



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL501668-DN-26

Development	The development will consist of the construction of a two storey, two bedroom, end of terrace dwelling, including the adaptation of the existing boundary wall, a rear landscaped courtyard, and all associated site and ancillary works
Location	187 North Circular Road, Cabra East, Dublin 7 D07 Y9K5
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1980/26
Applicant(s)	Chris Capital Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Chris Capital Limited
Observer(s)	
Date of Site Inspection	28 th September 2026
Inspector	Andrew Hersey

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1 The appeal site is located at the junction of North Circular Road and Old Cabra Road, at Hanlon's Corner, Dublin 7. It comprises an irregularly shaped side garden adjoining No. 187 North Circular Road and has a stated area of approximately 110 sq m. No. 187 forms the end of a terrace of two-storey red-brick dwellings. The site has frontage to both roads and is enclosed along Old Cabra Road by a high red-brick boundary wall.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is predominantly residential, although the junction includes a mix of commercial and other urban uses. The site is within an established built-up area served by public transport and local services. No. 187 has been subdivided into five self-contained flats, according to the Planning Authority's report

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 Permission is sought for the construction of a two-storey, two-bedroom dwelling in the side garden of No. 187 North Circular Road. The proposal includes alterations to the existing boundary wall, a pedestrian entrance, a rear landscaped courtyard and associated site works.
- 2.2 The dwelling would have a stated floor area of approximately 90 sq m. The ground floor would contain a kitchen, living and dining area, WC and storage space, with two bedrooms and en-suite bathrooms at first-floor level. The submitted scheme also shows a south-facing front terrace and a rear courtyard as private outdoor space. No off-street car parking is proposed

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

- 3.1 Decision – Refuse Permission on the 19th June 2026 for the following reasons:
- 1. The proposed development for a new dwelling on a restricted site with insufficient quality private open space would provide poor residential amenity to future residents and would be contrary to Specific Planning Policy Requirement 2*

(SPPR2) of the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas and Compact Settlements – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, 2024), and to the Z1 zoning objective of the site which is ‘to protect, provide and improve residential amenities’ and Section 15.13.3 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028. The proposal would result in the private amenity space being significantly overlooked. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site as a whole and by the precedent established for such development, be contrary to the policies and objectives of the current Dublin City Development Plan and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- 2. Having regard to the Z1 zoning objective, which seeks to protect, provide and improve residential amenities, and the policies set out in Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 regarding residential developments, it is considered that the proposed development due to its design, form and arrangement would be out of character with the form of the existing and the immediate adjoining period set-piece hipped-roofed block of terrace dwellings and as such would be visually incongruous to the streetscape. It is therefore considered that this development, if permitted, would set an undesirable precedent for oversized infill corner site developments and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2 Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1 The planning case officer considered residential development acceptable in principle under the Z1 zoning objective and acknowledged that the revised scheme was substantially improved in scale, massing, materials and appearance compared with the previously refused proposal (Reg. Ref. WEB5664/25). The officer nevertheless considered the private open space confined, north-facing and overlooked from No. 187.
- 3.2.2 The report also raised concerns about the amenity space retained for the flats at No. 187, the relationship of the proposed building to the public footpath, and its fit with the adjoining terrace. Refusal was recommended

3.3 Other Technical Reports

- 3.3.1 *Transportation Planning Division Report* (dated 4th June 2026): The Division raised no objection to the absence of car parking or the proposed pedestrian access, subject to conditions concerning the entrance gate, bicycle parking and any projection over the public road area.
- 3.3.2 *Drainage* (dated 5th June 2026): recommended that additional information be sought. It requested a flood risk assessment and a separate foul and surface water drainage system, stating that satisfactory surface water management had not been demonstrated. It is noted that this issue is not reflected in the case planners report.

3.4 Prescribed Bodies

- 3.4.1 *Transport Infrastructure Ireland* (15th May 2026): TII requested a Section 49 supplementary development contribution condition if permission were granted and the development were liable.

