



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP – 323359-25

Development

Planning permission is sought for works to existing 5 bedroom single storey bungalow. Works to include ground floor extension to the rear, changes to fenestration, conversion of garage to the side of the dwelling and construction of a first floor extension with a screened roof terrace.

Location

Lanterna, Saint Fintan's Road, Sutton, Dublin 13, (D13 TV70)

Planning Authority

Fingal County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

F25A/0465E

Applicant(s)

Lorna and Sean Smith

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission with Conditions

Type of Appeal

First Party v's Condition

Appellant(s)

Lorna and Sean Smith

Observer(s)

Daragh Minogue

Date of Site Inspection

29 October 2025

Inspector

Vanessa Langheld

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description.....	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision.....	5
4.0	Planning History	7
5.0	Policy Context	8
6.0	EIA Screening	10
7.0	The Appeal.....	11
8.0	Assessment	15
9.0	AA Screening	19
10.0	Water Frame Directive	20
11.0	Recommendation	20
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	21
13.0	The Conditions	21

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1 The site is located off Saint Fintan's Road on the west side of Howth Head. It is situated to the east of Saint Fintan's Road in Sutton, Dublin 13. The site shares a driveway with the adjoining house, Daheim, a two storey dwelling to the immediate west. The site is bound on all sides by residential dwellings of various styles and scale. The South Hill housing estate is situated in the immediate west and north of the site, with No. 9 and 10 South Hill being located on the north side of the appeal site.

The appeal site relates to a detached house, Lanterna. The Planning Application states that the site is 0.196 ha. The site is located on a slope, with the house set

into the slope with a raised terrace to the front. It is a flat roof contemporary style detached bungalow built in the 1960's but altered several times since that time. The site slopes upwards from the south-west to the north-east and there are uninterrupted views of Dublin Bay. The house is located c. 2 m from the northern and southern boundaries and c.0.8m from the western boundary of the site.

The established character of the area is that of large-detached houses on large sites. The site slopes steeply from the southwest to the northeast and shares the lower part of the driveway with the house, Daheim, a two storey flat roofed detached dwelling with a glass balcony to the front at first floor level.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1 Planning permission is sought for works to the existing 5 bedroom single storey dwelling to include the following:

- Ground floor extension to the side and rear.
- Alterations to the existing fenestration to the ground floor with replacement of large windows beside the entrance door.
- Alterations to front elevational cladding to include smooth render finish, stone cladding to be used in place of stone and metal cladding at lower ground floor.
- Conversion of the existing garage to the side of the dwelling to be used as a gym (25 sq m).
- Construction of a partial first floor extension over part of the existing ground floor to include a mono pitched roof and screened terrace. The first floor extension will accommodate a living room (32.2 sq m, an office 7.4 sq m, a bar area of 4.5 sq m, a toilet of 2.8 sq m and an externally screened and roofed terrace of 32.7 sq m. The dimensions of the first floor extension

measure 9.5 m in depth with 2.6 m in depth of external screened area by 8.9 m in width.

- The development provides for modifications to the internal layout of the house so that the bedrooms are located to the rear of the dwelling and the living rooms to the front.
- Installation of a low pitched roof to most of the remaining ground floor.
- Landscaping and site works.

Overall, the proposed development provides for an additional 65.10 sq m of space to add to the existing floor area of 243 sq m.

The application documentation includes an Architects Design Report prepared by Brennan, Furlong Architects and Urban Planners.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision

By Order dated 16 July 2025, Fingal County Council issued a Notification of decision to grant permission for the development subject to Conditions.

Condition No. 3 relates to the modifications to the development and states:

‘3. (a) External finishes shall be as indicated on the plans submitted unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development.

(b) All bathroom / WC windows shall consist of opaque glazing. The use of films is not permitted.

(c) The screen around the first floor terrace shall be a minimum of 1.8m in height and shall consist of opaque material (glass or other).

REASON: In the interest of visual amenity.’

