



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-322554-25

Development	Construction of extension
Location	6 Carrickhill Rise, Portmarnock, Co. Dublin, D13 RD73
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F25A/0222
Applicant(s)	Aisling and Bryan Dignam
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party V conditions
Appellant(s)	Aisling and Bryan Dignam
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	29/7/25
Inspector	Ronan Murphy

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at No.6 Carrickhill Rise, a residential area approximately 2.3km to the north-east of Portmarnock in north County Dublin.
- 1.2. The site is located on the northern side of Carrickhill Rise and has a stated area of c. 281.1m² and is rectangular in shape.
- 1.3. The appeal site comprises of a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling which is attached to No. 4 Carrickhill Rise to the east and is bound by No. 8 Carrickhill Rise to the west.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development comprises of a single storey flat roofed extension to the front of the dwelling. The proposed extension project c. 1.8 m from the front of the dwelling and would have a width of c.6.950m to provide an internal floor area of c.9.20m². The proposed extension would have a height of c. 2.7m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1 By order dated 8th May 2025 the Planning Authority decided to grant planning permission for the proposed development, subject to 8 conditions. Condition 3 states the following:

3. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:

(a) Reduce the depth of the proposed front extension so as to match that of the adjacent No.4 Carrickhill Rise.

(b) Amend the flat roof profile to that of a pitched and hipped roof profile to harmonise with that of No.4 Carrickhill Rise.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and sustainable development and residential amenity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.1.1 There is one planning report on file which is dated 8th May 2025. The area planner considers that the proposed development is acceptable in principle. However, the area planner's report highlights concern with respect to the depth of projection of the proposed extension which is considered excessive. Concerns were also raised with respect to the flat roof profile, and it was recommended that it be replaced with a pitched and hipped roof profile to match the adjacent No.4 Carrickhill Rise.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Water Services Department: Report dated 29/4/25 outlining no objection, subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Dublin Airport Authority: Response dated 22nd April 2025 stating that the DAA has no comment to make.

3.4. Third Party Observations

There are no third-party observations on file.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 *Appeal site*

4.1.1 No planning history.

4.2 *Site to the east*

Reg. Ref. F23A/0176: Application to remove existing pitched roof over ground floor extension to east side of house and construct single storey extension attached to side of house first floor level bedroom and bathroom with pitched roof finish and extension to kitchen ground floor level attached to rear of house with flat roof finish. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

Reg. Ref. F97B/0018: Application for Kitchen, bedroom, bathroom, w.c., lobby and living room (extension to side and rear) and porch and living room extension to front of house. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

General Area

F22A/0119: 14 Carrickhill Rise. Application for (a) a first-floor extension at side (west elevation), with existing pitched roof extended over, and 1 no. Velux roof-light at rear (north elevation). (b) a single storey extension at front (south elevation) enlarging existing study, hallway, and playroom, with new hipped roof over. (c) widening of existing vehicular entrance from 3.7 metres to 5.2 metres, including additional permeable paving to parking area, together with associated site works. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

F15B/0167: 20 Carrickhill Rise. Application for 1) Single storey ground floor extension to the front. 2) Proposed first floor extension to the side over existing dwelling. 3) Proposed 2 no. rear roof lights. 4) Amendments to all elevations, including internal alterations and all associated site works. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

F15B/0287: 22 Carrickhill Rise. Application for (1) The conversion of an existing garage to the side (2) construction of a single storey extension to the front (3) construction of a first floor to the side of the existing dwelling and (4) external insulation to all original exterior walls to the front, side, and rear. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* is the operative plan for the area. The appeal site is zoned 'RS,' Residential with the associated land use objective '*to provide for residential development and to protect and /or improve residential amenity.*' The appeal site is also located within the Dublin Airport Noise Zone C.

5.1.2 The following sections /policies / objectives are pertinent:

Section 14.10.2 Residential Extensions which supports applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend as the needs of the household

change, subject to specific safeguards. In particular, the design and layout of residential extensions must have regard to and protect the amenities of adjoining properties.

Section 14.10.2.1 Front Extensions which states that the scale, height, and projection from the front building line of the dwelling should not be excessive to dominate the front elevation of the dwelling.

SPQH41: which seeks to support the extension of existing dwellings.

SPQO43: which seeks to promote the use of contemporary / innovative design.

SPQHO45: which seeks to encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1 There are no designated sites in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. The closest sites are the North-West Irish Sea c. SPA which is c.154m to the east of the site and Malahide Estuary SAC and the Malahide Estuary pNHA which are c.179m to the north-east of the site. There is no connection to any European (Natura 2000) sites and no pathways.

5.3. EIA Screening

5.3.1 The proposed development does not come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA, that is, it does not comprise construction works, demolition or intervention in the natural surroundings. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 A first party appeal against condition 3a) and 3b) has been lodged by Aisling and Bryan Dignam. The appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The design of the extension to the front is proportionate in scale any sympathetic to the character of the streetscape.

