



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322226-25

Development

2 storey extension to side and rear, garage, balcony, rooflights, dormer, and all associated internal and external works.

Location

8 Sycamore Crescent,
Mount Merrion,
Blackrock, Co. Dublin
A94 H9P0.

Planning Authority

Dún Laoghaire
Rathdown County
Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D24A/0937/WEB.

Applicant(s)

Robert Relihan & Lisa
Smyth.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission.

Type of Appeal	Third Party.
Appellant(s)	Tony & Barbara Lambe.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	30 th May, 2025.
Inspector	Aiden O'Neill.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description.....	4
2.0 Proposed Development.....	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1. Decision	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports.....	6
3.4. Third Party Observations.....	8
4.0 Planning History	9
5.0 Policy Context	10
5.1 Development Plan	10
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	12
6.0 EIA Screening	12
7.0 The Appeal.....	12
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	12
7.3. Planning Authority Response	14
7.4. Observations	14
7.5. Further Responses.....	14
8.0 Assessment	15
9.0 AA Screening	18
10.0 Recommendation.....	19
11.0 Reasons and Considerations	19
12.0 Conditions.....	20
Appendix 1 - Form 1	23
Appendix 2 - AA Screening Determination	25

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1 The proposed development site is 0.073ha in area and comprises a vacant two-storey semi-detached 4-bed dwelling (c. 188m² in area) to the east of, and set back from, Sycamore Crescent, in the established suburban residential area of Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Co. Dublin.
- 1.2 Sycamore Crescent is characterised by pairs of two/three storey semi-detached dwellings constructed by John Kenny in the 1930s on large plots with long front and back gardens. Like the majority of dwellings on Sycamore Crescent, No. 8 has the signature white stippled exterior with bow windows on one side. A number of the semi-detached dwellings in the vicinity have been modernised/extended.
- 1.3 There is a single-storey extension to the rear (east) of the dwelling; a single-storey garage/carport to the south separated from the house by an access door to the rear garden; a tall brick chimney to the front of the southern elevation, and 2no. smaller chimneys to the front and rear of the northern elevation. The dwellinghouse is also connected to existing public services.
- 1.4 The dwellinghouse, which is c. 8.445m in height to ridge level, is c. 0.5m lower than the front driveway is accessed via steps from the front driveway. The front garden is up to 17.7m long and the rear garden is up to 21.6m long. The rear garden is less than 1m lower than the rear ground floor level. There is a tall hedge c. 3.5m in height between no. 8 and its pair no. 7 to the front, and a lower hedge c. 2.5m in height, to the rear.
- 1.5 No. 7 Sycamore Crescent is gated and bounded by a hedge/trees to the front and side, with a low front wall, and it is very secluded. There are solar panels on the front roof, and there is a part two-storey hipped roof rear extension with rooflights and solar panels, as well as an external flue pipe next to no. 8 Sycamore Crescent.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The proposed development seeks to demolish an existing single storey flat roof extension (c. 45.2m²) and construct a part two-storey extension to the side/and rear covering an area of proposed works of 140.90m², total overall house area is 284.4m² (including 143.5m² of the

existing dwelling to be upgraded). The proposed extension will facilitate the provision of enhanced living accommodation at ground and first floor level, as well as an internal corridor along the southern boundary providing access to the rear garden at ground floor level. The front garden is unchanged at up to 17.7m long, with a front deck area, and the rear garden is reduced to up to 17.7m long, but is still sizeable, accessed via steps from the rear patio and deck area.

2.2 Specifically the proposed development as originally submitted will include:

- Proposed internal layout modifications and alterations at both the ground and first floors.
- Demolition of the existing garage, widening of the existing entrance boundary wall with a new sliding gate,
- Part removal of side (southeast), and rear (northeast) roof areas to facilitate the new rear extension roofs.
- Proposed construction of a new rear attic dormer with a flat roof at the second-floor level integrated within the existing roof space.
- Proposed new roof lights in the existing roof over the main stairwell and Velux roof lights.
- Proposed new balcony at the first floor facing Northeast elevation.
- The existing house's external walls are proposed to be fitted with external insulation and clad in brick slips at ground level and rendered at first-floor level.
- Replacement of all existing windows and new entrance door.
- Proposed new single-storey shed of 18m² to the rear to be used for storage purposes and a bin store to the front
- All associated site works, landscaping, and drainage connected to existing services.

