



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321271-24

Development	Retention of extension to granny flat, permission to widen vehicular entrance and installation of electric gate.
Location	Palm Court, North Circular Road, Limerick, V94 88H4
Planning Authority	Limerick City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460871
Applicant(s)	TJ O'Dea
Type of Application	Retention Permission & Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	TJ O'Dea
Date of Site Inspection	20 th January 2025
Inspector	Clare Clancy

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History	7
5.0 Policy Context	8
5.1. Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028	8
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	10
5.3. EIA Screening	11
6.0 The Appeal	11
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	11
6.2. Planning Authority Response	12
6.3. Observations	12
6.4. Further Responses	12
7.0 Assessment	12
7.1. Principle of Development & Compliance with Zoning	12
7.2. Other Matters	15
7.3. Access	15
8.0 AA Screening	17
9.0 Recommendation	18

10.0	(i) Reasons and Considerations	18
11.0	(ii) Reason and Conditions	19
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening		

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site occupies a corner site located at the junction of Fortmary Park road and North Circular Road. It comprises of a two-storey semi-detached red brick dwelling with first floor single-fronted projection. The roadside boundary is defined by a c.1.8 m block rendered wall backed by mature hedging. It extends for a length in excess of 20 m. There is an existing 'A' pitched roof structure (granny flat) to the east of the dwelling forming part of an adjoining garage structure and shared boundary associated with the adjoining property immediately to the east. The subject extension is located to the rear of the granny flat and abuts the shared boundary of the adjoining site to the east. To the rear of the site, the eastern boundary of the site is defined by a timber panel fence, the northern boundary comprises of a low block wall adjoined by a c. 2+ m high panel fence and block wall along the western boundary. There is an existing outbuilding and small shed to the rear of the dwelling. The immediate area is characterised by similar type development.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought to retain the extension to the existing granny flat, and permission is sought to widen the existing vehicular entrance and install electric gates.
- 2.2. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.059 ha. The gross floor area of the development for retention is 6.72 m² and it comprises of a single storey structure with a mono-pitched roof which has a max roof height of 3.15 m, and is attached to the existing granny flat structure.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By Order dated 22nd October 2024, Limerick City and County Council decided to refuse retention permission for 2 no. reasons as follows:

- 1. The proposed development is contrary to Objective HO O11 Subdivision of Dwelling to Accommodate Dependent Relative of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 which specifically states that a granny flat should facilitate the*

provision of accommodation for older people and dependent relatives and shall be attached to the main dwelling with an internal connecting door with the main residence. The stand alone structure does not comply with same and therefore is considered to be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Further to the above, the development by reason of the independent standalone nature of the proposal located adjacent to an existing semi-detached dwelling in a residential area, would set an undesirable precedent for similar such development and would be contrary to Objective HO O11 of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 and therefore contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. *The site is located within a designated Rent Pressure Zone, where stringent regulations apply to short-term letting. It has been identified that the existing granny flat and the existing dwelling on site is intended or likely to be used for short-term letting purposes. Such use is contrary to the relevant legislation and policies governing Rent Pressure Zones, which aim to prioritize long-term residential accommodation in areas experiencing significant rental pressure. The proposal would further exacerbate the housing supply shortage by potentially reducing the availability of housing for permanent residents. The existing use is therefore contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

One planning report dated 21st October 2024 forms the basis of the assessment and recommended that retention permission be refused.

Retention Permission

- The subject development i.e. the extension to the existing granny flat was not considered to comply with Section 11.4.4.8 Short-term Lettings of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 and Objective HO O11 which relates to the subdivision of a dwelling to accommodate a dependent relative.

- The granny flat did not have direct physical connection to the host dwelling as required by Objective HO O11.
- The use of the existing granny flat is unauthorised development. The planning history of the site P.A. Ref. 89/315 indicates the use of the structure as a washroom and playroom, not as a separate dwelling.
- No details of existing or intended occupiers provided.
- The extension was built on the party wall, no letter of consent from adjacent landowner provided.
- The planning history in particular enforcement history relating to the site indicates that the existing dwelling and granny flat are being used for short-term letting which is a change of use and which requires planning permission having regard to Section 11.4.4.8 of the development plan.
- The area in which the site is located is a 'Rent Pressure Zone¹' and national policy establishes a presumption of prioritisation for reversal of the decline in supply of rental properties in use as permanent residential accommodation within RPZs.

