



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-321593-25

Development	Demolition of existing house, construction of house with all associated site works.
Location	41 Coliemore Road, Dalkey, Co. Dublin, A96 DX90
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D24A/0239
Applicant(s)	Eugene and Mary Peppard
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refusal
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Eugene and Mary Peppard
Observer(s)	Aideen Doyle
Date of Site Inspection	3 March 2024
Inspector	Natalie de Róiste

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
6.0 The Appeal	10
7.0 Assessment.....	13
8.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	17
9.0 Recommendation.....	17
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	18
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	
Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site, 41 Coliemore Road, is located on the west side of Coliemore Road, facing Dillon's Park on the seafront, and beyond that, Dalkey Island. To the south is Sorrento Park, a hilly public park. To the north is a pair of semi-detached three-storey houses, 39 and 39a Coliemore Road. The site is steeply sloping and irregularly-shaped, narrowing and rising to the rear. The house is elevated over the road, accessed by flights of steps.
- 1.2. The house (which appears to have been built as a single-storey villa or bungalow in the 1950s) has been extended and altered a number of times. It has a single-storey extension to the rear, as well as a conservatory to the side over a lower level garage. An attic conversion with a mansard roof to the rear is accessed via a spiral staircase, providing two bedrooms and a study. There are three bedrooms to the ground floor. An annex building to the south of the site provides a one-bedroom apartment, split over two blocks connected by a staircase. This unit has a small patio, while the main house has a terraced landscaped garden to the rear. There is a steep driveway to the garage, and a pull-in parking area in front of the steps.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to demolish the existing house and annex (c. 270 sqm total) , and build a two-storey house over basement garage with garden store/plant room (c. 410 sqm total), vehicular entrance and associated site works, including excavation of granite.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Refused, for one reason as follows:

Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, the Planning Authority considers the demolition of the subject existing dwelling house and its replacement, would not be in accordance with Policy Objective CA6:

Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings and Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation, nor would it accord with the provisions of Section 12.3.9 Demolition and Replacement Dwellings of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, in that a strong justification has not been provided for the demolition of the existing dwelling on site, nor has it been demonstrated that the existing dwelling has fallen into such a state of disrepair to render it uninhabitable. Furthermore, the proposed development, if permitted, would set an undesirable precedent for the demolition of existing dwellings and would, therefore, be contrary to the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- Report dated 29/05/24 noted the zoning and location; the acceptability of the proposed house design regarding residential amenity; the departmental reports; and requested further information on AA screening and a justification or supporting evidence for demolition of the dwelling in light of Development Plan policy.
- Report dated 02/12/24 did not consider the material submitted as Further Information to provide evidence that the property was uninhabitable or inappropriate for retrofitting, and recommended refusal as above. AA Screening Report deemed satisfactory.

3.2.1. Other Technical Reports

- Transportation Planning – no objection subject to conditions
- Drainage Planning – no objection subject to conditions
- Parks and Landscape – no objection
- Environmental Enforcement/Waste Management – further information on demolition and excavation requested, as Construction Environmental Management Plan

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No reports.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One received from neighbour to north, expressing concerns regarding the following planning matters:

- potential damage to neighbouring properties due to vibration and excavation
- overlooking, and subsequent devaluation of property
- impact on views
- construction impacts
- No justification for demolition

4.0 Planning History

4.1.1. On site, as per planner's report:

- D11B/0139 Permission granted by the Planning Authority for a single-storey bedroom extension at first floor level to side and rear, the roof level to be above existing roof level.
- D96B/0466 Permission granted for extension to side, incorporating new bathroom, dressing rooms and storage
- 526/88 Permission granted for conservatory to side
- 32/85 Permission granted for attic storage and replacing front door and windows

4.1.2. Recent and relevant applications (demolition of one house, to facilitate construction of a new one, decided under current development plan):

- ABP-321283-24 (D24A/0678/WEB) – permission refused for demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a new dwelling for one reason, non-compliance with Policy Objective CA6 and the requirements of Section 12.3.9 of the Development Plan.

