



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501650-DS-26

Development	New extensions, demolition of extension, vehicular access and associated site works.
Location	265 South Circular Road, Dublin D08 VW6N
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1853/26
Applicant	Joe McDonagh
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Split decision
Type of Appeal	First Party v. decision
Appellant	Joe McDonagh
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	10 September 2026
Inspector	B. Wyse

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. No.265 is a mid-terrace period house on the southern side of the South Circular Road in Dublin 8. The house was originally single storey. There is a ground floor rear extension that extends deep into the rear garden and includes a kitchen/dining area, two bedrooms (one ensuite) and a garden shed at the end of the garden. Construction is currently underway reconfiguring a rear dormer extension at first floor level. The ground floor of the original house accommodates a bedroom (ensuite), a bathroom and a living-room. The house has front and rear gardens. There is no rear access.
- 1.2. The house adjoins three other similar single storey houses to the west up to the corner with dolphin Avenue and five three storey houses to the east. The latter are somewhat unusual in that they feature a setback dormer style upper floor. A three storey block of apartments, likely added in the 1970's or 1980's, completes the terrace to the east.
- 1.3. The wider area is mostly characterised by terraces of two storey period houses in a wide variety of styles, together with some later additions. However, the character of the area is now undergoing significant change with previously industrial/warehouse sites coming up for redevelopment. These include the Player Wills site directly opposite on the northern side of the South Circular Road and where a large scale residential development is currently under construction – one of the tall buildings under construction is already clearly visible from the front of the subject property. The Bailey Gibson site and the White Heather Industrial Estate site are a short distance to the west and are also the subject of proposals for large scale residential development.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is described as follows:
 - First and second floor extension above existing bungalow to match adjacent No.263.
 - Demolition of ground floor extension to rear and construction of new (smaller) ground floor extension to rear.
 - Change of roof profile with dormer windows to front and rear to harmonize with No.263.

- New vehicular access to front as per previously granted permission PA Ref. WEB5820/25.

At ground floor level the proposal essentially involves the removal of the two rear bedrooms and a slight reconfiguration of the dining area. The garden shed would remain. The ground floor of the original house would also be reconfigured. The two new upper floors would accommodate bedrooms, five in all, and associated bathrooms etc. The overall design approach is to replicate the adjacent No.263.

The application documentation includes a Design Statement.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority issued a split decision as follows:

- (i) To grant permission for demolition of the existing ground floor extension to the rear and the construction of the new ground floor extension to the rear and the vehicular access to the front. The permission is subject to 8 standard conditions.
- (ii) To refuse permission for the first and second floor extension. The reason for refusal is as follows:

The proposed development, by virtue of its location within a residential conservation area, the scale, height and massing of the proposed first and second floor extensions and dormers, and the resulting loss of the existing cottage which contributes positively to the character and streetscape of the area, would be visually intrusive and out of keeping with the established pattern of development. The proposal would detract from the special interest, character and setting of the Conservation Area and would set an undesirable precedent for similar forms of development in the vicinity. The proposed development would therefore seriously injure the visual and residential amenities of this Z2 zoned area (Residential Neighbourhood- Conservation Area), and would be contrary to Policy BHA9, Section 11.5.3 and Appendix 18 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, which seek to protect the special interest and character of Dublin's Conservation Areas. The proposed

development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

Basis for decision. Includes:

- *While the proposed extension is shown to match with the neighbouring house no. 263, it is considered that the neighbouring cottages to the west, and the wider streetscape will be impacted in terms of visual amenity.*
- *Policy BHA9 notes that development within or affecting a Conservation Area 'must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible'. It is noted that retention of buildings and features that contribute to the overall character and integrity of the Conservation Area will be encouraged. It is considered that no. 265 South Circular Road occurs in a prominent location within this Z2 Zoned area and is one of 3no. single storey dwellings that provides a 'gateway feature' onto Dolphin Avenue. The existing streetscape graduates down in height from 3 storey to 2 storeys (plus attic levels) and down to single storey. Furthermore, the design principle of the dwellings is noted to vary as the height transitions downward. Nos. 265, 267 and 269 serve to bookend the adjoining terrace and provide context to the existing streetscape. Having regard to the afore mentioned, there is concern that the proposed additional two storey extension would result in the subject dwelling being visually incongruous and adversely impacting on the streetscape in this Z2 Zoned Conservation Area.*
- *The existing cottage forms the beginning of a trio of single storey dwellings that have a lower ridge height than the adjoining houses on the terrace. There are significant concerns that the upper-level extensions would have a negative impact upon the legibility of the streetscape, adversely impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling and be injurious to residential amenity.*

