alone are considered sufficient mitigation measures.

- The Planning Authority did undertake an assessment of the impact on the residential amenity where they found that the development as granted would pose no threat to the residential amenities of the surrounding area.
- It is considered that the existing privacy measures in place inclusive of extensive planting on the boundary are more than sufficient to mitigate any concerns of overlooking. It is further submitted that no additional privacy measures are required due to the substantial separation distances achieved.
- In relation to the matter of separation distances set out in section 12.8.7.1 of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028, it states "A minimum standard of 22m separation between directly opposing rear first floor windows should usually be observed for new developments."
- Figure 13.0 in the appeal response displays the separation distances which range from 22m to 27m between the windows on the lower and upper ground floors of the eastern elevation of 'Altamont' and the first-floor windows of no. 3 Knock-na-cree Road. Therefore, it is submitted that it is in accordance with 12.8.7.1 of the Development Plan. As such it is considered that the development as granted which relates solely to window treatments and mitigation measures will not cause any undue harm to the neighbouring property or any property in the vicinity of the site.
- In conclusion, having regard to the 'Objective A' zoning provisions of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028, the site history, and the nature and scale of the development for which retention permission was granted by Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council, it is considered that the development would not seriously injure the residential amenities of neighbouring properties and would not negatively impact upon the character of the surrounding area.
- The first party request that the Commission assess whether the development as granted under Reg. Ref. D26A/0274/WEB provides as effective a level of protection to the residential amenity of the adjoining dwelling 'Sraithin' as previous permissions on site. As is considered standard practice the first party request that the Commission assess the subject application de novo and

against the standard measures of assessing an application which may have impact upon the residential amenity of a neighbouring property.

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

- 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.
- The Coimisiún is referred to the previous Planner's Report.

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:

- Impact upon residential amenity

8.1. Impact upon residential amenity

8.1.1. The appellants are the adjacent neighbours in the property 'Sraithin' which is located to the east of the appeal site at 'Altamont'. The grounds of appeal set out that the privacy measures proposed to be retained under the current application are not adequate and that the privacy measures attached under the permission granted under Reg. Ref. D19A/0692 should be provided.

8.1.2. The privacy measures provided under Reg. Ref. D19A/0692 specifically referring to east elevation of the dwelling were external architectural fins. Since this original permission there have been four subsequent permissions referring to the dwelling Reg. Ref. D20A/0718, Reg. Ref. D20A/0978, Reg. Ref. D24A/0574 and Reg. Ref. D24A/0642, the current application.

8.1.3. Under Reg. Ref. D20A/0718 permission was granted for amendments to the design of the Lower House permitted under Reg. Ref. D19A/0692. This included additional east facing windows with internal fins. Condition no. 2 of the permission specified that the proposed windows on the east elevation of the lower house serving the

bedroom and living area shall be fitted and fixed with obscure glass. Under Reg. Ref. D20A/0978 permission was granted for the provision of external fins to courtyard of the Lower House. Under Reg. Ref. D24A/0574 permission was granted for amendments and modifications to the permission granted under amendment and modifications to the permission granted under planning Ref. D19A/0692, Ref. D20A/0718 and Ref. D20A/0978 including the omission of the single storey house permitted under Planning Ref. D19A/0692 and modifications to the Lower House.

8.1.4. Under the current application it is proposed to retain the non-provision of obscure glazing on 1 no. east elevation window at upper ground floor level and 1 no. eastern elevation window at lower ground floor level and the non-provision of external fins on the southern and eastern courtyard windows at lower and upper ground floor levels.

8.1.5. In relation to the proposal to retain the non-provision of external fins on the southern and eastern courtyard windows, the first party highlighted in their appeal response that the inward courtyard orientation and the extensive boundary treatment mean that the courtyard windows are not directly visible from the appellants' property.

8.1.6. I note that the grounds of appeal primarily relate to the two windows to the eastern elevation. The appellants set out that the mitigation as permitted under Reg. Ref. D19A/0692 comprising external fins and obscure glazing should be provided rather than the proposed internal privacy fins and applied privacy film to the two east facing windows. They argue that this would represent a diminution in the mitigation.

8.1.7. In response to the matter the first party highlighted that condition no. 2 Reg. Ref. D20A/0718 was attached solely in response to the appellant's previous observation on that application and that the original application did not require these measures. The first party state that they prefer the privacy measures which have been granted in the current retention application.

8.1.8. The appellants highlighted the specific site conditions and relationship between the site and their property which they stated should be taken into consideration when assessing the proposed mitigation measures. They referred to the orientation of the east facing elevation and the location of the private amenity areas of their property specifically the first-floor balcony and also the three-bedroom windows of their dwelling.

8.1.9. In relation to the location of the subject windows in the east elevation of ‘Altamont’ relative to the windows in the appellants’ property ‘Sraithin’, I note that there are no directly opposing windows. The first party highlighted that separation distance of the nearest window to the appellants’ dwelling is 23.3m and that the minimum separation distances of 22m set out in Section 12.8.7.1 in the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028 are achieved. They submit that the significant separation distances, existing boundary treatments, absence of direct window to window alignment and the narrow side windows ensure no significant negative overlooking or loss of privacy would arise.

8.1.10. The two subject windows in the eastern elevation of ‘Altamont’ are set forward from the appellants’ dwelling and therefore do not directly address existing windows. The provision of privacy film which it is proposed to retain, I consider provides a satisfactory level of mitigation having regard to the siting of the windows relative to the appellants’ property. Therefore, I would not concur with the appellants' that the non-provision of obscure glazing to the subject windows and external fins on the southern and eastern courtyard windows would result in significant impacts upon their residential amenities.

8.1.11. In conclusion, having regard to the separation distance provided and the proposal to retain the privacy film to the subject windows and internal fins to the courtyard windows, I am satisfied that that no material overlooking or loss of privacy will occur and that the proposed development would therefore not adversely affect the residential amenities of adjoining properties.

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.

9.1.1. Dalkey Island SPA (Site Code 004172) is located 790m to the east of the appeal site. Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 0030000) is located 833m to the east of the appeal site. South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) is located 4km to the north-west of the appeal site. South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) is located 4.24km to the north-west of the appeal site.

9.2. The proposed development comprises the retention of the non-provision of obscure glazing and external fins, approved under Reg. Ref. D19A/0692.

9.3. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

9.4. No streams/watercourses are identified on site.

9.5. 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.

9.6. 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 a grant of retention permission for the reasons and considerations set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. Having regard to the site location on lands zoned 'A' where it is an objective to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting existing residential amenity, the policies and objectives set out in the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 (As Varied) and having regard to planning history of the site and the nature and design of the proposed development for which retention is sought, the Commission was satisfied that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below the development proposed for retention would not seriously injure residential or visual amenities, established character or appearance of the area. The development to be retained would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

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

   Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Apart from any departures authorised by this permission, the development shall comply with the terms and conditions of Planning Permission Reg. Ref. D19A/0692, D20A/0718 and D24A/0574, unless the conditions set out hereunder specify otherwise.

   Reason: In the interest of clarity and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. The premises shall be used as a single residential unit and shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

   Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and to prevent unauthorised development.

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

9th of October 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL 501593-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of the non-provision of obscure glazing and external fins, approved under Reg. Ref. D19A/0692
Development Address	Altamont, Knocknacree Road, Dalkey, Co. Dublin, A96YP60
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.** **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: _____