



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-322891-25

Development	Protected Structure: Alterations to roof and fenestration, rear extension, garden room and all associated works.
Location	The Priory, Monkstown Road, Monkstown, Blackrock, Dublin, A94F6Y2 (a Protected Structure)
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25A/0305/WEB
Applicant(s)	Caroline Moloney
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Caroline Moloney
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	15 th September 2025.

Inspector

Carol Smyth

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1. Decision	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
5.1. Development Plan.....	8
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	10
5.3. EIA Screening	10
6.0 The Appeal	10
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	10
6.2. Applicant Response	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3. Planning Authority Response	11
6.4. Observations	11
6.5. Further Responses.....	11
7.0 Assessment.....	11
8.0 AA Screening.....	18
9.0 Recommendation.....	20
10.0 Reasons and Considerations	Error! Bookmark not defined.
11.0 Conditions	Error! Bookmark not defined.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site has a stated area of 0.426 ha and is located within the administrative boundary of Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council, approximately 400 metres to the west of Monkstown Village. The subject site is a corner site located on the southern side of Monkstown Road at the junction of Monkstown Road and Monkstown Way. The surrounding urban context is predominately residential in nature, characterised by a mix of protected structures and more recently constructed dwellings comprising a variety of architectural typologies and styles. Access to the site is from Monkstown Road.
- 1.2. The subject site contains a two-storey over basement, detached Gothic style house which is a Protected Structure and a two-storey gate lodge. The original dwelling was constructed between the 1820's and 1830's and has since been altered and extended. A two-storey over basement level, flat roofed extension, has been constructed to the eastern side of the main dwelling under DLRD Reg. Ref. D16A/0156 and a one storey over basement level, flat roofed extension has been constructed to the west of the Protected Structure under DLRD Reg. Ref. D15A/0710. The site slopes from front to rear and existing dwelling is two storeys to the front and three storey to the rear.
- 1.3. The dwelling is setback from the street with a large front garden which comprises a tennis court. The large rear garden is fully enclosed by mature trees and hedging.
- 1.4. The site is bounded by No. 65 Monkstown Road and Beaumont Downs to the east, Omev Lodge and the roadway of Beaupark Downs to the south, and public lands consisting of mature trees to the west.

2.0 Proposed Development

Planning permission sought for:

- (i) Change of roof profile atop existing side extension at first floor level (granted under Reg. Ref. D16A/0156) from flat roof to hipped roof and extension of the building southwards at this location by 30sqm;
- (ii) The removal of 1 no. existing window and providing for 1 no. circular window to eastern elevation, the replacement of 2 no. existing windows to the north

and south, and the provisions of painted timber windows to the north, south, and east elevation of the new bedroom and its en-suite;

- (iii) The provision of a 43.3sqm single storey garden room along the western boundary of the rear garden; and;
- (iv) All ancillary landscaping, SuDS drainage, and site works necessary to facilitate development. The proposed works will result in the existing 4 bedroom house now comprising 5 bedrooms and the provision of a rear garden room.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council issued a notification of decision to Refuse Permission on the 4th June 2025, due to impacts of the proposed development on the character of the Protected Structure and the Monkstown ACA. The reason for refusal is as follows:

1. *The proposed works notably (1) change of roof profile atop existing side extension at first floor level from flat roof to hipped roof and extension of the building southwards at this location by 30sqm and (2) provision of a 43.3sqm single storey garden room along the western boundary of the rear garden would disrupt the architectural expression and composition of the Protected Structure and the Monkstown ACA. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Policy Objective HER 8 and Section 12.11.2.1 of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan, 2022-2028, which seeks to protect Protected Structures from any works that would negatively impact upon their special character and appearance. Furthermore, the proposed development is not in accordance with the DLR Monkstown Architectural Conservation Area – Character Appraisal & Recommendations.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planners report recommendation is consistent with the notification decision issued.

The report considered that the proposed change of roof profile from a flat roof to hipped roof and the extension to the south at first floor level of the two-storey, over basement existing extension to the eastern side of the main dwelling would negatively impact upon the character of the Protected Structure. In addition, the Planning Authority considered the proposed garden room structure to be over-scaled. The proposal was deemed not in compliance with the relevant policies and the provisions of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage

The Drainage section raised no objection to the development subject to a condition in relation to surface water runoff from the proposed garden room to the proposed raised rainwater planters.