- *While the proposed extension would result in additional accommodation for the occupants, and the design statement submitted notes that the 'proposed extended dwelling will provide adequate and appropriately proportioned accommodation, resulting in good quality and adaptable living space for future occupants', there is serious concern with regard to the scale of the development.*
- *The proposed addition of this two-storey extension would completely change the character of the cottage, changing it from a single storey cottage to a three-storey house. There is a general presumption against development which would involve the loss of a building of conservation or historic merit within the Conservation Areas or that contributes to the overall setting, character and streetscape of the Conservation Area. This has implications for character buildings that positively contribute to their built heritage, integrity, character and sense of place.*
- *As noted above, the City Development Plan places an emphasis upon the retention of buildings and features that contribute to the overall character and integrity of the Conservation Area. It is therefore desirable for a precautionary approach to any alterations and extensions to be applied. This aspect of the proposal would therefore not accord with the policy outlined above and would be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development and would set a negative precedent for the future development of the area.*
- No requirement for environmental impact assessment or appropriate assessment.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Transport Planning Division – no objection subject to conditions.

Drainage Division – no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None received.

4.0 Planning History

Subject Property

PA Ref. WEB1651/22, ABP Ref. 314747-22

This is a 2023 refusal of permission to retain a part two storey, part single storey rear extension. The two storey element was a large dormer accommodating two bedrooms. The single storey element was the extension as currently exists, with one of the bedrooms labelled as a study. Reasons for refusal referred to conservation issues and overdevelopment by reference to inadequate private open space.

PA Ref. WEB2595/24, ABP Ref. 321975-25

This is a July 2025 refusal of permission to retain essentially the same development as previously refused (above). In this case the dormer element rooms were labelled as home office and playroom and the single storey element was indicated as including two bedrooms. The single reason for refusal referred to conservation issues.

PA Ref. WEB2697/25

This is an October 2025 grant of permission to retain the single storey rear extension and permission for a smaller rear dormer extension to replace the larger structure the subject of the previous refusals. The dormer room was labelled as an attic space.

PA Ref. WEB5820/25

This is a March 2026 grant of permission for a wider rear dormer extension (than that approved under PA Ref. WEB2697/25), three rooflights to the front roof plane and a new vehicular access to the front. The dormer room is again labelled as an attic space. This appears to be the development currently under construction.

Relevant cases in the Vicinity

PA Ref. 2647/24

This is a March 2025 split decision in relation to a proposed development at 9 Lombard Street, Portobello, Dublin 8. Permission was granted for a single storey office in the rear garden with connecting walkway to the house. Permission was refused for the addition of a floor to the house on conservation grounds.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

Zoning: Z2 – Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) - *To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.*

Section 14.7.2 includes:

Residential conservation areas have extensive groupings of buildings and associated open spaces with an attractive quality of architectural design and scale. A Zone Z2 area may also be open space located within or surrounded by an Architectural Conservation Area and/or a group of protected structures. The overall quality of the area in design and layout terms is such that it requires special care in dealing with development proposals which affect structures in such areas, both protected and non-protected. The general objective for such areas is to protect them from unsuitable new developments or works that would have a negative impact on the amenity or architectural quality of the area.

The principal land-use encouraged in residential conservation areas is housing...

Chapter 11 - Built Heritage and Archaeology

Section 11.5.3 - Built Heritage Assets of the City, includes:

These include heritage assets such as conservation area land use zonings, mews structures, vernacular buildings, 20th century heritage, industrial heritage and street furniture, which may not be protected structures but which contribute significantly to the streetscape and to the character of the city.

The Z8 Georgian Conservation Areas, Z2 Residential Conservation Areas and red-lined Conservation Areas are extensive throughout the city. Whilst these areas do not have a statutory basis in the same manner as protected structures or ACAs, they are recognised as areas that have conservation merit and importance and warrant protection through zoning and policy application.

Designated Conservation Areas include extensive groupings of buildings, streetscapes and associated open spaces and include (parts of) the medieval/walled city, the Georgian Core, the 19th and 20th century city, and the city quays, rivers and canals. The special interest/value of Conservation Areas lies in the historic and architectural interest and the design and scale of these areas. Therefore, all of these areas require special care in terms of development proposals. The City Council will encourage development which enhances the setting and character of Conservation Areas.

As with Architectural Conservation Areas, there is a general presumption against

development which would involve the loss of a building of conservation or historic merit within the Conservation Areas or that contributes to the overall setting, character and streetscape of the Conservation Area. Such proposals will require detailed justification from a viability, heritage, and sustainability perspective.

