



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323751-25

Development	PROTECTED STRUCTURE: Demolition of extension, construction of extension and all associated site works
Location	18 & 19 Thomas Hand Street, Skerries, Co. Dublin, K34 HH24
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F25A/0368E
Applicant(s)	David Nolan & Emily Neacy
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Conditional Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Joseph and Geraldine Grimes
Observer(s)	Ian and Karen Butler
Date of Site Inspection	14 th January 2026
Inspector	Emma Gosnell

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0 Planning History.....	8
5.0 Policy Context.....	10
6.0 Natural Heritage Designations	14
7.0 EIA Screening.....	15
8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening	15
9.0 The Appeal	15
10.0 Assessment.....	19
11.0 Recommendation	33
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	33
13.0 Conditions	34

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

Appendix 2 - AA Screening Determination

Appendix 2 – Screening for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at 18 & 19 Thomas Hand Street, Skerries, Co. Dublin and includes 2 no. single storey thatched-roof cottages (Protected Structure (RPS 0194)) which form a single block. The properties are also designated as being of regional architectural and social interest on the NIAH (Reg. No. 11311006). The site comes within the Skerries Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) and forms part of a mixed-use urban streetscape which is characterised by 1-2 storey properties of varying scale/width, design and use (residential, charity retail etc.) whose plots run north to south.
- 1.2. The site is located on the north side of Thomas Hand Street (with the gable of No. 18 being sited perpendicular to the public footpath) and is adjoined to the west by No. 40 The Square (2-storey stone building) and No. 39 The Square (residential property comprising of a non-original single story thatched cottage to the front with a 2-storey extension to rear), to the north by No. 20A Thomas Hand Street (a detached 1.5 storey residential property with a steeply pitched roof) and to the north-east by No. 20 Thomas Hand Street (a replacement 1-storey residential property is currently under construction on that site). No's 18-19 are adjoined to the immediate east by a shared triangular area of hardstanding which opens onto the public footpath and which is used for car parking for the aforementioned dwellings.
- 1.3. The appeal site is 0.045ha in area, has a generally narrow linear form and slopes gently upwards from south to north. Its southern portion comprises of a pair of single storey vernacular thatched cottages (c. 56sq.m) which date from the mid-19th century: No. 18 being a small 2-bay house with mezzanine level and No. 19 being a larger 4-bay house with a modern rear single-storey extension comprising of a link corridor, kitchen and toilet, with a further single storey office extension adjoining its northern gable. The northern portion of the site is undeveloped and serves as the property's rear garden. The site's rear boundaries comprise of a mix of blockwork and stone walls, which vary in height from c. 0.5m to c. 1.5m, together with fencing, trees and hedges.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises of: Works to a Protected Structure (RPS 0194) comprising of: (a) the demolition of an existing rear extension, link corridor and shed;

(b) the construction of a one and two-storey extension to rear with link-corridor between new extension and existing cottage; (c) renovation of cottage; (d) and, all associated site works.

2.2. Further information stage changes concerned the design of the parking area to the front of the Protected Structure and the proposed surface water design only, with no further design changes made at clarification of further information stage.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission granted on 10/09/2025 subject to 8 no. conditions. Conditions of note:

- *Condition No. 5* – prior to commencement: agree detail of reinstated chimneystack with PA; omit step in rendered front elevation; and, omit ventilation ducts and vents at upper levels on gable end walls.
- *Condition No. 6* – 1 no. car parking space only permitted.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

2 no. planning reports formed the basis of the planning authority's (PA) assessment:

Planner's Report (18/06/2025) – Initial Application Stage

Key points of note raised in the report are as follows:

- *Principle of development* – residential permitted in principle on TC zoned site.
- *Design* – contemporary coastal vernacular design of proposed extension is an acceptable contrast to traditional vernacular cottage and enhances character of existing dwelling. Proposal in-keeping with pattern of substantial redevelopment to rear of historical dwellings elsewhere in Skerries.
- *Visual Impact* – no negative visual impact on structure/ extension not visible from street.

- *Conservation* – demolition, 1-2 storey extension connected to existing dwelling via link corridor, sensitive renovation/ use and connection of cottages are all compliant with FDP policy on refurbishment of Protected Structures. Integrity of Protected Structure preserved, and historic street pattern will be reinstated to front of dwelling. CO recommends that design details relating to the reinstatement of the chimneystack are agreed by pre-commencement condition and that the step rendered finish on front elevation wall and perforated ventilation ducts and vents are omitted.
- *Residential Amenity* – no likelihood of overshadowing or overlooking of neighbouring properties on basis of submitted shadow study and separation plan.
- *Car Parking* – Site location in Zone 1 allows for max. 1 no. space for 3-bed dwelling. Property currently benefits from one-off street car parking space. However, design/ layout of parking area needs further consideration and demarcation for driver-pedestrian intervisibility and to ensure it cannot be used to park 2 no. cars. **FI recommended.**
- *Water Services* – discharge to public surface water sewer on Thomas Hand Street not permitted, scope to retrofit SuDS into site to be considered and, further clarification needed on proposed surface water discharge rate. **FI recommended.**
- *AA Screening* – site located to west of Skerries Islands SPA (004122). Project not connected with any European site and no realistic pathways exist. No likelihood of significant effects on account of nature, size and location of project.
- *EIA Screening* - proposal is subthreshold development. No EIAR required.

A request for Further Information (FI) issued on 18/06/2025 in relation to 4 no. items.

The applicant's response to the FI request was received on 21/07/2025 and consisted of a cover letter and revised plans. The response was not determined to be significant and did not require readvertising.

Planner's Report (12/08/2025) – Further Information Stage

Key points of note raised in the report are as follows:

- *FI Item 1 (Design of Parking Area)* – revised onsite parking configuration of 1 no. parking space consisting of gravel area with paver border enclosed by permeable paving as illustrated on drawing no. 24-103-PL-02 is acceptable.
- *FI Item 2 (Surface Water Outfall)* – FI response refers to an engineering drawing (24082-1) that was not provided with the FI response. **CFI recommended.**
- *FI Item 3 (Use of SuDS)* - FI response refers to an engineering drawing (24082-1) that was not provided with the FI response. **CFI recommended.**
- *FI Item 4 (Relationship to No. 39 The Square)* – drawing 24-103-PL-02 does not provide sufficient clarification regarding separation distance between the eastern elevation of No. 39 and the proposed extension. However, existence of a boundary wall between properties is noted and relationship acceptable on this basis.
- *AA & EIA Screening* – FI proposals do not give rise to change in determinations.

A request for Clarification of Further Information (CFI) issued on 13/08/2025 in relation to 1 no. item (request to provide engineering drawing 24082-1 in order to clarify matters raised in FI items 2 & 3).

The applicant's response to the CFI request was received on 14/08/2025 and consisted of a cover letter and revised plans. The response was not determined to be significant and did not require readvertising.

Planner's Report (03/09/2025) – Clarification of Further Information Stage

Key points of note raised in the report are as follows:

- *CFI Item 1 (Submission of Engineering Drawing)* – PA satisfied that concerns regarding surface water outfall to public combined sewer on Thomas Hand Street have been addressed. Proposed SuDS planters are acceptable, but further SuDS measures and calculations are still required. Can be addressed by condition.
- *AA & EIA Screening* – CFI proposals do not give rise to change in determinations.