3.5 Third Party Submissions

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

4.0 Planning History

4.1 Subject Site

- 4.1.1 *Planning Reg. Ref. WEB5664/25*: Permission was refused on 19 January 2026 for a three-storey, three-bedroom dwelling on the appeal site. The reasons concerned the quality of private open space, overdevelopment, and the scale and appearance of the proposed dwelling in relation to the adjoining terrace. The current application is a revised, two-storey scheme.
- 4.1.2 *Planning Reg. Ref. 1191/02*: Permission was refused for additional bedrooms at the side and rear of No. 187 at first-floor level.

- 4.1.3 Planning Reg. Ref. 0556/01: An application for a first-floor and side extension was deemed withdrawn following a request for additional information

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028

- 5.1.1 The statutory development plan is the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028, as varied. The appeal site at No. 187 North Circular Road is zoned Z1, *Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods*. The objective is to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. Residential use is permissible under this zoning, subject to the proposal meeting the applicable design and amenity standards.
- 5.1.2 Section 15.13.3 of the Plan refers to infill and side garden housing. It supports an additional dwelling on a suitable site where the development is of a high design standard. For corner and side garden sites, the stated assessment criteria includes for protecting the character of the street; compatibility of design and scale with adjoining dwellings; accommodation and open space standards for both existing and proposed dwellings; effects on neighbouring residential amenities; safe access; boundary treatment; and visual harmony. The section allows a contemporary design response where appropriate to its context.
- 5.1.3 Section 15.11.3 normally requires 10 sq m of private open space per bedspace for houses, while providing for a case by case relaxation supported by a qualitative assessment. It also addresses the usability, privacy and enclosure of private outdoor space. Section 15.11.4 requires adequate separation and careful window design to protect privacy. These provisions are relevant to the proposed rear courtyard and the Planning Authority's first reason for refusal

5.2 National Guidance/S28 Guidance

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

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

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

5.3 Natural Heritage Designations

- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024) which is located 4.4km to the east of the site and
- North Bull Island SPA (Site Code 004006) which is located 8.6km to the east of the site

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1 Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1 A first-party appeal was lodged by Chris Capital Limited on the 6th July 2026. The appellant requests that the decision be overturned and permission granted. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- *Principle of development:* A dwelling is permissible on the Z1-zoned site. The proposal would make efficient use of serviced urban land and accord with national and Development Plan policies supporting compact infill development.
- *Response to the previous refusal:* The appellant states that the scheme has been substantially redesigned since the refusal under Reg. Ref. WEB5664/25. It has been

reduced from three storeys to two, with a smaller floor area and a simpler architectural form.

- *Private open space:* The appellant submits that the Planning Authority concentrated on the 17 sq m rear courtyard and did not adequately consider the 15 sq m south-facing sunken terrace. The two areas are said to provide 32 sq m in total. Shadow studies submitted with the appeal are stated to show direct midday sunlight to the terrace on 21 March and 21 June. The appellant also relies on the flexibility for small urban infill sites under SPPR 2 of the 2024 Compact Settlements Guidelines.
- *Design and streetscape:* The appellant contends that the reduced scale, brick finish and restrained design respond appropriately to the adjoining terrace and the wider, varied character of Hanlon's Corner. It submits that the Development Plan allows scope for contemporary design on corner sites.
- *Overdevelopment and precedent:* The appellant disputes that the dwelling would constitute overdevelopment or establish an undesirable precedent, having regard to the particular characteristics of this corner site. It also disputes the Planning Authority's interpretation that the first floor would overhang the public footpath, stating that the building would remain within the site boundary.
- *Existing dwelling:* The appellant states that No. 187 North Circular Road would retain independent access, separation and private amenity. It considers that the Planning Authority's concerns about the existing arrangement have not established a specific adverse impact arising from the proposal.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- 7.3.1 A response was received on the 21st July 2026 and the city council recommends that the Commission upholds their decision.
- 7.3.2 In the event that is recommended that permission is granted the city council urge the Commission to include for S48 and S49 Development Contributions and a condition regarding naming and numbering of the proposed house.