- ABP-319835-24 (D23A0819) – permission refused for demolition of 176 sqm bungalow and garage, to facilitate construction of a 250 sqm two-storey house with dormer attic at Merville Avenue, Stillorgan, for one reason, non-compliance with Policy Objective CA6 and the requirements of Section 12.3.9 of the Development Plan.
- D24A/0667/WEB – permission granted for demolition of single-storey dwelling and construction of two-storey dwelling subject to conditions at 73 Quinn’s Road, Shankill.
- ABP-319952-24 (D23A/0662) – permission granted for demolition of 127 sqm dormer house and construction of a new 212 sqm dormer dwelling in the grounds of a protected structure. (Seacroft Mews, Seafield Road, Killiney)
- ABP-315310-22 (D22A/0705) Permission granted for demolition of existing 2 storey house and construction of new 2 storey house at Anastasia Lane, off Sorrento Road, Dalkey
- ABP-313301-22 (D21A/0835) (Sanford, Green Road, Dalkey) – permission granted for demolition of 140 sqm dormer house and construction of replacement dwelling of 442 sqm.
- ABP-312743 (D21A/1024) Permission granted for demolition of the existing single storey bungalow and construction of a 2 storey house and all associated site works at 70a Booterstown Avenue, Booterstown.
- ABP-310459-21 (D21A/0224) – permission granted for demolition of three-storey four-bedroom house and construction of five bedroom house at Whitestacks, Killiney Hill Road, Killiney.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-28

- 5.1.1. The zoning objective for the subject development site is “A”: *To provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.* Residential is permitted in principle as a land use in this zoning. The public parks to the south (Sorrento Park) and across the road to the west (Coliemore

Park or Dillon's Park) are zoned "F", *To preserve and provide for open space with ancillary active recreational amenities.* These parks also lie within the Vico Road ACA, which surrounds the site on three sides.

5.1.2. Chapter 3 deals with Climate Action.

Policy Objective CA5: Energy Performance in Buildings

It is a Policy Objective to support high levels of energy conservation, energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources in existing and new buildings, including retro fitting of energy efficiency measures in the existing building stock.

Policy Objective CA6: Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings

It is a Policy Objective to require the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction where possible recognising the embodied energy in existing buildings and thereby reducing the overall embodied energy in construction as set out in the Urban Design Manual (Department of Environment Heritage and Local Government, 2009). (Consistent with RPO 7.40 and 7.41 of the RSES).

Policy Objective CA9: Radon Gas

It is a Policy Objective, in partnership with other relevant agencies, to promote best practice in the implementation of radon prevention measures.

5.1.3. Chapter 4: Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place sets out policies and objectives on housing in Section 4.3: Homes.

Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock - Adaptation

It is a Policy Objective to:

- *Conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF.*
- *Densify existing built-up areas in the County through small scale infill development having due regard to the amenities of existing established residential neighbourhoods.*

Policy Objective PHP20: Protection of Existing Residential Amenity.

It is a Policy Objective to ensure the residential amenity of existing homes in the Built Up Area is protected where they are adjacent to proposed higher density and greater height infill developments.

As part of a long section 4.3.1, the following text is included:

The Council will encourage the retention and deep retrofit of structurally sound, habitable dwellings in good condition as opposed to demolition and replacement and will also encourage the retention of existing houses that, while not Protected Structures or located within an ACA, do have their own merit and/or contribute beneficially to the area in terms of visual amenity, character or accommodation type - particularly those in areas consisting of exemplar 19th and 20th Century buildings and estates (see Chapter 3, Policy Objective CA6 and Chapter 12, Section 12.3.9).

Chapter 8 deals with Green Infrastructure, and Policy GIB6: Views and Prospects and Table 8.1 deal with views and prospects to be preserved and protected.

Chapter 11 Heritage and Conservation contains policies regarding demolition as follows:

11.4.2.1 Policy Objective HER13: Architectural Conservation Areas

It is a Policy Objective to:

iii. Ensure that any new development or alteration of a building within an ACA or immediately adjoining an ACA is appropriate in terms of the proposed design, including scale, height, mass, density, building lines and materials.