Report concluded by recommending permission granted as detailed in Section 3.1.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Conservation Officer (16/06/2025) – no objection subject to pre-commencement conditions requiring the exact detail of the proposed reinstated chimneystack and how

this physically impacts the existing thatched roof to be agreed in writing with the PA; omission of the step in the rendered finish on the front elevation wall between No's. 18 and 19; and, omission of perforated ventilation duct and vents on the upper levels of the end gable walls.

Transportation Planning Section (11/06/2025) – seeks FI in respect to the proposed layout of the area to front of cottage as a retained parking area and how it integrates with the existing car parking spaces to the immediate east (serving No's 20 & 20A).

Transportation Planning Section (29/07/2025) – no objection subject to conditions permitting 1 no. car parking space only and no additional parking; dishing of footpath & kerb; works to public footpath & roadway at developer's expense; undergrounding/ relocation of overhead services and poles at developer's expense; and, disposal of stormwater on site and not via public infrastructure.

Water Services Dept. (03/06/2025) - seeks FI in respect to proposed surface water design to ensure no discharge to public surface water sewer on Thomas Hand Street, clarification on proposed surface water discharge rate which is considered excessive given small scale of the site and, the retrofitting of SuDS into the site.

Water Services Dept. (07/08/2025) – seek that applicant address items 2 & 3 of FI.

Water Services Dept. (02/09/2025) – no objection subject to conditions requiring no foul/ surface water discharges to public drainage system and pre-commencement of development submission of detailed surface water drainage proposal which complies with Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No submissions on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Initial Application Stage

2 no. third party submissions were received from neighbouring property owners Ian & Karen Butler and Joseph & Geraldine Grimes. These raised the following issues:

- Overbearance.

- Overshadowing.
- Overdevelopment.
- Overlooking.
- Negative Design Impact on Skerries ACA.
- Fire Safety.
- Security Issues.
- Drawing Inaccuracies.
- Non-Compliance with Surface Water Drainage Policy.
- Planning Precedent.
- Car Parking.

Further Informaiton Stage

1 no. third party submission was received from neighbouring property owners Joseph and Geraldine Grimes. This raised the following issues:

- Materiality of proposed parking area is inappropriate given town centre location.
- Applicant has failed to address PA's surface water FI.
- Applicant has not clarified separation distance between proposed western elevation and No. 39 Thomas Hand Street.
- Concerns raised regarding incorrect details in planning history section of PA report.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

P.A. Ref. F24A/0170 – application by David Nolan for change of use from commercial (office) to residential and for provision of a bin and bike store to front (east) of cottage, granted permission on 11/07/2024 subject to 5 no. conditions, incl. “4. *Proposed bicycle and bin storage shall be omitted from the proposed plans*”.

P.A. Ref. F05A/1483 – application by David Salmon for the change of use of existing residential cottages to commercial (office) use to include new internal and external renovation work, granted permission on 22/03/2006 subject to 10 no. conditions,

including: “3. No car parking provision is to be made to the front of the development. Reason: To protect the setting of the Protected Structure” and “4. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority a Landscape Plan for the small area of land to the front of the development. REASON: To protect the amenity of the area”.

P.A. Ref. F01A/0627 (PL 06F.127910) – application by Skerries Credit Union for change of use to Credit Union Offices, single storey extension to rear, internal alterations, site works and new signage to the Protected Structure, refused permission on appeal on 06/08/2002 for 2 no. reasons: 1. Overdevelopment and inappropriate extension to PS; 2. Potential for negative impact on fabric and character of PS.

4.2. Neighbouring Sites

No. 20A Thomas Hand Street - Site to Immediate North-East

P.A. Ref. F17A/0526 – application by Joseph & Geraldine Grimes for demolition of the existing old house at 20 Thomas Hand Street, Skerries granted permission on 28/11/2027 subject to 4 no. conditions.

No. 20 Thomas Hand Street - Site to Immediate East

P.A. Ref. F22A/0179 – application by Joseph & Geraldine Grimes for new single storey house on the cleared site of the former house at 20 Thomas Hand Street, with associated works to drainage, paving, boundary walls and site works. The overall site includes 4no. existing car parking spaces to the front that will be shared by the two houses on this site, granted permission on 26/11/2022 subject to 9 no. conditions.

P.A. Ref. F21A/0248 – application by Joseph & Geraldine Grimes for new 2-storey house on the cleared site of the former house at No. 20 Thomas Hand Street, refused permission on 18/06/2021 for 3 no. reasons: 1. Overall design inappropriate given location in ACA and proximity to Protected Structure; 2. Overbearance and overshadowing on adjoining property to east; 3. Design of rear elevation.

No. 38 The Square - Site to West

P.A. Ref. F22A/0172 – application for demolition of 1-2 storey mixed-use building above and construction of a new part 2 storey part single storey dwelling, new garage

to the rear, renovation of the existing outbuilding and all associated site works, granted permission on 13/09/2022 subject to 12 no. conditions.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (2025):

- NPO 3c (deliver 30% new housing in existing built-up footprint).
- NPO 6 (regenerate cities, towns and villages).

Climate Action Plan (2024 & 2025) and Ireland’s 4th National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2023-2030.

Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (BRE, 2022).

Architectural Heritage Protection: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2011) – Part 2: Detailed Guidance Notes.

Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2007).

5.2. Regional Policy

Eastern & Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy 2019-2031 - RPO 3.2 (achieving compact growth); RPO 4.3 (consolidation and re-intensification of infill/brownfield sites); and, RPO 8.3 (promoting sustainable transport).

5.3. Development Plan

The Fingal Development Plan (FDP) 2023-2029 applies.

Skerries

Section 2.7.2 (Role of Each Settlement) – Self-Sustaining Towns incl. Skerries.

Policies CSP34 – Consolidate Growth of Self-Sustaining Towns and CSP36 - Focus Growth Within and Contiguous to Core in Self-Sustaining Towns.

Zoning

The site is zoned 'TC – Town and District Centre' with the objective to 'Protect and enhance the special physical and social character of town and district centres and provide and/or improve urban facilities'. Residential is a use class which is permitted in principle under the TC zoning.

The stated vision for this zoning objective is, inter alia, to develop and consolidate these centres with an appropriate mix of uses, and to enhance and develop the urban fabric of these centres with urban design, conservation and sustainable development.

The site is also located within a 'highly sensitive', 'coastal' landscape character area and also forms part of the Skerries Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).

Residential Development

Section 3.5.11 and Policy SPQHP35 – Quality of Residential Development.

Sections 14.6 (Design Criteria for Residential Development in Fingal) and 14.6.4 (Residential Standard) and Objective DMSO19 – New Residential Development.

Sections 14.6.6.3 (Separation Distances), 14.6.6.4 (Overlooking and Overbearance), 14.6.6.1 (Daylight & Sunlight) and Objectives DMSO22 – Daylight & Sunlight Analysis, DMSO71 – Overshadowing of Private Open Space, DMSO72 – Boundary Treatment to Private Open Space and DMSO23 & DMSO26 – Separation Distances.

Residential Extensions

Section 3.5.13.1 and Policy SPQHP41 (Residential Extensions).