2.3 The ridge height of the existing dwelling remains at c. 8.445m, with the proposed two-storey extension at a lower level, subordinate to the existing dwelling. Of note in the context of the appeal is the replacement of the front door and the creation of an arched overhead porch element.

2.4 The design statement that accompanies the application states that the scale and massing have been considered in the context of the surrounding built form, with a contemporary façade to the proposed extension. The design approach has been to create a harmonious integration of the proposed development within the urban context, and utilising a simple

palette of materials, with existing brick façade on the ground floor, render/plaster finish to the upper floors, with the option of metal cladding to the new proposed 2-storey extension; and replacing all existing windows with new aluminium window frames in conjunction with contemporary detailing. Roof lights have been introduced for the existing house interior and the new extension spaces.

- 2.5 The proposed development was amended in the submission dated 24th February, 2025 in response to an RFI dated 21st January, 2025 to provide a traditional hipped roof form, the omission of the rear balcony, revised fenestration, and a reduced dormer stairwell (but increased in height from 2.5m to 3.3m up to the ridge line). The master bedroom has been extended out to create a better living space internally. 2no. soakaways are also proposed to the front garden.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority decided to grant permission on 19th March, 2025 subject to 11no. conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

Of the 11no. conditions, condition no. 2 states that the proposed rear dormer shall be constructed as per the originally proposed drawings, set down from the roof ridgeline by 200mm. The development should also include the reduced stairwell dormer window as clarified by the Further Information request.

REASON: To protect the residential amenities of the area and in the interests of visual amenity and harmony.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The planner's report dated 27th January, 2025 states that residential development, including extensions to existing dwellings, is permitted in principle in zoning objective 'A'.
- It is considered that the proposed development would not create undue negative impacts in terms of energy use/performance and is acceptable in terms of materials

proposed.

- It is noted that the site, and many of the surrounding houses, are Kenny built houses, which are architecturally distinctive with inspiration from Tudor and Art Deco style. While there is no protection of Kenny Houses, there are policies within the Development Plan that seek to protect vernacular architecture and heritage interest, as well as 19th Century and 20th century housing.
- The proposed two-storey extension with setback from the front façade and side boundary is considered acceptable in principle.
- However, having regard to section 11.4.3.2 Policy Objective HER21: Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Buildings, Estates and Features, the Planning Authority has serious concern regarding the proposed open gable 'A' roof shape to the front and its potential impact on the character of the dwelling and its ability to harmonise with the existing dwelling and the existing streetscape. A revised roof style is required as part of an RFI, noting that a hipped roof style is more complementary.
- The planner is also concerned about the front fenestration of the proposed extension. Reduced windows more in keeping with the character of the existing windows is required as part of an RFI.
- The alterations to the front door are considered acceptable.
- The alternative option of additional metal cladding to the extension is not favoured, with the original considered more acceptable, with the proposed brickwork to match existing.
- The omission of the first-floor balcony and balcony door opening is recommended, as is the reduction in size of the proposed large window opening.
- The first-floor attic dormer is considered to be acceptable. A reduction in the size of the stairwell window is also recommended.
- The proposed garden shed is considered acceptable.

A Request for Further Information was requested on 27th January, 2025 in accordance with the recommendation of the planner and the drainage engineer in relation to surface water, and a response was submitted on 24th February, 2025.

