



Inspector's Report

ACP-323726-25

Development

Demolition of rear extensions and construction of a front single storey extension and two storey side extension.

Location

30, Linden Grove, Blackrock, Dublin,
A94T273

Planning Authority

Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D25B/0394/WEB

Applicant(s)

Sarah-Jane O'Shea.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission.

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Clarie and Mark O'Regan.

Observer(s)

None.

Date of Site Inspection

22nd October 2024.

Inspector

Kathy Tuck.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History	7
5.0 Policy Context	8
5.1. Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan2022-2028	8
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	10
6.0 EIA Screening	10
7.0 The Appeal	10
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	10
7.2. Applicant Response	13
7.3. Planning Authority Response	14
7.4. Observations	14
8.0 Assessment	14
8.1. Introduction	14
8.3. Principle of Development	14
8.4. Impact on amenity	14
8.5. Other Issues	18
9.0 AA Screening	19
10.0 Water Framework Directive	20

11.0 Recommendation	21
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	21
13.0 Conditions	21
Appendix 1	24
Appendix 2	26

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The subject site which has a stated area of c.0.037ha is situated at no. 30 Linden Grove, Blackrock, Co. Dublin. Linden Grove is a mature residential area which is located approximately c.2km to the south-west of the centre of Blackrock and comprises of a cul-de-sac of two storey semi-detached dwellings which are all served within in-curtilage parking.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development consists of the demolition of the existing rear extensions and internal modifications together with the construction of the following:

- Single storey extension to the front which projects c.1.418m from the front elevation with a width of c.3.7m and is finished with a hipped roof profile that ties in to the existing front elevation.
- Two storey extension to the side of the dwelling including the provision of undercroft side passage. The side extension has a width of c.1.875m at first floor level, continues for the entire elevation of the dwelling and is finished with a hipped roof profile that ties into the existing roof profile.
- Two storey extension to the rear which projects c.3.65m from the rear elevation, has a length of c.10.5m and is finished with a hipped roof profile.
- Single storey extension to the rear which projects c.4.9m from the rear elevation of the proposed two-storey rear extension, has a width of c.6m and is finished with a hipped roof profile of c.3.985m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority granted permission on the 29th August 2025 subject 7 no. conditions. Conditions of note are as follows:

Condition 4:

Contribution of €85.14 in respect of the provision of Surface Water Infrastructure.

Condition 5:

Contribution of €1,281.56 in respect of the provision of Transport Infrastructure.

Condition 6:

Contribution of €7,174.12 in respect of the provision of Community & Parks facilities & Recreational amenities.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planning Officer concluded that the proposed development would not adversely impact on the residential amenity of adjacent properties by reason of overshadowing, overbearing appearance or overlooking. It was further considered that it would not detract from character of the areas and be in accordance with the relevant policies of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Report – Notes no objection subject to condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None Received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

The Planning Authority received 1 no. submission within the statutory period and concerns can be summarised as follows:

- Visually overbearing.
- Loss of Sunlight.
- Restrict the development potential of adjoining property.

- Reducing visual separation between a pair of semi-detached dwellings – creating terracing effect and contrary to development plan.
- Contrary to para 12.3.7.1 of the Dun Laoghaire Development Plan 2022-2028,
- Request a condition to prevent the use of boundary wall as part of the proposed development.
- Negative impact on streetscape.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject Site

D06A/0282: Permission GRANTED for alterations and extensions to existing 2 storey family dwelling, including demolition of existing three storey return to rear and construction of new three storey extension and change of use of ground floor from residential to dental surgery with live in accommodation to first and second floors.

4.2. Within the Vicinity

20 Linden Grove

D24B/0067 Permission GRANTED for single storey front extension with lean to roof, a first-floor side extension with a hipped roof to match the existing roof, a single storey rear extension with flat roof and an attic conversion with a rear dormer with a flat roof.