11.4.3.2 Policy Objective HER20: Buildings of Vernacular and Heritage Interest

11.4.3.3 Policy Objective HER21: Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Buildings, Estates and Features

Chapter 12 gives detailed guidance on Development Management.

Section 12.3.9 Demolition and Replacement Dwellings

The Planning Authority has a preference for and will promote the deep retro-fit of structurally sound, habitable dwellings in good condition as opposed to demolition and replacement unless a strong justification in respect of the latter has been put forward by the applicant. (See Policy Objective CA6: Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings and Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock - Adaptation).

Demolition of an existing house in single occupancy and replacement with multiple new build units will not be considered on the grounds of replacement numbers only but will be weighed against other factors. Better alternatives to comprehensive demolition of, for example, a distinctive detached dwelling and its landscaped gardens, may be to construct structures around the established dwelling and seek to retain characteristic site elements.

The Planning Authority will assess single replacement dwellings within an urban area on a case by case basis and may only permit such developments where the existing dwelling is uninhabitable.

Applications for replacement dwellings shall also have regard to Policy Objectives HER20 and HER21 in Chapter 11. In this regard, the retention and reuse of an existing structure will be preferable to replacing a dwelling, and the planning authority will encourage the retention of exemplar nineteenth and twentieth century dwellings on sites in excess of 0.4 hectares. Applications for replacement dwelling within the rural area will be assessed under the provision of Section 12.3.10.4.

Section 12.2.1 Built Environment states

The Planning Authority will encourage and promote the repair, retrofitting and reuse of buildings in preference to their demolition and reconstruction where possible (Refer also Section 12.3.9 Demolition and Replacement Dwellings). Where this cannot be achieved, the Planning Authority will support the use of sustainably sourced building materials and the reuse of demolition and excavated materials.

5.2. Vico Road Architectural Conservation Area Dalkey Character Appraisal (2011)

- 5.2.1. This Character Appraisal of the ACA that surrounds the site on three sides addresses Views in Section 3.9, with a list of 9 of the most significant views in the ACA.

5.3. National Policy and Guidance

- Understanding Radon Remediation: A Householder's Guide (2019, Environmental Protection Agency)

- Domestic Energy Assessment Procedure (DEAP) Version 4.2.6: Ireland's official method for calculating and rating the energy performance of dwellings (August 2024, Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland)

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

Rockabill to Dalkey SAC – 150 m east

Dalkey Islands SPA – 170 m east

Dalkey Coastal Zone and Killiney Hill pNHA – 100 m east

5.5. EIA Screening

See completed Form 1 and 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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

One appeal was received against refusal, on behalf of the applicant. This appeal was accompanied by the following documents in support (some of which had been submitted with the planning application as further information):

- Property Condition Survey Report (by chartered surveyor)
- Structural Survey Report and addendum letter (by engineer)
- Statement of Energy Efficiency Goals for a Replacement Dwelling
- Letter from sales agent, stating house was last occupied in March 2022
- Sustainability Report, comparing BER of retrofitted building and new build, and including Life Cycle Assessment
- Digital Radon Gas Monitor Test Results

- Architect's drawings showing deficiencies of building

Issues raised included the following:

- The granny flat (for which no valid permission exists) is being lived in by a caretaker on a short-term basis for security. It is a small part of the house, and only marginally habitable.
- The exterior appearance of the house has been maintained by a management company to avoid the appearance of dereliction, giving the planning authority a false impression of a habitable structure; no internal inspection was undertaken.
- The building was last occupied in March 2022, confirmed by estate agent's letter.
- The planning authority has misinterpreted the standard disclaimers in the Surveyor's and Architect's reports regarding inspections being 'visual in nature'. Opening up works were carried out on key areas of the house, in the presence of the scheme architect, structural engineer, and building surveyor, and photographs were submitted.
- The report authors are professionally qualified, and two additional reports are now submitted: a Radon report, and a Sustainability report.
- The proposal is fully compliant with policy objectives CA6 and PHP19, and Section 12.3.9 of the Development Plan. The house is uninhabitable, as evidenced in the material submitted to the Planning Authority (Cover letters by architect, Condition Survey by Building Surveyors, Structural Report by Structural Engineering Consultant, Statement of Energy Efficiency Goals by Mechanical and Electrical Consultant Engineer, Sustainability Report prepared by an Engineering Company, a letter from Radon Ireland, and drawings showing the deficiencies in the building).
- A renovation/deep retrofit would emit 19 times more Carbon Dioxide annually than the proposed A-rated new build.
- The house is over 75 years old, and at the end of its natural lifespan

- The house has numerous defects, partly as a result of inappropriate alterations to provide an attic conversion and mansard roof to rear:
 - Roof deflection due to purlin being cut for roof window
 - Undersized steels used for support in living room ceiling, following removal of internal wall and chimneybreast to create open plan living area
 - No damp proof course or radon barrier – very high radon levels evident
 - Damp staining in various areas
 - The current storm and foul sewer drainage is combined, and not consistent with current building regulations
 - The house does not have universal access, and there is no possibility of providing it
 - Subsistence and cracking to surrounding pathways and steps
- The appellant refers to the following appeals as precedent: ABP-310459, 312743, 313301, 313943, 315103, 315310.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority referred the Board to the previous planner's report, stating no new matter was raised that would justify a change of their attitude.

6.3. Observations

One observation was received, from the neighbour to the north. This raised a number of issues that are not pertinent to planning, and as such, they are outside the consideration of this appeal. Relevant issues are summarised below:

- Vacant property refurbishment grants are available and should be availed of
- House is not uninhabitable, and has been inhabited
- Granny flat has planning permission

6.4. Further Responses

None received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal and the report 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 issue in this appeal to be considered is as follows:

- The principle of demolition

7.2. The Principle of Demolition

7.2.1. It is the appellant's case that the house is uninhabitable, cannot be repaired, and therefore demolition is justified. The planning authority considered that the dwelling had not deteriorated to an uninhabitable condition, (noting part of the building was occupied), and considered that remedial works could be undertaken to address the deficiencies. The appellant also sets out that the greater energy efficiency and compliance with current building regulations are further justification for a demolition and rebuild, and that the annex building does not have the benefit of planning permission.

7.2.2. Policy Objective CA6: Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings is to *"require the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings, rather than their demolition and reconstruction where possible"*. Section 12.3.9 provides further guidance on dwellings only, and notes a preference for the deep retro-fit of structurally sound habitable dwellings unless a strong justification is provided. Demolition of a single house and replacement with multiple units will not be considered on numbers alone, but will be weighed against other factors. When it comes to one-for-one replacement in urban areas, they will assess such developments *'on a case by case basis and may only permit such developments where the existing dwelling is uninhabitable'*.

7.2.3. This latter piece of text is (in my view) somewhat ambiguous, and in previous appeals (see planning history above) has variously been interpreted as a limitation (the planning authority can only permit demolitions where the dwelling is uninhabitable, and not otherwise) or as a note of caution (the planning authority will

assess such proposals on a case-by-case basis, and might only permit such developments if the dwelling is uninhabitable).