7.5 Observations

7.5.1 None received

8.0 Assessment

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Residential amenity and private open space for the proposed dwelling and the existing accommodation at No. 187;
- Design, scale and impact on the streetscape;
- Access, servicing and drainage.

8.3 Principle of Development

8.3.1 The site is zoned Z1, Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods, under the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028, the zoning objective of which is “*to protect, provide and improve residential amenities*”, Residential use is a permissible use under this land use zoning objective.

8.3.2 Section 15.13.3 of the Plan supports infill and side garden housing on suitable sites subject to certain criteria with respect to design, integration with the existing streetscape, the minimum provision of private open space and residential amenity issues all of which will be detailed later in this report.

8.3.3 The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024) identify consolidation and intensification within Dublin’s existing built-up area, including incremental infill development, as priorities.

8.3.4 With respect to the foregoing, I consider that an additional dwelling on this serviced site is acceptable in principle, subject to an assessment of residential amenity and its relationship with the adjoining buildings and streetscape

8.4 Residential Amenity and Private Open Space

- 8.4.1 The proposed two-bedroom dwelling has a stated internal floor area of approximately 90 sq m. Section 15.11.1 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028 requires houses to comply with the internal layout and space standards in Section 5.3 of *Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities* (2007). Having regard to the submitted floor plans and the size and arrangement of the proposed rooms, I am satisfied that the dwelling would provide an acceptable standard of internal accommodation and is compliant with the standards set out in the above stated guidelines.
- 8.4.2 The dispute centres on the external amenity space. Drawing A101 identifies a 17sq m rear garden and a 15sq m sunken private terrace to the south, giving a stated total of 32sq m. The Planning Authority's assessment appears to have concentrated on the rear garden without fully addressing the proposed open space to the front
- 8.4.3 SPPR 2 of the *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines* (2024) specifies 30 sq m of private open space for a two-bedroom house. It also permits the standard to be relaxed, in part or in whole, for a small urban infill site on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality and proximity to public open space. In every case, the applicant must demonstrate that residents would enjoy a high standard of amenity. Accordingly, the numerical standard does not, of itself, resolve the first reason for refusal.
- 8.4.4 The 17 sq m rear garden is north-facing and lies close to windows in the existing building at No. 187. A boundary wall could screen views from ground-floor windows, but it would not adequately address overlooking from the first-floor windows. Depending on its height, such a wall could also further limit daylight to the garden. I therefore consider that the privacy and usability of this space would be constrained. The south-facing terrace has the potential to contribute to the proposed dwelling's amenity, but does not remove the need to assess the quality of the rear garden.
- 8.4.5 The proposed 15 sq m southern terrace benefits from a favourable orientation and direct association with the living accommodation. The submitted shadow studies indicate sunlight at midday on 21 March and 21 June. However, sunlight provision must be considered alongside privacy and usability. The terrace occupies a street-facing position at a busy junction, where its amenity value depends on effective screening from the adjoining public realm. Its sunken form may provide some

screening, but the submitted information does not sufficiently demonstrate the relationship between terrace level, adjoining footpath levels and the height and treatment of the enclosing boundaries to establish that satisfactory privacy would be achieved. Any screening must also preserve adequate daylight and avoid an excessively enclosed space. I am therefore not satisfied that the southern terrace has been demonstrated to provide a sufficiently private and usable amenity area having regard to Section 15.11.3 of the Development Plan and Section 5.3.2 of the Compact Settlements Guidelines. Its stated area cannot, by itself, establish satisfactory overall private open space provision.