Objective SPQHO45 (Domestic Extensions).

Refurbishment

Section 3.5.13 & Policy SPQHP38 (Compact Growth, Consolidation & Regeneration).

Objective SPQHO41 – Refurbishment and Refitting of Existing Buildings Promote measures to reduce vacancy and underuse of existing building stock and to support the refurbishment and retrofitting of existing buildings.

Objective SPQHO44 – Retention, Retrofitting and Reuse of Existing Dwellings.

Objectives SPQHO37 – Residential Consolidation and Sustainable Intensification and SPQHO38 – Residential Development at Sustainable Densities.

Protected Structures/ Architectural Heritage

Policy HCAP9 – Re-use of Architectural Heritage: encourages maintenance, repair, re-use and sensitive retro-fitting of county’s architectural heritage and older building stock and require that adaptative re-use and regeneration adheres to best conservation practice.

Policy HCAP10 – Retention: support and encourage the sympathetic and appropriate reuse, rehabilitation and retention of protected structures and historic buildings.

Policy HCAP12 – Interventions to Protected Structures: ensure that direct interventions to Protected Structures are guided by architectural conservation principles/ are sympathetic, sensitive and appropriate to the special interest, appearance, character, and setting of the Protected Structure and are sensitively scaled and designed.

Policy HCAP14 – Architectural Conservation Areas: Protect the special interest and character of all areas which have been designated as an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). Development within or affecting an ACA must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting wherever possible. Development shall not harm buildings, spaces, original street patterns, archaeological sites, historic boundaries or features, which contribute positively to the ACA.

HCAP15 – Character of Architectural Conservation Areas: Support and encourage the sympathetic and appropriate adaptive reuse, refurbishment, and upgrading of protected structures and buildings or structures that contribute to the character of an Architectural Conservation Area.

Policy HCAP16 – Conservation Best Practice: Promote best conservation practice and encourage the use of appropriately qualified and experienced conservation professionals, contractors, and craft persons.

Policy HCAP22 - Retention and Reuse of Existing Building Stock: Seek the retention, appreciation and appropriate revitalisation of the historic and vernacular building stock, and 20th century built heritage of Fingal in both the urban and rural areas of the County by deterring the replacement buildings with modern structures and by protecting (through the use of Architectural Conservation Areas and the Record of Protected Structures and in the normal course of Development Management) these buildings where they contribute to the character of an area and/or where they are rare examples

of a structure type, a distinctive piece of architecture or have an innate value. (See also Table 14.26).

Policy HCAP24: Works to vernacular buildings should adhere to best conservation practice and use traditional, especially vernacular, building methods and materials.

Policy HCAP25: Encourage the retention of the original or historic fabric such as windows, doors, wall renders, roof coverings, shopfronts, pub fronts and other significant features of older or historic buildings, whether protected or not.

Objectives HCAPO22 – Record of Protected Structures, HCAO24 - Alteration and Development of Protected Structures and ACAs, HCAO25 – Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment and DMSO186 – Retention of Existing Building Stock within ACA.

Sections 14.19.3.1 (Protected Structures), 14.19.3.3 (Architectural Conservation Area), Tables 14.21 (Directions for Proposed Development of Protected Structures) and 14.22 (Planning Documentation), Objective DMSO187 - Planning Applications within an ACA and Table 14.24 (Direction for Proposed Development within Architectural Conservation Areas).

Table 14.26 (Direction on Development of Vernacular Buildings or Other Built Heritage Assets): Proposals for extensions to vernacular buildings or the historic building stock should not erode the setting and design qualities of the original structure which make it attractive and should be in proportion or subservient to the existing building.

Parking/ Other

Section 14.17.7 (Car Parking), Tables 14.18 (Car Parking Zones) and 14.19 (Car Parking Standards).

5.4. **Skerries Architectural Conservation Area – Statement of Character (2008)**

Section 8.1.3 (Windows & Doors - Replacement): Original timber or metal windows, doors and fanlights are key features which enrich the character of the ACA. Examples of authentic historic fenestration and external doors are relatively rare in Skerries and their retention is therefore crucial to the preservation of the character of the ACA. Decayed timber sections can in most cases be repaired and cannot be accepted as a reason for replacement.

Section 8.1.4 (Vernacular Buildings): Alterations to provide modern facilities must be carried out in sympathy with the historic value of these buildings. Alterations to

increase the size of vernacular houses are not always appropriate and must be confined to the rears of houses.

Section 8.1.6 (New Build Interventions – Alternative Design Approach): New buildings which depart from the proportions and façade arrangements typical to Skerries must be of a very high standard of architectural design and must positively contribute to the character of the area. A character impact statement outlining the design concept and providing justification for the proposal in terms of its response to the scale, materials and grain of the ACA must be accompany any such application.

Section 8.1.6 (New Build Interventions – Rear Extensions): Additions to the rears of properties can often be visible, because of the network of streets and laneways...As the laneways are key elements of the special character of the Skerries ACA it is important that extensions should therefore be designed to minimise their visibility from any public laneway, they should be subsidiary to the main building, of an appropriate scale, and should follow the guidance for new infill buildings given above.

Section 8.1.6 (New Build Interventions – Materials and Features): Only materials of good visual quality and durability may be used in new developments.

Sections 8.1.7 (Amalgamation of Properties or Sites) and 8.1.8 (Demolition).

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located within or adjoining any designated site.

The nearest European Sites in close proximity to the appeal site are as follows:

- c. 150m from North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236).
- c. 1km from Skerries Islands SPA (Site Code 004122).
- c. 2.9km from Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 003000).
- c. 3.3km from Rockabill SPA (Site Code 004014).

The nearest Natural Heritage Areas in close proximity to the appeal site are as follows:

- c. 1km from Skerries Islands NHA (Site Code 001218).

7.0 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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). 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.

8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

I have 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 (refer to form in Appendix 3 for details).

9.0 The Appeal

9.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal submission was received on 29/09/2025 from Joseph and Geraldine Grimes. The grounds of appeal (GOA) are as follows:

- Welcome improvement works to Protected Structure.
- Concerns raised regarding nature and extent of proposal – amalgamation, works to Protected Structure and extension.
- Extension is oversized (c. 146sq.m) and will be overbearing on Protected Structure (c. 56sq.m) affecting its setting & amenity and on neighbouring properties.
- Does not comply with FDP policy on residential extensions, development in ACAs or alteration/ development of Protected Structures or with Skerries ACA Statement of Character as it relates to rear extensions, alternative design approach or materials and features.

- Scale, height and visibility of extension is out of character with area and will give rise to detrimental impact on neighbouring and visual amenities of streetscape.
- Will materially and adversely affect character of Protected Structure on account of 0.6m high differential between flat roof parapet and apex of thatched roof.
- Proposal does not address previous relevant refusals under PL06F.127910 (related concerns raised that PA did not take account of this refusal in their assessment) and P.A. Ref. F21A/0248.
- Extension's materials and finishes do not reflect those of other Skerries historic buildings and will not complement or enhance the Protected Structure. Lack of detail provided in respect to colour of metal cladding.
- Concerns raised re: accuracy of submitted visual impact and shadow studies. More detailed analysis is required.
- Proposal will impact on existing daylight/ sunlight to front garden and front façade of No. 20a and shadow impact of shared boundary not accurately modelled.
- Third party concerns/ requested changes not fully addressed at application stage.

