



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500033-DF

Development	Permission for the construction of a first-floor extension on top of the existing ground floor to the rear, the extension ridge height will be higher than the existing ridge of the parent bungalow to the front, sides and rear, with all associated site works and internal alterations
Location	15 Church Avenue, Blanchardstown, Dublin 15
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	FW25A/0331
Applicant(s)	Emma Flanagan & Darrell McAllister
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Emma Flanagan & Darrell McAllister
Observer(s)	None

Date of Site Inspection

11th December 2025

Inspector

Conor Hughes

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	4
2.0	Proposed Development	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision.....	4
4.0	Planning History	7
5.0	Policy Context	8
6.0	EIA Screening	13
7.0	The Appeal	13
8.0	Assessment.....	15
9.0	AA Screening	20
10.0	Water Frame Directive.....	21
11.0	Recommendation	22
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	22
	Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	24

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site at 15 Church Avenue is located approximately 175 metres southwest of the junction of Main Street Blanchardstown and is comprised of a single storey mid-terrace cottage with a modern single storey extension to the rear.
- 1.2. The building is of masonry construction with wet dash render finish on the front elevation with brick detail around the window reveals and a storm porch. It has a tiled roof with a brick chimney, uPVC windows, doors, fascia and gutters. The rear elevation of the cottage and side elevations of the modern extension have a smooth render finish. The rear elevation has a brick finish.
- 1.3. There is in-curtilage parking in front of the dwelling for one car and a small garden to the rear. The boundary with the footpath in front of the dwelling is defined by a block wall and driveway. The boundaries to the rear and with the two properties either side are comprised of block walls with some brick details and/or fencing.
- 1.4. There is a small area of hardstanding beyond the rear boundary wall used for bin storage and parking.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is comprised of the construction of a first-floor extension to the rear of the main dwelling to create three new bedrooms and bathroom, internal alterations to the ground floor to create a kitchen/dining room and utility and associated siteworks.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- On 25th September 2025 the Planning Authority issued notification of their decision to refuse permission for the construction of a first-floor extension, to the rear of the existing dwelling, internal alterations and associated siteworks for the following reason:

The subject site is zoned “RS” Residential with the objective to “provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity” within the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. The proposed development by virtue of its design, proximity, massing and protruding roofline is visually incongruous and unsympathetic to the design qualities of the original cottage and is at odds with the visual amenity of the receiving environment. Furthermore, the development results in adverse overlooking, overbearing, domineering and overshadowing impacts on nos.14 & 16 Church Avenue which will seriously injure residential amenities and depreciate the value of their properties. In this regard, the development materially contravenes the “RS” Residential zoning objective and contravenes Sections 14.10.2 & 14.10.2.4, Objectives HCAO36, DMSO190 & SPQHO45, Table 14.26 and Policies HCAP22 & SPQHP41 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and will set an inappropriate precedent for other similar forms of development. The development is therefore contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.1.2. Planning Authority Reports

- The planning report noted that the proposed development is on land zoned as ‘Residential’ in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and that the development is normally considered acceptable where the Planning Authority is satisfied that it is compatible with the policies and objectives for the zone.
- The planning report noted an earlier history of approval for a single storey extension and that the footprint of the extension is not increased.
- The replacement of the ground floor rear doors and windows with larger doors and windows and the materials proposed in the construction of the first-floor extension is considered by the Planning Authority to be appropriate.
- It is also accepted that there is no loss of private amenity space within the curtilage of the dwelling as a result of the proposed development and that approximately 39 metres of amenity space is adequate for a three-bedroom dwelling.

