



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500045-DF

Development	Reconfiguration of house
Location	4 Seamount Road, Malahide, Co. Dublin
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F25A/0487
Applicant(s)	Sharon Farrell & Tom Murphy
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Sharon Farrell & Tom Murphy
Observer(s)	None
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.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
6.0 Natural Heritage Designations	10
7.0 EIA Screening.....	10
8.0 Water Framework Directive	11
9.0 The Appeal	11
10.0 Assessment.....	12
11.0 AA Screening.....	18
12.0 Recommendation.....	19
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening and Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination	
Appendix 2 – Screening for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.075ha appeal site is located on the southern side of Seamount Road in Malahide, Co. Dublin.
- 1.2. The site is adjoined to the west by No. 3 Seamount Road, to the east by the side garden of No. 5 Seamount Road, and to the south by a further development site (in the ownership of the applicant) with a large bank of undeveloped land lying beyond this. The 6 no. residential properties on the southside of this part of Seamount Road are generally uniform in character (semi-detached bungalows with hipped roofs) with some featuring 1-storey and 2-storey rear extensions. A much wider variety of housing types and designs are also evident on the north side of the road.
- 1.3. The site comprises of an existing semi-detached bungalow (59sq.m) with full-width rear extension on a large plot. The property features a small garden and driveway to the front and a large rear garden which is partially overgrown with brambles (the southern part of which constitutes a further development site in the ownership of the appellant). The eastern boundary to the site is a mature hedgerow with the western site boundary featuring a mix of hedging, blockwork structures and boundary walls. The front boundary to the public road comprises of a c. 1.2m wall with a vehicular entrance on its north-east side. The site slopes gradually downwards from the north to south.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development for which permission is sought comprises of the reconfiguration of existing house to provide 3 no. bedrooms and combined bathroom/WC, split level 1-2 storey full width extension (with flat roof max. 5.9m in height) of 125sq.m to rear, accessible WC at entrance level, living/dining/kitchen with utility room at lower ground level and master bedroom with en-suite & dressing room at first floor level. Proprietary insulation to existing house to match adjoining property, widening of existing vehicular access to provide a new 2.6m wide entrance to site, and replacing existing eastern side boundary with 1.8m high block wall.

2.2. Further information (FI) stage changes comprised of an alteration to the planning application boundary and the proposed setback of first floor level extension by c. 1m from the east elevation.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission refused on 22/09/2025 for 2 no. reasons as follows:

“1. The proposed extension, by virtue of the bulk and mass would present as an unsympathetic and dominant addition to the existing dwelling, which would be harmful to visual amenity when viewed from the side (east) elevation. To permit the development as proposed would be contrary to Policy 14.10.2.4 and objective SPQHO45 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, and would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The applicant has failed to supply an adequate surface water drainage proposal and the proposed development would therefore be prejudicial to public health and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

2 no. planning reports formed the basis of the planning authority’s assessment:

Planner’s Report (dated 24/07/2025) - Initial Application Stage

Points of note in the report include:

- *Principle of Development* – proposal acceptable on RS zoned lands.
- *Procedural* – application red line omits proposed 2.6m wide vehicular access to development site to rear and related works. **FI requested.**
- *Visual Impact* – bulk & mass of extension (2-storey element) would be visible from public realm to east and could give rise to a negative visual impact. **FI requested.**

- *Residential Amenity* – no impact arises on account of layout and fenestration arrangements of neighbouring property.
- *Access* – proposal to provide new gate piers to existing vehicular access to appeal site is acceptable. Proposal to provide a further (new, adjoining) 2.6m wide access to rear development site is generally acceptable but details (incl. compliance with Building Regulations Technical Guidance Document B) to be agreed by condition.
- *Parking* – bike parking capable of being facilitated in private garden. 2 no. parking spaces is compliant with standards of 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines.
- *Drainage* – inadequate information on surface water drainage. **FI requested.**
- *Noise* – noise insulation requirement on account of location in Airport Zone C can be addressed by condition.
- *EIA* – project is sub-threshold and EIAR not required.
- *AA Screening* – proximity to Malahide Estuary SAC and SPA are noted but PA satisfied that there are no pathways from the site to same – no potential for significant effects on European sites.