The following were also appended to the appeal:

- Appendix 1a: Fingal Thatch Project (2022) record for 18-19 Thomas Hand Street.
- Appendix 1b: Fingal Thatch Project (2022) record for 39 The Square.
- Appendix 2: ABP Decision Order and Board Direction in respect of PL06F.127910.
- Appendix 3: Copy of FI stage observation on P.A. Ref. F25A/0368E dated 24/07/2025 with comments made in respect to site planning history (under item no. 4) highlighted.
- Appendix 4: Part of PA decision notice in respect of refusal under P.A. Ref. F21A/0248; partial copy of unknown architectural site plan drawing with layout of No. 2 Thomas Hand Street highlighted; partial copy of proposed east elevation of unidentified property; and, extract from PA report on P.A. Ref. 21A/0248 with certain text highlighted.
- Appendix 5: Copy of PA Conservation Officer report on P.A. Ref. F18A/0531 with text referring to historic 'quadrant' relationship between No's 18-19 and No. 20 Thomas Hand Street highlighted.

The appeal is accompanied by copies of correspondence received from the PA in respect to their application stage submissions.

9.2. Applicant Response

The applicant, in their response to appeal received 28/10/2025, states the following:

- *Previous Refusals* – ABP refusal on site under PL06F.127910 related to an entirely different and irrelevant proposal made over 20 years ago. Refusal under P.A. Ref. F21A/0248 related to proposal for a new dwelling on neighbouring site and is not relevant to proposal for extension to existing dwelling.
- *Conservation* – PA determined proposal to be fully compliant with relevant FDP policy on ACAs and Protected Structures, and it was supported by CO.
- *Protected Structure* – proposal will not materially adversely affect character of same which will be sensitively restored, conserved and extended ensuring its longevity and continued use. PA and CO share this view.
- *Visual Impact* – rear extension be visually imperceptible from public road as illustrated by submitted photomontages/ will not give rise to negative visual impact.
- *Impact on Residential Amenity* – height of proposed 2-storey extension is only marginally higher than that of existing extension and is not disproportionate and will not give rise to overbearance. PA were satisfied with submitted shadow study and determined that proposal would not give rise to overbearance on adjoining properties.
- *Materials and Finishes* – concerns regarding extension’s metal clad exterior & flat roof not being in-keeping with existing buildings in ACA not reasonable on basis that proposed extension utilises a high quality contemporary design & materiality and will not be visible from public realm.

9.3. Planning Authority Response

The PA, in their response received 17/10/2025 state that they have no comments to make on the appeal and seek that their decision to grant permission be upheld and, where relevant, conditions relating to the payment of a financial contribution/ special

contribution in accordance with FCC's Section 48 Development Contribution Scheme be applied.

9.4. Prescribed Bodies

Response from DoHLGH Development Applications Unit (received 11/11/2025).

- *General* - It is considered that PA has undertaken a robust assessment of proposed works to the Protected Structure. The proposal is acceptable and in accordance with FDP's development management policies and objectives relating to Protected Structures and Architectural Conservation Areas. DAU support grant of permission.
- *Conservation* - Conservation and renovation of Protected Structure is in line with best conservation practice as per the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines.
- *Design of Extension* - Structure's inclusion on RPS and location in Skerries ACA do not preclude its extension or the taking of a contemporary design approach to same. Design of extension responds to site constraints and its roof profile seeks to minimise its overall height and impact on the Protected Structure and on surrounding area.
- *Visual Impact* - Whilst the extension will be visible from the public realm to the south and east, the relatively minor height difference between it and the existing structure is acceptable in the context of its setback from the cottage, its immediate built context and roofscape of taller pitched roofs. Overall, the relative scale and visual impact of the proposed extension is acceptable.
- *Materials and Finishes* - Refined material palette of extension is acceptable. Concerns raised regarding design and materiality of cottage's front and gable windows. It is recommended that PA's condition No. 5 also include requirement to repair the historic sash windows and to redesign the part-glazed door – with details to be agreed with the PA's CO.

9.5. Observer

1 no. observation was received (28/10/2025) from neighbouring property owners, Ian and Karen Butler and raised the same issues as previously raised at application stage:

- Overdevelopment arising from height and scale of proposed extension.

- Overbearance on neighbouring properties and on Protected Structure.
- Design and materiality of extension is out of character with the area.
- Obstruction of light to skylights to first floor/ attic bedrooms in No. 39 The Square.
- Proximity of extension to skylights gives rise to a fire escape and security issue.
- Extension would block No. 39's long standing east-facing ground floor living room window cutting off this source of natural light.
- Submitted drawings/ shadow assessment does not accurately reflect opes on No. 39 and does not consider impact of proposal on daylighting to property.
- Concerns raised re: accuracy of submitted shadow studies relative to lived experience and more detailed analysis is required.
- Height and proximity of proposed rear extension to No. 39's rear amenity space will give rise to visual intrusion, overbearance and overshadowing.
- Proposed first floor bedroom windows and ground floor patio door will give rise to overlooking of No. 39's patio and rear garden.
- Current proposal does not address reason for refusal under PL06F.127910 with many of the same issues which gave rise to the refusal arising. Refusal reasoning under P.A. Ref. F21A/0248 is also relevant to subject proposal.
- Proposal is not compliant with Skerries ACA Statement of Character, with Objective DMS157 or Section 8.1.6 [no such policy or section in FDP] or with policy guidance on 'Alternative Design Approaches', 'Infill Buildings' or 'Rear Extensions'.
- Negative impact on neighbouring property values.

9.6. Further Responses

None received.

10.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, 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:

- Principle of Development

- Works to Protected Structure
- Design and Visual Impact of Extension
- Impact on Existing Residential Amenity
- Other Matters

10.1. Principle of Development

- 10.1.1. Government policy is to encourage consolidation and compact growth in order to make efficient use of zoned and serviced land, with NPOs 3c and 6 of the National Planning Framework and RPO 4.3 of the RSES 2019-2031 supporting the re-intensification of brownfield sites.
- 10.1.2. FDP Section 3.5.13, Policy SPQHP38 and Objectives SPQHO37 and SPQHO38 encourage sustainable compact residential growth via consolidation and intensification whilst Objectives SPQHO41 and SPQHO44 promote the reuse and refurbishment of existing buildings and dwellings. I am satisfied that the proposal to refurbish, extend and bring a disused Protected Structure back into active residential use is compliant with same.
- 10.1.3. The appeal site is zoned 'TC – Town Centre' with the objective to 'Protect and enhance the special physical and social character of town and district centres and provide and/or improve urban facilities'. 'Residential' is a use class which is permitted in principle under the 'TC' zoning and, on this basis, I am satisfied that the proposal is acceptable in principle subject to the detailed considerations below.

10.2. Works to Protected Structure

- 10.2.1. The GOA raise concerns regarding the nature and extent of the proposal and contend that it does not comply with FDP policy on the alteration and development of Protected Structures.
- 10.2.2. The applicant in their response to the GOA state that their proposal will not materially or adversely affect character of the Protected Structure, which they argue will be sensitively restored, conserved and extended ensuring its longevity and continued use.

