



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322307-25

Development	House extension.
Location	17 Coolamber Park, Knocklyon, Dublin 16.
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD25B/0045W.
Applicant	Elaine Kearns.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission subject to conditions.
Type of Appeal	First v. Condition.
Appellant	Elaine Kearns.
Observers	None.
Date of Site Inspection	30 June 2025.
Inspector	B. Wyse

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. No.17 Coolamber Park is a semi-detached house within an estate of similar houses, probably dating from the 1970's/1980's. No.17 retains what appears to have been the original feature recessed entrance door and car port/storage area behind an archway. In most of the houses in the vicinity this feature has been modified through a variety of interventions, from closing in the area to provide a room and moving the entrance door flush with the house frontage to closing in the area and adding a front extension projecting forward of the front façade. The latter extensions are very varied in terms of design and scale.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is a single storey front extension that comprises enclosing and extending the car port area to provide a bathroom, living room and an extended hall and porch area. The substantive extension would project 2050mm from the front façade of the house with a proposed bay window to the new room projecting a further 450mm, giving an overall projection of 2500mm. The extension would have a flat roof with parapet. External finishes would match existing.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The decision to grant permission is subject to 7 conditions. All are standard except Condition 2, the condition under appeal. This condition states as follows:

2. Amendments.

Prior to the commencement of development the applicant, owner or developer shall submit the following for the written agreement of the Planning Authority: Revised plans that demonstrate the front extension reduced in depth to project a maximum of 1.5m in depth from the main front building line of the subject dwelling, in accordance with the SDCC House Extension Design Guide.

REASON: In the interests of orderly development, and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

Basis for planning authority decision. Includes:

- *While a driveway depth in excess of 6m would be retained in line with the proposed front extension, the element of same projecting beyond the front building line of the main dwelling as proposed, by reason of depth and the uniform front building line of the subject dwelling and adjacent properties, would not accord with the provisions of BFP2. As the principle of the proposed front extension is considered acceptable, the depth of the front extension element can be amended by **condition** to project a maximum of 1.5m from the main front building line of the existing dwelling to ensure compliance with the SDCC House Extension Design Guide.*
- No requirement for appropriate assessment, environmental impact assessment or screening for environmental impact assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Roads Department – no objections.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None relevant.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None received.

4.0 Planning History

None relevant.

The planning authority Planners report refers to a number of front extensions in the vicinity:

PA Refs SD19B/0189 (No.12); SD11B/0304 (No.21); and SD00B/0064 (No.18).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

South Dublin County Development Plan (SDCC) 2022-2028

Zoning Objective RES – *To protect and/or improve residential amenity.*

SDCC House Extension Design Guide 2025

Section 1.1 includes:

The Council has prepared this House Extension Design Guide to supplement policies and guidance in the County Development Plan and to provide advice on how to achieve well designed extensions and residential development.

Whilst it is important to provide a standardised set of rules and principles for design approaches, SDCC is cognisant of the fact that design is subjective.

In general all house extensions in urban areas of the county shall have regard to this guide...

The contents of the guide is considered applicable to most site and circumstances within SDCC's functional area, however there may be cases where there are deviations from the guide due to on site constraints or design parameters. Additionally, proposed alterations and extensions may be extremely innovative and creative, and therefore a more flexible approach may need to be applied when using the guide to assess proposals.

Section 3.2.2 Built Form Principle (BFP2) includes:

Front Extensions

- *Should not dominate the front elevation of the house.*
- *Should not exceed 1.5 metres in depth where there is a regular/uniform front building line along the street.*
- *Should retain a driveway depth of 6 metres.*
- *Should complement the design and materials used in the main house...*

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

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. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 Water Framework Directive (WFD)

I have considered the proposed development in the light of the objectives of Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive, which seeks to protect and where necessary, restore surface and groundwater to reach good status and prevent deterioration. Having regard to the nature, small scale and location of the proposed development in a serviced urban area, I am satisfied that there is no conceivable risk to any water body from the proposed development. No further assessment is required.

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

This is a first party appeal against Condition 2 only of the planning authority decision. The main grounds can be summarised as follows:

- In response to the planning authority condition the applicants are now proposing to revise the depth of the proposed extension to 2.2m.
- It is submitted that this would allow the extension to sit comfortably in line with the neighbouring property immediately adjacent, or just slightly behind it. It would integrate more harmoniously with the established pattern of front extensions on the street.
- Both neighbouring properties have had front extensions for many years and each extends well beyond the 1.5m limit currently set out in Condition 2. Setting back the proposed extension by the full metre required would create a noticeable misalignment in the building line.
- The extension would still leave generous off-street parking space.

- With reference to the house extension design guide the front building line has already evolved. A small allowance here would not set an unwelcome precedent but rather reflect and respect the character of the immediate surroundings.

8.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority confirms its decision. The issue raised has been covered in the Chief Executive Order.

8.3. Observations

None.

9.0 Assessment

- 9.1. This is an appeal against Condition 2 only of the planning authority decision. I am satisfied, having regard to the nature of the condition, that determination of the application as if it had been made to the Commission in the first instance is not warranted. The appeal, therefore, can be dealt with under the terms of Section 139 of the Act.
- 9.2. The SDCC House Extension Design Guide 2025, as the name suggests, is in the nature of guidance. While extremely useful its provisions need to be applied with reasonableness and flexibility rather than as mandatory standards as has been done in this case by the planning authority. The former approach is clearly signalled in the opening provisions of the guide (see Section 5.1 above).
- 9.3. In this case it is clear that the front building line along Coolamber Park, as referenced by the applicants, has been significantly modified over the years with the addition of extensions of varying dimensions and designs. Many of these, including those of the immediate neighbouring properties to No.17, easily exceed 1.5m in depth.
- 9.4. While the proposed extension in this case, at an overall depth of 2.5m but with bulk of the extension extending to 2.05m, may extend slightly further than some of the existing extensions, I see no substantive basis, in terms of scale or design or effect

on neighbouring properties, to impose the restriction sought by the planning authority. And the planning authority has not advanced any such substantive argument either – its decision is simply based on an assumed requirement to comply with the guideline dimension of 1.5m advised in the guidance document and a reference to the existing uniform building line in the vicinity which is clearly not correct (see section 3.2.1 above).

- 9.5. It follows that I do not consider it necessary to require the extension to be reduced in depth as suggested by the applicants. The proposed reduction by 300mm would not, in my view, make any significant difference.
- 9.6. Finally, the Commission might note that the three history cases in the vicinity referenced in the planning authority planners report (see Section 4.0 above) relate, respectively, to permissions for 1.5m, 2.24m and c.2m deep front extensions of varied design. This is not to say that I would place any emphasis on the precedent issue in any event.

10.0 Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening

- 10.1. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project within an established urban area, and taking account of the screening determination of the planning authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 10.2. 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. Appropriate Assessment, therefore, is not required.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that the Commission should direct the planning authority to remove Condition 2.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the scale and design of the proposed extension, the absence of any significant negative effects on properties in the vicinity, the varied form of existing extensions in the area and the provisions of the SDCC House Extension Design Guide 2025, it is considered that the imposition of the said condition is not warranted.

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.

B. Wyse
Planning Inspector

18 July 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	House extension.
Development Address	17 Coolamber Park, Knocklyon, Dublin 16
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input type="checkbox"/> X Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input type="checkbox"/> X No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> X No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of	

<p>proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X</p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ **B. Wyse** **Date:** _____ **18 July 2025**

INTENTIONALLY BLANK.