Permission

- This relates to the proposal to increase the width of the existing access serving the site and to widen it from 3.1 m to 4.6 m and install electric gates.
- The proposed alteration was assessed in line with Section 11.8.5 of the development plan.
- The proposed entrance is less than 50% of the entire roadside boundary and that the proposed increase in width is excessive and should be reduced substantially to comply with Section 11.8.5 of the development plan.

I note for the Board that the planning authority did not issue a decision in relation to the proposal to alter the existing access.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Roads Department – No objection subject to conditions.

¹ RPZ designation by DHPLG 2019

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One third party observation was made in relation to the proposed development. The matters raised include for the following:

- Unauthorised Development – the extension is unauthorised and is not an extension of the family home.
- Precedent case referenced in relation to a modular home refused permission for the applicant's mother.
- The subject development has been used for short and medium term lets with as many as 14 students residing at the premises causing parking issues, blocking footpaths.
- There are several eircodes for the subject site, it appears that the interior of the existing dwelling has been altered to subdivide the house for apartments without planning permission or fire certification.
- The premises has been used as an AirB&B. No planning permission for a change of use was sought.
- Increased car parking, anti-social behaviour, impact to foul sewer and damage caused to sewerage pipes, dangerous electricity connections.
- Dangerous removal of asbestos when extension to garage was being carried out.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

- 4.1.1. P.A. Ref. 89/315 – permission granted for retention of extension to existing dwelling, patio to front, kitchen and dining room to rear.
- 4.1.2. Enforcement

- Legal proceedings instituted in relation to unauthorised extension and change of use, with the alleged use of the granny flat and the existing house being used for short-term letting.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028

The relevant policy and objectives of the current development plan include the following:

- Land Use Zoning

The appeal site is zoned 'Existing Residential'

Objective: To provide for residential development, protect and improve existing residential amenity.

Purpose: This zone is intended primarily for established housing areas. Existing residential amenity will be protected while allowing appropriate infill development. The quality of the zone will be enhanced with associated open space, community uses and where an acceptable standard of amenity can be maintained, a limited range of other uses that support the overall residential function of the area, such as schools, creches, doctors surgeries, playing fields etc.

- Objective HO O3 Protection of Existing Residential Amenity

It is an objective of the Council to ensure a balance between the protection of existing residential amenities, the established character of the area and the need to provide for sustainable new development.

- Objective HO O11 Subdivision of Dwelling to Accommodate Dependent Relative

It is an objective of the Council to facilitate the provision of accommodation for older people and dependant relatives within the existing family home, subject to compliance with the following criteria:

- Accommodation by way of extension shall be attached to the main dwelling;
- There shall be an internal connecting door with the main residence;
- The extension shall be subservient to the main dwelling;

- In a rural location any external door shall not be located on the front elevation;
- On vacancy of the unit, the accommodation shall be integrated with the main dwelling. No such unit shall be used as rental accommodation. There will be a presumption against proposals for detached independent units within the curtilage of a dwelling, regardless of urban or rural location. Proposals must accord with planning considerations such as residential amenity, environmental and public health standards and traffic safety.
- Chapter 11 Development Management Standards
 - Section 11.4.4.1.2 Rear / Side Extensions

Ground floor rear/side extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining.

First floor rear/side extensions will be considered on their merits and will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions, the following will be considered:

- Degree of overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking, along with proximity, height and length along mutual boundaries;
- Size and usability of the remaining rear private open space;
- Degree of setback from mutual side boundaries. No part of the extension shall encroach or overhang adjoining third party properties.

Any planning application submitted in relation to extensions, basements or new first/upper floor level within the envelope of the existing building, shall clearly indicate on all drawings the extent of demolition/ wall removal required to facilitate the proposed development. In addition, a structural report, prepared by a competent and suitably qualified engineer, may be required to determine the integrity of walls/structures to be retained and outline potential impacts on adjoining properties. This requirement should be ascertained at preplanning stage

- Section 11.4.4.8 Short-term Letting

Section 38 of the Residential Tenancies (Amendment) Act 2019 inserts a new Section 3A into the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), to provide that the short-term letting of a house (the definition of which under the Planning Act also includes apartments) in a rent pressure zone, is a material change of use of the property concerned, thereby requiring planning permission, unless otherwise specifically exempted from this requirement.

The current Rent Pressure Zone designation by DHPLG applies to Limerick City East, Limerick City West and Limerick City North. The Council will be guided by the Guidance Notes for Planning Authorities on the Regulation of Short-Term Letting, 2019 and in particular Section 7 when determining its decision to permit or otherwise.