8.4.6 Section 15.13.3 of the Plan also requires consideration of open space for the existing dwelling. The Planning Authority's report records that No. 187 has been subdivided into five flats, but the application does not establish the amount and arrangement of usable outdoor space that would remain available to their occupants following subdivision of the site. The appeal states that the existing property would retain private amenity, but does not provide a sufficiently clear account of that provision. On the information before me, I cannot conclude that an acceptable standard of amenity would be maintained for the existing accommodation. The available information indicates that bin storage serving No. 187 may be located within the appeal site. The application does not clearly establish whether this facility would be displaced or how replacement storage would be accommodated following development. Suitable arrangements should be demonstrated for both the existing accommodation and the proposed dwelling, including adequate storage capacity, convenient access and a practical route for presenting bins for collection. Such provision should not obstruct access or materially diminish the usable amenity space retained for either property. This further limits the conclusions that can be drawn regarding the adequacy of the proposed subdivision.

8.4.7 The submitted drawings do not provide a sufficiently clear account of existing structures within the appeal site or establish whether these would be retained or removed as part of the proposed development. A survey identifying their location and dimensions, together with a layout distinguishing structures to be retained from those proposed for demolition, would clarify the extent of the works. In the absence of this information, the implications for the proposed layout, facilities serving No. 187 and usable outdoor amenity space cannot be fully assessed.

- 8.4.8 Although the application identifies a combined outdoor area of 32 sq m, satisfactory amenity depends on the quality and functionality of those spaces rather than their aggregate area alone. The rear courtyard is constrained by overlooking and limited sunlight, while adequate privacy for the southern terrace has not been demonstrated. Furthermore, the extent and quality of outdoor space retained for No. 187, the accommodation of its bin storage and the treatment of apparent existing structures remain unclear. Taken together, these matters prevent me from concluding that the proposed subdivision would provide an acceptable standard of residential amenity for both the proposed dwelling and the existing accommodation.
- 8.4.9 The Planning Authority also considers that the proposal would constitute overdevelopment of the site as a whole. The proposed dwelling occupies a stated footprint of 45 sq m on a 110 sq m application site, giving a site coverage of approximately 41%. Its two-storey scale, internal accommodation and absence of car parking do not, in themselves, indicate overdevelopment. The question is whether the subdivision would provide an acceptable relationship between the proposed dwelling and the existing accommodation at No. 187.

8.5 Design and Streetscape

- 8.5.1 The appeal site occupies a conspicuous position at Hanlon's Corner, beside a period terrace with a coherent brick finish and roof form. It is noted that the revised dwelling as now proposed is appreciably smaller than the three-storey proposal refused under Reg. Ref. WEB5664/25. Its two-storey height, simpler form and red brick finish are material improvements which should be assessed on their own merits.
- 8.5.2 Section 15.13.3 of the Development Plan requires infill development to respond to the established character of the street, while allowing for a contemporary design where appropriate. The adjoining terrace has a consistent red-brick finish and pitched roof form. The proposed flat roof and building line would distinguish the new dwelling from that terrace, and this difference would be visible at Hanlon's Corner. Nevertheless, a corner site does not necessarily call for a continuation of the terrace's roof form. The proposed two-storey height and red-brick finish would provide a clear visual relationship with the adjoining buildings, while the simpler form would mark the corner.

- 8.5.3 The case planner expressed concern that the first floor would overhang the public footpath on Old Cabra Road. Having examined the submitted drawings, I am satisfied that the first floor would remain within the application site and would not encroach over the footpath. I therefore do not attach weight to this concern. The proximity of the building to the street boundary makes its design particularly visible, but I do not consider that this would give rise to an unacceptable visual impact.
- 8.5.4 The current proposal is substantially reduced in height and scale compared with the three-storey dwelling previously refused under Reg. Ref. WEB5664/25. Its red-brick finish responds to the adjoining terrace, while its contemporary form reflects the prominent corner location and the variety of buildings around Hanlon's Corner. On balance, I consider that the dwelling would make an acceptable contribution to the streetscape. The particular setting and configuration of this site would also limit its value as a precedent for other side garden sites. I therefore do not uphold the Planning Authority's second reason for refusal.