- Whilst not in an architectural conservation area the dwelling is identified in the report to be part of a group of early twentieth century terraced cottages of a distinctive and consistent design and a vernacular style.
- The proposed first-floor extension is considered to harm the design and vernacular quality and appearance of the existing dwelling and the other dwellings in the terrace by interrupting the roofline and chimney stack which are important and distinctive characteristics that should be preserved.
- More specifically it is identified the proposed first-floor roof extending above the roofline of the host dwelling by 0.9 metres is visually incongruous, unbalancing the roofline and visually competing with the chimney stack. This is considered to erode the design qualities of the cottage contrary to policy HCAP22, objectives HCAO36 and DMSO190 and table 14.26 of the Development Plan.
- The prominence of the proposed extension along Church Avenue is further considered to adversely disrupt the visual amenity and character of the cottages in the area by disrupting the prevailing roofline character contrary to objective SPQO45 of the Development Plan.
- The proposed development is considered to harm the residential amenity of the adjacent dwelling at 14 Church Avenue as a window proposed in the first-floor elevation serving bedroom 3 overlooks the private amenity space of this property.
- It is also considered that the form, bulk and height of the first-floor extension being separated from the boundaries with 14 and 16 Church Avenue by one-metre would further harm the residential amenity of these properties as the extension would be overbearing and domineering and overshadowing.
- As a consequence, the report identified that the proposal materially contravenes the 'RS' residential zoning objective and contravenes policy SPQH41 and Sections 14.10.2.2 and 14.10.2.4 of the Development Plan.
- Despite being offered as part of the reason for refusal the report does not engage with the reasons why the proposed development would depreciate

the value of the properties at 14 and 16 Church Avenue or how this will set an inappropriate precedent for other similar forms of development.

3.1.3 Other Technical Reports

- Transport Planning Division: No objection in principle as the access and parking arrangements are not being altered and there is no intensification of the use.
- Water Services Department: No objection in respect of flood risk. Further information was requested requiring the applicant to submit an acceptable SuDS surface-based water drainage proposal.

3.2. Prescribed Bodies

- None

3.3. Third Party Observations

- None

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal site

- Planning Authority Reference FW09A/0049 – permission granted for construction of a single storey extension to the rear, single storey porch extension to front, demolition of existing single storey extension at rear, 6 No. Velux rooflights (5 to the rear and 1 to the front elevation) interior alterations and all associated site works, and widening of existing pedestrian access to vehicular access exiting onto Church Avenue.
- A condition attached to this grant of planning permission required an existing shed and store to be demolished and all rubble and foundations removed from the site. I observed that the building is demolished when I visited the site but that the hardstanding on which the building was constructed remains in situ.

4.2. Adjacent properties

- Planning Authority Reference F05B/0302 – permission refused at 16 Church Avenue Blanchardstown for demolition of existing shower room and store and erection of a two-storey extension to rear of existing dwelling and associated site works.
- Although decided in a different development plan context a two-storey extension was refused for the adjacent dwelling as the Planning Authority considered it to be a substantial extension to a vernacular cottage that in terms of its design, bulk and scale not to respect the vernacular heritage of the area.
- It was further considered that because of its proximity to the boundary with the adjoining property it would be visually obtrusive and result in a loss of outlook for the neighbouring property.
- The Planning Authority concluded the proposal would therefore seriously injure the residential amenity and depreciate the value of properties in the vicinity of the site.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- The Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 (the Development Plan) is the relevant plan for the area and the site is inside the development boundary for Blanchardstown and zoned as Zoning Objective 'RS -Residential'. Church Avenue is identified as a route on the (GDA) Cycle Network Plan.
- The proposed development comprises a first-floor extension to an existing dwelling, internal alterations to the ground floor and associated siteworks.
- Section 3.5.13.1 Residential Extensions of Chapter 3: Sustainable Placemaking and Quality Homes refers to the need for people to extend and renovate their dwellings and that this type of development will be considered favourably where it does not have a negative impact on adjoining properties or on the nature of the surrounding area.

- Policy SPQHP41 – Residential Extensions states:
‘Support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.’
- Objective SPQHO45 – Domestic Extensions states:
‘Encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area.’
- Section 14.10.2 Residential Extensions of Chapter 14: Development Management Standards recognises the need for housing to be adaptable to changing family circumstances and that the Council will support applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend as the needs of the household change, subject to specific safeguards.
- It further states that:
‘the design and layout of residential extensions must have regard to and protect the amenities of adjoining properties, particularly in relation to sunlight, daylight and privacy. The design of extensions must also have regard to the character and form of the existing building, its architectural expression, remaining usable rear private open space, external finishes and pattern of fenestration. Additionally, careful consideration should be paid to boundary treatments, tree planting and landscaping.’
- Section 14.10.2.4 First Floor Extensions states:
First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:
 - *Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking – along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries.*
 - *Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability. “ Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.*