- Conservation

The Conservation section was not supportive of the proposal and considered the proposed development to be contrary to Policy Objective HER8, Section 12.11.2.1, HER13 and Section 12.11.4 and recommended refusal.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None received.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. The following planning history relates to the appeal site:

4.1.1. DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D16A/0156

Permission granted for amendments to Reg. Ref. D15A/0710 in relation to new extension to east of the Protected Structure. The extension is reduced in scale with a flat roof and more contemporary aesthetic, accommodating family rooms with external terrace and boot room to ground floor, one bedroom and en-suite to first floor and gymnasium and storage facilities to lower ground floor.

DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D15A/0710

Split decision issued.

Permission granted for the western extension and internal alterations to the Protected Structure.

Permission refused for the eastern extension and associated works. The reason for refusal related to the scale and architectural expression of the extension and its over-powering impact on the character of the Protected Structure which detracts from its architectural significance. The proposal is contrary to Policy AR8 and DM4 of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2010-2016.

DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D10A/0208

Permission granted for the construction of 1 no. 2 storey 4-bedroom house at lower and ground floor level within the grounds of the Priory (on site of former sunken tennis courts). The dwelling was not constructed.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Guidance

5.1.1. Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011)

The Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines provides a framework to ensure the protection, conservation and sensitive management of architectural heritage and provides advice and guidance on alterations and extensions in historic contexts.

5.2. Development Plan

5.2.1. The site is governed by the policy and objectives of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 (referred to hereafter as the Development

Plan). The site is zoned 'A' with the objective to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting existing residential amenities.

Residential development is listed within the 'Permitted in Principle' category of this zoning objective.

- 5.2.2. The site is a Protected Structure and listed on the Record of Protected Structures (RPS) Ref: 704. Policy Objective HER 8 of the Development Plan seeks to protect the character and special interest of Protected Structures against any works that would negatively impact their distinctive character and appearance.
- 5.2.3. The site is situated within the Monkstown Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). Policy Objective HER 13 of the Development Plan seeks to protect the character and special interest of the ACA ensuring high quality and sensitive design is permitted which is sensitive to the scale of surrounding development.
- 5.2.4. The Monkstown ACA Character Appraisal & Recommendations Report sets out policy and objectives in relation to any development including modifications and/or alterations or extensions affecting structures within the Monkstown ACA and seeks to protect the character of the structure and its setting and context within the ACA.
- 5.2.5. Chapter 11 Heritage and Conservation includes specific objectives and guidance relating to the protection of the County's heritage under the headings of archaeological heritage, architectural heritage, and countywide heritage (which includes the DLR Heritage Plan).
- 5.2.6. Section 12.11.2.1 Works to a Protected Structure, provides guidance in relation to works to protected structures including extensions, alterations and change of use etc.
- 5.2.7. Sections 12.11.3 Architectural Conservation Areas (ACAs) and 12.11.4 New Development within an ACA, provides guidance in relation to works within ACAs and requires a sensitive design approach for any development proposals in order to respect the established character and urban morphology.
- 5.2.8. Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan provides development standards for extensions and alterations to dwellings.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is situated approximately circa 337 metres from the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and South Dublin Bay SAC, and from the South Dublin Bay proposed NHA.

5.4. EIA Screening

See EIA Pre-Screening Form 1 in Appendix 1. The development is not a class of development requiring mandatory or sub-threshold EIA and therefore there is no EIA Screening requirement.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

This is a First Party appeal against the Planning Authority's decision to refuse permission. An alternative design option prepared by Tyler Owens Architects, has been submitted by the First Party in support of the grounds of appeal. In addition, the grounds of appeal include a Planning Report prepared by Hughes Planning Consultants, a Conservation Impact Report prepared by Historic Building Consultants and photomontages prepared by ArchFX.