A request for Further Information (FI) issued on 24/07/2025 in relation to 3 no. items.

The applicant's response to the FI request was received on 19/08/2025 and consisted of a cover letter, revised plans and a technical report.

The response was determined to be significant on account of the changes to the application red line and required readvertising. The applicant responded to Significant FI request on 2nd September 2025.

Planner's Report (dated 22/09/2025) – (Significant) Further Information Stage

Points of note in the report include:

- *FI Item 1 (procedural)* – amendment to red line boundary to include proposed second vehicular access from Seamount Road to development site to rear of the appeal site is acceptable.
- *FI Item 2 (scale of extension)* – proposed setback of first floor level of extension by c. 1m from the east elevation is not sufficient to address bulk/ mass concerns. **Refusal recommended.**

- *FI Item 3 (surface water drainage)* – drainage calculations noted. Inadequate details provided on GDSDS and SuDS manual compliance and on exact nature and location of proposed SuDS measures. **Clarification of FI recommended.**
- *Procedural* – inconsistency on drawings re: proposed changes to rear extension.

Report concluded by recommending that permission be refused as per Section 3.1.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Initial Application Stage

Transportation Planning Section (04/07/2025) – No objection subject to condition.

Water Services Department (03/07/2025) – FI requested on surface water drainage proposals and design of proposed soakaway.

Environment - Air & Noise Unit (03/07/2025) – No objection subject to condition (measures to ensure internal noise levels comply with BS8233:2014 guidance).

(Significant) Further Information Stage

Transportation Planning Section (12/09/2025) – no objection subject to conditions in respect to the design and dimensions of the 2 no. proposed vehicular entrances; sightlines; dishing of kerb; undergrounding of services; no stormwater discharge onto public road; and, repairs to public roadway at developer's expense.

Water Services Department (29/08/2025) – Clarification of FI requested. Surface water drainage report acceptable but drainage layout plan with details of sizing and exact location of proposed SuDS measures and drainage piped network required. Statement of compliance with GDSDS and SuDS Manual also required.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Initial Application Stage

Dublin Airport Authority (DAA) (08/07/2025) – no comments on proposal.

(Significant) Further Information Stage

None received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None received.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. **Appeal Site**

P.A. F25A/1079 – application for reconfiguration of existing house to provide 3 bedrooms and combined bathrooms/WC, single storey split level extension to rear with level extension to rear with accessible WC at entrance level, living/dining/kitchen with utility room at lower ground level. Proprietary insulation to existing house to match adjoining property. New vehicular access to site at rear and replacing existing eastern side boundary with 1800 mm high block wall. Lodged on 21/11/2025. Live application due for decision on c. 26/01/2026.

P.A. Ref. F24A/0360 – application for demolition of the existing single storey house and erection of a detached 3 bed two storey dwelling house, including improved site entrance and access to rear. new car parking and all associated site works with all services connections to existing supplies and any other associated site works, refused permission on 10/06/2024 for 2 no. reasons: 1. Failure to provide justification for replacement dwelling, 2. Design, scale and bulk and visual obtrusion.

P.A. Ref. F20A/0658 – application for the demolition of the existing single storey house, and erection of a detached 3-bed, 2-storey dwelling house with all services connections to existing supplies and associated site works, refused permission on 12/02/2021 for 4 no. reasons: 1. Design and visual intrusion, 2. Substandard POS, 3. Negative impact on residential amenity & material contravention of zoning, 4. Precedent.

4.2. **Applicant's Development Site to Rear**

P.A. Ref. F24A/0361 – application for erection of a detached 4 bedroom, two storey dwelling house to the rear garden of existing house, including improved site entrance and access drive to rear, new car parking spacing and associated site works, refused permission on 10/06/2024 for 1 no. reason: Design, scale and bulk.

