



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-320133-24

Development

Upgrading works to existing house to include: internal alterations; new two-storey side extension with hipped roof to match existing; and new single-storey rear extension with 3 no. rooflights.

Location

5 Casino Road, Marino, Dublin 3

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB1477/24

Applicant(s)

Ms. Ann Kennedy

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant with conditions.

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Brendan Singleton and Maria Malone

Observer(s)

Dublin City Council

Date of Site Inspection

18th December 2024

Inspector

Paul Christy

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description.....	5
2.0 Proposed Development.....	6
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1 Decision.....	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports.....	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History	7
4.1. Subject site.....	7
4.2. No.3 Casino Road (Adjacent Plot On Immediate Eastern Side Of Subject Site):	7
4.3. No.4 Casino Road (Dwelling On Opposite Side of Casino Road, and Slightly To The West of Subject Site)	9
5.0 Policy Context	9
5.1. Development Plan: Dublin City Development Plan, 2022-2028	9
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	12
5.3. EIA Screening	12
6.0 The Appeal.....	13
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	13
6.2. Applicant's Response.....	13
6.3. Planning Authority Response	14
6.4. Observations	14
7.0 Assessment	14

7.1. Overview	14
7.2. Side Extension	14
7.3. Rear Extension, and Amenity of No.7 Casino Road	17
7.4. Development Contributions.....	19
8.0 AA Screening	19
9.0 Recommendation	20
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	20
11.0 Conditions	21

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject dwelling is located in the residential area of Marino, Dublin 3, an inner suburb on the north side of the City developed during the 1920s and 1930s. It is widely acknowledged that the development concept for the Marino area was heavily influenced by the Garden City Movement, which organisation originated in the United Kingdom. The historic character of the broader Marino area is recognised in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (hereinafter referred to as the '*Development Plan*') wherein it is designated as a 'Z2 Residential Neighbourhood (Conservation Area)' (please refer to Section 5.1 '*Development Plan*' below).
- 1.2. The subject dwelling is a two-storey, hipped roof, semi-detached dwelling typical of the area with a pebbledash render finish painted grey, and what appears to be light maroon-coloured roof tiles when originally constructed (it is difficult to be precise re the colour due to weathering). Approximately half of the front boundary is comprised of iron gates and associated pillars for vehicular and pedestrian access, while the remaining half is formed of a low wall with planting immediately inside rising above the height of the wall. There is an existing rear extension running along the entire rear elevation. The extension is single-storey with a mono-pitched roof that falls down from the rear elevation towards the rear fence. The existing extension has an area of circa 17m² and the western elevation runs close to the party boundary wall. There are additional sheds located towards the back fence of the property.
- 1.3. There is also an existing two-storey extension attached to the rear of the adjacent property to the west, No.7 Casino Road. This extension has a pitched roof, the line of which generally runs parallel with the party boundary wall and at right-angles to the main dwelling. It has an area of 18m². The eaves height is circa 0.3m higher than the top of the party boundary wall (scaled from submitted plans) and is generally at the same height as the lower level of the mono-pitched roof of the subject property.
- 1.4. The dwelling to the east was recently the subject of a two-storey, contemporary-style extension on its western side.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed side extension is 3m in width (the width of the existing dwelling is 6.6m), two-storey along the full depth of the existing structure and incorporating opaque glass to both an ensuite wc at first floor and a wet room at ground floor. The proposed front facade is in line with the existing front facade.
- 2.2. The rear extension is proposed as single-storey along the entire length of the proposed extended structure including the proposed side elevation, and incorporating a mono-pitched roof sloping down from the rear elevation towards the rear fence. The proposed rear extension would extend 1.8m further than the existing rear extension. The submitted Block Plan shows the rear elevation of the proposed rear extension being in line with the rear elevation of the rear extension of No.7.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision:

- 3.1.1. Grant, subject to standard conditions, plus a condition requiring that the development 'shall not oversail any property boundaries adjoining the application site.'