The following provides a summary of the content of the appeal:

- The proposal as originally submitted to Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Council under Reg. Ref. DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D25A0305/WEB on the 15th April is consistent with the provisions of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan, does not negatively impact upon the character of the Protected Structure or the Monkstown ACA. The First Party requests that An Coimisiún Pleanála consider this option in the first instance.
- Should An Coimisiún Pleanála agree with the Planning Authority decision to refuse permission, an alternative design option has been submitted to be considered by the Commission.
- The First Party states that the alternative design option reduces the overall scale, bulk and height of the proposed extension and garden room and includes the

removal of architectural details such as the rear entablature and circular window, thereby improving the relationship between the Protected Structure and the development.

- The First Party further contends that the alternative design option minimises the impact on the ACA and existing protected trees through the reduction in height and massing of the proposed structures preserving the setting of the Protected Structure and the ACA.
- The First Party highlights several similar planning precedents within the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown administrative area.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the Planning Authority would justify a change in attitude to the proposed development.

6.3. Observations

None on file.

6.4. Further Responses

None on file.

7.0 Assessment

Having examined the applications details and all other documentation on file, including the submission received in relation to the appeal, the report/s of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Site Planning History
- Impacts on the Character of the Protected Structure
- Impacts on the Character of the Monkstown Architectural Conservation Area

7.1. Site Planning History

- 7.1.1. The site is zoned 'A' with the objective to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting existing residential amenities. Residential development is permitted in principle under this zoning objective. The site is also located within the Monkstown Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).
- 7.1.2. This site has an established planning history. A split decision was issued under DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D15A/0710 on the 17th February 2016, where permission was granted for an extension to the west of the Protected Structure and for internal alteration works. Given the changes in level across the site, the western extension reads as a single storey extension to the front of the Protected Structure and a two-storey extension to the rear.
- Permission was refused for an eastern extension which reads as a two-storey extension to the front of the Protected Structure and a three-storey extension to the rear. The reason for refusal related to the scale and architectural expression of the extension, and its overbearing impact on the character of the Protected Structure, which the Planning Authority considered would detract from the architectural significance of the Protected Structure. The Planning Authority also considered that the proposal was not subsidiary to the Protected Structure and was contrary to Policy AR8 and DM4 of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2010-2016.
- 7.1.3. On the 25th August permission was granted under DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D16A/0156 for amendments to DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D15A/0710 for a revised eastern extension. The extension, now constructed, was reduced in scale and comprised a flat roof and a more contemporary aesthetic. The footprint of the first floor was significantly setback from the primary rear elevation of the Protected Structure than that previously proposed to reduce the overall massing of the proposal in terms of its relationship to the Protected Structure. The proposed development now seeks to extend this extension to the south at first floor level, and extend and replace the entire flat roof of the eastern extension with a hipped roof profile.
- 7.1.4. The First Party appeal refers to several planning precedents within the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown administrative area. I have had regard to the planning precedents submitted, however notwithstanding, appeal cases are assessed and determined on their own merits having regard to the sensitivity of the receiving

environment and the specifics of the proposed development. Therefore, I do not consider the precedents highlighted by the First Party relevant to the assessment of the proposed development and grounds of appeal.

7.2. Impacts on the Character of the Protected Structure

The First Party appeal against the Planning Authority's decision to refuse permission, requests that An Coimisiún Pleanála review the proposal as submitted to the Planning Authority, under DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D25A/0305/WEB, in the first instance. The First Party contends that the proposal complies with the policy and objectives of the Development Plan and does not negatively impact upon the Protected Structure.

The First Party has also submitted an alternative design proposal for the development also to be considered by An Coimisiún Pleanála, should the Commission consider the original planning application proposal to be unacceptable.

I will therefore assess both proposals in terms of their impact on the character Protected Structure in the sections below.

7.2.1. Original Proposal Submitted under DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D25A/0305/WEB

The First Party contends that the proposal as submitted under DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D25A/0305/WEB is representative of a high-quality development, which provides a modest first floor extension to the rear of the existing eastern extension (as constructed under the grant of permission DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D16A/0156) and an appropriately scaled garden room structure, to provide for the evolving needs of the applicant's household. The First Party contends the development respects the character and setting of the Protected Structure.