P.A. Ref. F16A/0053 – application for dormer bungalow to rear garden, new access drive to rear, improved site entrance and associated site works, granted permission on 25/10/2016 subject to 15 no. conditions.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (NPF) (First Revision, 2025) – NPO 45: increase density in settlements and NPOs 77: integration of sustainable water management solutions and 79: Use of SuDS and Nature Based Solutions.

Climate Action Plan (2024 & 2025) and National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2023-2030 – Outcome 2A protection of designated areas and protected species.

The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2024).

Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes and Sustaining Communities (DoHLGH, 2007) – Table 5.1 (Space provision and room sizes for typical dwellings).

5.2. Other Relevant Guidance

Nature Based Management of Urban Rainwater and Urban Surface Water Discharges, A National Strategy (2024).

DN-GEO-03060: Geometric Design of Junctions (TII, May 2023).

CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753) (2015).

BS 8233:2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings (2014).

The Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (2005).

5.3. Regional Policy

Eastern & Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy 2019-2031 - RPO 3.2 (achieving compact growth) and RPOs 10.35 – storm water management and 10.16 Implement policies contained in GDSDS, including SuDS.

5.4. Development Plan

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

Zoning

Section 13.5 (Zoning Objectives, Vision and Use Classes): The appeal site is zoned 'RS – Residential' with the objective to 'Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity'. Residential development is permitted in principle under the 'RS' zoning objective. The site is located in Dublin Airport Noise Zone C and within a highly sensitive coastal landscape character zone.

Residential Extensions

Sections 3.5.13.1 and 14.10.2 (Residential Extensions).

Policy SPQHP41 – Residential Extensions: 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: encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area.

14.10.2.3 (Ground Floor Extensions (rear)): Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining to serve the dwelling house. The proposed extension should match or complement the existing dwelling house.

14.10.2.4 (First Floor Extensions): 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.

Drainage

Section 14.20.3 (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems).

Appendix 11 (Fingal SuDS Guidance Document).

Objectives GINHO15 and DMSO202 (SuDS), DMSO203 (FCC SuDS Guidance Document), DMSO24 (Surface Water Run-Off from Domestic Driveways) and DMSO205 (Surface Water Management Plan).

Policy IUP5 (Greater Dublin Drainage Study).

Parking/ Noise/ Open Space/ Hedgerows

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

Table 14.17 (Bicycle Parking Standards) and Objective DMSO109 – Bicycle Parking. Section 11.9.2 (Noise), Table 8.1 & Objective DAO11 – Requirement: Noise Insulation. 14.8.3 (Private Open Space), Table 14.8 (Private Open Space for Houses).

Objectives SPQHO91 - Retention Hedgerows and Other Distinctive Boundary Treatments and DMSO126 – Protection of Trees and Hedgerows during Development.

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located within or adjoining any European sites.

The nearest European sites to the appeal site are as follows:

- Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025) – approx. 1km to north.
- Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205) – approx. 1km to north.
- North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236) – approx. 1.4km to east.

The site is also proximate to the following Natural Heritage Areas and proposed Natural Heritage Areas:

- Malahide Estuary pNHA (Site Code 000205) - approx. 1km to east.

7.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendix 1 of this

report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

8.0 Water Framework Directive

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 first party appeal submission was received (09/10/2025) and seeks to address the PA's reason for refusal. The grounds of appeal (GOA) can be summarised as follows:

- Relevant planning history of permissions for 1-storey and 2-storey rear extensions and 1-2 storey replacement dwellings to No's 2, 3, 5 and 6 Seamount Road over the period c. 2004 – c. 2013 is outlined as example of planning precedent.
- Particular emphasis given to the 1-2 storey rear and side extension permitted under P.A. Ref. 06A/1795 at No. 2 Seamount Road. The appellant argues that their proposal is akin to the nature and extent of this permitted development.
- GOA note that SPQHO45 cited in the PA's refusal reasons relates to family flats and is not relevant to their proposal.
- GOA set out the wording of Section 14.10.2.4 (first floor rear extensions).
- Appellant considers that permission could have been granted subject to amending conditions.