Policy BHA9 Conservation Areas

Includes:

To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas – identified under Z8 and Z2 zoning objectives and denoted by red line conservation hatching on the zoning maps. Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.

Enhancement opportunities may include:

- 4. Contemporary architecture of exceptional design quality, which is in harmony with the Conservation Area.*
- 6. Retention of buildings and features that contribute to the overall character and integrity of the Conservation Area.*
- 7. The return of buildings to residential use.*

Policy BHA10 - Demolition in a Conservation Area

Includes:

There is a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of a structure that positively contributes to the character of a Conservation Area, except in exceptional circumstances where such loss would also contribute to a significant public benefit.

Appendix 18 Ancillary Residential Accommodation

Includes:

1.1 General Design Principles

It is acknowledged that the development of residential extensions plays an important role in promoting a compact city in line with the core strategy as well as providing for sustainable neighbourhoods and areas where a wide range of families can live.

The design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular, the need for light and privacy. In addition, the form of the existing building should be respected, and the development should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar or contrasting materials and finishes.

Innovative, contemporary design will be encouraged. A contemporary or modern approach, providing unique designs, can offer a more imaginative solution. However, such proposals are still required to take account of the design issues outlined in this document.

Applications for extensions to existing residential units should:

- Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling*
- Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight*
- Achieve a high quality of design*
- Make a positive contribution to the streetscape (front extensions)*

1.2 Extensions to 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.

1.4 Privacy and Amenity

It is important to make sure that any extension does not unacceptably affect the amenities of neighbouring properties. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight.

1.7 Appearance and Materials

The extension should not dominate the existing building and should normally be of an overall scale and size to harmonise with the existing house and adjoining buildings; the appearance of the existing structure should be the reference point for any consideration of change that may be proposed. The materials used should complement those used on the existing building; features such as windows and doors on the new extension should relate to those on the original building in terms of proportion and use of materials.

4.0 Alterations at Roof Level/ Attics/ Dormers/ Additional Floors

The roofline of a building is one of its most dominant features and it is important that any proposal to change the shape, pitch or cladding of a roof is carefully considered. Alterations at roof level can include the conversion of an attic space and inclusion of dormer windows or the provision of an additional storey modifying the roof profile entirely.

The following criteria will be considered in assessing alterations at roof level:

- Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.*

- *Existing roof variations on the streetscape.*
- *Distance/ contrast/ visibility of proposed roof end.*
- *Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence.*

5.0 Attic Conversions / Dormer Windows

The conversion of attic spaces is common practice in many residential homes. The use of an attic space for human habitation must be compliant with all of the relevant design standards, as well as building and fire regulations. Dormer windows, where proposed should complement the existing roof profile and be sympathetic to the overall design of the dwelling. The use of roof lights to serve attic bedrooms will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Where it is proposed to extend the ridge height to accommodate an increased floor-to-ceiling height, the design should avoid an overly dominant roof structure. The proposed scale of the roof should retain similar proportions to the building where possible.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant.

6.0 Environmental Impact assessment (EIA)

- 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. See Form 1 in Appendix below.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appeal is stated to relate solely to the refusal element of the planning authority decision.

The main grounds can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal has been designed to align with the scale and height of the adjoining dwelling No.263. It responds appropriately to the established built form and maintains a satisfactory relationship with the adjoining streetscape.
- The proposal will improve the spatial arrangement of the site.

- The proposed form, height, roof profile, chimney treatment, fenestration and external material palette draw from the defining characteristics of the existing streetscape and serve to reinforce a coherent and legible terrace composition.
- A new wall along the boundary with No.267 will provide appropriate protection, enclosure and containment in relation to that property.
- The proposal will make a positive contribution to the visual amenity and architectural coherence of this section of South Circular Road.
- The provisions relied upon by the planning authority do not establish any blanket prohibition on the alteration or extension of unprotected dwellings within the Z2 area.
- While the development plan states that Z2 areas comprise groupings of buildings and associated open spaces of attractive architectural design and scale, and that special care is required in dealing with proposals affecting both protected and non-protected structures, it also states that the principal land use encouraged in such areas is housing.
- It is accepted that Policy BHA9 is an important policy test. It requires an evaluative planning judgement as to whether a proposal contributes positively or causes unacceptable harm. It does not require the freezing of every existing unprotected building in its current form nor does it prohibit adaptation or extension where a proposal is of sufficient design quality and contextual sensitivity. The planning authority has applied the policy in an unduly restrictive manner by attributing disproportionate significance to the existing single storey form of No.265 and by insufficiently recognising the broader and more varied streetscape context of South Circular Road, including the immediately adjacent and taller No.263.
- By reference to Appendix 18 the development plan does not exclude additional floors, roof alterations or dormers in principle. Rather, it regulates them by reference to design quality, contextual fit and impact.
- The development plan and wider strategic planning frameworks promote compact growth, appropriate infill and better use of existing urban sites.