- *External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.*
- The building is identified as a vernacular dwelling by the Planning Authority and part of a group of twentieth century buildings of merit that contribute to the character of the area.
- Section 10.5.2.5 of Chapter 10 states that heritage is not confined to buildings, features and items designated as Protected Structures or located within Architectural Conservation Areas and that scattered throughout Fingal is an extensive stock of modest older buildings and structures some of which have been designed by an architect or engineer while others are vernacular structures built to no formal plans using traditional building types and materials. The Council consider their retention and continued use or reuse exemplifies sustainable development and best energy conservation practice, which is supported by national and regional policy.
- Objective HCAO36 - Extensions to Vernacular Dwellings states:

Require that the size, scale, design, form, layout and materials of extensions to vernacular dwellings or conversions of historic outbuildings take direction from the historic building stock of Fingal and are in keeping and sympathetic with the existing structure.
- Objective DMSO190 - Structures Contributing to Distinctive Character states:

Where development is proposed for a site that contains a vernacular or historic building, 20th Century building of merit and/or structures that contribute to the distinctive character of the rural or urban areas of Fingal then the scheme should have regard to the direction in Table 14.26.
- Policy HCAP22 - Retention and Reuse of Existing Building Stock states:

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 states:

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

- Section 14.19.5 of Chapter 14 states the retention and reuse of vernacular buildings and other non-protected built heritage assets that contribute to the distinctive character of the rural or urban areas of Fingal is supported and encouraged by the Council.
- Table 14.26 provides Direction on Development of Vernacular Buildings or Other Built Heritage Assets. Of specific relevance to the appeal proposal are the following:
 - *Proposals affecting vernacular buildings need to be accompanied by a detailed measured survey, photographic record and written report carried out by a professional with appropriate conservation expertise, preferably with an understanding of vernacular buildings. Where layers of historic thatch still survive within the building the proposal needs to clearly state how the thatch is to be dealt with. The conservation expertise should be retained to supervise and certify the proposed works and ensure that the existing building is properly supported prior to and during construction works.*
 - *Appropriate materials and methods are to be used to carry out repairs to the historic fabric of older buildings.*
 - *Any proposed changes need to be sympathetic to the special features and character of the existing building by respecting the existing setting, form, scale and materials.*
 - *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.*

- *Original building features or materials should be retained including windows, doors, roof coverings, boundary treatments and site features (such as stone walls, hedges, railing, gates, gate piers, cobbles and courtyards).*
- *Seek the retention of surviving historic plot sizes and street patterns in the villages and towns of Fingal and incorporate ancient boundaries or layouts, such as townland boundaries, into re-developments.*
- *Direction for the design of new insertions in historic towns and villages or for extensions to existing older or vernacular buildings should be taken from the historic building stock of the area but can be expressed in a contemporary architectural language.*

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

- None are identified.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1 The site is located approximately:

- 10 kilometres northeast of the Rye Water Valley/Carton Special Area of Conservation (SAC:001398)
- 18 kilometres northwest of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA:004024)
- 18 kilometres northwest of the South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC:000210)
- 15 kilometres southwest of the North Bull Island Special Protection Area (SPA:004006)
- 15 kilometres southwest of the North Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC:000208)

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. 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.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- Paul Sheehy acting for Emma Flanagan and Darrell McAllister have appealed the decision of Fingal County Council to refuse permission. The grounds of the appeal can be summarised as follows:

Refusal Reason

- In respect of the zoning objective the appellants argue that their residential amenity is improved by extending the dwelling.
- This dwelling has been in the ownership of the same family for more than 100 years; the appellant is the fourth generation to occupy it and is committed to ensuring the property continues to be a family home.
- Whilst previously extended in 2010 circumstances have changed and the layout of the rooms is no longer suitable for a young family. The extension is required to meet the genuine needs of the family.
- It is further explained that the appellant's parents also live at the rear of the dwelling and it is important to maintain those close family ties and bonds given the changed circumstances described above.
- The two bedrooms in the existing dwelling are not adjacent to one another and the only way to facilitate this is to extend into a first-floor. They argue that this will not impact on the residential amenity of the two properties on either side of the site for the following reasons.