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. [Planning Report]: One report on file. The report addresses, inter alia, the following key issues:

~ Principle: Location of site within an area zoned in the Development Plan as 'Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas)'. Concludes that the principle of residential development is accepted, subject to key Development Plan considerations of visual impact, including the character of the area and residential amenity.

~ Detailed considerations: Concludes that the development is consistent with relevant policy provisions of the Development Plan. Also concludes that the proposed extensions '*would not have any undue impacts*' on neighbouring

properties. Specifically in response to concerns raised in a third party observation re the proposed extension appearing to be built on top of the boundary wall, concludes that the proposed development is acceptable on the grounds that '*while the proposed ground floor extension would abut the boundary ... the proposal would not overhang the boundary*'. Also notes that a ground floor extension of the relevant neighbouring property '*abuts the boundary with the subject land.*' Concludes that the matter can be dealt with by way of condition '*which requires that the proposed development would not overhang or oversail the western property boundary.*'

- 3.2.2. [Other Technical Reports] One report from City Council Engineering Department – Drainage Division: Standard report identifying various technical matters to be complied with in the event of a grant of permission.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- 3.3.1. None.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.4.1. One submission received. Please refer to Section 6.1: 'Grounds of Appeal' below.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. **Subject site:**

- 4.1.1. None.

4.2. **No.3 Casino Road (Adjacent Plot On Immediate Eastern Side Of Subject Site):**

- 4.2.1. Permission for extension to dwelling (Ref. 2704/16) granted by Dublin City Council (hereinafter referred to as '*the Planning Authority*'), subject to conditions. First party appeal (ABP Ref. PL29N.246847) in relation to two conditions re: (i.) setback of front elevation of side extension relative to existing dwelling front elevation; and (ii.) finishes. Both of these issues are relevant to the subject appeal and are therefore summarised below.

4.2.2. Side Elevation Setback Relative To Existing Front Facade

- ~ The plans submitted to the Planning Authority proposed a setback of 400mm behind the existing front elevation for the two-storey side extension.
- ~ Condition 3 of the Planning Authority's grant of permission required that this extension be set back, at a minimum, 2m behind the existing front elevation of the house. The reason given was in the interests of visual and residential amenity.
- ~ The Planner's Report indicated that it was felt that the extension, being located close to the front façade, would read too much as a strident feature in the street.
- ~ At appeal stage, the Board decided having regard to the contemporary design and nature of the proposed extension that, subject to a setback distance of 400 millimetres, the proposed side extension will remain adequately subordinate to the front façade of the existing dwelling on site and will not interfere with the visual amenities of the streetscape which forms part of a residential conservation area as zoned in the Dublin City Development Plan 2011 – 2017.

4.2.3. Finishes:

- ~ The plans submitted to the Planning Authority proposed a light grey brick finish on the front elevation and wrapped around the side elevation for approximately 1.5m from the front corner, with the remainder of the side elevation to be finished with render.
- ~ Condition 5 of the Planning Authority's grant of permission required that: '*The external finish of the extensions shall match the existing house, as appropriate, in respect of materials, colour and detailing. Reason: To protect existing amenities.*' The Planner's Report does not elaborate on the rationale for this Condition.
- ~ At Appeal stage the Board, having regard to the elevations and particulars submitted with the application indicating the proposed external finishes to the extensions, and also having regard to the sample of the light grey brick to be used on the said extensions and the photomontages submitted with the grounds of appeal, considered that the proposed finishes complement those of the existing dwelling on the site and would not adversely impact on the visual amenities of the

existing dwelling or the streetscape. It was therefore determined that condition number 5 was not warranted.

4.3. **No.4 Casino Road (Dwelling On Opposite Side of Casino Road, and Slightly To The West of Subject Site)**

- 4.3.1. Permission for extension to dwelling: The application was granted by the Planning Authority (Ref. WEB1110/21), subject to conditions. First party appeal (ABP Ref. 310108-21) in relation to Condition 7, which Condition required the omission of the proposed front and side walls external insulation. This issue is relevant to the subject appeal and is therefore summarised below.

~ The plans submitted to the Planning Authority proposed external wall insulation on three elevations at a depth of 150mm.