- 7.2.2. The scheme submitted under DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D25A/0305/WEB, proposes revisions to the eastern extension of the Protected Structure, previously granted and constructed under DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D16A/0156. It is proposed to replace the existing flat roof of the extension with a hipped roof and extend the first floor of the extension southwards to the rear by 30sqm. The extension projects circa 5.4 metres from the existing rear elevation at first floor level and aligns with the rear elevation of the Protected Structure. The proposed extension comprises side and rear facing box bay windows and is offset approximately 2.3 metres from an existing two storey

bay window to the east side of the Protected Structure. The extension provides an additional ensuite bedroom for the dwelling, thereby providing 5 no. double bedrooms with ensuites at first floor level.

- 7.2.3. A detached single storey garden room structure is also proposed along the western boundary of the rear garden. The proposed garden room is positioned within the footprint of an existing outdoor seating area and has an overall stated floor area of 43.3 sqm. The structure comprises a double hipped roof set behind a parapet and has an overall height of 5.2 metres.
- 7.2.4. The Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment (AHIA) submitted to the Planning Authority in conjunction with the planning application material, considers the proposed alterations and additions to be modest in scale in comparison with the existing house. The AHIA also considers that the proposal will blend in with the existing buildings without an adverse impact on the character of the Protected Structure. The AHIA further states that the proposed garden room, through its siting, will not obstruct the rear elevation of the Protected Structure, being offset to the western side and located southward from the house.
- 7.2.5. The Planning Authority considered that the proposal represented over-development of the Protected Structure, its setting and curtilage. It was considered that the increased height of the roof profile, together with the increased scale, bulk and massing of the eastern extension, collectively adversely affected the architectural significance and presence of the Protected Structure. The Conservation Report highlighted that the proposal to extend forward to meet the rear building line of the Protected Structure at first floor level, would obscure a bay window on the eastern elevation of the Protected Structure. In addition, the Conservation Section considered that the circular window on the east elevation should be omitted as it added unwarranted architectural detail.
- 7.2.6. The Planning Authority also raised concerns in relation to the proposed garden room in terms of its scale and height. The Conservation Officer considered that the proposed structure encroaches upon the setting and appreciation of the Protected Structure and that the proposal as currently presented is contrary to HER8 of the Development Plan.

- 7.2.7. In terms of policy and guidance, Section 12.11.2.1 Works to a Protected Structure and Policy Objective HER8 of the Development Plan seeks to protect buildings listed on the Record of Protected Structures from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance, and also seeks to ensure that any development proposals to Protected Structures have regard to the '*Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities*'. Furthermore, Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan provides development standards for extensions and alterations to dwellings and requires design to be proportionate to the parent dwelling.
- 7.2.8. The '*Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, (2011)*', acknowledges *inter alia* that it will often be necessary to permit appropriate new extensions to protected structures to make them fit for modern living. The Guidelines further note that the cumulative effect of minor additions can compromise the special interest of a protected structure, and that any new extension proposal should ensure that important features of a protected structure are not obscured, damaged or destroyed.
- 7.2.9. After visiting the site and having regard to the contents of the AHIA, the documents submitted with the First Party appeal, I am not satisfied that the extension as submitted to the Planning Authority will not have a negative impact on the Protected Structure.
- 7.2.10. The proposed first floor extension aligns with the rear elevation of the Protected Structure. I consider that the extension, in terms of its scale and footprint and in combination with its hipped roof structure, adds additional bulk and height to the eastern extension. The proposal would appear overbearing in combination with the existing eastern extension, would not be considered subordinate to the main house and would therefore detract from the character and significance of the Protected Structure.
- 7.2.11. I further consider that the circular window on the east facing side elevation and rear facing box bay window of the proposed extension adds unnecessary detail and visual clutter to the extension that would detract from the original external architectural features, detailing and appearance of the Protected Structure.

7.2.12. In addition, while I do not have concerns regarding the footprint of the proposed garden room or its impact on existing boundary trees, given its position on an existing hard standing area, I am concerned regarding the height and architectural detailing of the proposed garden room. I consider that the roof design of the garden room is unnecessarily complex, adds additional bulk and scale to the proposed structure which detracts from the setting and context of the Protected Structure.