- Section 11.8.5 Parking in Front Gardens

Where the re-development of a drive-way is permitted, the following shall apply:

- Not have outward opening gates;
- Have a vehicular entrance not wider than 3 m;
- Have a vehicle entrance not wider than 50% of the width of the front boundary;
- Have an area of hardstanding (parking space of 2.5m x 5m). Suitably landscape the balance of the space taking into account the existing context;
- Dish and strengthen the footpath and relocate any services at the applicant's expense;
- The hardstand/paving areas shall comprise a permeable (or porous) surface which allows water to drain through, such as gravel, permeable concrete block paving or porous asphalt, unless the rainwater is directed to a lawn or border to drain naturally.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- SAC Lower River Shannon Site Code 002165 – approx. 417 m to the south.
- SPA River Shannon & River Fergus Estuaries SPA Site Code 004077 – approx. 596 m to the south.
- pNHA Fergus Estuary and Inner Shannon North Shore Site Code 002048 – approx. 417 m to the south.

- pNHA Knockalisheen Marsh Site Code 002001 - approx. 2 km to the northeast.

5.3. EIA Screening

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). 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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. A First Party appeal submission was made by TJ O'Dea of Palm Court, North Circular Road, Limerick, the site owner. The grounds of the appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The first party states that the appeal submission focuses exclusively on the retention aspect of the application and seeks to address the reasons for refusal with proposed amendments to comply with HO O11 of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028.
- The appeal site is the permanent residence of the first party and the granny flat is intended for long-term residential use and the purpose of the application is to provide housing for family members within the curtilage of the primary dwelling.
- The first party has sought to address the issues raised by the planning authority through the following proposed modifications:
 - To physically connect the granny flat to the existing main dwelling by the construction of a covered corridor thereby negating the granny flat as a standalone structure.
 - An internal door is proposed to be installed to provide direct access between the granny flat and the existing dwelling which will comply with objective HO O11.

- It is proposed to give an undertaking to the local authority that the granny flat is intended for long-term use as accommodation.
- Compliance with RPZ Regulations – It is proposed to provide a formal legally binding undertaking that the granny flat will not be used for short-term letting.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

No further comments made outside of the assessment made in the planning report.

6.3. Observations

None.

6.4. Further Responses

None.

7.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details and all other documentation 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 are as follows:

- Principle of Development & Compliance with Zoning
- Other Matters
- Access

7.1. Principle of Development & Compliance with Zoning

- 7.1.1. The appeal site is zoned 'Existing Residential' the objective for which is to provide for residential development, protect and improve existing residential amenity. The purpose of the zoning is to inter alia protect existing residential amenity and also to enhance the quality of the zone with associated open space etc.

- 7.1.2. The development for which retention is sought relates to an extension carried out to the rear of an existing detached granny flat structure, within the curtilage of an existing semi-detached two-storey dwelling. This structure is referred to as a granny flat in the public notices.
- 7.1.3. The planning authority's first reason for refusal relates to the standalone structure referred to as the granny flat. This structure did not form part of the permission being applied for in terms of its legal status, but rather its physical association with the subject extension. Through the appeal and in order to address the issues cited in the first reason for refusal, the first party has proposed measures that include the construction of a covered passage linking the existing granny flat structure to the southeast elevation of the main dwelling. Reference is also made to the provision of an internal door to provide direct access between the granny flat and the main dwelling in order to comply with the provisions of Objective HO O11. No elevations / drawings are provided with the appeal submission of these proposals.
- 7.1.4. The subject extension has a stated gross floor area of 6.72 m² and a max roof height of 3.15 m. The drawings indicate that the 'Rear Elevation (north)' contains a patio sliding door which I noted at time of site inspection.
- 7.1.5. The planning authority's assessment relates to the existing granny flat structure rather than the extension itself concluding that it was unauthorised development. The planning authority refused permission on the basis that it did not comply with Objective HO O11 as it was detached from the existing house and functioning as a standalone residential unit.
- 7.1.6. The second reason for refusal relates to the use of the main dwelling and the existing standalone granny flat being used for short-term rental / lettings. The planning authority noted the enforcement history of the site related to the use of the existing dwelling and the adjoining granny flat and concluded that both were being used for short-term letting which contravened Section 11.4.4.8 Short-term Lettings of the development plan, and the second reason for refusal reflects these findings.
- 7.1.7. In response to the second reason for refusal the first party has stated that the existing granny flat is intended for long-term use as accommodation, and that it is their intention to give a legal undertaking to the planning authority that the granny flat will not be used

for short-term letting, but not that it will be ancillary to single occupancy of the main dwelling.