The response of the planner dated 19th March, 2025 notes that a traditional roof form has been proposed; the balcony and balcony door have been omitted and the master bedroom

has been extended out, and the dormer stairwell window has been reduced. An increase in the size of the dormer structure so that it is no longer set down from the ridge line of the existing roof is noted. A condition requiring that the dormer be constructed to the dimensions as originally proposed while also including provision for a reduced stairwell dormer window is recommended.

The planner's report is the basis for the Planning Authority's decision to grant planning permission.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

The Transportation Planning Report dated 16th January 2025 stated no objection subject to conditions.

The Drainage Planning Report dated 9th January 2025 requested further information in relation to surface water disposal.

The Drainage Planning Report dated 5th March 2025 stated no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One no. third party submission was lodged on 24th December, 2024 setting out the following comments, and seeking a refusal of permission:

- (a) There is no context to the application, with the adjoining twin at no. 8 not shown.
- (b) The houses are 1930 Kenny built homes and are Buildings of Heritage Interest. They were constructed in pairs, mirrors of each other.
- (c) Reference is made to PA Ref. No. D22B0058 in relation to 16 Sycamore Road, where it is stated that:
 - a. The retention of original features including windows, doors, roof coverings... will be encouraged.

- b. Side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size and visual harmony with existing (especially front) elevations and external finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.
 - c. Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures and prominence.
 - d. Dormer extensions to roofs will be considered with regard to impacts on existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties.
 - e. Retain, where appropriate and encourage the rehabilitation and suitable reuse of existing older buildings/structures/features which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of a streetscape.
- (d) There is no proposal for the safe removal and disposal of the large amount of asbestos sheeting.
- (e) The proposed balcony off the first-floor bedroom is intrusive and will interfere with the observer's privacy and enjoyment of their garden.
- (f) The mass scale and size of the dormer window at roof level, which is not set back from the eaves, will also interfere with the observer's privacy and enjoyment of their garden.
- (g) The two-storey side extension with A roof is presented as a barnlike structure, with two proposals for external finishes, one of which is to be metal, which is totally at odds with the architecturally historic setting.
- (h) The pair of properties share a pan-tiled roof. The proposed removal of the existing small roof tiles, to be replaced with grey or black concrete roof tiles to match the extension and to clad half a chimney in brick slips of a different colour will render the roof a pastiche of old and new and would visually diminish the character and form of the roofscape.
- (i) No details are provided on the potential implications and potential structural damage for the observer's property from the removal of four shared internal chimney breasts at ground and first floor level, which are tied to the party wall. The removal of the stand-alone brick chimney is not mentioned.

4.0 Planning History

There is no recent planning history.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

- In the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, the site is subject to zoning objective 'A', which seeks 'to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities'. Residential development is listed within the 'Permitted in Principle' category of this zoning objective.
- Section 11.4.3.2 Policy Objective HER21 of the Development Plan seeks to:
 - i. Encourage the appropriate development of exemplar nineteenth and twentieth century buildings, and estates to ensure their character is not compromised.
 - ii. Encourage the retention and reinstatement of features that contribute to the character of exemplar nineteenth and twentieth century buildings and estates such as roofscapes, boundary treatments and other features considered worthy of retention.
 - iii. Ensure the design of developments on lands located immediately adjacent to such groupings of buildings addresses the visual impact on any established setting.

Section 11.4.3.3 Policy Objective HER21 in relation to Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Buildings, Estates and Features seeks to encourage the appropriate development of exemplar nineteenth and twentieth century buildings and estates to ensure their character is not compromised.

Chapter 12 of the Plan provides development management details. Section 12.3.7.1 relates to extensions to dwellings, as follows:

Section 12.3.7.1(ii) (Rear Extensions) states:

In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:

- Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries.
- Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability.

- Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.
- External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.

Section 12.3.7.1 (iii) Extensions to the Side:

Ground floor side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity.

First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable.

Side gable, protruding parapet walls at eaves/gutter level of hip-roofs are not encouraged.

Section 12.3.7.1(iv) (Alterations at Roof/Attic Level) states: Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles - changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/ 'A' frame end or 'half-hip' for example – will be assessed against a number of criteria including:

- Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
- Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
- Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
- Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence.

