



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321346-24

Development	Construction of 2 storey house, demolition and reconstruction of boundary wall, with associated works.
Location	12 Old County Glen, Crumlin, Dublin 12
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1748/24
Applicant(s)	Declan Heery
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party v. Decision
Appellant(s)	David Sullivan & Residents of Old County Glen
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	3 rd February 2025
Inspector	Louise Treacy

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site has a stated area of 430.5 m² and is located at No. 12 Old County Glen, Crumlin, Dublin 12. The site forms part of an established residential estate and accommodates a 2-storey, end-of-terrace dwelling with off street parking and a small garden to the front and private amenity space to the side and rear. The dwellings within the terrace have a stepped building footprint. A triangular area of green space adjoins the subject dwelling to the west, which is enclosed by boundary walls to the north and east and is open onto the public footpath along its southern boundary.
- 1.2. The dwelling has a brick finish at the ground floor level, with pebbledash above at 1st floor level. The roof profile is hipped facing onto the adjoining green space. The design of the dwelling reflects that of the neighbouring properties within the estate.
- 1.3. The site is located on the northern side of the internal estate road and fronts onto a communal green space on the opposite side of the road. An undeveloped site is located to the rear, with construction works noted to be ongoing at the time of the inspection.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the demolition of the existing wall to the north and the construction of a new boundary wall to the legal boundary with the adjoining lands to the north; the subdivision of the site; the construction of a new 2-storey dwelling adjoining the existing dwelling; and a change of roof profile to the existing dwelling.
- 2.2. The proposed dwelling has a stated floor area of 133.7 m². It accommodates a living room, kitchen/dining room, utility room and w.c. at ground floor level and 2 no. double bedrooms, 2 no. single bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor level. The stated private open space provision is 105.6 m² which is arranged to the side of the proposed dwelling. Private open space of 32.5 m² will remain for the existing dwelling. Off-street parking for 2 no. cars is also proposed to the side of the dwelling. The footprint of the proposed development steps forward of the front building line of the existing dwelling by 3.8 m, which reflects the building line of the adjoining

properties within the terrace. The building materials are comprised of brick at ground floor level and render above, which reflects the existing properties within the estate.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Notification of the Decision to Grant Permission for the proposed development subject to 10 no. conditions issued on 6th November 2024.

3.1.2. All conditions are standard in nature.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. **Planning Reports (6th August 2024 and 1st November 2024):** Following an initial consideration of the application, Dublin City Council's Planning Officer recommended that **Further Information** be requested in relation to 4 no. items which can be summarised as follows:

3.2.2. **(1)** The applicant is requested to submit a revised site layout plan and elevations which provide for a vehicular entrance with a maximum width of 3 m to serve 1 no. car.

3.2.3. **(2)** The Planning Authority has concerns that the proposed boundary to the private open space will have a negative impact on the quality of the streetscape and will not provide sufficient privacy to occupants of the new dwelling. The applicant is requested to address the following:

(a) Provide a robust boundary of 1.8 m – 2 m high to the private open space.

(b) The south boundary of the private open space shall be set back by a minimum of 1 m from the primary front building line of the dwelling to facilitate the provision of a landscaped strip.

(c) The area of private open space may extend further to the west on foot of the reduced vehicular entrance and driveway and additional landscaped strips shall be provided on the western side of the private open space to soften the appearance of the boundary.