~ Condition 7 of the Planning Authority's grant of permission required the omission of the insulation in its entirety. The stated reason for this condition was given as follows: *'The dwelling is located in an important Z2-zoned residential conservation area, one of whose critical elements is the appearance and finishes of individual houses and terraces. The proposed render finish to the cladding would replace the original façade finishes which would have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the streetscape through the loss of original finishes.'*

~ At Appeal stage, the Board decided to amend Condition 7 as follows: *'The external insulation to the front and side walls shall harmonise with the colour of the original external facades.'* In doing so, the Board concluded that: *'Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed works, subject to compliance with the amended Condition 7 ... the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area ...'*

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Development Plan: Dublin City Development Plan, 2022-2028**

- 5.1.1. Zoning: The subject site is covered by one zoning objective: **Land Use Zoning**

Objective Z2 Residential Neighbourhood (Conservation Area) (Chapter 14 refers). The relevant objective is: *‘To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.’*

The associated narrative in Section 14.7.2 elaborates on this Zoning Objective and includes, inter alia, the following commentary:

~ *‘Residential conservation areas have extensive groupings of buildings and associated open spaces with an attractive quality of architectural design and scale. The overall quality of the area in design and layout terms is such that it requires special care in dealing with development proposals which affect structures in such areas, both protected and non-protected. The general objective for such areas is to protect them from unsuitable new developments or works that would have a negative impact on the amenity or architectural quality of the area.’*

~ *‘The principal land-use encouraged in residential conservation areas is housing but can include a limited range of other uses.’*

- 5.1.2. Built Heritage and Archaeology: Section 11.5.3: *‘Built Heritage and Assets of the City’* clarifies as follows in relation to Residential Neighbourhood (Conservation Areas): *‘Whilst these areas do not have a statutory basis in the same manner as protected structures or Architectural Conservation Areas, they are recognised as areas that have conservation merit and importance and warrant protection through zoning and policy application.’* Policy BHA9 refers:

Policy BHA9: *‘To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin’s Conservation Areas ... Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.’*

- 5.1.3. Development Standards: Chapter 15: Development Standards, Section 15.15.2.2, Conservation Areas provides that:

‘All planning applications for development in Conservation Areas shall:

- *Respect the existing setting and character of the surrounding area.*

- *Be cognisant and/ or complementary to the existing scale, building height and massing of the surrounding context.*
- *Protect the amenities of the surrounding properties and spaces.*
- *Provide for an assessment of the visual impact of the development in the surrounding context.*
- *Ensure materials and finishes are in keeping with the existing built environment.*
- *Positively contribute to the existing streetscape. Retain historic trees also as these all add to the special character of an ACA, where they exist.'*

5.1.4. Detailed Guidelines for Residential Extensions: 'Volume 2 Appendices, Appendix 18: Ancillary Residential Accommodation, Section 1.0 Residential Extensions' sets out a number of general principles that should be addressed in all cases and further notes that: '*The guidelines should be interpreted in the context of the development plan Core Strategy, which promotes a compact city, sustainable neighbourhoods and areas where a wide range of families can live.*' This Section then provides more detailed guidance in relation to relevant considerations including for: Extensions to Rear; Extensions to Side; Privacy and Amenity; Separation Distances; Daylight and Sunlight; and Appearance and Materials. Those key provisions of relevance to the subject case are summarised in the table below.

General Principles	<p>Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling.</p> <p>Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight.</p> <p>Achieve a high quality of design.</p> <p>Make a positive contribution to the streetscape (front extensions)</p>
Extensions To Rear	<p>Considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining. Should match or complement the main house.</p>
Side Extension	<p>Ground floor side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially</p>

	front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity. (The Guidelines do not address side extensions incorporating first floor work other than those built 'over existing structures'.)
Privacy and Amenity	Should not result in any significant loss of privacy to the residents of adjoining properties. Generally, windows overlooking adjoining properties (such as in a side wall) should be avoided. Where essential, the size of such windows should be kept as small as possible and consideration should be given to the use of high-level windows and/ or the use of obscure glazing where the window serves a bathroom or landing.
Daylight and Sunlight	Consideration should be given to the proportion of extensions, height and design of roofs as well as taking account of the position of windows including rooms they serve to adjacent or adjoining dwellings.
Appearance and Materials	The extension should not dominate the existing building and should normally be of an overall scale and size to harmonise with the existing house and adjoining buildings. Materials used should complement those used on the existing building; features such as windows and doors on the new extension should relate to those on the original building in terms of proportion and use of materials.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The site is located 1.096km from South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area, and 978m from North Dublin Bay Proposed Natural Heritage Area.