Dormer extensions to roofs, i.e. to the front, side, and rear, will be considered with regard to impacts on existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties.

The proposed quality of materials/finishes for dormer extensions will be considered carefully as this can greatly improve their appearance.

Section 10.2.2.6 Policy Objective EI6: Sustainable Drainage Systems of the County Development Plan 2022-2028 states that all surface water run-off generated by the development is infiltrated or reused locally within the property curtilage with no overflow to the public sewer.

5.1. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines (where relevant)

N/A

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The proposed development site is c. 1.71km to the south-west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) and the South Dublin Bay pNHA (Site Code: 000210).

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The Third Party's appeal raises two grounds as follows:

- The window treatments in the proposed extension to the side of the property.
- The removal or infill of the undercroft, along with an arch treatment in its place.
 - The window treatments in the proposed extension to the side of the property:
 - The Council requested at RFI stage to reduce the size of the proposed window elements however it has approved the exact same fenestration to the new extension. The proposed windows in the side extension bear no correlation to the existing windows. Notwithstanding that, the sills have been lowered with a continuous built out box window through both floors.
 - The removal or infill of the undercroft, along with an arch treatment in its place.
 - The Council considered that the alteration to the front door (and arched porch element overhead) to be acceptable, noting the pattern of similar porch style

structures along the streetscape, however these houses are a mirror of each other. There are no examples of two different finishes.

- The removal of the undercroft would be a significant loss to the uniqueness of these considered Kenny built houses.
- Reference is made to the Council's assessment 2no. applications relating to 16 Sycamore Road. In that instance, the Council stated that the proposed ground floor fenestration is out of scale and character of the pair of dwellings and with the streetscape in the vicinity. The Council also stated that it was not in favour of the proposed infill of the porch area and undercroft, given the effects on the visual character of the dwelling.
- The proposed development will have a direct impact on the front fenestration of not only the twinned houses but on the overall area and is at odds with the Council's policies for this scheme of early 20th Century Kenny built homes.
- No. 7 and 8 mirror each other in terms of the original footprint and fenestration and form a coherent pair with common historic design elements which should be retained in line with Council policies.

7.2. Applicant Response

The applicant responded to the Third Party appeal on 7th May, 2025 outlining the following:

- The Board is respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal on the basis that the grounds of appeal were not raised during the local authority's consultation process.
- The appellants previously raised separate concerns that were taken into account and appropriate revisions were made.
- While the proposed style was considered acceptable by the Planning Authority, Drawing No. 3.1.400_Rev_B illustrates the proposed changes to the front door (arched porch element overhead), specifically the retention of the entrance porch design to match the adjacent property, as well as the front window sizes of the proposed extension to the side of the property have been revised to align with the existing proportions and character, and the proposed brickwork will match existing.
- The undercroft infill results from the proposed extension to Living Room 01, which forms part of the open plan dining and seating area. It is proposed to retain the infill as its

removal would result in a significant reduction in the minimum usable floor area of Living Room 01. To address the concerns raised, a modification to the external arch treatment has been proposed.

- The Board is asked to uphold the Council's decision.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority's response dated 15th April, 2025 states that the Board is referred to the previous Planner's Report, and that it is considered that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the Planning Authority, would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

7.4. Observations

None.

7.5. Further Responses

Third Party

The Third Party made an observation dated 30th May, 2025 on the applicant's response to the Third Party appeal.

The observation makes the following comments:

- Front Elevation - Window Treatment on Proposed Side Extension
 - The Third Party welcomes the proposed alteration to the sill heights of the front windows in the proposed side extension to match those of the existing dwelling.
- Removal/Infill of Undercroft and Arch Treatment
 - The Third Party consider the undercrofts to be one of the most distinctive and historically significant architectural features of the matching pair of houses,
 - The Third Party does not deny that arches exist in the area, however, these arches are generally part of coordinated, mirrored pairs, a defining aspect of the architectural language of these semi-detached homes.
 - In the most recent submission, the additional photographs appear to contradict the updated plan, which now proposes a rectangular opening along with the undercroft's removal. Its removal erodes the architectural narrative, rendering the dwelling indistinct and diluting its original character. It is argued that the undercroft must be

infilled to allow more light into the home. However, these homes receive substantial sunlight from the front—from midday until evening—due to their positioning.