- 10.2.3. Relevant development plan requirements which relate to the proposal include Policy HCAP9 which promotes the repair, re-use and sensitive retrofitting of architectural heritage and requires that its adaptive re-use and regeneration adheres to best conservation practice; Policy HCAP 10 which encourages the sympathetic and appropriate reuse, rehabilitation and retention of protected structures and historic buildings ensuring the special interest, character and setting of the building or structure is preserved; Policy HCAP12 which seeks to ensure that direct interventions to Protected Structures is guided by architectural conservation principles so that they are sympathetic, sensitive and appropriate to the special interest, appearance, character, and setting of same; and, Policy HCAP13 requiring the retention and appropriate active use of Protected Structures. Section 8.1.4 (Vernacular Buildings) of the Skerries ACA Statement of Character requires alterations to provide modern facilities must be carried out in sympathy with the historic value of these buildings.
- 10.2.4. It is proposed to renovate, refurbish and amalgamate no's 18-19 to allow for the reuse of the Protected Structure as the dwelling's entrance hall, study and living room. I note that the structure's proposed use in connection with this living accommodation will not necessitate significant structural intervention and will have a comparatively low impact on the structure's built fabric (i.e. when compared to an alternative proposal for use as a kitchen or bathroom for example which would have additional and more invasive service requirements). It is also proposed to open up the middle area of the structure in order to provide for a large living room whilst simultaneously retaining the structure's 2 no. existing hearths/ fireplaces which are identified as important heritage features by the PA's CO.
- 10.2.5. The submitted plans and Conservation Methodology Report show that no material changes are proposed to the vernacular structure's distinctive (and locally rare) pitched thatched roof (other than its general repair and flashing repairs around chimney etc. to be undertaken by a specialist thatcher) or to its six-bay ope arrangement or character of its sash fenestration – which are characteristic features identified in its description on the NIAH and in the 2022 Fingal Thatch Project Report.
- 10.2.6. The PA were satisfied that the proposed works to the existing structure comply with FDP policy on the refurbishment of Protected Structures. The CO, in their report of 16/06/2025, welcomed the re-use and sensitive renovation of the vernacular building, with the DoHLGH's Development Applications Unit being satisfied that it is in

accordance with FDP's development management policies and objectives relating to Protected Structures and Architectural Conservation Areas.

10.2.7. In light of the foregoing considerations set out in preceding paragraphs 10.2.4 - 10.2.6, I am satisfied that the conservation and renovation of the Protected Structure is generally in line with best conservation practice as set out under the 2011 Heritage Guidelines and I am also satisfied that the proposal, which protects the integrity of the structure and minimises the removal of its original fabric, is compliant with FDP policy relating to the alteration and development of Protected Structures.

10.2.8. Notwithstanding, I note that the CO and DAU have raised some concerns regarding proposals for the structure's sash windows and front door (requirement to repair rather than replace historic sash windows and to redesign the part-glazed door); the need for additional details in respect of proposed reinstated chimneystack (incl. how it physically impacts the existing thatched roof); and, the requirement to omit perforated ventilation duct and vents on the upper levels of the end gable walls and the proposed step in the rendered finish on its front elevation to distinguish between no's 18 and 19. Having regard to the high profile location of the structure, its architectural significance and the rarity of its original built fabric in Skerries and, to Sections 8.1.3 and 8.1.6 of the Statement of Character for the Skerries Architectural Conservation Area (2008) which provide guidance on replacement windows & doors and on appropriate materials & finishes, I consider that (as per the approach recommended by the PA's CO and the DAU) these matters are reasonably capable of being addressed via condition requiring the applicant to agree the detail of same with the PA prior to the commencement of development.

10.3. **Design and Visual Impact of Extension**

10.3.1. The appellant and observer consider the proposed extension constitutes overdevelopment on the basis of its scale and height relative to the Protected Structure, to adjoining properties and to the existing character of the area. They are also of the view that the extension does not comply with FDP policy on residential extensions, development in the Skerries ACA or alteration/ development of Protected Structures or within ACAs generally.

- 10.3.2. The PA were satisfied that the proposal was in-keeping with pattern of substantial redevelopment to rear of historical dwellings elsewhere in Skerries, with the CO raising no objection to the proposed rear extension and the DAU noting that the structure's inclusion on RPS and location in Skerries ACA does not preclude its extension or the taking of a contemporary design approach to same.
- 10.3.3. The existing single storey structure (to be retained) is c. 56sq.m and c.14m in length, c.5m in depth, with a pitched thatched roof which reaches a maximum ridge height of c 5.7m at its apex (where it adjoins Thomas Hand Street) and c. 5.5m where it adjoins No. 20A to the north on account of the differing site levels. The existing single storey rear extension, link corridor and office which are proposed to be demolished comprise of c. 39sq.m. The proposed extension has a total area of c. 146sq.m is 1-2 storeys in height (reaching a max. height of 5.8m) and is c. 14-19m in length on account of its stepped rear elevation with a variable width on account of its glazed link to the Protected Structure and its modulated footprint.
- 10.3.4. I note that the proposed rear extension, whilst much larger in scale than the existing rear extension, has a flat roof, is sited in a setback position from the Protected Structure (c. 1.5m – being connected to same by a single storey glazed link) and steps from 2-storeys to single storey on its north elevation. I consider that its proposed roof profile, siting and massing modulation all serve to reduce and minimise its bulk and impact on the Protected Structure and on neighbouring properties to the east and west. This was also the opinion of the DAU who recognise that the design of the proposed extension responds to site constraints and its roof profile seeks to minimise its overall height and impact on the Protected Structure and on surrounding area.
- 10.3.5. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the proposed south and east elevation drawings show that the proposed extension would be visible to the south to the rear of the Protected Structure and above the pitched gable of the No. 40 The Square and also, and to a lesser extent, from the east above the ridge of and beyond the Protected Structure on account of the relative street and site levels (notwithstanding the construction of a replacement dwelling at No. 20 which will enclose and obscure much of the view of the side gable of the extension from the east (looking west) minimising its visibility from the public realm). For these reasons, I do not agree with the PA's opinion that the extension would not be visible from the street.