- 7.2.4. In any event, Policy Objective CA6 is quite clear that retrofitting and reuse of an existing building is required, where possible, rather than demolition and reconstruction. As such, I consider that a high threshold is set for demolition of a house. Should retrofit and reuse be possible, that is the path that is required by the Development Plan, whether the building is currently habitable or not.
- 7.2.5. The appellant sets out a number of structural deficiencies in the property. Some of these (deteriorating asphalt roofs, missing roof tiles, blocked gullies, decaying external timbers) are maintenance issues, while others are typical of older properties (cracking and settlement of concrete footpaths, steep access driveways, combined drains, attic conversion floor to ceiling height of less than 2.4 metres) and do not typically require or justify demolition of the property.
- 7.2.6. There are some more significant and less typical structural issues, due to previous interventions. A purlin was cut to insert a rooflight in the front roof slope on foot of a 1985 permission, and this has caused deflection, visible both internally and externally. Additionally, the removal of one chimneybreast at ground floor and the support of the upper chimneystack on undersized steel beams has led to a need for additional support. However, these are localised issues which could be addressed without demolishing the house and annex.
- 7.2.7. The site (and large parts of Dalkey and Killiney) lie in an area shown on the EPA Radon Risk Map of Ireland as being at higher risk of radon (with about 1 in 5 homes likely to have high radon levels). Results of a Digital Radon Gas test have been provided, along with a letter from a company specialising in radon remediation. The radon concentration levels were well above the national reference level of 200 Bq/m³ (averaging over the duration of the test at 379 Bq/m³ in the rear bedroom, 1,015 Bq/m³ in the front bedroom, and 804 Bq/m³ in the living room). The national reference level is the level above which the EPA recommends remedial action should be considered.
- 7.2.8. The appellant notes the impossibility of retro-fitting a radon barrier. The EPA booklet *Understanding Radon Remediation: A Householder's Guide* (referenced in the submitted letter from Radon Ireland Ltd) does not recommend radon barriers as a

remediation measure, but a suite of measures including sealing gaps, increased ventilation, and/or the provision of a sump, with a fan-assisted sump having a high likelihood of success, and being the preferred option for radon levels greater than about 1000 Bq/m³. It notes that radon barriers have been compulsory in high radon areas since the adoption of the 1997 Building Regulations.

7.2.9. I do not consider the high radon levels, or the impossibility of retrofitting a radon barrier, to be justification for the demolition of the house. The EPA booklet states *'having received the result of a radon test the important point to note is that radon is not a problem one has to live with. There are a number of effective and relatively inexpensive remediation techniques available for reducing indoor radon. There is nothing complex about these techniques and the majority involve relatively simple building work.'* No indication has been given that the appellant has explored the best-practice remedial measures recommended by the EPA, and I consider the focus on the lack of a radon barrier to be misguided.

7.2.10. The appellant has submitted a Sustainability Report comparing a DEAP survey of the existing dwelling, the existing dwelling with a proposed 116 sqm extension and retrofit, and of the proposed new building. It finds that a Deep Renovation and Extension to the house would result in an energy rating of C1, while a new build would have an energy rating of A1, with the existing house having an energy rating of D2 (notwithstanding that it has a BER certificate of D1).

7.2.11. The DEAP survey for the existing house refers to all walls as 325 mm solid brick walls dating from 1950-66, with a U-value of 1.64, and refers to all windows as single-glazed windows, with a U-value of 4.80. It takes no account of the more recent construction of the annex building, (subsequent to permissions granted in 1996 and 2011), or the mix of single- and double-glazed windows. The DEAP Manual specifies in Section S4 of *Appendix S: DEAP for existing dwellings*

'In general, if one building element is thermally different from another within a dwelling, they are to be measured individually so that their respective areas can be calculated, the appropriate U-values can be assigned, and then values can be entered separately into the DEAP software.'

- 7.2.12. Additionally, the DEAP report for the proposed extended house makes no proposals to insulate floors, no proposal to replace doors, the boiler, or the hot water cylinder lagging jacket, no proposals to fit solar panels or a water thermostat.
- 7.2.13. I note the large extension proposed (112 sqm) as part of the DEAP Assessments and Life Cycle Assessment. This is a theoretical extension, and no drawings have been provided. While it is understandable that the appellant wants to make a like for like comparison with the proposed house, I do not accept the premise that the available options are the construction of a 375 sqm house or the extension of the existing house to match this figure, which is an arbitrary one when considering Development Plan policy on demolition versus refurbishment. The construction of such an extension makes a large contribution to the embodied carbon of the refurbishment and extension option. Additionally, the U-values attributed to its materials are identical to the refurbished house, rather than those of a new build construction, and it would increase the energy required to run the house, emitting additional operational carbon. Furthermore, the DEAP report for the proposed extended house makes no proposal to replace the boiler, or the hot water cylinder, or to fit solar panels, which would be typically undertaken.
- 7.2.14. As such, I have concerns about the accuracy of the Life Cycle Assessment, which uses the energy consumption figures from the DEAP assessments.
- 7.2.15. I note the appellant has put forward a number of cases as precedent for a grant; there are also a number of precedents for refusal, and each case must be assessed on its merits. Having regard to the information on file, and having regard to Policy Objective CA6 and Section 12.3.9, it has not been demonstrated that retrofitting and reuse of the house is not possible, and no strong justification is given for its demolition. As such, I find a refusal is in order.