- No.265 is not a protected structure. It is an ordinary building within a sensitive streetscape context rather than a building of special individual heritage status.
- The front façade forms part of the established streetscape and contributes, to some degree, to the character of this section of South Circular Road. However, the building has been altered over time, including the addition of a dormer window and a substantial single storey rear extension.
- The reason for refusal refers to the loss of the existing cottage and has attributed a degree of significance that is disproportionate. The streetscape in the area is not uniform and includes varied urban grain, building heights, roof profiles, and building forms and periods. The current single storey expression of No.265 is not so individually significant that it must remain unaltered in all circumstances. The planning authority also attributes an excessive degree of formal significance to the three single storey cottages, as a gateway feature to Dolphin Avenue, when, in reality, they form a modest grouping within a varied streetscape.
- The planning authority reference to precedent does not sufficiently recognise the particular characteristics of the subject site, its immediate context and the specific architectural response proposed. No.265 is immediately adjacent to No.263, a taller dwelling of substantially different scale and vertical expression. The interface is not representative of all sites within the Z2 area nor is it a generic condition capable of repetition elsewhere.
- The planning authority has overstated the extent of visual harm. While the building would be materially altered in height and profile, the proposal is grounded in the architectural vocabulary of the area and does not introduce an inappropriate design approach or a visually disruptive building type.
- In relation to the impact on the conservation area increased scale does not automatically equate to unacceptable visual impact.
- The submission notes that the planning authority raised no planning issues or objections to the other elements of the proposed development for which a decision to grant permission was made.
- The submission includes drawings and photomontages (Figures 1,2,3 and 4) of the front façade of the development as proposed.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority decision should be upheld and a Section 48 development contribution condition should be attached to any grant of permission.

7.3. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. The Commission will note that the appeal in this case is stated to be in relation to the refusal element of the planning authority decision only. There is no express provision in the legislation for split decisions but they are quite common and have constituted an established approach for a very long time. It follows that there is no equivalent, in relation to split decisions, of Section 139 of the Act and which allows for appeals of conditions only and the discretionary authority of the Commission to confine its assessment of the appeal to those conditions.
- 8.2. Strictly speaking, therefore, the entire planning authority decision is before the Commission in this appeal.
- 8.3. I agree with the applicant that no planning issues arise in relation to the proposed new ground floor extension, the demolition of the bulk of the existing extension and the vehicular entrance to the front in themselves and which are the subject of the grant element of the planning authority decision.
- 8.4. I am satisfied that the main issues in the appeal are those relating to the proposed first and second floor extension and the matters referenced in the planning authority reason for refusal for this element of the development. Depending on the Commission's final determination on this it might be necessary to consider the grant element of the decision further – I comment on this at the end of this assessment.
- 8.5. I agree with the applicant that the references in the planning authority reason for refusal to visual impacts, including intrusiveness and 'out of keeping', are misplaced. The proposal is essentially to replicate the adjacent No.263, and thereby extend the three storey element of the terrace to six houses and shorten the single storey element to two houses/cottages. The result, in visual terms, is demonstrated in the

drawings and photomontages included with the grounds of appeal. In my view, the visual change would be imperceptible to most people and the new development would not be intrusive or out of keeping. The all too often cited references in the reason for refusal to 'scale, height and massing' are, in this context, meaningless. As referenced in Section 1.0 above the wider area in the vicinity is currently undergoing very significant change in structural and visual terms with the development of new large scale residential complexes. I do not consider that any issues in relation to residential amenity arise either.

- 8.6. In my view, it is the conservation issue that is at the core of this case. The proposed development essentially involves the loss of the existing period single storey cottage and it's replacement with a new three storey house, albeit designed to mimic the adjacent period three storey houses.
- 8.7. While the conservation area designation attaching to the Z2 residential zoning does not have a statutory basis, as is the case with protected structures and architectural conservation areas, and, therefore, might be expected to allow for greater flexibility in relation to new development proposals than would be the case in relation to those designations, the development plan does clearly signal that there is still a presumption against the loss of buildings of conservation or historic merit or that contribute to the overall setting, character and streetscapes within such conservation areas. Proposals to remove such buildings are stated to require detailed justification from a viability, heritage and sustainability perspective (see Section 5.1 above – Section 11.5.3 of the development plan refers).
- 8.8. This approach is further elaborated on in Policy BHA9 and which includes, amongst identified enhancement measures, the retention of buildings that contribute to the overall character and integrity of the conservation area. Policy BHA10 further reinforces the position in stating a presumption against demolition or substantial loss of a structure that positively contributes to the character of the conservation area, except in exceptional circumstances where such loss would also contribute to a significant public benefit.
- 8.9. I agree with the applicant that these provisions do not amount to a blanket prohibition on alterations or extensions to buildings that are not protected structures or the freezing of such buildings in their current form. I also agree that it is important to allow

for adaptation and renewal, in this case most importantly for the purposes of housing, the main land use to be encouraged in the area.