33 Linden Grove.

D22A/0697 Permission GRANTED for single storey and 2-storey extensions to front, rear and side together with attic conversion and dormer window at roof level, alterations to internal layout and elevations, garage conversion, demolition of external WC and shed, widening of vehicular access and car parking areas.

47 Linden Grove

D21A/1087 Permission GRANTED for demolition of a single storey to the side (12.5m²) & construction of a 2 storey extension & conversion of attic (44 m²). Alterations including 2 no. bay windows and porch, new external

insulation, render and brickwork and new windows, 2 no. rooflights, dormer window & solar panels. Ancillary works including widening of the entrance gate, automatic gate and dishing to the pavement.

18 Linden Grove

D17A/0903 Permission GRANTED for the demolition of the existing single storey garage and utility at ground floor level to the side of the house, a bedroom at first floor level to the side of the house and a shed in the rear garden. It is proposed to construct a two-storey extension to the side of the house, a single storey extension to the rear of the house, a single storey bay window extension to the front of the house and a new shed in the rear garden. The proposal includes the reconfiguration of the ground and first floor levels. It is proposed to modify the front and rear elevations to facilitate the new layout. The development includes roof lights and sundry other minor works. It is proposed to widen the existing vehicular access from Linden Grove.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan2022-2028

The site is subject to the Land Use Zoning Objective 'A', which seeks 'to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting existing residential amenities. Residential development, including alterations to existing dwellings, is permitted in principle under this zoning.

Development Plan policies:

Chapter 3 Climate Action

Section 3.4 Achieving Sustainable Planning Outcomes

Section 3.4.1.3 Policy Objective CA7: Construction Materials.

Chapter 4 Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place

Section 4.3.1.2 Policy Objective PHP19 – Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation

Section 4.3.1.3 Policy Objective PHP20 – Protection of Existing Residential Amenity

Chapter 12 (Development Management)

Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings

- (i) Front extensions, at both ground and first level will be considered acceptable in principle subject to scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. A break in the front building line will be acceptable, over two floors to the front elevation, subject to scale and design however a significant break in the building line should be resisted unless the design can demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the proposal will not impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings. Excessive scale should be avoided.
- (ii) 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.
- (iii) Ground floor side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity.
- (iii) First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. However, in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front façade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.
- Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles - changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/ 'A' frame end or 'half-hip' for example – will be assessed against a number of criteria including:
 - Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.

- Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
- Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
- Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence

Section 12.4.8.1 – General Specifications

Section 12.4.8.3 – Driveways/Hardstanding Areas.

Section 12.8.7 – Private Amenity Standards – Quality Standards.

Section 12.8.7.1 – Separation Distances.

Section 12.8.7.2 – Boundaries.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The subject site is not situated within or directly adjoining a Natura 2000 site. The subject site is situated c. 1.48 to the south-west of the South Dublin Bay SAC (site code SAC 000210), the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (site code SPA 004024), and the South Dublin Bay pNHA (Site Code pNHA 000210).

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 Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 **The Appeal**

7.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The Commission received a 3rd Party Appeal against the decision of the Planning Authority to grant permission from Clare and Mark O'Regan, residents of no. 28 Linden Grove, which is situated immediately north of the subject site. The grounds of the appeal can be summarised as follows:

1. Overbearing

- Rear and 1st floor extension will be overbearing on views from adjoining gardens (front and rear) and from 1st floor bedroom window on side elevation.
- Impact as a result of extent to which the 2-storey extension will project outward into the rear garden and also that the full depth of the 2 storey house will extend to the boundary wall – removing the existing side passage between no. 28 and no. 30.
- Single storey rear extension will exacerbate overbearing impact – proximity to boundary (0.7m) and its eaves height of 2.7m will create an oppressive effect from private amenity space.
- Reference by the Planning Officer to the fact that the existing setback between dwellings will be maintained is not understood – if it means separation between no. 28 and no. 30 this is incorrect as the distance between the 2 storey parts of both dwellings will be reduced from 7.5m to 4.2m as indicated on existing and proposed site layout plans.
- Suggestion in the Planning Officers report that the proposal will not result in an overbearing impact is not accepted.