3.2 Planning Authority Reports

The Planning Officer notes the RS zoning of the site *‘to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity’*. The relevant policy and objectives are noted as follows:

Chapter 3 – Sustainable placemaking and Quality Homes.

Objective SPQHQ43 – Contemporary and Innovative Design Solutions.

3.5.13.1 – Residential Extensions

Objective SPQH045 – Domestic Extensions

14.6.6.4 – Overlooking and Overbearance

14.10.2.3 – Ground Floor Extensions (rear)

14.10.2.4 – First Floor Extensions

The Planning Officers Report notes that the principle of the development is acceptable in terms of its impact on the visual and residential amenity, the ground floor works are all considered acceptable.

As regards the first floor extension the Report states that *‘the addition of the screening element to the first floor terrace would reduce the impact of the perception of overlooking on the existing residential amenity of the property to the west. The nature of the materials to be used in the screen around the terrace is not clear and therefore it will be required by condition to be an opaque material. The height will also be specified to not be less than 1.8m.*

In addition, the subject site is located within a sloping terrain, this in combination with the mature trees on the subject site and within the adjacent residential site helps to reduce the impact of the first floor extension on the existing residential amenity of the area.

Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed works it is not anticipated that undue impact to adjoining residential amenities would arise in the form of overlooking, overbearance or overshadowing.’

On the above basis, the Planning Authority recommended permission be granted for the development subject to Conditions.

3.3 Other Technical Reports

Water Services had no objection subject to Condition.

3.4 Prescribed Bodies

The application was not referred to any Prescribed Bodies.

3.5 Third Party Observations

Third party objections from the owners of neighbouring properties were received during the determination of the application. Issues raised related to overlooking from the roof terrace, overlooking from new windows and general loss of privacy.

4.0 Planning History

The site has a history of applications for modifications to the original house and includes a permission for an additional house on the site, now constructed and known as Daheim to the west of the appeal house.

The Planning History of the appeal site

F14B/0036 – permission granted for a domestic garage to the side of the existing house.

F08A/0003 – permission granted and retention permission granted for the approved two storey dwelling.

F06A/1412 – Permission granted for a two storey dwelling on a site to the west of Lanterna.

F05A/1449 – Permission granted for a two storey dwelling on a site to the west of the existing dwelling.

Planning history in the vicinity

F22A/0349 – Lisselan, Saint Fintan's Road, Sutton – Permission granted for an extension of existing house to rear and sides and several other modifications to include the addition of a new first floor covered and screened external terrace.

F22A/0339 – Roebuck, Saint Fintan's Road, Sutton - extension to existing house, addition of new windows in existing walls and alterations to existing front windows and existing canopy above the front door, addition of a new first floor rear covered and screened external terrace and addition of a new external stairs and other works. This application was granted planning permission. It is noted that it provides a first floor terrace with screening at the sides and guarding at the front

F19A/0467 – Lisselan, Saint Fintan's Road, Sutton, Dublin 13 (D13XY33) – Permission granted for changes to the existing house and construction of a new two storey dwelling.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

The site is located in an area zoned RS in the Fingal Development Plan, 2023-2029 with the stated objective *'to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential development'*. The landscape character is coastal and highly sensitive and the site is located in the Buffer Zone of the Howth Special Amenity Area.

Relevant Development Plan policy and objectives are considered below:

Chapter 3 – Sustainable Placemaking and Quality Homes.

Objective SPQHQ43 – Contemporary and Innovative Design solutions, to promote the use of contemporary and innovative design solutions subject to design respecting the character and architectural heritage of the area.

Policy SPQHP41 – Residential Extensions, supports the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

Objective SPQH045 – Domestic Extensions, encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area.