5.3. EIA Screening

- 5.3.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (As Amended). 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. One third party appeal was received from Brendan Singleton and Maria Malone, the owners of the associated semi-detached dwelling, No.7 Casino Road. Central to the grounds of appeal are the appellants' concerns around the impact of the development on the '*original party/boundary wall*'. In particular, they object to; '*The removal of the original boundary/party wall constructed 100 years ago as part of the Marino Housing Scheme development.*' They refer to Condition 3 of the Permission that provides that the development 'shall not oversail any property boundaries adjoining the application site' and express concern that it '*does not mention nor take into account the removal of the existing boundary/party wall.*' The Appellants then set out concerns that 'the architect's plans '*falsely indicate that the existing extension at No.5 already encompasses this wall*' and that '*this is a misrepresentation*' ... '*It is currently stepped back and built within the boundary of No.5*'. Their concerns arising include:

- The wall is built 50/50 on each property and it is impossible to remove half on the side of No.5 without damaging the side of No.7 at both the main property and the extension;
- The fabric, nature and age of the Marino houses; and
- Potential physical damage to the building fabric of No.7 and water ingress.

6.1.2. For these reasons, the Appellants request the attachment of a condition preventing the removal of this boundary wall.

6.2. Applicant's Response

6.2.1. None.¹

¹ A response submitted by the Agent for the Applicant was received outside of the statutory period as provided for under Section 129(2)(a) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (As Amended) and may not be considered therefore.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- 6.3.1. Requests that ABP upholds the Authority's decision and that, if permission is granted, a condition requiring the payment of Section 48 development contribution is applied.

6.4. Observations

- 6.4.1. None received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Overview

- 7.1.1. 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 policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be assessed are as follows:
- Side extension: Impact on the general amenity and architectural quality of the area; and amenities of dwelling to immediate east (No.3 Casino Road); and
 - Rear extension: Impacts on amenities of dwelling to west (No.7 Casino Road).

7.2. Side Extension

- 7.2.1. General Amenity and Architectural Quality of the Area: Casino Road is comprised of a mixture of semi-detached dwellings, and terraces of four, and six dwellings, respectively either side of a narrow tree-lined road. A key design feature in the area is the incorporation of hipped roofs at either end of the terraces and semi-detached dwellings. The submitted plans include:
- a hipped roof feature along the extent of the two-storey side extension similar to the hipped roof feature on the existing dwelling and others in the vicinity;

- a fenestration pattern on the front elevation consistent with the existing dwelling and those in the wider area; and
- a roof tile '*to match existing*' (refer drawing labelled 'Roof Plans – Existing and Proposed').

7.2.2. In terms of elevation treatment, the submitted plans propose:

- '*Pebbledash finish similar to existing rear wall*' for the rear elevation of the rear extension; and
- '*New uniform pebbledash finish to front*' for the front elevation.

(The submitted plans do not include details for the proposed treatment of the side elevation.)

7.2.3. I am satisfied that the mass and scale of the proposed development is sympathetic to, and will successfully integrate with, the general amenity and architectural quality of the area. I note the front elevation setback issue that arose during the planning process for the dwelling located immediately to the east (refer Section 4.2.1 above). However, in my opinion, the subject extension does not warrant the imposition of such a setback as the incorporation of the traditional hipped roof design feature in the proposed side extension shall ensure that the finished dwelling shall not result in a strident feature on the street, particularly given the presence nearby on Casino Road of the four-unit and six-unit terraces incorporating hipped roofs.

