



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323512-25

Development	Single-storey extension with a pitched roof to the side of an existing three-storey semi-detached house, and to relocate the existing pedestrian entrance gate.
Location	61 College Square, Wainsfort Manor Drive, Terenure, Dublin, D6WV662.
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD25B/0395W
Applicant(s)	Brian & Julie Kirwan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Brian & Julie Kirwan
Date of Site Inspection	25 th October 2025
Inspector	Colin McBride

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	3
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	4
3.4. Third Party Observations	4
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy Context.....	4
6.0 The Appeal	5
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	5
6.2. Planning Authority Response.....	5
7.0 Assessment.....	6
8.0 Recommendation.....	7
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	8

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.029ha, is located within an existing residential development, College Square, which is to the west of Terenure and located off Wainsfort Road (R817). The site is occupied by a three-storey semi-detached dwelling. To the north is no. 62, to the south is a green area within College Square and to the east is a two-storey dwelling fronting Wainsfort Road.

2.0 Proposed Development

Permission is sought to construct a single-storey extension with a pitched roof to the side of an existing three-storey semi-detached house, and to relocate the existing pedestrian entrance gate. The extension has a floor area of 18.5sqm and ridge height of 3.604m. It features a shallow monopitch roof. It is proposed to relocate an existing pedestrian gate to the side boundary to the rear of the existing dwelling.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission granted subject to 4 conditions. Of note is the following condition.

Condition no. 4: The proposed extension shall be located fully within the site boundary, with the existing boundary wall abutting same maintained as existing.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report (31/07/25)

- The design and scale of the extension was considered satisfactory and in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. A grant of permission was recommended subject to the conditions outlined above.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

ACP-323512-25

Roads Department:

- No objection subject to condition requiring any gates to open inwards.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None.

4.0 **Planning History**

None on the application site.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1 **Development Plan**

The relevant Development Plan is South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028

The site is zoned objective 'RES' with a stated objective 'to protect and/or improve residential amenity'.

SDCC House Extension Design Guide 2025

3.3.2 Built Form Principle (BFP) 3 – Side Extensions

- Should not dominate the front elevation of the house.
- Should retain a driveway depth of 6 metres. - Roof profile of first floor/two storey side extension should be carefully considered relative to the ridge height and profile of the main house and parapet height should always be minimised.
- A setback of first floor/two storey side extension element may be required where a terracing effect would otherwise occur.

- Should consider fenestration treatment relative to adjacent properties.
- In the case of corner plot, should be located within and not form part of the boundary wall of the property.
- In the case of corner plot, should provide for gable fenestration to avoid blank façades and provide for passive surveillance.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal has been lodged by Studio S.O.A.P on behalf of the applicants, Brian & Julie Kirwan. The grounds of appeal are as follows:

- The appeal is against Condition no. 4 on the basis that the condition is unnecessary.
- It should be omitted on the basis that the proposed extension has no adverse visual impact. It is consistent with the established pattern of development with numerous extensions constructed directly onto or incorporating boundary walls and such is a well-established form of suburban development. Requiring retention of wall is inconsistent with such.
- Requiring a setback from the boundary wall would create unusable dead space and undermine compact growth objectives of Development Plan.
- The existing boundary wall may not be of sufficient structural quality or compatibility to be retained alongside the extension.
- The proposed extension fully accords with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1 Response by South Dublin County Council.

- The PA confirms its decision and note that the issues have been covered in the Chief Executives Order.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. At the outset, I wish to point out that following consideration of the documentation on the appeal file and the site location and context, I am satisfied consideration of the proposal on a de novo basis, (that is as if the application had been made to the Commission in the first instance), is unwarranted and that it is appropriate to determine the appeal in accordance with the provisions of Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended. Having inspected the site and examined the associated documentation, the following are the relevant issues in this appeal.

Condition no. 4

7.2 Condition no. 4

7.2.1 Condition no. 4 states the following:

The proposed extension shall be located fully within the site boundary, with the existing boundary wall abutting same maintained as existing.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

The proposed extension is located in such a manner that its southern elevation is built to the centreline of the existing boundary wall. The appellants raise concerns that the condition attached under no. 4 is unnecessary and has the effect to require the extension to be pushed back to degree that it is within the boundary walls and does not go to the centreline of the wall with the proposed arrangement a well-established pattern of development at this location and in suburban areas.

7.2.2 The Local Authority raised no issues with the design and scale of the extension and did not reference such a modification was necessary or a significant factor in assessing the proposal in the associated planning report. I would note that the Planning Report refers to the SDCC House Extension Design Guide 20255 and in relation to side extensions, BFP3. Under BFP3 one of the criteria is as follows:
“In the case of corner plot, should be located within and not form part of the boundary wall of the property”.

The Planning Report states that “it is considered the proposed side extension would, by reason of design, layout and form, accord with the provisions of BFP3 of the SDCC House Extension Design Guide”. The Planning Report also goes on to state that the “as per the plans submitted, the existing side boundary wall, which the proposed extension would abut, would be maintained. In the interest of visual amenity, it is recommended that this be confirmed by condition”.

8.2.3 It would appear that such is a standard condition and is not response to any specific design issue that was raised on the assessment of the case. It is common for residential extensions to be built to the centreline of the existing side boundary walls with ownership normally to the centreline of the wall. I can see no reason in terms of physical design and scale to preclude the extension as proposed, with the proposed extension modest in scale, subordinate to the design of the existing dwelling and having no major physical impact either in terms of the visual amenity of the area or the amenities of adjoining properties. The Planning Report confirms that the proposed extension as proposed conforms to the criteria for side extensions under the SDCC House Design Guide 2025. I would consider that condition no. 1 of the permission granted is sufficient to ensure the extension is built as per the proposed drawings and in this regard do not consider that condition no. 4 is necessary. In this regard I would recommend omission of condition no. 4.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend that condition no. 4 be omitted for the following reason and considerations and I would recommend a Board Order as follows:

DECISION

Having regard to the nature of the condition 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 REMOVE Condition no. 4 and the reasons therefor.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

(a) Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, which is satisfactory in the context of visual amenity, adjoining amenities and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, and to fact that it is located wholly within the curtilage of an existing dwelling, condition no. 4 is considered unnecessary with condition no. 1 adequate to ensure the proposal is constructed in compliance with the approved drawings.

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.

Colin McBride
Senior Planning Inspector

28th October 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary			
Development Address			
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)	Yes	Tick if relevant and proceed to Q2.	
	X		
	No	Tick if relevant. No further action required	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes	Tick/or leave blank	State the Class here.	Proceed to Q3.
No	X		Tick if relevant. No further action required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes	Tick/or leave blank	State the relevant threshold here for the Class of development.	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	Tick/or leave blank		Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	Tick/or leave blank	State the relevant threshold here for the Class of development and indicate the size of the development relative to the threshold.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	Tick/or leave blank	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)
Yes	Tick/or leave blank	Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____