2. Loss of Sunlight

- Proposed 1st floor extension situated to the south-east and south-west of no. 28 – no shadow analysis was submitted with the application.
- Having regard to the relative orientation and the fact that the finished floor level of no. 28 is below that of no. 30 – significant loss of sunlight can be expected as a result of the proposal.
- Significant loss of sunlight in relation to 1st floor bedroom window situated over garage – likely result from 1st floor proposed extension which projects 5m forward of window and is to the south-east.
- Significant loss of sunlight to rear garden, kitchen roof lights and 1st floor rear bedroom windows of no. 28 – proposed 2 storey extension will extend 3.65m beyond the rear upstairs window of no.28 and has a built height of 6.5m up to the boundary wall and situated to the south-west of the boundary wall.
- Impacts are all exacerbated as a result that no. 28 is finished at a lower level than no. 30.
- Not clear what Planning Officer means by 'having regard to the size and orientation of the proposed development and those of adjoining properties' –

clear that orientation of site is to the south of no. 28 which is the worst possible orientation for a 1st floor extension up on the boundary wall.

- 6.5m high wall extending 3.5m beyond the rear wall of adjoining house and built on the common boundary will cast a significant shadow on rear garden of no. 28 from early morning.

3. Loss of Outlook

- Projection of 1st floor extension to the common boundary will result in loss of outlook from bedroom window to both the front and rear of no. 28.
- Particularly severe for the bedroom window to the front (over the garage) as it is set back from the front building line and the proposed 1st floor extension will create a tunnel effect on views from this window.
- Loss of outlook will result in serious injury to residential amenity currently enjoyed at no. 28.

4. Impact on Streetscape

- Proposed first floor extension to side of dwelling to the boundary will remove the benefit of the set back of the 1st floor bedroom window that was deliberately included in the original design of the dwellings in Linden Grove.
- Existing streetscape comprises a separation distance at 1st floor level of the full width of the garage and side passage to each of the semi-detached houses – creates a pleasing streetscape.
- While it is accepted that some extensions at 1st floor level are acceptable – the proposed development would create a ‘terraced housing’ effect.
- Impact on streetscape direct conflict with Dun Laoghaire County Development Plan 2022-2028 policy - a set-back of an extension’s front façade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a ‘terracing’ effect.
- The Planning Authority assumes that the adjoining property will never propose a 1st floor extension over the garage – contiguous elevation drawing indicates that the proposal would prevent the adjoining property to propose a 1st floor extension. Therefore, proposal sterilises future development potential for no. 28.

- Proposed development prevents the owners of no. 28 proposing a 1st floor extension over their garage as it would create a closed terrace of 4 no. dwellings.

5. Precedent

- The planning officer states in relation to potential loss of sunlight and overbearing impacts that precedents at no.18 and 43 Linden Grove include for similar 1st floor extensions over ground floor.
- Permission granted at no. 18 (DA17A/0903) was for single storey to the rear and 2 storey to side – not considered relevant because house is at the end of a row with a remaining separation distance of c.5m to 11 Cedar Square.
- No record of a permission at no. 43 of the Planning Authorities planning register.
- Reference to precedent in the vicinity no based on relevant evidence.

6. Summary

- Proposed 2 storey extension to the rear up to boundary wall with a height of 6.5m and a depth of 3.65m will have an overbearing impact on the views from rear bedroom windows – single storey extension will exacerbate this impact.
- Proposal will cast significant shadow in the rear garden of no. 28 – result in serious injury to residential amenity by reason of loss of sunlight as a result of the extension including the extended roof.
- Outlook from bedroom window to the front and rear of no. 28 will result in serious injury to residential amenity currently enjoyed.
- Proposal would prevent owners of no. 28 to seek permission for a 1st floor extension over their garage – would create a closed terrace of 4 dwellings.
- Reference by Planning Officer to precedent developments within the vicinity are incorrect and not base on factual evidence.

7.2. Applicant Response

None received.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

None received.