- The design extends further than No.4 Carrickhill Rise but is modest in depth and does not dominate the frontage or impact on neighbouring properties.
- The design complements the proportions of the existing dwelling.
- There are several examples of similar or larger front extensions on neighbouring lands.
- There is no significant impact on the visual or residential amenity of No.4 or any adjoining property.
- Flat roof extensions are a recognised architectural approach for ensuring that new additions do not visually compete with the original structure.
- There are several properties in the surrounding area which have been extended using a mix of flat and pitched roof forms, reflecting a natural and acceptable variety within the streetscape.
- A flat roof reduces the overall height and bulk of the extension, which benefits neighbouring properties and minimises potential overshadowing.

The first party appeal states that they have enclosed a signed letter from the owners of No.4 Carrickhill Rise. I can not find any such letter on file.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1 Letter dated 10th June 2025 stating that the application was assessed against the policies and objectives of the *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029*, existing government policy and guidelines. The Planning Authority considered that the reduction in depth and change of roof profile of the proposed development acceptable to retain the visual uniformity of the area. The Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposed works, subject to amendment would not unreasonably compromise the residential amenity of properties within the vicinity. It is requested that the decision of the Planning Authority is upheld. If the appeal is successful then conditions relating to Section 48 Contributions, cash bonds and tree bonds as required should be included.

6.3. Observations

6.3.1 There are no observations on file.

6.4. Further Responses

6.4.1 There are no further responses on file.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. This appeal relates to a first party appeal against condition 3 a), and 3b) only. I consider that there are no other planning issues raised in the application, other than the said condition, and I recommend that the Board consider the appeal under section 139 of the Planning and Development Acts 2000, as amended, and confine its consideration to the matters raised in the appeal. Each of the conditions which have been the subject of the appeal are assessed under separate headings below.

7.2. *Condition 3(a)-Depth of the front extension*

7.2.1 With respect to condition 3a) the appellants state that while the proposed extension to the front does project further than that at No.4 Carrickhill Rise, it is proportionate in scale and does not dominate the frontage of the building or impact on neighbouring properties.

7.2.2 The area planner's report states that the depth of the proposed extension at c1.8m is excessive and would disrupt the visual uniformity of the area.

7.2.3 Having considered the plans on file, and having been on site, I do not share the concerns of the planning authority. While I note that depth of the proposed extension to the front of the dwelling is greater than the permitted extension to the front of No.6 Carrickhill Rise to the immediate east of the appeal site, it is only marginally so (c.570mm).

7.2.4 I do not consider the scale of the proposed extension to be significant having regard to permitted extensions to the front of other dwellings along Carrickhill Rise. In my opinion, the proposed development would comply with Section 14.10.2.1 of the *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* as the projection from the front building line would not be so excessive that it would dominate the front elevation of the dwelling and it would not impact on the residential amenities of either no 6 Carrickhill Rise to the east or No.8 Carrickhill Rise to the west. In addition to this the front garden would retain a depth of c.6m which is adequate to sustain car parking.

7.2.5 I am therefore satisfied that the depth of the proposal is acceptable and in my opinion condition 3(a) should be removed. I consider the condition unnecessary.

7.3. *Condition 3(b) Amend the flat roof profile to a pitched and hipped roof profile*

7.3.1 With respect to condition 3b) the appellants state that flat roof extensions are a recognised architectural approach for ensuring that new additions do not visually compete with the original structure and that the flat roof reduces the overall height and bulk of the extension, which benefits neighbouring properties and minimises potential overshadowing.

7.3.2 The area planner's report states that the flat roof should be replaced with a pitched and hipped roof profile to match the adjacent No.4 Carrickhill Rise and retain the visual uniformity of the area.

7.3.3 The proposed extension would have a height of c. 2.7m with a flat roof. While the proposed roof profile would not match that of the extension to the front of No.6 Carrickhill Rise, I am satisfied that the proposal would read as a contemporary intervention within an existing residential area and as such is acceptable.

7.3.4 In my opinion, the flat roofed design of the proposed extension would be appropriately subordinate to and would not dominate the design of the main dwelling. In addition to this, given the modest height and flat roofed design of the proposed extension, I am satisfied that there would not be any impact on the residential amenity of surrounding properties by way of overshadowing.

7.3.5 In addition to this, the flat roofed design of the extension would not impact on the visual amenity of the area. There are a number of extensions with flat roofs to the front of houses in the area (including Portmarnock Crescent to the south of the site).

7.3.6 The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable and in my opinion condition 3(b) should be removed. I consider the condition to be unnecessary.

Conclusion

7.3.7 Overall, I would have no significant concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on adjoining properties. On balance, the proposals will improve the usable floor space of the dwelling for the residents without impacting negatively on surroundings. I therefore recommend that condition 3(a) and 3(b) be removed.

8.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 8.1 Having regard to the nature and limited scale of the proposed development and the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that, the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the residential or visual amenities of the area and would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. I therefore recommend that condition 3(a) and 3(b) the Planning Authority's decision removed.

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.

Ronan Murphy
Planning Inspector

6th August 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322554-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of flat roofed single storey extension to the front of a dwelling
Development Address	6 Carrickhill Rise
	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"/> Yes, it is a 'Project.' Proceed to Q2.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, 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.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>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><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>	

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)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____