- 3.2.4. **(3)** The applicant is requested to submit a shadow analysis to demonstrate the levels of sunlight provision to the private open space of the proposed dwelling is sufficient and consider additional area provision to serve the parent dwelling within the area beyond the north wall of the proposed dwelling.
- 3.2.5. **(4)** The applicant is requested to demonstrate how nature-based SUDS devices are to be incorporated into the management of surface water run-off.
- 3.2.6. The applicant submitted a **Response to the Request for Further Information** on 10th October 2024, which can be summarised as follows:
- 3.2.7. **Item No. 1:** The proposed driveway has been reconfigured to allow for proposed open space and provides a vehicular entrance width of 3 m.
- 3.2.8. **Item No. 2 (a):** The boundary to the private open space has been modified to a 1.8 m high rendered and painted masonry wall with concrete capping to match existing rear boundary wall.
- 3.2.9. **Item No. 2 (b):** The southern boundary to the private open space has been set back by 1 m from the primary building line of the proposed dwelling.
- 3.2.10. **Item No. 2 (c):** The area of private open space has been modified to allow for a new driveway and vehicular entrance. Additional landscaping is provided to the west of the wall to the private open space.
- 3.2.11. **Item No. 3:** A shadow analysis has been provided which demonstrates that the proposed development has almost no impact on the shadowing to the private open space of No. 12 Old County Glen, except for around 3 pm on 21st December. Additional area is proposed to the private open space of the existing dwelling by relocating the garden wall and including the area to the north wall of the proposed dwelling.
- 3.2.12. **Item No. 4:** It is proposed to use a soakaway to collect surface water and percolate it to ground. Permeable surfaces have been considered for the front of the proposed dwelling and is subject to further site investigations on the sub-soil characteristics.
- 3.2.13. Following an assessment of the submitted information, the Planning Officer was satisfied that the proposed development was acceptable and recommended that planning permission be granted.

3.2.14. **Other Technical Reports**

3.2.15. **Transportation Planning Division (22nd July 2024 and 18th October 2024):** No objection to the proposed development subject to conditions.

3.2.16. **Engineering Department – Drainage Division (9th July 2024 and 15th October 2024):** Recommended that Further Information be requested in relation to the proposed surface water drainage proposals, with the extent of SUDS measures considered unacceptable.

3.2.17. Following the applicant's Further Information submission, no objections arose to the proposed development subject to conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. **Uisce Éireann (Irish Water):** None received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. One third party observation was made on the application by The Residents of Old County Glen (the appellant). The observer is opposed to the proposed development, with the issues raised reflecting those of the appeal submission (see section 6.0 of this report for details).

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. **Planning Authority Reg. Ref. 4264/15:** Planning permission refused for a change of use of existing crèche facility to residential use, alterations to roof, new 2-storey, 3-bedroom dwelling to side, subdivision of site, new vehicular entrance, boundary treatment and all associated site works.

4.2. Planning permission was refused for 1 no. reason relating to substandard private open space provision for the existing and proposed dwelling.

4.3. **Planning Authority Reg. Ref. 2315/08; ABP Ref. PL29S.229834:** Planning permission refused for 2-storey, 4-bedroom dwelling to side of existing dwelling.

- 4.4. Permission was refused for 1 no. reason relating to the overdevelopment of the site, impact on visual amenities of the area and endangerment of public safety by reason of obstruction to pedestrians.
- 4.5. **Planning Authority Reg. Ref. 1868/05:** Planning permission refused for 2-storey detached crèche facilities to existing private open space to side of existing crèche.
- 4.6. Planning permission was refused for 3 no. reasons relating to: (1) overdevelopment of the site by reason of inadequate private open space to cater for the existing house, (2) the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan in relation to childcare facilities, (3) unacceptable vehicular access arrangement to the front of the crèche.
- 4.7. **Planning Authority Reg. Ref. 3226/00; ABP Ref. PL29S.122525:** Planning permission refused for the retention of the existing crèche facility, 2-storey extension to the side to provide additional accommodation for the crèche and enclosure of private open space with 2 m high boundary wall.
- 4.8. Permission was refused for 1 no. reason based on the noise, disturbance and nuisance generated by additional traffic arising on foot of the proposed development, which would seriously injure the amenities and depreciate the value of neighbouring residential properties.
- **Other Relevant Planning History**
- 4.9. **Planning Authority Reg. Ref. 3369/24:** Planning permission granted for the demolition of existing 2-storey dwelling and the construction of a residential development of 19 no. 2-storey houses.
- 4.10. This site extends around the rear (north) and side (west) boundaries of the current appeal site.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

5.2. Land Use Zoning

- 5.2.1. The site is subject to land use zoning “Z1 – Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods” which has the objective “to protect, provide and improve residential amenities”. Residential land uses are permissible under this zoning objective.