- No.16 Church Avenue already has a 1.5 storey structure to the rear and as it is located to the southern side of the site will not be overshadowed.
- No.14 Church Avenue has never been altered, extended or improved and is currently unoccupied. The proposed extension will only be increased in height by 1.2 metres and there is a large single storey extension to No.14. The private amenity space of this dwelling is beyond this and will not be overshadowed.
- They also argue the design is similar to the existing extension at the rear of the house and that there is precedence for a similar type of extension at No. 7 Church Avenue that does not detract from the appearance of the street. Photographs of this property are provided in support of the precedence argument.
- It is further suggested that the proposal is not visible from Main Street so the character of the existing streetscape is not adversely impacted.
- It is argued that depreciation in value arising from the proposed development cannot be measured and shouldn't be taken into account. No.16 has been extended many times and has a similar ridge height to the proposed extension. Only a small part of the property boundary of No.14 Church Avenue is impacted. The value of neither property will be adversely impacted.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- In response the Planning Authority make no further comment in respect of the appeal. It requests that the appeal is upheld.
- The Council further request should the appeal be successful that provision is made for applying a financial contribution for any shortfall in open space, any special contribution in accordance with the Council's Section 48 Contributions Scheme and a condition for a tree bond.

7.3. Observations

- None

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the application details and all the other documentation on file, including the submission received to appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regards to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered as follows:

- The principle of development
- The protection of visual amenity and character of the area
- The protection of residential amenities
- Other considerations

The principle of development

8.2. The site is zoned as RS - Residential in the Development Plan and Section 3.5.13.1 residential extensions refers to the need for people to extend their home and that this type of development will be considered favourably where it does not have a negative impact on adjoining properties or on the nature of the surrounding area.

8.3. This building was previously extended to the rear and I concur with the assessment of the Planning Authority that an extension to the dwelling is acceptable in principle subject to being in accordance with the requirements of the policies and objectives of the zoning and consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The protection of visual amenity and character of the area

8.4. Church Avenue is almost entirely comprised of terraced cottages or single storey dwellings from the junction with St. Brigid's Park to Main Street. Whilst some of the buildings are converted to other uses it remains primarily residential in form and character.

8.5. The terraces are in blocks of three or four units and whilst the appearance of many of the front façades of these buildings have been altered and modified the terraces have a similar form, mass and scale throughout. Many of the architectural details

and in particular the brick detail around the window reveals and brick chimney stacks have survived.

- 8.6. I agree with the Planning Authority that this group of buildings are vernacular in design and quality and contribute to the character of Blanchardstown village.
- 8.7. The primary purpose of policy HCAP22 is to retain and revitalise the historic and vernacular building stock, and twentieth century-built heritage of Fingal by deterring replacement.
- 8.8. This is a first-floor extension to a retained cottage and the appellant is committed in the grounds of appeal to the continued use of the building as a dwelling in the future.
- 8.9. The extension is designed to be large to meet a recent change in the personal circumstances of the applicant and protect their residential amenity by bringing the building up to modern day standards.
- 8.10. This proposal in its broadest sense for the reasons outlined above is consistent with the objective of the 'RS' zoning and the requirements of policy HCAP22. I do not agree that a refusal of permission solely on the basis of policy HCAP22 can be sustained.
- 8.11. That said the proposal must still be in accordance with objectives HCAO36 and DMSO190 of the Development Plan and the directions in table 14.26.
- 8.12. I consider that at least two of the directions of table 14.26 are not met. I agree that the first-floor extension as designed is not sympathetic to the special features and character of the existing building nor does it respect the existing setting, form and scale of the buildings adjacent to the site.
- 8.13. An example of precedent is quoted in the grounds of appeal for a two-storey extension to No. 7 Church Avenue. I have had regard to this example and note that planning permission was granted for this in 2006 in a different plan context and in a non-residential zoning where a change of use to offices was also granted.
- 8.14. No account was taken in that decision of the vernacular character of the building despite an application for a two-storey extension for an extension to No.16 Church Avenue having been refused in 2005 for a similar reason to this planning application.