7.2.13. I therefore consider that the proposal as submitted to the Planning Authority under DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D25A/0305/WEB is contrary to HER 8 and Section 12.11.2.1 of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 and should be refused.

7.2.14. Alternative Design Option submitted in conjunction with the First Party Appeal

To address the Planning Authority's reason for refusal the First Party have submitted an alternative design proposal for the development for consideration by An Coimisiún Pleanála. The Conservation Impact Report and the Planning Report submitted in conjunction with the First Party grounds of appeal, considers that the alternative design proposal addresses the Planning Authorities reason for refusal by modifying the roof design, extension and garden room.

7.2.15. The revised proposal reduces the depth and footprint of the first-floor extension and retains and extends the existing flat roof structure over the additional floor area to the rear. The roof structure of the extension will therefore not be visible from the front of the house. The revised first-floor extension has an overall floor area of 24sqm, reduced from the 30sqm previously proposed. The proposed extension projects approximately 4.1 metres from the rear elevation of the existing first floor extension. The internal layout of the first floor has been revised to provide an additional double bedroom and a 'Jack and Jill' bathroom shared with the existing double bedroom in the extension.

7.2.16. The extension maintains the setback of approximately 2.3 metres (as previously proposed) from the existing two-storey bay window to the master bedroom on the eastern elevation of the Protected Structure. I note the previous concerns raised by the Conservation Officer in relation to the bay window. I also note that there is an additional rear facing window in the master bedroom. I am therefore satisfied that the bedroom would receive adequate daylight. Furthermore, I note that the existing

eastern extension at upper ground floor level, wraps around the lower level of the two-storey bay window. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed extension will not cause a significantly greater impact at first floor level on the two-storey bay window than the impact already resulting from the existing extension at upper ground floor level. I also consider that the change in roof profile from hipped roof to flat roof and the subsequent reduction the bulk and mass of the proposed extension will also lessen the impact of the development on the existing bay window in terms of daylight and overbearance.

- 7.2.17. I consider that the proposed flat roof profile, the reduction in architectural detailing such as the removal of a rear facing box bay window and the omission of the circular window on the side elevation, reduces the impact of the proposed extension on the character and significance of the Protected Structure. The proposed revised extension matches the height and profile of the existing flat roof structure of the existing eastern extension and maintains a setback from the upper ground floor level below which serves to reduce the overall massing of the extension. I further note that proposed revised extension matches the existing extension in terms of materiality and architectural detailing. On balance, I am satisfied regarding the scale, height and architectural expression of the alternative design proposal at first floor level.
- 7.2.18. The First Party contends that the scale of the garden room has also been reduced in the revised proposal. I note that the proposed floor area remains at 43sqm and that the double hipped roof profile has been omitted and replaced with a flat roof which has a maximum height of 3.75 metres. The Conservation Officer raised concerns that the original proposal would negatively impact upon the setting and context of the Protected Structure. I am satisfied that given the proposed reduction in height and scale, the proposed garden room will not detract from the setting, context or character of the Protected Structure. Furthermore, in terms of materiality and architectural detailing, I am satisfied that of the garden room harmonises with the existing and proposed extension and the character of the Protected Structure.
- 7.2.19. Overall, I am satisfied that the alternative design proposal for the extension and garden room is subordinate to the main house, will not detract from the character or significance of the Protected Structure and accords with Section 12.11.2.1 Works to a Protected Structure and Policy Objective HER8 of the Development Plan which seeks to protect buildings listed on the Record of Protected Structures from any

works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance and ensure that any extension to a Protected Structure is sensitively sited and designed.