The GOA are accompanied by a copy of the PA's decision notification.

9.2. **Planning Authority Response**

The PA, in their response received 06/11/2025 seeks that their decision to refuse permission be upheld and, in that instance their decision is overturned, that where relevant, conditions relating to the payment of a Section 48 financial contribution/ special development contribution and tree bond be applied.

9.3. **Observations**

None on file.

9.4. **Further Responses**

None on file.

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
- Design of Rear Extension
- Surface Water Drainage
- Other

10.1. **Principle of Development**

- 10.1.1. The proposed residential extension, internal house reconfiguration and related domestic improvement works subject of this appeal, are permissible in principle under the site's 'RS – Residential' zoning which seeks to 'provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity'. In light of the foregoing, I consider the proposal to be acceptable in principle, subject to the further detailed considerations outlined below.

10.2. Design of Rear Extension

- 10.2.1. A c. 125sq.m 2-storey part flat-roofed part pitched-roof extension is proposed to the rear of the existing bungalow, reaching a maximum height of c. 5.8m above rear ground level and features a small external courtyard at ground floor level on its west side. The extension is c. 10.7m or full width at ground floor level and c. 9.8m wide at first floor level, being marginally setback from the east elevation. The proposed extension would project c. 9m from the main rear elevation of the bungalow at ground floor level, with this depth in-keeping with the (extended) rear building line of the property to the east, and by c. 8m at first floor level (featuring an L-shaped arrangement).
- 10.2.2. The PA are of the view that the form of the proposed rear extension renders it excessively visible from the public realm to the east and would therefore give rise to a negative visual impact. This concern underpins their refusal reason no. 1
- 10.2.3. I note that the extensive list of planning precedents cited in the GOA related to proposals for permission that were assessed under previous development plans and not to the policy and objectives in force under the current Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. Notwithstanding this point, 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 - but also its visual impact on the streetscape.
- 10.2.4. Section 14.10.2.4 of the FDP provides that first floor rear extensions can only be provided where there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding visual amenities, with this policy stance being reiterated by Policy SPQHP41 (Residential Extensions) and Objective SPQHO45 (Domestic Extensions).
- 10.2.5. Having considered the section drawings on file, I note that the top of the parapet wall of the flat-roofed portion of the rear extension would be partially visible above the ridge of the main dwelling from the public realm on Seamount Road and I draw the Commission's attention to a potential discrepancy in the (over datum) levels given (both 43.371) in this regard. The south and north elevation drawings also indicate that, on account of its significant scale, bulk and depth, the full height of the first floor level of the rear extension would be readily visible from the north and north-east along

the Seamount Road. Having considered the 2-storey rear extension constructed at No. 2 Seamount Road which has a width of c. 5m at first floor level, I note that whilst this is also visible to the side from the public realm, the design modulation of its massing and its siting setback from the hip of the main roof, somewhat mitigates its bulk, visibility and visual impact on the streetscape. This is not the case with the subject proposal which I consider would be visually dominant and overbearing on the main dwelling (when viewed from the north and north-east) for the reasoning I have outlined above.

10.2.6. In light of the foregoing, and having inspected the site and its surrounds, I consider that the design and scale of the proposed rear extension is at odds with the design character and architectural form of the main dwelling and also with that of the neighbouring bungalows at no's 1-3 and 5-6 Seamount Road. I also consider that its scale, design and extent of vertical and horizontal projection from the main rear elevation are such that it would give rise to a negative impact on the visual amenity of the streetscape by reason of visual intrusion and visual incongruity. For these reasons, I recommend to the Commission that permission for the proposal be refused.

