



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322374-25

Development	House renovation and extensions
Location	1 Donnybrook Close, Donnybrook, Dublin 4
Planning Authority	Dublin City council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB2683/24
Applicant	Breda Clifford
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission subject to conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party v. decision
Appellant	Morgan Sheehy
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	2 July 2025
Inspector	B. Wyse

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. Donnybrook Close is a small cul-de-sac development of six detached houses, five two storey and one dormer bungalow. The two storey houses are all of the same design and all the houses have similar finishes, featuring brick frontages and concrete tile roofing. No.1 is the first house at the northern end of the row of the two storey houses.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of the following:

- Demolition of porch, sunroom, storeroom and detached shed.
- Removal of rooflights and replacement rooflight layout to rear.
- Infill construction of ground floor porch and extension above.
- Timber cladding to first floor bay window.
- Single storey flat roof extension to side (northwest) and rear, incorporating new rooflights and a covered terrace area.
- New sand and cement render to all external elevations.
- Enclosure of front garden with wall/fence and electric gates, including reduction in width of vehicular entrance.
- Amendments to all elevations.
- Internal reconfiguration and all associated site works.

- 2.2. The planning authority issued a further information request in relation to the following:

- Revised drawings clearly illustrating the relationship between the proposed side and rear extension and the adjoining properties.
- Revised drawings clarifying the nature of the proposed covered terrace area to the rear.

- Reconsideration of the proposed finishes to the front elevation to ensure the scheme is more sympathetic to the character and streetscape of Donnybrook Close.
- Revised vehicular access proposals indicating a maximum width of 3m.
- Revised front garden boundary to a maximum height of 1.2m.

2.3. Further information submitted includes:

- Revised drawing site layout plan clearly illustrating the relationship between the proposed side/rear extension and neighbouring properties.
- Revised drawings indicating that the proposed side storage area and rear terrace are a single structure independent of the existing boundary walls. The store would have a flat roof of selected membrane. The terrace would have a flat roof of selected perspex/glass finish.
- Revised front elevation finishes incorporating elements of matching brick. These include brick quoins, a small brick panel above the new window at first floor level and a brick plinth.
- Revised vehicular entrance not exceeding 3m.
- Front boundary height reduced to 1.2m and now proposed in matching brick.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The decision to grant permission is subject to 10 conditions, mostly standard.

Condition 1 requires the development to be carried out as modified by the further information.

Condition 4 disallows the use of the flat roof as a balcony or terrace unless authorised by a grant of planning permission.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Basis for planning authority decision. Include:

- The proposed sand and cement render (original application) would create a dwelling that is visually dominant on the street and would appear visually out of character.
- The applicant has provided (further information) for a render finish which comprises of selected brick finish quoining detailing. It is noted that the applicant has sought to find a balance between a render finish and introducing elements of Donnybrook Close which comprises primarily of brick-finish buildings into the design through brick quoin detailing. A balance must be struck, and it is considered that the applicant has sufficiently provided for a design that is sympathetic to the streetscape of Donnybrook Close but also enables the applicant's desire for a render finish.
- It is also noted that the applicant has changed the front boundary treatment from render finish to a brick finish and reduced the height to 1.2 metres. It is considered that this has also had a positive impact on the streetscape of the area and the overall design is more sympathetic to the surrounding neighbouring properties.
- No requirement for appropriate assessment, environmental impact assessment or screening for environmental impact assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Transport Planning Division – no objection subject to standard conditions.

Drainage Division – no objection subject to standard conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No submissions received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Two submissions received. Issues raised similar to those in the grounds of appeal (see Section 8.1 below).

4.0 Planning History

None relevant.

5.0 Policy Context

Development Plan

Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

Zoning: Z1 – Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods. Objective – *To protect, provide and improve residential amenities.*

Appendix 18 Ancillary Residential Accommodation

Indicates design principles for extensions. Though there is no explicit reference to proposals for revised finishes to front elevations the following general design principles are relevant to the assessment in the subject case.

Section 1.1 General Design Principles

...residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular, the need for light and privacy the form of the existing building should be respected the development should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar or contrasting materials and finishes.

Applications for extensions to existing residential units should:

- *Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling*
- *Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight*
- *Achieve a high quality of design*
- *Make a positive contribution to the streetscape (front extensions)*

1.7 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; the appearance of the existing structure should be the reference point for any consideration of change that may be proposed. The 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.