7.4. Observations

None received.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Introduction

8.2. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the reports of the Local Authority, having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local and national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development.
- Impact on amenity.
- Impact on Streetscape.
- Other Issues.

8.3. Principle of Development.

8.3.1. The subject site is zoned under Objective Residential (A) in the Dun Laoghaire County Development Plan 2022 – 2028. The zoning objective seeks to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting existing residential amenities. It is therefore considered that the provision of the proposed amendments to the exiting dwelling are acceptable in principle.

8.4. Impact on amenity.

8.4.1. The main concern raised by the appellant relates to the impact upon residential amenities. The appellant considers that in its current form the proposed side extension together with rear single storey extension and shed structure will give rise to a significant level of negative impact upon the current level of residential amenities

enjoyed at this location by way of overbearance, loss of sunlight/overshadowing and loss of outlook. I will consider each of the concerns raised individually below:

Overbearance

- 8.4.2. The appellant contends that the proposed 1st floor extension, to both the side and rear of the dwelling, will be overbearing upon views from their adjoining gardens and from the 1st floor bedroom window which is situated on the side elevation. It is further argued that the extent of the 2 storey side extension, which extends to the common boundary of the site removing the existing side passage between no. 28 and no. 30 Linden Grove, will restrict the development potential of no. 28 and create a terracing effect.
- 8.4.3. Concern is further raised over the provision of the single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling which is considered by the appellant to exacerbate the overbearing impact on foot of the proximity to the boundary of the site and the eaves level of c.2.7m. It is contended that the rear extension will create an oppressive effect from the neighbouring private amenity space.
- 8.4.4. The proposed first floor extension projects from the northern elevation of the dwelling and continues to meet the boundary of the site which is shared with the appellants property. The extension maintains the front elevation of the dwelling and extends to meet the proposed rear two storey extension, which projects approximately c.3.6m beyond the rear elevation. The proposal maintains the access lane to the rear private amenity space at ground floor level with the proposed 1st floor side extension being provided as an over croft.
- 8.4.5. The Planning Officer in their assessment considered that the proposed side extension would not be overbearing as the setback between dwellings will be maintained.. Further reference is made by the Planning Officer to a precedent which has been established along Linden Grove for similar types of development.
- 8.4.6. From a review of the Planning Authority's Planning Register, I note that permission for 1st floor extensions has been granted to no. 33, no. 34 and no. 47 Linden Grove for 1st floor side extensions. However, all of these extensions have maintained the existing side elevation of the dwelling and have not extended to the boundary of the site. The only permission granted for a side extension to meet the site boundary relates to no. 18 Linden Grove. However, this site differs from other dwellings within Linden Grove as it is provided with a larger side passage given that it is the last dwelling

situated within the estate with the northern boundary being formed with dwellings located within Cedar Square.

- 8.4.7. Section 12.3.7.1 (iii) of the Dun Laoghaire County Development Plan 2022-2028 notes with regard to 1st floor side extensions that side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable and that they should be designed in a manner that they protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a 'terracing' effect.
- 8.4.8. In the first instance, I note from undertaking a site visit there are currently no window opes situated along the side elevation of no. 28 Linden Grove serving habitable accommodation. The window serving a bedroom at first floor level, referenced by the appellant, relates to a window ope which is situated along the front elevation which has been set back c.5m from the front elevation.
- 8.4.9. I accept the concerns raised by Appellant and agree that the separation distance is not maintained in this instance as the proposal seeks to extend the dwelling to meet the northern boundary of the site, not only with the proposed side extension but also with the two-storey extension to the rear. While I note that the applicant has maintained a hipped roof profile with the proposed side extension, I consider that the proposed front elevation of the dwelling would be at odds with the established streetscape along Linden Grove where the separation distance from the side elevation of dwelling is maintained to the boundary. I further consider that in the instance the proposed side boundary was permitted in its proposed form It would impact upon the development potential of no. 28 Linden Grove.
- 8.4.10. Having regard to the Section 12.3.7.1 (iii) and the established precedent along Linden Grove, I consider that the proposed side extension should be amended so that it does not extend beyond the established side (northern) elevation of the existing dwelling. I consider that this amendment will overcome the concerns raised with regard to issues of overbearance and also negative impact upon the streetscape of Linden Grove. This can be achieved by way of condition.
- 8.4.11. With regard to the concerns raised over the proposed single storey rear extension, I note that the proposed extension has been set of the northern boundary of the site and is finished with a hipped roof profile. I consider having regard to the separation distance from the shared boundary together with the single storey nature of this part