10.3. **Surface Water Drainage**

10.3.1. The PA's second refusal reason is based on the lack adequate surface water drainage information. In this regard, I note that the PA's Water Services Department, in their report of 29/08/2025, were satisfied with the surface water drainage report provided but sought clarification in respect to the exact size and specific location of the sustainable drainage infrastructure proposed, in addition to requesting a statement of compliance with the GSDSDS and the SuDS Manual.

10.3.2. The requirements of the following FDP drainage policies and objectives are relevant to my consideration of the issues raised. Section 14.20.3 (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems) requires SuDS to be included in all new developments in compliance with Appendix 11 (Fingal SuDS Guidance Document) and Objectives DMSO202 (SuDS), DMSO203 (FCC SuDS Guidance Document), DMSO24 (Surface Water Run-Off from Domestic Driveways) and DMSO205 (Surface Water Management Plan). Policy IUP5 (Greater Dublin Drainage Study) seeks to promote and support the implementation of the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (2005)

whilst Objective GINHO15 (SuDS) seeks to *‘Limit surface water run-off from new developments through the use of appropriate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) using nature-based solutions and ensure that SuDS is integrated into all new development in the County’*.

10.3.3. I note that the proposal does not give rise to a material contravention of the foregoing surface water management policy guidance on the basis that it provides for sustainable drainage and the management of surface-water run-off using SuDS measures (such as rainwater planters to the front, rear and courtyard and rainwater pond to rear), as required by same. Therefore, whilst I do acknowledge that there is insufficient detail on file in respect to the specific design and location of the proposed SuDS measures, I consider that this, and the PA’s requirement that a statement of compliance with the GSDS and SuDS Manual be provided, to be relatively minor matters which are capable of being addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

10.4. Other

Residential Amenity

10.4.1. Having regard to the siting, design and layout of the proposal, I am satisfied that it has no potential to give rise to negative impacts on the amenities of neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking, overbearance or overshadowing. I have reached this conclusion in respect to No. 3 Seamount Road having considered the existing as-built arrangements (i.e. single storey rear flat roofed extension (akin in depth to that of the proposed rear extension) which abuts the shared boundary) to the rear of that property and the relationship of same to the proposal. With regard to No. 5 Seamount Road, which features a substantial single storey rear extension with hipped roof and south-facing conservatory, I consider that the c. 12m separation distance, intervening boundary and north-south orientation of both properties would mitigate the potential for negative impacts.

Residential Standards – New Issue

10.4.2. Having reviewed the stated housing quality requirements for 4-bedroom houses detailed in the 2007 Housing Guidelines, I am satisfied that the reconfigured bungalow

complies with the aforementioned policy guidance in respect to floor areas and room dimensions.

Private Open Space – New Issue

- 10.4.3. The proposal seeks to subdivide the lands within the redline area between the existing bungalow to the north and the development site to the rear. As such, the appellant proposes to provide a c. 1.8m blockwork boundary wall to delineate the lands. Whilst no dimensions are provided on the submitted plans in respect to the area of the new rear garden that would be created, having approximated on the basis of the dimensions that are available to me, I am satisfied that this private amenity space would significantly exceed the min. requirement of 75sq.m for a 4-bed house specified in Section 14.8.3, Table 14.8 of the FDP.

Access

- 10.4.4. It is proposed to upgrade the property's existing c. 2.6m wide vehicular access, by providing a set of gate piers, and to provide a new c. 2.6m wide vehicular access to the immediate east of the existing access in order to maintain access to the development site to the rear. I note the PA's Transportation Planning Section were satisfied in principle with the proposal, seeking that conditions in respect to the design, dimensions and dishing of the accesses be provided by condition. I also note their recommendation that the width of the proposed laneway leading to the site to the rear may need to be widened in order to provide for future fire tender access in accordance with Building Regulations Technical Guidance Document B – Fire Safety. This technical matter falls under a different statutory code and, as such, is outside the scope of the appeal before the Commission.
- 10.4.5. Having reviewed the information on file, including the proposed site layout plan and elevations, and having considered the intermediate grass verge between the site and nearside edge of the road (c. 2.2m setback) together with the 30kmph design speed of the adjoining road, I am satisfied that the sightlines that would be provided would comply with the requirement for 35m under DN-GEO-03060 Table 7.1 (Stopping Sight Distances).
- 10.4.6. Having reviewed the information on file, I am satisfied that the appellant is proposing no material changes to the pedestrian pathway adjoining the site or other development that would affect existing levels of driver or pedestrian visibility on Seamount Road.