Chapter 14 – Development Management Standards:

‘14.6.6.4. – Overlooking and Overbearance

Development proposals must assess levels of overbearance and potential to cause significant levels of overlooking to neighbouring properties. Issues in relation to excessive overlooking and overbearance may be addressed through relocation or reduction in building bulk and height. Mitigation measures to ameliorate overbearance should be considered and may include alterations to the bulk and massing of the proposed scheme relative to neighbouring property. Overlooking may also be addressed by appropriate design-led solutions including the sensitive placement of fenestration and balcony treatments.....

14.10.2.2 Side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on residential amenity. First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. In certain cases, a set-back of the extension’s front facade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape and avoid a ‘terracing’ effect. External finishes shall generally match the existing.

14.10.2.3 Ground Floor Extensions (rear) Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining to serve the dwelling

house. The proposed extension should match or complement the existing dwelling house.

14.10.2.4 First Floor Extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. 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.'

5.2 Natural Heritage Designations

The nearest European sites are:

Baldoyle Bay SAC (Site Code: 000199) which is located 350m to the north of the site, North Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000206) and North Bull Island (Site Code: 004006) are located c. 350m to the site. The site is also located approximately 1.03 km to the east of the Howth Head proposed Natural Heritage Area (Site Code 000202).

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 first party appeal is submitted by Downey, Chartered Planners, 29 Merrion Square on behalf of the applicants Lorna and Sean Smith. It relates to Condition No. (c) of the Fingal County permission for the development. The applicants welcome the decision of the Council to grant permission and accept that the other Conditions attaching to the permission.

The appeal against Condition No. 3 (c) relates to the requirement to install a 1.8m high screen around the first floor terrace, which is required to consist of opaque material (glass or other). The appeal includes revised drawings and 3D views showing the slatted side canopy and 1.8m opaque screens to the entire side elevations of the terrace and a 1.1m glass screen the front of the terrace. These revisions go some way to addressing Condition No. 3 (c) attaching to the permission.

The grounds of appeal are summarised below:

- Condition 3 (c) is considered entirely disproportionate and unnecessary because the proposed development gives due regard to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in its sensitive design of the first floor extension and terrace.
- The roof terrace was substantially set back from the edge of the building and the neighbouring properties. The design provides a 1.1m balustrade and would not give rise to overlooking issues.
- The requirement to surround the terrace with a 1.8 m high opaque screen would make the terrace feel claustrophobic and would block natural light from entering the room. It would also reduce the quality of the design and appear obtrusive in its form and appearance.
- The applicant would accept the screen to the sides of the terrace if the front screen could remain as a 1.1m high clear screen.
- As was the case in the appeal for a similar screen / first floor balcony to the neighbouring property Daheim, the siting of the house on the slope and the existence of mature screening reduces the impact to

neighbouring properties in terms of possible overlooking or loss of privacy.

- The enclosed nature of the terrace which would arise from it being wrapped in a 1.8m opaque screen would also give rise to overheating of the terrace and first floor extension which is unacceptable in terms of the use of the space.
- The proposed separation distances are enough to eliminate the possibility of overlooking of the adjacent properties due to distance and indirect views.

The First Party Appeal reviews in details Section 14 of the Development Plan policy as it relates to first floor extensions. It is noted that they will only be permitted if they are unlikely to significantly impact on the surrounding residential amenities. This impact is assessed under the following the headings:

- Overshadowing
- Degree of set back from mutual side boundaries.
- External finishes and design.

It is considered that the degree of setback from mutual side boundaries is enough to preserve the existing residential and visual amenity of the area without the addition of Condition 3 (c). The front of the existing dwelling faces west to the rear of the adjacent Daheim while No. 10 and No. 9 South Hill lie to the northeast and north respectively; therefore, the only direct view from the proposed roof terrace would be to the west towards Daheim. At a separation of 24.5m from the proposed roof terrace marked on the Proposed Site Plan, it exceeds the minimum separation distance.

The details of the design of the first floor extension / terrace are also noted to include measures to reduce possible injury of the existing residential amenity of adjoining properties. These measures include setback from the eaves, inset windows, and the north and south elevation walls and screening measures.