of the proposed development I do not anticipate that it would negatively impact upon the level of residential amenity enjoyed by the neighbouring property.

Loss of sunlight/Overshadowing

8.4.12. The appellant has raised concern over the impact the prosed development would have upon the private amenity space and a number of windows serving habitable rooms of the adjoining dwelling in terms of overshadowing and loss of light. It is argued that having regard to the orientation of the site and the difference in levels between the appeal site and the neighbouring property that the proposal will give rise to a significant loss of light.

8.4.13. The Planning Officer within their assessment considered that the having regard to the orientation of the proposed development and those of the adjoining properties that the proposal will not result in significant levels of overshadowing or loss of light.

8.4.14. In the first instance I note that rights to light is ultimately a matter for the courts, and I do not consider that the Commission is in a position to draw any conclusions in relation to the matters raised.

8.4.15. However, with regard to overshadowing, the appeal site and adjoining property have an eastern orientation and as such the sun rises along the front elevation of the dwelling. While it is proposed to provide for a side extension that extends to meet the front elevation of the existing, I do not anticipate that it would give rise to undue issues of overshadowing to the neighbouring dwelling, in the instance that my recommendation to pull the extension of the side boundary of the site is accepted by the Commission. I consider that this separation distance together with the hipped nature of the proposed roof profile of the side extension, will overcome concerns raised with regard to overshadowing of the front elevation of the adjoining dwelling.

8.4.16. The appellant considered that a shadow analysis should have been submitted given that there is a significant level change between the rear private amenity space serving no. 28 and no. 30 Linden Grove with no. 30 being significantly higher. It is contended that this level change will further exacerbate issues of overshadowing.

8.4.17. Notwithstanding the level change between no. 28 and the appeal site, the rear two storey extension projects c.3.6m from the rear elevation of the dwelling and will be set c.1.2m from the common boundary on foot of my recommendation set out in section 8.4.10 of my report above. The rear amenity space serving the appeal site and

appellants property is westerly in orientation and as such benefits from the evening sun. While I note that the rear amenity space serving the appellants property may experience some level of overshadowing during the day, I do not accept that it would be more than what would be expected within the urban context of the site. I further consider that the setback from the common boundary together with the use of a hipped roof profile will further ameliorate against any undue issues of overshadowing.

Loss of Outlook

8.4.18. The original dwellings within Linden Grove are served with a 1st floor projection from the side elevation which is set back in excess of 5m from the front elevation of the dwelling and provides for a bedroom. The appellant contends that their first-floor bedroom will result in loss of outlook on foot of the proposed 1st floor side extension projection to the boundary of the side. It is argued that this will in turn create a tunnel effect on views from this window.

8.4.19. I accept the concerns raised and consider that the view from this window will change, however, given the precedent of similar development within Linden Grove and the urban context of the site I do not consider that these concerns would warrant a reason for refusal. Furthermore, I note that the Dun Laoghaire County Development Plan 2022-2028 promotes extensions to existing dwellings.

Conclusion

8.4.20. On balance, I am of the opinion, on foot of the recommendation to amend the proposed side extension, that the works to the existing dwelling would not negatively impact upon the adjoining residential amenities, in terms of overbearance, overshadowing or loss of outlook. I therefore recommend that permission be granted.

8.5. Other Issues

8.5.1. Precedent

Reference is made within the assessment of the Planning Officer to a number of cases which provide for a precedent for the proposed development. The appellant contends that one of these dwellings referenced by the Planning Officer, no. 43, does not have a planning history.