5.3. Housing

- 5.3.1. **Policy QHSN6 (Urban Consolidation):** To promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification through the consideration of applications for infill development, backland development, mews development, re-use/adaption of existing housing stock and use of upper floors, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.
- 5.3.2. **Policy QHSN10 (Urban Density):** To promote residential development at sustainable densities throughout the city in accordance with the core strategy, particularly on vacant and/or underutilised sites, having regard to the need for high standards of urban design and architecture and to successfully integrate with the character of the surrounding area.
- 5.3.3. **Policy QHSN38 (Houses and Apartments):** To ensure that new houses and apartments provide for the needs of family accommodation with a satisfactory level of residential amenity in accordance with the standards for residential accommodation.

5.4. Development Management – Infill / Side Garden Housing Developments

- 5.4.1. The Planning Authority will have regard to the following criteria in assessing such proposals:
- The character of the street.
 - Compatibility of design with adjoining dwellings.
 - Accommodation standards for occupiers.
 - Development plan standards for existing and proposed dwellings.

- Impact on residential amenities of adjoining sites.
- Open space standards and refuse standards for existing and proposed dwellings.
- The provision of a safe means of access and egress from the site.
- Landscaping and boundary treatments in keeping with other properties in the area.
- Maintenance of front and side building lines, where appropriate.
- Level of visual harmony.
- Side gable walls as side boundaries facing corners in estate roads are not considered acceptable and should be avoided.
- Appropriate boundary treatments should be provided both around the site and between the existing and proposed dwellings. Existing boundary treatments should be retained / reinstated where possible.
- Use of 1st floor / apex windows on gables close to boundaries overlooking footpaths, roads and open spaces for visual amenity and passive surveillance.

5.5. A minimum standard of 10 m² **private open space** per bedspace will normally be applied for houses.

5.5.1. The site is located within Zone 2 of the city with respect to **car parking** provision and within which a max. standard of 1 no. space per dwelling applies.

5.6. **Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)**

5.6.1. The Guidelines acknowledge that to achieve compact growth, more intensive use of existing buildings and properties will need to be supported, including more intensive use of previously developed land and infill sites.

5.6.2. Development standards for housing are set out in Chapter 5 of the Guidelines, with the key standards applicable in this case including: (1) separation distance of 16 m between opposing 1st floor windows (or less where no opposing windows serving habitable rooms), (2) private open space of 50 m² for 4+ bedroom house, and (3) a max. of 1 no. car parking space.

5.7. Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities (2007)

- 5.7.1. The Guidelines do not identify a target gross floor area for 4-bedroom, 6-person, 2-storey dwellings. A target gross floor area of 110 m² is identified for 4-bedroom, 7-person, 2-storey dwellings. The area of a double bedroom shall be at least 11.4 m² and of the main bedroom shall be at least 13 m² in a dwelling designed to accommodate 3 or more persons.

5.8. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.8.1. None.

5.9. EIA Screening

- 5.9.1. See Appendix 1 and 2 of this report.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. A third-party appeal against the Planning Authority's decision has been lodged by David Sullivan & Residents of Old County Glen, the grounds of which can be summarised as follows:
- Adverse impact on the character of the estate as the proposal fails to integrate with the existing terraced dwellings.
 - Overdevelopment of the site.
 - Negative traffic impact and increased parking congestion due to Lourdes Celtic football club / grounds.
 - Loss of green space which has been maintained and taken-in-charge by the Local Authority.
 - Overlooking of proposed development at the rear from proposed development at No. 60 Old County Road.
 - History of planning refusals on the site.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. A first party response to the appeal was received on 20th December 2024 which can be summarised as follows:

- The validity of the appeal is queried given that the submission on the planning application has a different address and signatories to that of the appeal submission.
- The stepped building line follows the pattern already established to this terrace of dwellings on the bend in the road by Nos. 12 and 13 Old County Glen. Dublin City Council's Planning Officer considered it to be consistent with the layout of the parent dwelling.
- The proposed development does not constitute overdevelopment and has an appropriate plot ratio and site coverage with respect to the DCC Development Plan 2022-2028 (Chapter 15 Design Standards) and the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities: Design Guidelines.
- The proposed development includes car parking within the application site and no additional impact is expected to on-street parking. The proposed development comprises one single dwelling and it is unlikely there would be a noticeable impact on traffic.
- The applicant's site has not been taken in charge by the Local Authority.
- The 1st floor windows have been orientated to the west only, to avoid any potential overlooking to the proposed dwellings to the north.

6.3. The submission includes Local Authority Drawing No. R.M. 21756 which shows the areas to be taken in charge in the Old County Glen estate and a copy of correspondence dated 2nd December 1998 which confirms that the open space between Nos. 11 and 12 Old County Glen was not taken in charge.

6.4. Planning Authority Response

6.4.1. A response to the appeal was received from Dublin City Council on 6th January 2025. The Planning Authority requests that the decision to grant permission be upheld by the Board. It is also recommended that conditions be attached in relation

to a S. 48 development contribution, a contribution in lieu of open space if applicable and a naming and numbering condition.

6.5. Observations

6.5.1. None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including 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 planning policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues to be considered in this appeal are as follows:

- Planning History of the Site
- Impact on Character of Old County Glen
- Overdevelopment
- Overlooking
- Traffic Impacts and Parking Congestion
- Loss of Green Space
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Each of these issues is considered in turn below.

7.3. Planning History of the Site

7.3.1. The appellant submits that there is a history of planning refusals on the site. It is considered unclear how circumstances have changed to enable planning permission to be granted. I acknowledge that 4 no. previous planning applications have been refused permission on the subject site. Two of these applications related to crèche facility proposals, and as such, are not relevant to the adjudication of this appeal case.

7.3.2. The two most recent applications sought permission for the development of a house to the side of the existing dwelling. I note that these applications are 20 and 25 years

old, and in my opinion, cannot be relied upon as precedents given the passage of time. I also note that the policy context has changed considerably in the interim, including national, regional and local policy support of more compact forms of development in urban areas. Thus, I consider that the relevant planning history on the site does not infer a negative outcome in this case given that each application must be adjudicated on its merits with reference to the policy context and development standards pertaining at the time.

7.4. Impact on Character of Old County Glen

- 7.4.1. The appellant submits that the proposed development would fail to integrate with the existing terraced dwellings, would be out of line with the existing dwellings and would have an adverse impact on the character of the estate. In response, the applicant submits that the stepped building line of the proposed development follows the pattern which has already established to the existing terrace. It is noted that Dublin City Council's Planning Officer considered the arrangement to be consistent with the layout of the parent dwelling.
- 7.4.2. I do not agree with the appellant's assertion that the proposed development would "destroy the streetscape". The existing dwelling on the site, together with No. 13 Old County Glen directly adjoining step forward of the remaining dwellings within the terrace (Nos. 14, 15 and 16 Old County Glen). The proposed development will extend this pattern and will step forward of the front building line of the existing dwelling by 3.8 m. While the proposed development will read as a modern insertion within the estate, I note it's overall building height and materials will reflect the existing. I acknowledge it is proposed to remove the hipped roof to the gable elevation of the existing dwelling, but it is not a Protected Structure and is not located within a conservation area. As such, I am satisfied that the design of the proposed development is acceptable and would have no significant negative impact on the character of the estate.