The likelihood of overlooking is further reduced by the slope of the land in a westerly direction which result in views from the roof of the appeal site being centred on the roof of the house Daheim to its front (west). There will be no overlooking of windows or garden space of Daheim the roof of the appeal house.

Combined with the mitigation measures of the sensitive design, it is considered that the 1.8m opaque screen is excessive and would create an oppressive visual dominance when viewed from both the inside and outside of the appeal house. In addition, it would eliminate any view outwards from the first floor level and negate the entire design approach for the extension.

It is important to note that there is no direct line of sight between the outward view from the proposed terrace and No. 10 South Park. The partial screening to the side of the balcony would further block the view of No. 10. It is also noted that this indirect view is also not to a habitable room of No. 10 South Hill but rather to an attic storage room. Furthermore, the distance from the proposed roof terrace to No. 10 is 28.54m which is sufficient to minimise or wholly eliminate any perception of overlooking.

It is also noted that the mature trees along the boundary of the appeal property and No. 10 were recently removed by the owners of No. 10.

As regards No. 9 South Park, the angle of the roof terrace is such that the north side screening completely screens any views northeast towards it.

Downey Planning Consultants have done extensive research on the planning history of the adjacent sites and surrounding area for the balconies and roof terraces and have not found any precedence for such a restrictive Condition on screening or any so open to interpretation.

The orientation of the roof terrace is westward and does not directly or significantly overlook the garden of No. 10 South Hill. One would have to stand at the northwest corner of the terrace at an angle to overlook No. 10 South Hill, with c. 19m to the balcony 28m to back garden / home itself.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority has responded that the application was assessed against relevant policy and guidance in the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029

and relevant national and regional guidance and policy. Ultimately the Planning Authority concluded that a grant was appropriate subject to the Conditions, including Condition No. 3 (c). Accordingly, the Planning Authority asks that the Commission uphold the decision of the Planning Authority.

7.3. Observations

Observations from the Daragh Minogue, 10 South Hill, Sutton were submitted and support Condition No. 3 (c) of the Fingal County permission for the development. The Observations are summarised as follows:

- The family have lived in the property for over 40 years and have carefully cultivated a private oasis in their south facing back garden.
- A north-west view from the proposed first floor / terrace will clearly overlook the back garden of No. 10. It is reasonable to suggest that people on the terrace would not only look straight ahead (as depicted in the First Party appeal) but also in other directions, which would significantly compromise the privacy currently enjoyed in the back garden of No. 10 South Hill.
- The aspect of Lanterna is slightly biased in the direction of No. 10 South Hill's back garden, due to the significant elevation of Lanterna compared to No. 10. There is overlooking on a daily basis which will be much more significant when a first floor living room and terrace are added to the existing house.
- Lanterna already enjoys a spectacular sea view from its west facing front patio looking directly over the roofline of Daheim. This house is way below the level of No. 10 South Hill and is far too low to be in a position to overlook anyone else and this is why the clear screen first floor balustrade was considered appropriate to the front of that Daheim.
- There is already significant overlooking from Lanterna of the kitchen / garden of No. 10 as shown in photographs attached to the observation letter.
- In 2002 planning permission was refused for a south facing attic conversion with a balcony facing Lanterna's front garden. At that time there extremely

tall Leylandii trees which were replaced and subsequently removed. Regardless of what is planted there now, there is no guarantee that any subsequent owner would not remove them.

- The pitched roof style is at odds with the original design of the building, and the house will look odd.
- The addition of a first floor extension and terrace without a screen will be unacceptable, will appear domineering and give rise to increased overlooking of an already intolerable situation. It is also unnecessary as the house is already sufficiently large and there is an existing terrace with view of the both the bay and the observers back garden.

Photographs of the view from the back of No.10 to the front of Lanterna are attached.

8.0 Assessment

I have examined the application details, and all other documentation on file including the First Party appeal, the Observation received in relation to the appeal and the Reports of the Local Authority. I have also inspected the site and have had regard to the relevant local policies and guidance.