I have set out a detailed planning history pertaining not only to the appeal site but also the wider Linden Grove estate under section 4 of this report. I agree with the comments of the Appellant and note that there does not seem to be a planning history pertaining to no. 43 however I consider this may have been a typological error by the Planning Officer and does not have any bearing on the decision made.

8.5.2. Planning Authority Conditions

Permission was granted by Dun Laoghaire County Council subject to 7 condition which are all consider to be typical for the development proposed. However, I note that conditions 4, 5 and 6 all related to Section 48 Development Contributions. The Development Contributions have been broken into 3 no. headings which include for Countywide Surface Wate; Countywide Transport Infrastructure; and Countywide Community & Parks facilities & Recreational amenities. While this may be the way the Planning Authority organise their conditions with regard to Development Contributions, I consider that it would be more concise for the Commission to include their model condition for Development Contributions that allow for the applicant to agree the overall cost with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the South Dublin Bay SAC (site code SAC 000210), the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (site code SPA 004024), and the South Dublin Bay pNHA (Site Code pNHA 000210). or any other European site, in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

9.1. This determination is based on:

- The relatively minor scale of the development and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site.
- Distance from and weak indirect connections to the European sites.

- Taking into account screening determination by LPA

9.2. See Appendix 2 of this report for Appropriate Assessment Screening Determination. No mitigation measures aimed at avoiding or reducing impacts on European sites were required to be considered in reaching this conclusion.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The subject site is located at 30, Linden Grove, Blackrock, Dublin, A94T273. The proposed development consists of the demolition of rear extensions and construction of a front single storey extension, a rear single storey extension and a two-storey side extension and for all associated site works. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.2. The Brewery Stream is situated approximately c.141m to the east of the subject site and the Priory Stream is situated to c.225m to the west. Both the Brewery Stream and Priory Stream have a poor status. The site is also situated within the Kilcullen groundwater catchment.

10.3. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water bodies 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.

10.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works regard the scale;
- Location-distance from nearest Water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

10.5. I conclude that 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.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. Having regard to the above, I recommend that permission be granted for the development based on the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Objective 'A' zoning of the site (Residential) and the policies and objectives as set out in the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 nature and scope of the proposed development and the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the proposed alterations would be visually harmonious with the surrounding area, would not seriously injure the character or residential amenities of the area and would accord with the provisions of the Development Plan and with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application 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 interests of clarity

2. The first-floor side extension and two-story rear extension shall be amended so that they do not extend beyond the side (northern) elevation of the existing dwelling. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the planning authority amended drawings and particulars indicating such.

Reason: In the interest of protecting visual and residential amenity.

3. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwellings shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

4. The dwelling shall be occupied as a single residential unit and shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: To prevent unauthorised development and to restrict the use of the extension in the interest of the control of development

5. 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

6. All necessary measures should be taken by the applicant and contractor to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network, repair any damage to the public road arising from carrying out works and avoid conflict with between construction activities and pedestrian and vehicular movements on the surrounding public roads.

Reason: In the interest of amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection

7. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement

of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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.

Kathy Tuck
Planning Inspector
28th October 2025

Appendix 1

EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323726-25
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of rear extensions and construction of a front single storey extension, a rear single storey extension and a two storey side extension.
Development Address	30, Linden Grove, Blackrock, Dublin, A94T273
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.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.	State the Class here
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) <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i>
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3) <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i>

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2

Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive)

I have considered the project in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located at 30, Linden Grove, Blackrock, Co. Dublin and situated The subject site is situated c. 1.48 to the south-west of the South Dublin Bay SAC (site code SAC 000210), the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (site code SPA 004024), and the South Dublin Bay pNHA (Site Code pNHA 000210).

The proposed development consists of the demolition of rear extensions and construction of a front single storey extension, a rear single storey extension and a two storey side extension and for all associated site works.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works and the limited scale of what is being proposed.
- The location of the site from nearest European site and lack of connections

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.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.