7.2.4. With regard to the incomplete details for the proposed elevation treatments I consider that it is reasonable to address such matters by condition, and that it is equally reasonable that the condition shall require that the finishes for the front and side elevations shall generally match the existing front and side elevation pebbledash finish.

7.2.5. Subject to the requirement as set out at Section 7.2.4., I am satisfied that the proposed development generally shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan in terms of protecting the architectural quality of the area in that it:

- shall protect the general amenities of the residential conservation area as required under the Z2 zoning objective for such areas as set out in Chapter 14 of the Development Plan;
- shall protect the special interest and character of the residential conservation area, and shall contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness as required under Policy BH9 of the Development Plan;
- shall respect the existing setting and character of the surrounding area as required under Section 15.15.2.2 of the Development Plan, and shall also generally comply with the associated detailed architectural conservation standards in terms of: being complementary to existing buildings; protecting the amenities of surrounding properties; incorporating materials and finishes in keeping with the environment; and contributing positively to the existing streetscape.

7.2.6. No.3 Casino Road (Amenity Of): This dwelling, located immediately to the east of the subject dwelling, was the subject of a recent two-storey, contemporary-style side extension with an eaves height of 5.7m on its western side (ie. on the side adjacent to the subject plot). This followed a grant of permission on appeal by the Board (refer Section 4.2 above). The nearest part of this extended dwelling is just over 1m from the party boundary with the subject plot. The subject proposed extension would provide for an equal distance of just over 1m of the side elevation from the party boundary and an eaves height of 5.2m. I note that the permitted plans for the extension to No.3 provided for a bedroom window and bathroom window respectively on the side elevation at first floor level and the extension as constructed does incorporate such windows. The only fenestration proposed for the relevant side elevation of the subject property is: a small 0.6m x 0.6m opaque window serving an ensuite room at first floor level; and a narrow, but taller, 0.6m x 1.6m opaque window serving a wet room at ground floor level.

7.2.7. Having regard to the proposed incorporation of opaque glazing in the subject proposal, I am satisfied that the proposed side extension generally shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan (Detailed Guidelines for

Residential Extensions: Volume 2 Appendices, Appendix 18: Ancillary Residential Accommodation, Section 1.0 Residential Extensions) in terms of protecting the amenities of No.3 Casino Road to the east in that it:

- Shall not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of No.3 in terms of privacy and outlook;
- Shall provide for a distance to the party boundary equal to that resulting from the side extension to No.3.

7.2.8. Otherwise, as the issue of determining right to light is a matter for the Courts, I do not consider that the Board is in a position to draw any conclusions in relation to such matters.

7.3. Rear Extension, and Amenity of No.7 Casino Road

7.3.1. Privacy: The subject proposed rear extension and the neighbours' existing rear extension are both single-storey and without fenestration on their respective 'facing elevations', and would be located immediately adjacent to each other in a manner typical of such suburban locations. I am satisfied that the privacy of both dwellings will not be compromised. This issue is not raised by the Appellants.

7.3.2. Party Boundary Wall (Impact On): In their appeal submission the Appellants, the owners of No.7, express concerns that the submitted plans 'falsely indicate' the actual position on the ground and also suggest that the party boundary wall is to be removed and that this will have consequential negative physical impacts on their property. As the removal of the party boundary wall would be a material consideration for the amenities of the owners of the adjacent No.7, this matter is addressed below. Having reviewed the submitted plans, and from my site inspection I have found as follows.

7.3.3. [Site Inspection: Subject Property Existing Rear Extension]:

At my site inspection, I found that the side wall of the existing rear extension of the subject property is slightly stepped back from the party boundary wall, albeit it is adjoined to what appears to be a coping stone of the boundary wall by means of a

concrete 'bridge', which bridge is topped with lead flashing.

7.3.4. [Site Inspection: Appellants' Property Rear Extension]:

At my site inspection, I found that the existing rear extension of No.7 abuts the boundary wall and is adjoined to what appears to be a coping stone of the boundary wall by means of a lead flashing.