8.1. Appeal of Condition No. 3 (c) v's need to reassess the full application

This is a first-party appeal against a Condition. The Condition under appeal is Condition No. 3 (c) attached to the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission. The precise wording of Condition No. 3 (c) is set out at Section 3.1 of this Report.

Having regard to the nature of the Condition the subject of the Appeal, it is considered that the determination by the Commission of the application, as if it had been made to it in the first instance, would not be warranted. Therefore, in my opinion, the Commission may determine the matters raised in the appeal only, in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), and I intend to limit my consideration to the matters raised in relation to the terms of that Condition.

8.2 Substantive Issues in the Appeal

In above context, I believe the primary issues to consider in this appeal are the potential impacts of the first floor extension and outdoor terrace on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, particularly No. 10 South Park, along the northern boundary.

8.3 The design of the first floor extension / outdoor terrace

The proposed design, which includes a first-floor extension and outdoor terrace, aligns well with the existing house's character.

The first-floor extension is designed as a box with a sloped roof, positioned on the existing flat roof of the single-story dwelling. Its scale is modest compared to the ground floor and set back over the central spine of the house, ensuring a substantial distance from neighbouring properties to the north and west.

The proposed windows on the seaward/west elevation will be floor-to-ceiling, situated behind a 4m deep roofed terrace and strategically placed to meet the minimum requirement of 22 meters between opposing windows. A slatted canopy screens the terrace sides, specifically designed to prevent views into the northern and southern boundaries while focusing on the views of Dublin Bay to the west.

The canopy is approximately 1m shy of the front of the terrace, with a 1.1-meter high glass balustrade extending along the remaining sides and front of the terrace. The terrace itself is 4m deep, with an overall height of 3.5m above the ground floor, incorporating a gentle mono-pitch design. The proposed first-floor living room terrace is positioned significantly further from the garden of No. 10 South Park than the existing raised ground floor terrace.

Materials and fenestration will match those of the existing and upgraded ground floor. The glazing adheres to the policy requirement to consider existing window treatments and fenestration.

8.4 Potential Overlooking and Visual Obtrusion

As indicated in Section 5.1 of this Report, a key policy consideration from the Fingal Development Plan relevant to assessing the first-floor extension and terrace is outlined in Section 14.6.6.4, which states:

“Overlooking and Overbearance. Generally, this policy stipulates that first-floor extensions will be evaluated based on levels of overbearance and potential for overlooking, and the consequent impact on the residential amenities of adjacent properties. If issues arise, the Development Plan allows for addressing them through the relocation or reduction of building bulk and height. Overlooking may also be mitigated by design-led solutions, including thoughtful placement of fenestration and balcony treatments.”

The property in question is a large-scale, single-story, flat-roof contemporary bungalow set within an area characterized by substantial houses and balconies, many featuring various types of screens, including glass, to capitalize on sea views. The dwelling is located on an elevated site with surrounding houses being principally located on lower ground. It is located significantly higher than the back garden of No. 10 South Park on its northern boundary.

The appeal house is located on an elevated site with some existing views to the back garden and dwelling of No. 10 South Park a large, detached bungalow. As a result of the steep gradient of the site no other houses are significantly overlooked. The distance from the proposed first floor terrace to No. 10 is however 28m and c. 18m to its back garden. Due to the topography, no views of the private open space of the adjacent property to the west, Daheim, will be available; rather, only its roof will be visible.

On balance, and despite the significant distance between the proposed first floor terrace and the back of No. 10 South Park because the appeal property is located uphill of No. 10, there could potentially be significant overlooking of the private open space / windows to the back of No. 10 from the front section of the terrace. There could also potentially be a degree of visual obtrusion when the terrace is in use and viewed from the private back garden of No. 10.

The impact of the first floor terrace is considerably more significant because of the elevated gradient of the site and because the ground floor of the appeal property is already raised.