7.3. Other Issues

- 7.3.1. Regarding the planning status of the annex building, constructed under D96B/0466 and D11B/0139, there is no evidence on the file of enforcement proceedings, or any application to regularise any planning irregularities.
- 7.3.2. I note the number of protected views listed in the Architectural Conservation Area document; these have not been carried through into the Development Plan, and no

views listed in the Development Plan in Table 8.1 would be affected by the development. The proposed house has a larger footprint than the existing house, but a similar building line. The main impacts on visual amenity would be from the proposed high stone wall around the extended terrace to the front.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

- 8.1. The proposed development was considered in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. An Appropriate Assessment Screening Report prepared by Enviroguide was submitted at Further Information stage with the planning application.
- 8.2. The proposed development is not in any Natura 2000 site. The closest Natura 2000 site is Rockabill to Dalkey Islands SAC (003000), at 150 metres from the site, while the Dalkey Islands SPA (004172) is 170 metres from the site. There is potential for direct pathways to these sites (hydrogeological pathways, due to potential accidental discharge during construction, or surface water discharge during operation; and air and land pathways (potential for introduction of dust and noise to the sites, and increased human activity). There is no change to foul water disposal (Ringsend Wastewater Treatment Plant).
- 8.3. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, (demolition of a house, and construction of a house) the limited duration of the construction period, the limited intensification of use of the site, and the nature and location of the nearest Natura 2000 sites (located within a marine environment, with a high assimilative capacity to dilute any potential effects via hydrogeological pathways) it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely, to have a significant effect, individually, or in combination with other plans or projects, on any European sites.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend a refusal for the reason below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposed development includes the demolition of an existing habitable house and the construction of a replacement dwelling, which would be inconsistent with Policy Objective CA6: Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings or Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock - Adaptation, nor would it accord with the provisions of Section 12.3.9 Demolition and Replacement Dwellings of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, in that a strong justification has not been provided for the demolition of the existing dwelling on site, nor has it been demonstrated that the existing dwelling cannot be retrofitted and reused. Furthermore, the proposed development, if permitted, would set an undesirable precedent for the demolition of existing dwellings and would, therefore, 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, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Natalie de Róiste
Planning Inspector

18 March 2025

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

ABP Case Reference	ABP-321593-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of existing house, construction of house with all associated site works.		
Development Address	41 Coliemore Road, Dalkey, Co. Dublin, A96 DX90		
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		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"/>	Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units	Proceed to Q3.
No	<input type="checkbox"/>		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	<input type="checkbox"/>		EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units – Sub Threshold	Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units – Sub Threshold	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)
5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q4)	
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required	

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-321593-25
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of existing house, construction of house with all associated site works.
Development Address	41 Coliemore Road, Dalkey, Co. Dublin, A96 DX90
<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>	
Characteristics of proposed development (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).	Demolition of one house, to facilitate construction of another, and all associated site works. The size is not exceptional. The development would not be exceptional in the context. The development would not result in the production of significant waste, emissions, or pollutants.
Location of development (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).	The location is a suburban environment, a built up area, adjacent to public parks and the coast. The development would not have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	There are no likely significant effects on the environment.
Conclusion	
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. EIA is not required.	

Inspector:

Date:

DP/ADP: _____

Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)