- 10.3.6. It was noted during my site inspection that this part of the Skerries ACA is characterised by a variable built form and by 1-2 storey properties of varying widths/ siting arrangements relative to the road and with a wide variety of roof heights and profiles – with many rear extensions and backland properties (such as No. 20A) having a greater height and more prominent roof profiles than those fronting the street. This context clustering of street forms and scales is also referred to in the submitted Conservation Report submitted by the applicant which also notes the curvature of the road, the angles of building placement and the visual enclosure provided by same at this location, to the road in addition to the historical built form of site incl. 2-storey previous outbuilding on the site.
- 10.3.7. Having considered the height, form, roof profile, setback siting (from the cottage) and partial visibility of the proposed rear extension in the context of the varied streetscape and roofscape evident on The Square, Thomas Hand Street and further to the north along Quay Street, I am satisfied that, whilst the extension will be visible and will give rise to a slight change in visual character at this location, the scale and height of the proposal is reasonable and would not be out of character with the area. This view is shared by the DAU who were of the opinion that, whilst the extension will be visible from the public realm to the south and east, the relatively minor height difference between it and the existing structure is acceptable in the context of its setback from the cottage, its immediate built context and roofscape of taller pitched roofs. For the same reasons, I also do not consider that the extension would give rise to a negative or detrimental impact on the visual amenities of streetscape, on the Protected Structure or on the Skerries ACA. I am also of the view that the aforementioned minor height differential between the proposed extension and the Protected Structure when coupled with the extension's siting in a setback position from the latter would ensure that it would not give rise to undue overbearance on or materially adversely affect the character or setting of the Protected Structure as viewed from the public realm.
- 10.3.8. In respect to the architectural design and materiality of the extension, I note the concerns raised by the appellant and observer in this regard. The PA were satisfied with the 'contemporary coastal vernacular' design approach on the basis of its contrast with and enhancement of the character of the traditional vernacular cottage.
- 10.3.9. Having considered the policy set out in the 2011 Heritage Guidelines and the Skerries ACA Statement of Character in respect to rear extensions, alternative design

approaches, materials and features, I am satisfied that the proposal represents an appropriate and sufficiently justified design juxtaposition between new and old (historic/ vernacular). Whilst the extension's materials and finishes are a departure from those on other historic buildings in Skerries, I consider that they are of sufficient quality for the backland siting of the extension and I am satisfied that they present an identifiable contemporary layer which is visually distinguishable from the historic fabric at this location.

10.3.10. The appellant also raises an issue with the lack of detail provided in respect to colour of metal cladding. I consider that this is a minor issue that is capable of being addressed by condition.

10.4. **Impact on Existing Residential Amenity**

The appellant and observer have raised a range of concerns in respect to the proposal's impact on their residential amenity and the related negative impact on their property values.

Overlooking

The observer has raised concerns regarding the potential for overlooking of their patio and rear garden arising from the glazing arrangements to the rear (north elevation) of the proposed extension.

Having reviewed the proposed plans and elevations, I am satisfied that there is no potential for proposed ground floor kitchen/ living room/ dining windows or 2 no. first floor bedroom windows to give rise to direct overlooking of the adjoining property to the west on account of their relative siting, orientation and northerly aspect. Having regard to the nature and extent of the existing boundary which was observed between the properties during my site inspection, I also do not consider that the ground floor glazing arrangement could give rise to an unreasonable loss of privacy. Whilst some indirect overlooking of the adjoining private amenity space to the west may arise from the proposed bedroom windows, I note the existing view of the rear garden serving the subject site from the neighbouring first floor rear bedroom windows and balcony and consider any likely future mutual overlooking between these town centre properties to be acceptable on this basis of this equivalence.

Having regard to the orientation of the proposed extension relative to the siting and orientation of No. 20A to the north-east, I consider that there is no potential for the proposal to give rise to overlooking of that property or indeed to the adjacent properties further to the north fronting Quay Street on account of the very significant intervening separation distances involved.

The extension's east facing windows (serving an ensuite and walk-in-wardrobe) are oriented toward No. 20A's front garden and toward the side elevation of the replacement dwelling under construction at No. 20. It is not clear from the submitted drawings whether these are to be fitted with obscure glazing and, as such, they could give rise to overlooking of neighbouring properties. For this reason, where the Commission are minded to grant permission, I recommend the attachment of a condition to ensure they are fitted with manufactured opaque or frosted glass which shall be permanently maintained.

Overbearance/ Visual Intrusion

- 10.4.1. The appellant and observer consider that the proposed extension, on account of its siting design and scale, will give rise to undue overbearance on neighbouring properties and also to visual intrusion on No. 39's rear amenity space. The applicant in their response to the GOA state that height of proposed 2-storey extension is only marginally higher than that of existing extension and is not disproportionate and will not give rise to overbearance. The PA were satisfied with submitted shadow study and determined that proposal would not give rise to overbearance on adjoining properties.
- 10.4.2. As detailed in Section 10.3 of this report, I am satisfied that the rear extension on account of its siting and height would not be unacceptably visually perceptible from the public realm. Section 14.6.6.4 (Overlooking and Overbearance) of the FDP requires consideration to be had to levels of overbearance and to the bulk and massing of the proposed scheme relative to neighbouring properties. In this regard, I acknowledge that, on account of the dense, compact urban nature of this location, the proposed rear extension will be visible from neighbouring properties and will give rise to a change in the existing visual outlook from same. Notwithstanding, having considered the proposal against the height, scale and form of adjoining properties, including the built arrangements to the east (No. 20 under construction to the immediate front of No. 20A which occupies a backland location) and the large existing

2-storey extensions to the rear of No's 38 and 39 to the west (and particularly the former) which have an equivalent plot form to the appeal site, I am satisfied that its bulk and mass is acceptable and generally in-keeping with character of the existing built form at this location and would not give rise to undue overbearance on its immediately adjoining neighbours.

- 10.4.3. In respect to the concerns regarding the impact of the proposed extension on No. 39's rear amenity space, I note that c. 4.4m of the ground floor level and c. 2.95m of the first floor level of the extension would abut this area (i.e. projecting beyond the line of the neighbouring property's own 2-storey rear extension but being in line with that of No. 38's rear extension. Whilst the proposed arrangements would give rise to a greater enclosure of No's 39's rear patio area, having regard to the nature and extent of the existing built context to the rear of the properties at this location in addition to the significant length of No. 39's rear garden and to the design and massing of the north portion of the proposed extension which is modulated in order to step away from No. 39, I do not consider that the proposal would give rise to an unacceptable overbearing impact on same.

Overshadowing/ Daylight Impacts

- 10.4.4. The appellant considers that the proposal is likely to impact on existing daylight/sunlight to their front garden and to the front façade of their property. They also raise specific concerns regarding the accuracy of the submitted shadow studies, arguing that more detailed analysis in respect to the overshadowing impact on neighbouring properties is warranted.
- 10.4.5. The observer raises a concern that the proposed 2-storey extension will obstruct existing levels of daylight to skylights to first floor/ attic bedrooms in No. 39 The Square and would block light to an east-facing ground floor window/ lightwell serving the living room. In this context, they argue that the applicant's documentation does not accurately reflect or take account of the nature and extent of neighbouring opes or fully assess the overshadowing and daylighting impact of the proposal.
- 10.4.6. Having regard to the policy guidance set out under Section 14.6.6.1 (Daylight and Sunlight) of the FDP, I note that Objective DMSO22 only requires (more detailed) daylight and sunlight analysis for all proposed developments of 50+ units or as required by the PA. In the case of this proposal for works to an existing structure, the

PA concluded that there was no likelihood of overshadowing of neighbouring properties on basis of submitted shadow study and separation plan.

10.4.7. I note that No. 20A features a comparatively large rear garden and generous plot width considering its location is a built-up town centre, with the rear garden serving No. 39 being much narrower and linear in its form by comparison. Notwithstanding their configuration, the BRE 209 Guidelines (2022 edition) recommend that at least half of a garden or amenity area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on March 21st (the equinox) to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year. Having considered the aspect and orientation of the appeal site and the properties adjoining it, I note that there is some potential for the proposal to overshadow properties generally to its east in the earlier-to-mid part of the day and those to the west in the mid-to-latter part of the day. Notwithstanding, having regard to the built-up town centre context of the properties, I am satisfied that existing standards of residential amenity will be maintained.