7.5. Overdevelopment

- 7.5.1. The appellant submits that the proposed development would constitute the overdevelopment of the site. The applicant refutes this assertion and submits that the proposed development complies with development plan standards and national housing design guidelines.

- 7.5.2. In considering this issue I note that the appellant has not explained how the proposed development would constitute overdevelopment. The proposed dwelling has a stated floor area of 133.7 m² and includes 2 no. double and 2 no. single bedrooms at 1st floor level. The overall floor area exceeds the target for 4-bedroom/7-person/2-storey dwellings as set out in the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Guidelines, which is considered the most relevant target in this case.
- 7.5.3. Private open space of 105.6 m² is proposed to the side of the dwelling, which significantly exceeds the standard set out in the Compact Settlement Guidelines. This space is accessed from the kitchen / dining room at ground floor level and enclosed by a 1.8 m high masonry wall, which will provide privacy to future occupants. In my opinion, the proposed arrangement is acceptable.
- 7.5.4. In considering the remaining site area of the existing 3-bedroom dwelling, I note that it will retain an off-street car parking space to the front and a private amenity space of 47.1 m² to the rear. In reviewing the site plan submitted at Further Information stage (Drawing No. 004), I note that the side boundary wall of this space encroaches across the rear elevation of the proposed dwelling. Such an arrangement would not generally be encouraged to avoid negative residential amenity impacts arising to the affected property. However, in this instance, the open space extends across the utility room at ground floor level and a bedroom above at 1st floor level, neither of which have a window facing onto this space. As such, I am satisfied that the arrangement of the remaining private amenity space to serve the existing dwelling is acceptable and would not have an undue negative impact on the amenity of the new dwelling.
- 7.5.5. Overall, I am satisfied that the scale of the proposed development reflects that of the existing 2-storey dwellings within the estate and comprises an acceptable infill development at this location. I am satisfied that the issue of overdevelopment does not arise.

7.6. **Overlooking**

- 7.6.1. The appellant submits that the proposed development will be overlooked to the rear by the proposed development at No. 60 Old County Road. This site is located to the rear of this appeal site and in reviewing its planning history, I note that permission

has recently been granted for 19 no. 2-storey dwellings (Planning Authority Reg. Ref. 3369/24 refers). The dwellings located closest to the appeal site are set back from the shared boundary behind the internal estate road and an area of car parking. I also note a shared boundary wall of 2 m is proposed between both sites, which will serve to screen the private amenity spaces within the appeal site. Having regard to the configuration of the permitted development relative to the subject site and the nature of the proposed boundary treatments, I am satisfied that no undue overlooking would occur in this context.

7.7. Traffic Impact and Parking Congestion

- 7.7.1. The appellant submits that the proposed dwelling would impact negatively on the amount of traffic and contribute further to the existing parking congestion due to the Lourdes Celtic football club. In response, the applicant submits that no additional impact is expected to on-street parking and that there is unlikely to be a noticeable impact on traffic on foot of the proposed additional dwelling.
- 7.7.2. The proposed development includes 1 no. off-street car parking space, and as such, would not contribute to parking congestion given that parking will be contained within the site. The football club referenced by the appellant is located approx. 45 m to the south-west of the appeal site on the southern side of the internal estate road. There does not appear to be any car parking within the football club grounds. Any overspill parking which may be occurring within the estate on foot of the club is not a matter which is open for adjudication under this appeal case. I also consider that the appellant's suggestion that the proposed development would impact on local traffic levels is unreasonable given the scale of development proposed.
- 7.7.3. As such, I am satisfied that no undue impacts would arise with respect to parking or traffic levels on foot of the proposed development.

7.8. Loss of Green Space

- 7.8.1. The appellant submits that the green space within the site has been maintained by the Local Authority and a resident over the last 30 years and is used as a play space by local children. The loss of this space on foot of the proposed development is considered unacceptable.