- On the point of the removal of the infill resulting in a significant reduction in minimum usable floor area, the undercroft measures approximately 0.7m by 3m which is hardly a significant addition in terms of functional living space.
- While it is acknowledged that many homes in the area have undergone modifications, the facades of most remain recognisably intact.
- It is stated that it is unlikely that any John Kenny-built house remains in its original 1930s condition. However, these necessary changes should not come at the cost of distinctive historical façades.
- The precedent of 16 Sycamore Road, applications D22B/0058 and D22B/0390, sought to lower the sills and infill the undercroft, but the planning authority refused these elements.
- It appears that policy objective HER21 is applied inconsistently.
- The observation also responds to comments made on the new issues raised in the appeal.

Planning Authority

The Planning Authority also made a further response dated 22nd May, 2025 the contents of which are the same as its response dated 15th April, 2025.

8.0 Assessment

8.1 Having examined all the application and appeal documentation on file, and having regard to relevant policy, I consider that the main issue which requires consideration in this appeal is that raised in the grounds of appeal, and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise.

8.2 The main issue is as follows:

- Compliance with planning policy

8.2.1 The proposed development involves the part demolition, refurbishment and extension of an existing vacant two-storey semi-detached 4-bed dwelling at no.8 Sycamore Crescent, in the established low-density suburban residential area of Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Co. Dublin.

- 8.2.2 Of note is that the dwelling is one of a pair of John Kenny-built houses, with a distinctive architectural character on large plots with long front and back gardens.
- 8.2.3 As observed on the day of the site visit, a number of individual semi-detached dwellings in the vicinity have been modernised/extended, but the overall character remains.
- 8.2.4 Having regard to the applicable residential zoning objective, the nature of the proposed development is acceptable in principle.
- 8.2.5 Having regard to the relevant policies of the Plan guiding the nature and extent of the proposed development, the proposed extension is subordinate to the existing dwelling.
- 8.2.6 The Planning Authority raised concerns in its RFI about the proposed roof profile, rear balcony, dormer stairwell, and the treatment of fenestration on the 2-storey extension, but, of note in the context of the appeal, accepted the proposed revisions to the front door, i.e., the replacement of the front door and the creation of an arched overhead porch element.
- 8.2.7 The revised design, made in response to the RFI, provided a traditional roof form of similar style and design to the existing roof profile, with a similar pitch and matching concrete roof tiles along the front elevation; revised the fenestration of the extension; omitted the balcony; and reduced the dormer stairwell window but increased the size of the dormer structure itself. The Planning Authority recommended a condition be attached to set the dormer down from the ridge line and to reduce the size of the stairwell window.
- 8.2.8 The Third Party raises no concerns about the principle of the proposed two-storey extension or the rear dormer.
- 8.2.9 I would share the Planning Authority's opinion that the two-storey extension is subsidiary in scale to the main house, and that the rear extension, and the rear dormer as conditioned by the Planning Authority, will not have an adverse or overbearing impact on adjoining residential amenity or visual amenities in the area, and is consistent with Section 12.3.7.1 of the Dún Laoghaire County Development Plan in relation to extensions to dwellings. In the event of a grant of planning permission, I would concur with the Planning Authority in attaching a condition that the rear dormer shall be set down from the roof ridgeline, and that the stairwell dormer window is also reduced in scale, in accordance with the details submitted.
- 8.2.10 While noting that the Planning Authority has no comment on the appeal, being satisfied that the assessment carried out, and the decision to grant permission, is in accordance

with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, the key appeal matters relate to the impact of the proposed works on the uniformity of the pair of Kenny-designed dwellings at nos. 7 and 8 Sycamore Crescent.