10.4.8. Whilst the observer has not provided any details or evidence demonstrating the internal layout of their property, I acknowledge that the replacement of the existing single storey rear extension with a 2-storey rear extension abutting the boundary with No. 39 is likely to give rise to an impact on the daylight penetration to that property's first floor/ attic bedrooms via their existing rooflights. Notwithstanding, I do note the existence of front and rear first floor level windows which also serve the neighbouring accommodation at no. 39 and that, in accordance with BRE 2009 Guidelines (2022 edition) guidance on habitable rooms, bedroom accommodation has a comparatively lower daylight requirement than residential living spaces. In this regard, whilst the submitted shadow analysis indicates that there will be a degree of additional impact on light penetration to No. 39, it is my view that as the properties at this location are located in a relatively dense and built-up town centre context which is characterised by a compact, urban built form, some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable. For this reason, I consider that the degree of additional impact is acceptable in this specific instance.

10.4.9. In respect to the concerns raised regarding the blocking of light to No. 39's east-facing living room window, I note that a photograph of an obscured glass box-type window/ lightwell taken from the interior of the property is provided as part of the observation which also states that the window adjoins the subject property's existing deck area.

However, I could not identify the location or verify the existence of this window during my site inspection – I refer the Commission to my site inspection photos in this regard. I would also draw the Commission’s attention to the fact that there are also rear windows serving this living room space.

10.4.10. In respect to the reference made in the observation regarding the right to light, I note that this civil matter to be resolved between the parties, having regard to the provisions of s.34(13) of the 2000 Planning and Development Act (as amended).

Other Amenity Issues

10.4.11. The boundary between the subject site and No. 39 comprises of a c. 1.5m high blockwork wall with the stone side gable wall of the latter property’s rear 2-storey extension rising above this in a slightly setback position - with the extension’s guttering, downpipes and foul vent pipe overhanging the intermediate space between the properties.

10.4.12. The applicant is proposing to build up to the aforementioned blockwork boundary wall with No. 39, thereby maintaining a slight offset from the side wall of the existing 2-storey extension. On this basis, I am satisfied that the proposal would not give rise to encroachment on the adjoining property and I consider that the proposed extension’s interaction with the existing vent pipe serving No. 39 is a civil matter to be resolved between the parties, having regard to the provisions of s.34(13) of the 2000 Planning and Development Act (as amended).

10.4.13. Concerns have also been expressed regarding design of extension’s flat roof and the potential for same to give rise to a security risk to neighbouring properties. I note that no changes are proposed to the access arrangements to the subject property whose garden and rear extension are only accessible via the Protected Structure and not directly from the street. On this basis I am satisfied that the proposal reduces no new security risk to neighbouring properties.

10.4.14. Overall, in light of the foregoing conclusions on the proposal’s likely impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties, there is no evidence the proposal would negatively impact on property values in the vicinity.

10.5. **Other Matters**

Procedural

10.5.1. Third party concerns are raised regarding the nature and extent of the PA's assessment of the proposal, the planning history of the site and the information provided by way of submissions. I consider the appeal process has given all parties an equal opportunity to address and clarify all such matters and I am satisfied that there is sufficient information available to enable me to make an informed recommendation on the appeal.

Precedent

10.5.2. Both the appellant and the observer place significant emphasis on site specific and local planning precedent and seek to draw parallels between the subject proposal and the proposals which were previously refused under P.A. Ref. F01A/0627 (PL 06F.127910) and P.A. Ref. F21A/0248. In doing so, they seek to bring the Commission's attention to a perceived lack of consistency in planning decision making.

10.5.3. In respect to the relevance of the decision made under P.A. Ref. F01A/0627 (PL 06F.127910), I note that there are no history documents readily available in respect to this file and that this historic proposal for the change of use of the Protected Structure to Credit Union offices with a single storey extension to rear, was assessed under a previous development plan and not against the policy and objectives in force under the current Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. The more recent decision, under P.A. Ref. F21A/0248, relates to the proposal for a replacement dwelling on a neighbouring site with different constraints and has what I would consider to be a materially different planning and development context to the subject proposal.

10.5.4. Notwithstanding the foregoing, all 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. In the case of this appeal, the crux of the matter is not just whether the proposed design harmonises with and reflects the prevailing built character of the area and what impact it has on neighbouring properties, but also the impact on the Protected Structure and ACA and the merits of the planning and conservation gain which arise from the proposal – matters which are each assessed and concluded upon in the preceding sections of this assessment.

Parking

- 10.5.5. Concerns are raised by third parties regarding the proposal to provide for 1 no. car parking space (which I note was acceptable to the PA) having regard to the planning history of the site, which they argue extinguished the right to park to the front of the property, and the demand for on-street parking in the vicinity.
- 10.5.6. Having considered the parking requirements arising from the commercial office use on the site permitted under P.A. Ref. F05A/1483, I am satisfied that the proposed residential use of the site would not give rise to further car parking demand on the basis of the car parking standards set out under Table 14.19 of the FDP.
- 10.5.7. In respect to the concerns regarding the applicant's right to park to the front of the dwelling being extinguished, having reviewed the site planning history I note that whilst Condition No. 3 attached to P.A. Ref. F05A/1483 required that no car parking provision be made to the front of the development, a subsequent permission granted under P.A. Ref. F24A/0170 permitted the use of the area to the front of the cottage to be used as 1 no. car parking space.
- 10.5.8. In light of the foregoing, I am satisfied with the proposal to provide parking for 1 no. car off-street and to the front of the dwelling which is consistent with development plan policy for such development.
- 10.5.9. An issue is raised in respect to the proposal to use gravel in the redesigned parking area to the front of the dwelling. Notwithstanding the proposal for a paver border surround to contain the gravel in the proposed parking bay, having considered the proximity to the public footpath and carriageway and the potential for the displacement and scattering of the gravel, I consider that a more appropriate surface type such as permeable block paving is warranted at this location. I am satisfied that this is a minor design detail capable of being agreed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Surface Water

- 10.5.10. The surface water management arrangements which were subject to FI and CFI requests involve a blue roof on the proposed extension, French drains to the front and rear of the Protected Structure, SuDS rainwater planters adjoining the rear patio and a surface water outfall to the public storm sewer on Thomas Hand Street.
- 10.5.11. Whilst the PA were satisfied in principle with the applicant's surface water drainage design, the PA's Drainage Department whilst accepting the principle of the proposed

SuDS measures considered that further clarification on same and on their drainage calculations was needed by pre-commencement condition.

- 10.5.12. Having considered the information on file I am satisfied that sufficient information is already available on the scheme's surface water drainage design and that outstanding matters relating to the scheme's detailed SuDS design and the basis for its drainage calculations are matters which are capable of being addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Wastewater and Water Supply

- 10.5.13. The property has existing connections to the public wastewater (foul drainage) network and to the public water supply mains which are to continue to be used to serve the proposed dwelling. Whilst I note that there is no correspondence on file from Uisce Eireann (UE), I am satisfied that there is no evidence to suggest that the local water supply distribution network or foul drainage network are over capacity and I am satisfied that the bringing of No's 18-19 back into active use as an extended residential dwelling will not give rise to significant additional demand.