- 8.10. While inevitably somewhat subjective I am inclined to the view that the existing cottage, in its own right, is of considerable heritage value and that it does make a significant contribution to the distinct character of the conservation area. As the applicant says the local streetscape is highly varied. This variety is intrinsic to its quality. The cottage is one of just three in the immediate area so its loss would, in my view, be significant. The dormer alterations already carried out, and further underway, and the rear extensions have not changed the appearance of the cottage in the streetscape of the South Circular Road and this is its primary aspect in conservation terms.
- 8.11. As mentioned above the development plan requires a detailed justification for the removal of buildings not just in terms of heritage but also in terms of viability and sustainability.
- 8.12. In terms of viability it is now clearly the case, notwithstanding a somewhat chequered planning history, that the cottage, together with its now approved extensions and modifications, is entirely viable as a modern family home (see Section 4.0 above). In this regard also, the points made by the applicant in relation to the spatial arrangement of the site and the promotion of compact and infill developments are answered.
- 8.13. Given that the cottage is of considerable heritage value and that it is viable as a family home it would be difficult to conclude that its removal would be satisfactory from a sustainability perspective.
- 8.14. I conclude, therefore, that the applicant has not advanced a sufficient justification for the removal of the existing cottage and its replacement and that the proposal, therefore, would be contrary to the requirements of Section 11.5.3 and Policies BHA9 and BHA10 of the development plan.
- 8.15. I agree with the applicant that the issue of precedent is not an important one. Notwithstanding that every cases must be assessed on its own merits the subject property has a number of unique aspects that are not likely to be easily reproduced elsewhere.

- 8.16. Further to paragraph 8.4 above, if the Commission is minded to agree with my assessment, I consider that the scope of the Commissions' decision should extend to the entire proposed development. That is permission should be refused for the proposed development as a whole. While the applicant has not contested the matter the split decision of the planning authority does not seem to make sense. The proposed ground floor plans and access arrangements to the first floor within the original cottage, would not align with the approved layouts under PA Refs. WEB2697/25 and WEB5820/25. The proposal, including the demolition element, would result in a much reduced level of accommodation on the site even compared to what currently exists, never mind what was proposed. The proposed demolition of the existing extension was surely predicated on the grant of permission for the additional two floors. In a residential conservation area, where the primary objective is to secure and enhance residential use, and in the context of the wider strategic policy environment to encourage compact growth, such an outcome would, in my view, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 8.17. The Commission will note that the applicant can proceed with the new vehicular access to the front, and the works to the rear dormer extension, under permission PA Ref. WEB5820/25 granted earlier this year (see Section 4.0 above).

9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 9.1. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project within an established and serviced urban area, and taking account of the screening determination of the planning authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.2. I conclude, 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. Appropriate Assessment, therefore, is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. 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.
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project in a serviced urban area, 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.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that permission be refused for the proposed development.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development would effectively result in the loss of the existing cottage at No. 265 South Circular Road, a building that is considered to be of significant heritage value and that contributes positively to the overall setting, character and streetscape of the residential conservation area. The Commission is not satisfied that the loss of the cottage has been justified from a viability, heritage or sustainability perspective. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to Section 11.5.3 and Policies BHA9 and BHA10 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and, accordingly, it would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In relation to those elements of the proposed development the subject of the decision of the planning authority to grant permission, the Commission is not satisfied that the proposed floor plans, including access arrangements to the first floor level, would be workable along with the approved layouts for the original cottage under PA Refs. WEB2697/25 and WEB5820/25 or, consequent on the demolition of the rear extension, that the reduction in habitable accommodation could be justified in a residential conservation area where the primary objective is to secure and enhance residential use.

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.

B. Wyse
Planning Inspector

23 September 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	501650
Proposed Development Summary	Domestic extensions
Development Address	265 South Circular Road, Dublin D08 VW6N
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, No further action required.
(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 Preliminary Examination or 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 ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: B. Wyse Date: 23 September 2026