- 8.15.** This is the only example of a two-storey extension to a building fronting Church Avenue from my observations. I note the building at No. 7 Church Avenue is sited on a corner plot on the junction with Mary Brennan Park where there is a transition in the building heights from single to two-storey. The extension appears to have been designed to take account of this site-specific context.
- 8.16.** Conversely, this is a mid-terrace dwelling with a plot which is smaller in size than the plots for the two neighbouring dwellings either side. This is a very different context than the precedent example described in the grounds of appeal.
- 8.17.** It is directed in table 14.26 that 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*'.
- 8.18.** The proposed first-floor extension is not in proportion or subservient to the host dwelling. To achieve standard 2.4-metre-high floor to ceiling heights in the rooms on the first-floor a mansard style roof is used which is at odds with the original character of the building and projects above the ridge line which is contrary to objectives HCAO36 and DMSO190 of the Development Plan.
- 8.19.** The majority of residential properties have single storey rear extensions that extend back into the plot and are subordinate in scale and height to the host dwelling. It may in some cases be possible to achieve limited accommodation in the roof void of the extension but not on the scale envisaged in this proposal.
- 8.20.** The grounds of appeal argue that the proposed development cannot be seen from Main Street. However, this is not the only view of the site from my observations. On approach from Main Street travelling towards St. Brigid terrace the extension will be prominent in the backdrop of the cottage and from the private lane that wraps around the back of Nos. 14-16 Church Avenue.
- 8.21.** The proposal is therefore contrary to objective SPQHO45 as the proposed extension is not sensitively designed and will negatively impact on the area because of its scale.

The protection of residential amenities

- 8.22.** Section 14.10.2 of the development management standards recognises the need for housing to be adaptable to changing family circumstances and that applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend as the needs of the household change, will normally be acceptable subject to specific safeguards.
- 8.23.** The grounds of appeal argue that the proposed development is consistent with this requirement as it protects the residential amenity of the appellants given their family circumstances have changed and the layout and arrangement of the rooms in the dwelling are no longer suitable.
- 8.24.** In respect of the safeguards, it is stated in Section 14.10.2 that *'the design of extensions must also have regard to the character and form of the existing building, its architectural expression, remaining usable rear private open space, external finishes and pattern of fenestration'*.
- 8.25.** Whilst the external finishes and pattern of fenestration are designed to match the existing building the proposed first-floor extension is not consistent with the character and form of the existing building or its architectural expression as described previously in paragraph 8.18. of this report and is therefore contrary to Section 14.10.2 of the Development Plan.
- 8.26.** In respect of the impact of the proposed development on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties the Planning Authority considers the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties to be significantly impacted by overlooking and overshadowing. I accept the argument presented in the grounds of appeal that the proximity of the neighbouring extensions to the site mitigates any significant impact from overshadowing. I also observed that if the window to bedroom 3 was reduced in size and fitted with opaque glazing that the impact of overlooking into the private amenity space of No.14 would not be significant.
- 8.27.** That said having already concluded that the proposed first-floor extension is not of an appropriate scale for the site I concur with the Planning Authority that it will still have a significant negative impact on the residential amenity of the two neighbouring properties either side because of the height and length of the extended walls and their proximity to the mutual boundaries. The first-floor

extension will appear dominant and overbearing which is contrary to Section 14.10.2.4 of the Development Plan.

- 8.28.** For the reasons outlined in the preceding paragraphs I agree with the Planning Authority that the requirements of policy SPQHP41 are not met and the proposal is inconsistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Other considerations