8.2.11 The Third Party is particularly concerned that fenestration of the proposed two-storey extension, specifically the lowering of sill heights and style of window, is inconsistent with the existing fenestration on the original building, and, by association, the Third Party's adjoining dwelling at no. 7 Sycamore Crescent. The Third Party is also concerned about the removal and infilling of the undercroft of the porch area. It is contended that the proposed alterations are not in keeping with Section 11.4.3.2 Policy Objective HER21 of the Plan as the original windows and undercroft are features that contribute to the character of the dwelling.

8.2.12 The applicant's response to the Third Party appeal details that the front window sizes of the proposed extension to the side of the property have been revised to align with the existing proportions and character, and the proposed brickwork will match existing. The Third Party response states that the proposed change is welcome.

8.2.13 In the context of Section 11.4.3.2 Policy Objective HER21 of the Plan, I would agree that the proposed revised fenestration submitted by the applicant in response to the Third Party appeal is a more appropriate solution, and, in the event of a grant of permission, I would recommend the attachment of a condition requiring the fenestration of the proposed extension to be as per Drawing No. 3.1.400_Rev_B submitted to the Board on 7th May, 2025.

8.2.14 In relation to the Removal/Infill of the Undercroft and Arch Treatment, I note that in response to the Third Party appeal, the applicant proposes to retain the entrance porch design to match the adjacent property, but does not propose to omit the proposed infill of the undercroft, on the basis that it is necessary to provide livable accommodation and ensure adequate natural light. As a concession, the arched front door is proposed to be modified in design to align with the adjacent property.

8.2.15 The Third Party contends that the infilling of the undercroft erodes the architectural narrative, rendering the dwelling indistinct and diluting its original character.

8.2.16 I would agree that the applicant's proposal to retain the original entrance porch design in response to the Third Party appeal is welcome, as it will ensure that the character of the pair of semi-detached dwellings is maintained.

8.2.17 I fully acknowledge that the applicant has made a number of amendments to the original design on foot of the RFI and in response to the Third Party's concerns raised during the application stage and at appeal.

8.2.18 I am also cognisant of the Planning Authority's acceptance, subject to conditions, of the proposed development as revised in response to the RFI, and in response to the appeal.

8.2.19 However, I do consider the Third Party's concerns regarding the infill of the undercroft to be valid, particularly having regard to the precedent established at no. 16 Sycamore Road. The relatively small area of internal accommodation to be gained by infilling same has to be weighed up against the overall heritage value of its retention in the context of Section 11.4.3.2 Policy Objective HER21 of the Plan, notwithstanding that the property is not Protected or listed on the NIAH.

8.2.20 For this reason, it is my recommendation that, in the event of a grant of permission, that a revised design is submitted retaining the undercroft in situ, in the interests of preserving the visual and historic character and coherence of the pair of dwellings.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1 I have considered the 2 storey extension to side and rear, garage, balcony, rooflights, dormer, and all associated internal and external works at 8 Sycamore Crescent, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Co. Dublin in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located c. 1.71km to the south-west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024) and the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210).

The proposed development comprises a 2 storey extension to side and rear, garage, balcony, rooflights, dormer, and all associated internal and external works at 8 Sycamore Crescent, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Co. Dublin.