7.3. Impacts on the Character of the of the Monkstown Architectural Conservation Area

- 7.3.1. The First Party contends that the proposed development submitted at application stage has been sensitively sited and scaled, maintaining an appropriate separation distance from adjoining properties. The First Party considers that the proposed hipped roof profile replacing the existing flat roof of the eastern extension as submitted to the Planning Authority is more appropriate in the context of the ACA and nearby Protected Structures. It is further contended that the proposed hipped roof of the garden room structure as submitted to the Planning Authority has been designed to be consistent with the roof profile of the Protected Structure and the proposed eastern extension and does not detract from the character of the ACA.
- 7.3.2. In terms of impacts on the Monkstown ACA, I note Development Plan policy in this regard, including Policy Objective HER13, together with Sections 12.11.3 Architectural Conservation Areas (ACAs) and 12.11.4 New Development within an ACA, which provides guidance in relation to works within ACAs and requires a sensitive design approach for any development proposals in order to respect the established character and urban morphology. The Monkstown ACA Character Appraisal & Recommendations document also contains policy objectives which seek to ensure *inter alia* that any development including extensions affecting structures within the Monkstown ACA, are designed and sited appropriately and are not detrimental to the character of the structure or its setting and context within the ACA.
- 7.3.3. In terms of the original proposal submitted to the Planning Authority, I am not satisfied that the proposed roof structures would not impact on the character of the ACA. As previously noted, the proposed hipped roofs on the extension and garden room add unnecessary bulk and height to the structures and the change of roof profile from a flat roof to a hipped roof profile of the eastern extension would be visible from the front of the house and would therefore negatively impact upon the character of the ACA.

- 7.3.4. I consider that the original proposal as submitted to the Planning Authority is contrary to Policy Objective HER13, Sections 12.11.3 Architectural Conservation Areas (ACAs) and 12.11.4 New Development within an ACA of the Development Plan.
- 7.3.5. In terms of the alternative design proposal submitted in conjunction with the First Party grounds of appeal, I note the return to a flat roof profile, the reduced bulk, scale and proposed setback of the proposed extension, and the removal of unnecessary architectural detailing. Having regard to the scale of the alternative design proposal, which is not visible from the front of the dwelling, I am satisfied that the proposal would not be excessively visually incongruous or dominant in this context nor would it detract from the built heritage, character or urban morphology of the Monkstown ACA. I do not consider the proposal to be out of character with existing development in the vicinity nor does it represent over-development of the site. I am satisfied that the proposed development is in accordance HER13, Sections 12.11.3 Architectural Conservation Areas (ACAs) and 12.11.4 New Development within an ACA of the Development Plan and the Monkstown ACA Character Appraisal.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. The proposed development comprises the extension and alterations to a domestic dwelling in an established suburban area. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 8.2. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project, and taking account of the screening determination of the Planning Authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.
- 8.3. 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.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

- 9.1. Having regard to the modest nature and scale of the proposed development, it is concluded on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

10.0 Recommendation

I recommend permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 11.1.1. Having regard to the design, layout and scale of the alternative design option as submitted with the First Party grounds of appeal, it is considered that, subject to compliance with conditions below, that the proposed development would not seriously injure the character and integrity of the Protected Structure or the character of the Monkstown Architectural Conservation Area or the adjoining residential amenity of property in the vicinity and would be supported by the relevant provisions of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the revised plans and particulars lodged with the first party appeal, on the -- 27-- day of _June 2025, specifically Drawing No's 2024-28-ACP-100; 2024-28-ACP-101; 2024-28-ACP-102 and 2024-28-ACP-105 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. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2.	Apart from any departures specifically authorised by this permission, the development shall comply with the conditions of DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D16A/0156, and DLRDCC Reg. Ref. D15A/0710 unless the conditions set out hereunder specify otherwise. Reason: In the interest of clarity and to ensure that the overall development is carried out in accordance with the previous permission(s).
3.	Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.
4.	The 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. Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.
5.	(a) All foul sewage and soiled water shall be discharged to the public foul sewer. (b) Only clean, uncontaminated storm water shall be discharged to the surface water drainage system [or soakpits]. Reason: In the interest of public health.

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.

Carol Smyth

Planning Inspector

18th September 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP 322891-25
Proposed Development Summary	Protected Structure: Alterations to roof and fenestration, rear extension, garden room and all associated works.
Development Address	'The Priory', Monkstown Road, Monkstown, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, A94 F6Y2 (a Protected Structure).
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)	☐ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	☒ No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ 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
☒ 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?	
☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

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

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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____