8.5 Revisions sought by Condition No. 3 (c)

Accordingly, the Planning Authority has conditioned that the front and side screens must reach a height of 1.8m and include obscure glazing or other material. This amendment would address the concern regarding the impact on No. 10 but would not in my opinion, make for a well-designed terrace as it would be fully enclosed and block views of the bay.

8.6 Revisions offered by the Applicants in their First Party Appeal

In response to the appeal, the applicants have agreed to install a 1.8m high screen on the side boundaries and to extend the slatted canopy to the front boundary of the first-floor extension (see attached 3D views of the Development, Stage 2 as included in the First Party Appeal document). The front boundary is to be finished with clear glass, reaching a height of 1.1 meters.

The revised design of the proposed extension, with the living room set back 4 meters from the terrace boundary and a slatted canopy along the side boundaries will greatly reduce direct overlooking. Instances of overlooking could reasonably be expected to only occur occasionally when someone stands at the glass balustrade and looks northward. Given the 19-28m distance from the front glazed boundary to the garden boundary of No. 10, any potential overlooking should be negligible. It is also noteworthy that the boundary has recently been planted by the Applicants which will further mitigate any likelihood of overlooking.

I agree with the applicant's Planning Consultant regarding the potential impact of requiring a 1.8m opaque screen around the front and sides of the first-floor terrace, which could render it oppressive and largely unusable. My review of planning

decisions for comparable houses in the area reveals no precedent for such a Condition. Furthermore, it is unlikely that a Condition mandating opaque windows would be imposed on a similar extension without a terrace, even if a comparable level of overlooking were to occur.

In summary, I believe the design (as revised in the First Party Appeal document), coupled with the distance from the terrace to the back garden and windows of No. 10 South Park is adequate to prevent a significant increase in overlooking and visual obtrusion.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. I have considered the proposed alterations and extension to Lanterna, Saint Fintan's Road, Sutton, Dublin 13 in light of the requirements of S.177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. 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 there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reasons for this conclusion are as follows:

- the nature of the works: small scale dormer extension to an existing dwelling with existing connections to public services;
- the distance of the site from the nearest European site and the absence of any connections between the two.

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, 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 (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Frame Directive

The subject site is located on Saint Fintan's Road, Sutton, Dublin 13 and comprises an application for alteration to an existing house single storey including the provision a small ground floor extension and of a more sizeable first floor extension.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as the minor nature of the development.

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed alterations and extension of the existing dwelling 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.

11.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the nature of the condition the subject of the appeal, the Commission is satisfied that the determination by the Commission of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance, would not be warranted and based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (As amended) to AMEND Condition No. 3 (c).

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential land use zoning of the site and to the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the design of the proposed first floor terrace as amended in the documentation included in the First Party Appeal, coupled with the distance from the boundary with the adjoining properties would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity by reason of overlooking or loss of privacy.

13.0 The Conditions

Planning Authority's Condition 3 (c) shall be amended to read as follows:

3.(c) The slatted canopy to the first floor terrace shall extend to the front of the terrace and the screen to the side boundary shall be a minimum of 1.8m in height and shall consist of opaque material (glass or other). The screen to the front shall be 1.1m in height and shall be clear glass.

REASON: In the interest of visual amenity of the adjoining residential properties.

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.

Vanessa Langheld

Planning Inspector

03 November 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP323359-25
Proposed Development Summary	Planning permission is sought for works to existing 5 bedroom single storey bungalow. Works to include ground floor extension to the rear, changes to fenestration, conversion of garage to the side of the dwelling and construction of a first floor extension with a screened roof terrace.
Development Address	Lanterna, Saint Fintan's Road, Sutton, Dublin 13, D13 TV70)
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?	<div style="display: flex; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-right: 5px; text-align: center;">Yes</div> <div>Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.</div> </div> <div style="margin-top: 10px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required. </div>
<p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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) 	
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.	

<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 <u>Part 2</u>, 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"/> 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.	<i>n/a</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	<i>n/a</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> 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)	<i>n/a</i>
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"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____