- 7.1.8. I note that enforcement proceedings have commenced in relation to 2 no. structures within the appeal site, i.e. the main semi-detached two-storey dwelling and the existing standalone structure referred to as the granny flat. Having inspected the site, I noted that the existing granny flat structure is 'semi-detached' in nature as it forms part of the adjoining shed structure and boundary wall of the adjoining dwelling to the east. There is a window on the southern elevation and a door on the western elevation. 3 separate post boxes were also noted on the side elevation of the existing dwelling. It is therefore likely that this structure was originally a shed / outbuilding ancillary to the use of the existing dwelling, similar to that of the adjoining shed serving the dwelling immediately to the east, but now appears to be in use for residential purposes.
- 7.1.9. I therefore raise a concern to the Board that to permit the subject extension under this application would be an extension to an unauthorised use / unit, it would facilitate the consolidation and intensification of unauthorised development on the site and would give rise to undesirable precedent for ad hoc, haphazard development. On this basis I recommend that retention permission is refused in relation to the existing extension.
- 7.1.10. In addition to the zoning objective for the site, Objective HO O3 of the development plan seeks to achieve a balance between the protection of existing residential amenities, the established character of the area, and the need to provide for sustainable new development. In considering the subject extension, there is a requirement that the subject development should not adversely impact on either the residential amenities of the existing main dwelling or the residential character of the area.
- 7.1.11. In noting that the use of the standalone granny flat is as a separate independent residential unit, I consider that the extension to same and the associated cumulative impacts arising, that the subject development will significantly impact on the functioning of the main dwelling on the site. All amenities, services and access are communal and this could not be construed as orderly development. The proposal by the first party to link the existing granny flat structure to the main dwelling would restrict access to the rear of the dwelling and would be haphazard development. It is unsustainable to facilitate the functioning of this standalone residential structure and

the existing dwelling both within the one curtilage and with both dependent on the one water and wastewater services connection to the site and one access. In this regard, the subject extension would intensify the use of the site and encroach significantly on the amenity of the occupiers of the permitted house on the site. On this basis, I do not consider the subject extension to be acceptable and I therefore recommend that retention permission is refused as the subject development would contravene the zoning objective for the site and Objective HO O3 of the development plan, and to permit the development would give rise to a very undesirable precedent.

7.2. Other Matters

Revised Drawing / Proposals

- 7.2.1. As noted above in Section 7.1.3, the first party has provided revised site layout plan showing proposals for a covered corridor as part of the appeal to address the planning authority's first reason for refusal. No elevational drawings are not submitted. I consider the proposal to be a material change which would warrant further consideration given that the existing granny flat structure is a standalone structure, and which does not appear to have consent. On this basis, I do not recommend that the Board considers the new proposal as presented in the appeal.

7.3. Access

- 7.3.1. As part of the proposed development, permission is sought to widen the existing entrance from 3.1 m to 4.6 m (1.5 m increase) and to install an electric gate. The planning authority did not issue a decision on the proposal but noted in the planning report that the proposed entrance would be less than 50 per cent of the entire roadside boundary, and deemed the proposed increase in width to be excessive, noting a requirement to reduce it to 3 m to comply with Section 11.8.5 of the development plan. This element of the development was not raised by the first party in their appeal submission. Notwithstanding, should the Board need to consider this element of the proposed development, I will set out my assessment as follows:
- 7.3.2. Section 11.8.5 of Chapter 11 of the development plan is a specific development management requirement relating to Parking in Front Gardens which notes that the cumulative effect of removal of front garden walls and railings damages the character

and appearance of suburban streets and roads. It notes that proposals for off street parking need to be balanced against loss of amenity and that where the redevelopment of a driveway is permitted, a number of criteria shall apply. In particular, a vehicular entrance should not be wider than 3 m, or not wider than 50 per cent of the width of the front boundary. I note that the latter requirement allows for some scope for proposals in excess of 3 m.