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 it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale of the works and the nature of the development

- Location - distance from nearest European site and lack of connections

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1 I recommend permission is granted for the following reasons and considerations.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential zoning objective, the character of existing development in the area, the design, scale and massing of the proposed development, and the provisions of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028, in particular Section 12.3.7.1 (Extensions to Dwellings), and policy objective HER21: Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Buildings, Estates and Features, it is considered that, subject to conditions, the proposed development would constitute an acceptable form of development at this location and would not seriously injure the residential amenity of surrounding properties. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 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 received by the planning authority on the 24th February, 2025, and by An Bord Pleanála on 7th May, 2025, 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 and the development shall be retained, carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed development shall be amended as follows:</p> <p>(a) The proposed rear dormer shall be carried out and completed in accordance with Drawing No. 3.1 402 (3-3) submitted to the planning authority on 26th November, 2024.</p> <p>(b) The stairwell dormer window shall be carried out and completed in accordance with Drawing No. 3.1 402 Rev A (3-3) submitted to the planning authority on 24th February, 2025.</p> <p>(c) The fenestration of the proposed extension is to be carried out and completed in accordance with Drawing No. 3.1.400_Rev_B received by An Bord Pleanála on 7th May, 2025.</p> <p>(d) The proposed infill of the undercroft on the front elevation is not permitted. The existing infill is to be retained.</p> <p>Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development</p> <p>Reason: In order to appropriately integrate with the adjacent dwelling and the streetscape, and in the interest of visual amenity.</p>
3.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection to the public water supply and wastewater collection</p>

	<p>network.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.</p>
4.	<p>The attenuation and 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: In the interest of public health.</p>
5.	<p>All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.</p>
6.	<p>Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.</p>
7.	<p>A comprehensive boundary treatment and landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to commencement of development. The boundary treatment and landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed scheme.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
8.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution of 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</p>

	<p>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.</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.

Aiden O'Neill
Planning Inspector

18th June, 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-322226-25		
Proposed Development Summary	2 storey extension to side and rear, garage, balcony, rooflights, dormer, and all associated internal and external works.		
Development Address	8 Sycamore Crescent, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Co. Dublin.		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)	Yes	√	
	No		
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			Proceed to Q3.
No	√		Tick if relevant. No further action required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No			Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes			Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No		
Yes		

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2 - AA Screening Determination Test for likely significant effects

AA Screening where no screening report was submitted, and no significant AA issues arise.

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects				
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics Case file: ABP-322226-25				
Brief description of project	Normal Planning appeal Permission for 2 storey extension to side and rear, garage, balcony, rooflights, dormer, and all associated internal and external works.			
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	The proposed development site is located at There are no watercourses or other ecological features of note on the site that would connect it directly to European Sites in the wider area.			
Screening report	No South Dublin County Council screened out the need for AA.			
Natura Impact Statement	No			
Relevant submissions	None			
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development	Ecological connections	Consider further in screening Y/N
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024) South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210).	14 no. bird species https://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/spa/004024 4no. habitats https://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/sac/000210	1.71km	No direct connection Possible indirect	Y
The proposed development site is located c.1.71km to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024) and the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210)				

Further Commentary / discussion

Due to the location of the development site and the distance between the site and the nearest designated site, I consider that the proposed development would not be expected to generate impacts that could affect anything but the immediate area of the development site, thus having a very limited potential zone of influence on any ecological receptors.

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites
AA Screening matrix

Site name	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
Site South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024) Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046] Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130] Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) [A137] Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141] Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143] Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144] Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149] Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157] Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162] Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179] Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) [A192] Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193] Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999] South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210)	Direct: none Indirect: localized, temporary, low magnitude impacts from noise, dust and construction related emissions to surface water during operation	The contained nature of the site (defined site boundaries, no direct ecological connections or pathways) and distance from receiving features connected to the SPA make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SPA for the SCI listed. Conservation objectives would not be undermined.
	Direct: none Indirect:	The contained nature of the site (defined site boundaries, no

Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]	localized, temporary, low magnitude impacts from noise, dust and construction related emissions to surface water during operation	direct ecological connections or pathways) and distance from receiving features connected to the SAC make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SAC for the SCI listed. Conservation objectives would not be undermined.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site I conclude that the proposed development (alone or in combination with other plans and projects) would not result in likely significant effects on a European Site. No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.		
Screening Determination		
Finding of no likely significant effects In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) or any other European site, in view of the sites Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.		
This determination is based on:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The small scale of the works and the nature of the development• Location - distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.		

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____