- 8.29.** I note that the Planning Authority's reason for refusal states that the proposed development materially contravenes the 'RS' Residential zoning objective of the development plan. This objective refers to a general approach to development in a residential zoning and is not in my view sufficiently specific so as to justify the use of the term 'materially contravene' in terms of normal planning practice. The Commission should not therefore consider itself constrained by Section 37(2) of the Planning and Development Act.
- 8.30.** I note that the concerns raised by the planning authority in the reason for refusal in respect of the devaluation of neighbouring properties. However, having regards to the assessment and conclusions set out above, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the value of property in the vicinity.
- 8.31.** The Planning Authority consider this proposal to set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area. The appellant provides a contrary view based on the site-specific circumstances of case and their understanding that this form of development cannot be easily replicated elsewhere.
- 8.32.** I have considered this proposal on its own merits and do not accept the objectives of the Development Plan to be met for the reasons outlined above. That said I acknowledge that the design is a response to the applicant's needs and that the Planning Authority does not explain why granting planning permission for this proposal would set an undesirable precedent elsewhere.
- 8.33.** The other residents of Church Avenue may have different needs in terms of extending their homes and this proposal may not be easily replicated on neighbouring sites that have different plots sizes. For these reasons I do not

consider this proposal to set a wide range precedent and this part of the refusal reason is not sustained.

- 8.34.** Conditions are recommended by the Water Services Division of Fingal County Council. If the Commission is not minded to agree with the Inspector's recommendation, then the condition in the consultation response should be attached to any grant of planning permission.
- 8.35.** In response the grounds of appeal the Planning Authority indicates that provision is made for applying a financial contribution for any shortfall in open space, any special contribution in accordance with the Council's Section 48 Contributions Scheme and a condition for a tree bond.
- 8.36.** I understand a proposed domestic extension, with a floor area of 47 square metres, is not exempt from the requirement to pay development contributions under the Council's Section 48 Contribution Scheme.
- 8.37.** This is a small development however with a large area of open space adjacent to the west and northwest. The Planning Authority has not explained why a special development contribution to meet a shortfall in open space or play provision facilities or a tree bond is required in this instance.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1.** I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located more than 10 kilometres from the Rye Water Valley/Carton Special Area of Conservation (SAC:001398); South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA:004024); South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC:000210); North Bull Island Special Protection Area (SPA:004006); and North Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC:000208).

The proposed development is comprised of a first-floor extension to the rear of the main dwelling to create three new bedrooms and bathroom, internal alterations to the ground floor to create a kitchen/dining room and utility and associated siteworks.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The site in an established residential area and the scale of the proposed development which is the addition of a first-floor extension to a dwelling is small.
- The distance to the identified European sites and the lack of connection.
- Taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority.

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 (Stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Frame Directive

10.1. The subject site is located approximately 500 metres southwest of the River Tolka and approximately 400 metres north of the Royal Canal.

The proposed development is comprised of a first-floor extension to the rear of the main dwelling to create three new bedrooms and bathroom, internal alterations to the ground floor to create a kitchen/dining room and utility and associated siteworks.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface 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 wither qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The location of the site in an established residential area, the scale of the proposed development which is a first-floor extension to a domestic dwelling is small. No mitigation is required to reduce the impact of surface/storm is required in this case.
- The distance to the nearest water bodies and the lack of hydrological connection.

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. I recommend that planning should be refused for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. The Commission is satisfied, based on the information provided that the proposed development by reason of its design, scale and massing harms the visual amenity of the original cottage which is a vernacular building and part of a group of terraced cottages that contribute to the character of Blanchardstown village. The proposal is contrary to objectives HCA036, DMSO190, SPQHO45 and table 14.26 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.

12.2. Furthermore, the proposed development is not consistent with the character and form of the existing building or its architectural expression and will have a

significant negative impact on the residential amenity of the two neighbouring properties either side because of the height and length of the extended walls and their proximity to the mutual boundaries. It will be dominant and overbearing. The proposal is contrary to Sections 14.10.2 & 14.10.2.4 and policy SPQHP41 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and therefore also contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

Conor Hughes
Planning Inspector

15th December 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500033-DF
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a first-floor extension to the rear of the main dwelling to create three new bedrooms and bathroom, internal alterations to the ground floor to create a kitchen/dining room and utility and associated siteworks.
Development Address	15 Church Avenue, Blanchardstown, Dublin 15
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX /OR LEAVE BLANK	
<p>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</p> <hr/> <p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources) 	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.</p>
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.</p> <p>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</p>	<p>State the Class here</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of	

proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input 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	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
<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)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	

Inspector: _____

Date: 15th December 2025