7.3.5. [Review of Plans Submitted With Application]

'Ground Floor Plans – Existing & Proposed': This drawing could be interpreted as showing both the subject property existing rear extension and proposed rear extension extending half-way across the party boundary wall. Similarly, the drawing could also be interpreted as showing the existing rear extension of the appellants' property extending half-way across the party boundary wall (when considered in conjunction with the line of the rear elevation shown on the submitted Block Plan).

'Front & Rear Elevations – Existing & Proposed/Rear Elevation – Existing'. This drawing could be interpreted as showing both the subject property existing rear extension and proposed rear extension extending half-way across the party boundary wall.

7.3.6. The concerns of the Appellants as set out at Sections 6.1 and 7.3.2 above are noted.

Whilst any damage to the Appellants' property arising from the proposed development would be a civil matter, in my opinion it would be reasonable, in the interests of orderly development having regard to the form of the extension to the Appellants' property and how it abuts the boundary wall, to determine that the subject rear extension should equally not extend westwards beyond abutting the party wall. This is addressed in Condition 2 in my recommendation.

7.3.7. Subject to the aforementioned recommendation to impose a condition requiring the retention of the party boundary wall, I am satisfied that the proposed rear extension generally shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan (Detailed Guidelines for Residential Extensions: Volume 2 Appendices, Appendix 18: Ancillary Residential Accommodation, Section 1.0 Residential Extensions) in terms of protecting the amenities of No.7 Casino Road to the west in that it shall not

adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of that property in terms of privacy and outlook.

- 7.3.8. Otherwise, as the issue of determining right to light is a matter for the Courts, I do not consider that the Board is in a position to draw any conclusions in relation to such matters.

7.4. Development Contributions

- 7.4.1. I note that in its observations the Planning Authority requests that, if permission is granted, a condition requiring the payment of Section 48 development contribution is applied. Section 9 of the 'Dublin City Council Development Contribution Scheme 2023-2026' provides that 'Residential Development' shall be liable for payment under the scheme and the associated Note 3 clarifies that: '*New extensions to existing developments, including domestic extensions, will be charged ... other than in circumstances where no contribution or a reduced contribution applies...*' These circumstances are set out in Section 10 of the document, and the second bullet therein exempts from payment the first 40sq metres of extensions to a residential development but also notes that subsequent extensions or extensions over and above 40 square metres will be charged. As the proposed extension is greater than 40 square metres, it is recommended that such a condition is included in the Board's decision.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1 I have considered the proposed extensions to No.5 Casino Road, Marino, Dublin in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located 1.096km from South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area, and 978m from North Dublin Bay Proposed Natural Heritage Area. The proposed development comprises upgrading works to an existing house to include internal alterations, new two-storey extension to the side with hipped roof to match existing and new single-storey extension to the rear with 3 no. rooflights. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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 reasons for this conclusion are as follows:

- the nature of the works: small scale extension to an existing dwelling with existing connections to public services;
- the distance of the site from the nearest European site and the absence of any connections between the two.

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) is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. I recommend that permission for the development be granted, subject to conditions for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1. Having regard to the location of the site; and to the design and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with conditions below, the proposed development would not be injurious to the general amenity and architectural quality of the area, and would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application 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 existing party boundary wall between the subject property and No.7 Casino Road shall be retained and no part of the development hereby approved shall oversail the said property boundary. Revised plans providing for compliance with the aforementioned 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 orderly development and to clarify the terms of the permission.</p>
3.	<p>The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles/slates) shall be the same as those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture. Samples of the proposed materials shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into water and/or wastewater connection agreements with Uisce Éireann.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of orderly development.</p>

5.	<p>Surface water arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public health.</p>
6.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
7.	<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 and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development 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>

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.



Paul Christy

Planning Inspector

11th February 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-320133-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Upgrading works to existing house to include: internal alterations; new two-storey extension to the side with hipped roof to match existing; and new single-storey extension to the rear with 3 no. rooflights.		
Development Address	5 Casino Road, Marino, Dublin 3		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? <small>(that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)</small>	Yes	✓	
	No		
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			
No	✓		
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			
No			
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes			
5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No			
Yes			

Inspector: Paul Christy

Date: 11th February 2025