8.6 Access, Servicing and Drainage

- 8.6.1 No car parking is proposed. Having regard to the site's accessible urban location and the Transportation Planning Division's report, I consider this acceptable. The proposed pedestrian entrance and cycle parking could be addressed through detailed conditions if permission were otherwise warranted. Any gate should open inward so that it does not obstruct the footpath.
- 8.6.2 The Drainage Division requested additional information, including a flood risk assessment and further details of surface water management. These matters were not reasons for refusal, but the absence of a drainage objection in the appeal does not resolve the Division's stated concerns. Were the Commission minded to grant permission, it would need to be satisfied that the necessary information is available to assess flood risk and drainage before determining the appeal; a condition should not defer that substantive assessment.

8.7 Conclusion

- 8.7.1 I consider the principle of an additional dwelling on this serviced urban site acceptable. The revised design would make an acceptable contribution to the

streetscape, would not encroach over the public footpath and would provide acceptable access arrangements in principle. The outstanding flood-risk and drainage matters identified in Section 8.6 would require resolution if the Commission were minded to grant permission. However, the submitted information does not demonstrate that sufficiently private and usable outdoor amenity space would be provided for the proposed dwelling or that satisfactory amenity provision would be retained for the existing accommodation at No. 187. Accordingly, I consider that the residential amenity and overdevelopment concerns underlying the Planning Authority's first reason for refusal have not been overcome, and I recommend that permission be refused.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2 The subject site is located
- 4.4km to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024)
 - 8.6km to the west of the North Bull Island SPA (Site Code 004006)
- 9.3 The proposed development comprises of permission for a new house on an infill site in an urban area. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.4 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, and its location in an urban area, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site
- 9.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The relatively small scale nature of the works proposed
 - The lack thereof of any hydrological connection from the proposed development to the Natura 2000 site.

- Having regard to the screening report/determination carried out by the Planning Authority

- 9.6 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 9.7 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The proposed development is located 4.4km to the west of Dublin Bay.
- 10.2 The proposed development consists of permission for a new house on an infill site in an urban area
- 10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.4 I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 10.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The minor scope of the works and nature of the development
 - The distance to the nearest water body, Dublin Bay and the lack of hydrological connections to the same.
- 10.6 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1 I recommend that permission for the development be refused for the following reason:

1. Having regard to the restricted nature of the site and its proposed subdivision from No. 187 North Circular Road, it has not been demonstrated that the private open space serving the proposed dwelling would provide a satisfactory standard of residential amenity. In particular, the rear courtyard is constrained by overlooking and limited sunlight, while adequate privacy and usability of the street-facing southern terrace have not been demonstrated. Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided to establish the extent and quality of usable private open space that would remain available to the existing residential accommodation at No. 187. The proposed development would therefore fail to provide an acceptable standard of residential amenity across the site and, as a consequence, would constitute overdevelopment. It would be contrary to the Z1 zoning objective and Section 15.13.3 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028, and to the requirement under SPPR 2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024) to demonstrate a high standard of amenity for residents. The proposed development would thus be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Andrew Hersey

Planning Inspector

5th October 2026

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL501668-DN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Infill House
Development Address	187 North Circular Road, Cabra East, Dublin 7 D07 Y9K5
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 Q2.
	☐ 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 <u>Part 1</u>, 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 <u>Part 2</u>, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of	

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

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference Number	PL501668-DN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Infill House
Development Address	187 North Circular Road, Cabra East, Dublin 7 D07 Y9K5
The Board carried out a preliminary examination [ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended] of at least the nature, size or location of the proposed development, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations. This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development	<i>The proposed development comprises of permission for an infill dwelling and associated site works,</i>
Location of Proposed Development	<i>The development is situated in an urban area in Dublin city where services are present. There are no sensitive environmental receptors on site or in the vicinity of the same.</i>
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	<i>Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitat, the likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.</i>
Conclusion	

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

Inspector: Andrew Hersey

Date:

DP/ADP: _____

Date:

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)