- 7.8.2. In responding to this issue, the applicant has submitted correspondence and a map from Dublin City Council which confirms that the identified green space has not been taken in charge. I also note with reference to the planning application form that the applicant is identified as the freehold owner of the site. As such I am satisfied the applicant has provided sufficient evidence of their legal intent to make an application.
- 7.8.3. In considering the loss of green space, I note that 2 no. regularly spaced communal green spaces are located within the estate, including one directly opposite the appeal site and the other towards the entrance into the estate. Having regard to the nature of the greenspace within the subject site, which is indicated as being within the private ownership of the applicant, I consider that this point of objection is without substance.

7.9. **Appropriate Assessment - Screening**

- 7.9.1. I have considered the proposed development of an infill residential dwelling in the side garden of an existing 2-storey dwelling in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended). The subject site is located within an established residential housing estate in the inner suburbs of Dublin City. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the appeal.
- 7.9.2. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment as there is no conceivable risk to any European site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small-scale nature of the development / works
 - The distance from the nearest European site
 - Taking into account the screening determination of the Planning Authority
- 7.9.3. I conclude that, on the basis of objective information, the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) is not required.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend that planning permission be granted for the proposed development based on the reasons and considerations set out hereunder.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

9.1. Having regard to the location of the site on serviced land within the inner suburbs, its residential land use zoning, Policy QHSN6 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 which seeks, inter alia, to promote and support residential consolidation through infill development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or depreciate the value of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on 11th October 2024, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning</p>

	<p>and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid within 3 months of the date of this Order or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer, or in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>
3.	<p>The driveway entrance shall have a maximum width of 3.0 m and shall not have outward opening gates.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure an appropriate standard of development and in the interest of traffic safety.</p>
4.	<p>Details of the external finishes of the proposed development shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.</p>
5.	<p>Proposals for a house numbering scheme shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of urban legibility.</p>
6.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into connection agreements with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide service connections to the public water supply and wastewater network.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water and wastewater facilities.</p>

7.	<p>The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the Planning Authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interest of sustainable drainage.</p>
8.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. 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.

Louise Treacy
Senior Planning Inspector

4th February 2025

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála	321346-24		
Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary	Minor modifications to existing dwelling and the construction of new 2-storey dwelling to side of the existing 2-storey dwelling.		
Development Address	12 Old County Glen, Crumlin, Dublin 12		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?		Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		No	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Schedule 5, Part 2, Class 10 (b)(b)(i)	Proceed to Q3.
No	<input type="checkbox"/>		
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>		
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Proceed to Q4

4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	X	The relevant threshold for this class is more than 500 dwelling units. The proposed development comprises minor modifications to an existing dwelling and the construction of 1 no. infill dwelling within the site boundary. As such, the proposed development is significantly below the threshold.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	X	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q4)
Yes		

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-321346-24
Proposed Development Summary	Minor modifications to existing dwelling and the construction of new 2-storey dwelling to side of the existing 2-storey dwelling.
Development Address	12 Old County Glen, Crumlin, Dublin 12
<p>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.</p> <p>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>	
<p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>The proposed development comprises minor modifications to an existing 2-storey dwelling and the construction of a new infill 2-storey dwelling to the site. Having regard to the scale and nature of the proposed development, any nuisance, construction and waste impacts can readily be managed during the construction process.</p>
<p>Location of development</p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>The subject site is located within an established inner suburban area of the city. The site forms part of an existing housing estate and as such, is not located within an area of environmental sensitivity.</p>

<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>The proposed development will result in temporary disturbance impacts to the occupants of neighbouring dwellings. These impacts will be temporary.</p> <p>The proposed development will also result in the loss of a small parcel of open space. However, the site is within private ownership and the densification of established urban areas is supported under national and local planning policy. The overall long-term impact on housing supply is positive.</p>
---	---

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.	No
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.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.	

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____

Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)