Fire Safety

- 10.5.14. It was noted during the site inspection that there were 3 no. east-facing windows on the pitched roof of the neighbouring property to the west, with these rooflights being setback from the roof eaves.
- 10.5.15. The observer raises fire safety concerns regarding impact on means of escape from first floor/ attic bedrooms in their property on account of the proposed 1-2 storey rear extension.
- 10.5.16. The Development Management Guidelines (2007) state that fire safety considerations, which are covered and governed by a separate statutory code, can only be considered where they are relevant to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. In this case, issues have been raised in respect to the impact of the proposal on roof-level fire egress from a neighbouring property. Fingal County Council are the competent authority on such matters, however, there are no reports on file from their Building Control Office or Fire Safety Officer.
- 10.5.17. I note that no history documents are available in respect to the observer's property, with no details of the internal layout of the neighbouring property having been provided

as part of their submission. For these reasons, it has not been possible to verify whether or not these rooms have another means of escape in the event of a fire. Notwithstanding, I note that the proposed development does not encroach on the adjoining property (as discussed in paragraph 10.4.10) or impede access to same and for these reasons, I consider that there is no evidence that the proposal would affect fire access or egress from the adjoining property. There is also no evidence of a burden or wayleave across the appeal site in this regard.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend a GRANT of permission subject to the following conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of the site on lands zoned 'TC – Town and District Centre', to the planning policies, objectives and development standards of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, particularly to Sections 10.5.2.1 & 14.19.3.1 (Protected Structures), 14.19.3.3 (Architectural Conservation Area), 10.5.2.5 (Vernacular Heritage and Other Built Heritage Assets), 14.6.6.1 (Daylight and Sunlight) and 14.6.6.4 (Overlooking and Overbearance), to the Skerries Architectural Conservation Area – Statement of Character (2008) and to the provisions of the Architectural Heritage Protection: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2011), to available infrastructural capacity, to the nature, scale and design of the proposed development relative to adjoining dwellings, and to the existing pattern of development in the wider area, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would constitute an acceptable form of development at this location, would provide for an acceptable standard of future residential amenity and would not seriously injure the amenities of adjoining properties, and in particular would not give rise to undue overshadowing or overbearing impacts on adjoining properties, would not give rise to significant impacts on Skerries ACA or on the character and setting of the on-site Protected Structure, and would not give rise to an undue demand for parking in the surrounding area. The proposed development would therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further information received by the planning authority on the 21/07/2025 and the clarification of further information received on 14/08/2025, 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>(a) External finishes shall be in accordance with the details submitted with the application unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>(b) Prior to commencement, details are to be submitted for written agreement with the planning authority on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. the exact detail of the proposed reinstated chimneystack and how this physically impacts the existing thatched roof.ii. the omission of the step in the rendered finish on the front elevation wall between nos. 18 and 19.iii. the omission of proposed perforated ventilation duct and vents on the upper levels of the end gable walls and the provision of any alternative means of ventilation to the property.iv. proposals to repair rather than replace the historic sash windows and to redesign the part-glazed door on the basis that the slipped internal light in proposed half door is historically inaccurate and unacceptable.v. the nature and colour of the metal cladding proposed for the rear extension. <p>Final details in this regard shall be prepared by a suitably qualified Conservation Architect, and a Conservation Method Statement shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of orderly development, conservation heritage and the visual amenities of the area.</p>

3.	<p>Prior to commencement, revised proposals for an alternative finish to the proposed parking bay, to the immediate east of the Protected Structure, to comprise of a permeable block of bound finish are to be submitted for written agreement with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</p>
4.	<p>The glazing to all bathroom and en-suite windows shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.</p>
5.	<p>The existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.</p> <p>Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity.</p>
6.	<p>Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.</p>
7.	<p>The following requirements shall be complied with in full:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. One car parking space only is permitted for the development. b. The footpath and kerb shall be dished at the developer's expense to the satisfaction of the Council. c. Any works to the public footpath and road carriageway to facilitate the development and any repairs to the public footpath and road carriageway necessary as a result of the development shall be at the expense of the developer and completed to the Councils' standards for taking-in-charge and to the satisfaction of the Council. d. Notwithstanding the exempted development provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 - 2023 (or any amendment or replacement of said Regulations), no additional development whatsoever shall take place within the curtilage of each unit to provide for additional car parking save with a prior grant of planning permission.

	<p>e. All underground or overhead services and poles shall be relocated, as may be necessary, to a suitable location at the Developer's own expense and according to the requirements of the relevant utility service provider/service owner/statutory undertaker.</p> <p>f. All stormwater shall be disposed of to soakpits or drains within the site and shall not discharge onto the public road surface.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</p>
8.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.</p>
9.	<p>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 Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>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.</p>

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.

Emma Gosnell
Planning Inspector
4th March 2026

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323751-25
Proposed Development Summary	PROTECTED STRUCTURE: Demolition of extension, construction of extension and all associated site works.
Development Address	18 & 19 Thomas Hand Street, Skerries, Co. Dublin, K34 HH24.
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input 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. 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 development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<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)	

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination

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

I have considered the proposal: works to a Protected Structure (RPS 0194) comprising of the demolition of rear extension, link corridor & shed; the construction of a one & two-storey extension to rear with link-corridor between new extension and existing cottage; renovation of cottage, and all associated site works at 18 & 19 Thomas Hand Street, Skerries, Co. Dublin in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located:

- c. 150m from North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236).
- c. 1km from Skerries Islands SPA (Site Code 004122).
- c. 2.9km from Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 003000).
- c. 3.3km from Rockabill SPA (Site Code 004014).

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project in a town centre location, 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:

- The small scale and nature of the development.
- The location of the development in a serviced urban area, its distance from European Sites and the urban nature of intervening habitats and the absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.
- Taking into account screening report/ determination by PA.

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.

Appendix 3

Screening the need for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination

The subject site is located at 18 & 19 Thomas Hand Street, Skerries, Co. Dublin.

The Mill Stream (Skerries, Code: IE_EA_08M030500 which has a Poor Ecological Status and is At Risk) is located c. 650m to the south of the appeal site and separated from same by intervening commercial and residential developments, a town park and sports pitches. The site is underlain by the Balrothery groundwater body (Code: IE_EA_G_043) which has a Good ecological status and is Not At Risk. The Northwestern Irish Sea coastal waterbody (Code: IE_EA_020_0000), which has a Good ecological status but is At Risk, is located c. 300m to the east of the appeal site.

The proposal comprises of works to a Protected Structure (RPS 0194) comprising of the demolition of rear extension, link corridor & shed; the construction of a one & two-storey extension to rear with link-corridor between new extension and existing cottage; the renovation of cottage; and, all associated site works – see Section 2.0 of Inspector's Report for further details.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the proposal for permission to works to a Protected Structure on this brownfield site at Thomas Hand Street, Skerries, Co. Dublin and I have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and 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 follows:

- The relatively small scale nature and scale of the development on a serviced town centre site.
- The location-distance from nearest water bodies, intervening land uses and lack of hydrological connections.

Conclusion

I conclude that, on the basis of objective information, 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.