- 7.3.3. I noted at time of site inspection that the urban character of North Circular Road can be described as a mature residential area with a generally consistent building type, i.e. two-storey semi-detached dwellings with single two-storey front projection in most cases, a vehicular access and a separate pedestrian entrance. It was observed that in the immediate vicinity most cars were parked within the curtilage of dwellings with a small number parked on street. The roadside boundaries of the dwellings generally consist of plastered block walls and in some cases natural stone finish. The width of existing entrances to dwellings are similar to that of the appeal site, but in a small number of cases are wider for example to the north of the site on Fortmary Park Road.
- 7.3.4. The appeal site is a corner site and has a lengthy roadside boundary of c. 20+ m. It is not located within a conservation area and the proposal will not require the removal of any landscaping features. I noted at time of site inspection that space within the curtilage of the dwelling to the side and front is generous. It was also noted that the existing entrance is served by a dropped kerb.
- 7.3.5. Having regard to Section 11.8.5 of the development plan and having regard to my site inspection and given the substantial length of the existing roadside boundary defining the site which consists of a 1.8 m high block wall backed by mature hedging, I consider that there is scope to consider the proposal.
- 7.3.6. No rationale is provided in regard to the need for the increased width. I note that the Roads Department raised no objection to the proposal and recommended a condition in relation to reconstruction of the public footpath and the management of surface water entering onto the public roadway.
- 7.3.7. I would question the need to increase the width by 1.5 m given that the width of the existing entrance can adequately accommodate the site, and the space within the curtilage of the existing dwelling to enable turning movements. Notwithstanding, I would have no objection in principle to the proposal and I do not consider that it will

unduly impact on the visual amenities or the character of the area. I therefore recommend that if the Board decides to grant permission for the widening of the entrance that a condition is included restricting the width to 3.6 m (thus allow for an increase of 0.5 m).

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1.1. I have considered the appeal in relation to the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

The subject site is located approx. 417 to the south of the SAC Lower River Shannon Site Code 002165, approx. 596 m to the south of SPA River Shannon & River Fergus Estuaries SPA Site Code 004077

- 8.1.2. The proposed development comprises of two element, (i) the retention of an extension to an existing granny flat, (ii) permission to widen the existing vehicular entrance by 1.5 m and install an electric gate the works for which would be minor in nature. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

- 8.1.3. 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 nature of and scale of the development which is already carried out in relation to the subject extension.
- The sites' location in an established residential area which is serviced with public foul sewer and public water.
- Location-distance from the nearest European sites and the lack of connections.
- The absence of direct hydrological connections.
- Screening assessment of the Planning Authority.

- 8.1.4. I consider that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that the Board issue a split decision as follows:

- (i) I recommend that retention permission is refused for the extension to the granny flat for the reasons and considerations below.
- (ii) I recommend that permission is granted for the widening of the existing vehicular entrance and the installation of electric gates subject to the reasons and conditions below.

10.0 (i) Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the information provided on the file, the planning history of the site, the submissions made in connection with the planning application and appeal, the Board is not satisfied that the existing extension to the existing granny flat structure, is not unauthorised development. It is therefore considered that to permit retention permission in this instance would facilitate and consolidate an intensification of unauthorised development on the site and would be contrary to the property planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the restricted nature of the site, the nature and use of the existing free standing residential unit to which the subject development has extended, it is considered that the proposed development by reason of its ancillary nature to a standalone residential structure within the curtilage of an existing dwelling would adversely impact on the residential amenities of the existing main dwelling, would result in overdevelopment of the site and would give rise to undesirable precedence. The proposed development would be contrary to the zoning objective for the site which seeks to protect and improve existing residential amenities and to Objective HO O3 of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 (ii) Reason and Conditions

Having regard to the land use zoning of the site, to the residential character of the area and to the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development i.e. the widening of the existing vehicular entrance and the installation of electric gates would not seriously injure adjoining residential amenities, the visual amenities or character of the area. The proposed development would therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

1.	<p>The proposed development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on the 30th August 2024 except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions required details to be agreed with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The design of the proposed vehicular access shall be carried out as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) The driveway entrance shall be at most 3.6 m in width and shall not have outward opening gates.(b) The relocated gate pillar shall match that of the existing.(c) The footpath and kerb shall be dished at the access and the widened entrance provided in accordance with the requirements of the planning authority. <p>Revised plans and elevations incorporating the above amendments shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for written agreement, prior to commencement of development. In default of agreement, the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Board Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of pedestrian safety and residential amenity.</p>

3.	<p>Water supply and drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.</p>
4.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays</p> <p>Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>

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, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Clare Clancy
Planning Inspector

05th February 2025

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-321271-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of extension to granny flat, permission to widen existing entrance.		
Development Address	Palm Court, North Circular Road, Limerick, V94 88H4		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	✓
		No	No further action required
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes		State the Class here.	Proceed to Q3.
No	✓		Tick if relevant. No further action required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes		State the relevant threshold here for the Class of development.	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	✓		Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			

Yes		State the relevant threshold here for the Class of development and indicate the size of the development relative to the threshold.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)
5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No	✓	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q4)	
Yes		Screening Determination required	

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____