Appendix 5 Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements

Section 4.3.5 Treatment of Front Boundaries

There are many different types of boundary treatment in existence. When considering any alterations, minimal interventions are desirable and proposals should aim to be complementary or consistent to others in the area which are of a high standard and in keeping with the overall character and streetscape.

5.1. 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

The appeal is lodged by Morgan Sheehy of 4 Donnybrook Close, a house three houses to the south of the subject property.

The main grounds may be summarised as follows:

- Even as revised (at further information stage) the application makes every effort to ensure that almost all elements of the proposed front elevation differ from houses 2-5 and that No.1 stands out and looks entirely different to the other houses in this small, unified, single design, open plan development.
- Each element of the existing façade, common to all the houses, that is to be eliminated or altered is identified.
- The proposed brick quoins do not appear on any of the other houses and are totally out of character.
- In the design of 'The Lodge', at the entrance to the cul-de-sac, every effort was made to ensure that it blended in well with the existing houses.
- If approved the proposal would result in a complete loss of the design uniformity of this small attractive development and might support a negative precedent of further demolitions of the existing matching frontages.
- The proposed front garden boundary treatment, including sliding gate, would be a real architectural shock at this very prominent part of the development.
- The submission includes suggestions as to what would be acceptable and includes photographs.

8.2. Applicant Response

Includes:

- The appeal relates solely to a small detail of the application, the front elevation treatment, and the front boundary materials.

- The modified front elevation treatment, as per the further information, which reduced the extent of the render finish and included the brick quoins to match the brick of adjacent houses, achieves an appropriate balance in the context of Donnybrook Close and is sympathetic to the existing character and streetscape.
- The third party gives the impression that the streetscape cannot be altered in any way. This is not the case.
- The change to the front boundary treatment, now comprising a brick finish and a height of 1.2m, would be sympathetic to the neighbouring properties.

8.3. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority request that the Board uphold its decision, including the attachment of a development contribution condition.

9.0 Assessment

- 9.1. The main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise.
- 9.2. The issues raised relate to the proposed front elevation changes and to the proposed front garden boundary treatment.
- 9.3. In relation to the proposed front elevation changes I agree with the applicant that the grounds advanced by the appellants lean too far in the direction of suggesting that almost no change to the front elevation of the house would be acceptable. In so far as the development plan provisions relate to this issue the design principles set down clearly contemplate the use of contrasting materials and finishes while seeking to achieve a positive contribution to the streetscape. It is also advised that materials used should complement those in the existing building (see Section 5.0 above).
- 9.4. The proposed render is clearly in contrast to the existing brick finish but, in my view, would also be quite complementary and would not detract from the overall aesthetic of the cul-de-sac development. In fact it could be argued that it would represent a more contemporary and modern intervention such as would give the overall development something of an aesthetic renewal or uplift. The proposed timber

cladding to the upper level bay window would also be complementary, in my view, and the brick plinth and panel above the new upper level window, proposed in the further information, would provide effective design references back to the original and to the adjacent houses.

- 9.5. The one area that I agree with the appellant is in relation to the proposed brick quoins. In my view, these would significantly disrupt the clean lines of the front elevation as proposed. They would introduce a foreign design element into the cul-de-sac to an overall negative effect. Their removal can be required by condition.
- 9.6. The revised proposals for the front garden boundary, as submitted in the further information, and comprising 1.2m high walls of brick to match the existing with sliding gates, would, in my view, also be reasonably complementary within the cul-de-sac development. In no sense would it give rise to an architectural shock as suggested by the appellant.

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 permission be granted subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

It is considered that the proposed development, as amended in the further information received by the planning authority on 10 March 2025 and subject to

compliance with the following conditions, would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 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 10th day of March 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 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 brick quoins shall be omitted.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
3.	<p>Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
4.	<p>The developer shall prevent any mud, dirt, debris or other building material from being carried onto or placed on the public road as a result of the construction works and shall repair any damage to the public road arising from the works.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and amenity.</p>
5.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0700 and 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 and 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 amenity of property in the vicinity.</p>
6.	<p>The flat roof on the rear extension shall not be used as a balcony or terrace unless authorised by a grant of planning permission.</p>

	Reason: To protect the residential amenities of properties in the vicinity.
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. The contribution shall be paid prior to the 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 the Board 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 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.

B. Wyse
Planning Inspector

18 July 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	House extension and modications.
Development Address	1 Donnybrook Close, Donnybrook, Dublin 4
	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"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

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

INTENTIONALLY BLANK