10.4.7. In light of the foregoing considerations, I am satisfied that there is no potential for proposal to give rise to traffic hazard or to negatively impact on the mobility or safety of pedestrians.

Parking

10.4.8. Parking for 3 no. cars is proposed on the site plan and application form. The appeal site which is located within c. 1.3km of Malahide Train Station comes within Parking Zone 1 as defined under Table 14.18 (Car Parking Zones). Table 14.19 (Car Parking Standards) states that a maximum of 1 no. parking space is allowed in the case of 3+-bedroom residences in this zone. Notwithstanding, I am satisfied that the proposal does not constitute a material contravention of the plan car parking standards on the basis of the footnotes accompanying Table 14.19 which states that “*These requirements do not apply to development located in town centres as identified in this Plan where the development involves the re-use/refurbishment of an existing occupied or vacant building, any change of use or where small-scale infill developments (including residential) are proposed*”.

10.4.9. The proposal makes no provision for bike parking. Table 14.17 (Bike Parking Standards) of the FDP requires 2 plus 1 per bedroom for 3+-bed dwellings. Notwithstanding, I do not consider this to be a material contravention of FDP Table 14.17 on account of the wording of Objective DMSO109 which seeks to ensure bike parking provision in accordance with Table 14.17 where feasible. I consider that the provision of development plan compliant cycle parking (i.e. 5 no. spaces) in the dwelling’s rear gardens can be addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Noise

10.4.10. The appeal site is located within Airport Noise Zone C, with Objective DAO11 requiring the provision of noise insulation measures in this location where appropriate. The PA’s Environment - Air & Noise Unit have recommended that measures to ensure internal noise levels comply with BS8233:2014 guidance be provided. I consider that the implementation of noise mitigation is a minor design matter that can be addressed where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Trees/ Hedgerows

- 10.4.11. The PA's response to the appeal recommends the attachment of a tree bond. I did not observe any trees on the site subject of the proposed development during my site inspection and do not consider such a condition is warranted on this basis.
- 10.4.12. However, I did note the existence of mature hedgerows along the site's western and eastern boundaries. No proposals to remove same form part of the documentation on file. Notwithstanding, any required hedgerow removal should be undertaken outside of nesting season and hedging should be protected during the site works in accordance with Objectives SPQHO91 - Retention Hedgerows and Other Distinctive Boundary Treatments and DMSO126 – Protection of Trees and Hedgerows during Development. I recommend to the Commission that these matters are addressed by condition where they are minded to grant permission.

11.0 AA Screening

- 11.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 11.2. The subject site is not located within or adjacent to any European Site. The closest European Sites, part of the Natura 2000 Network, are Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025) and Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205) both c. 1km to the north and North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236) c. 1km to the east. The proposed development is located within a predominantly residential area.
- 11.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, 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 nature and scale of the development proposed.
 - its location in a serviced urban area.
 - its distance from European Sites and urban nature of intervening habitats and the absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.
- 11.4. I consider that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site and appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

12.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be REFUSED for the reasons and considerations set out below.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposed rear extension, by virtue of its design and scale, would be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area and would not respect the height and massing of the existing dwelling or the neighbouring residential properties at No's 1-3 and 5-6 Seamount Road. For these reasons it would be visually incongruous, obtrusive and would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area in contravention of Section 14.10.2.4, Policy SPQHP41 and Objective SPQHO45 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. The proposed development would, therefore, be 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.

Emma Gosnell
Planning Inspector
23rd January 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500045-LH
Proposed Development Summary	Reconfiguration of house, rear extension and site works.
Development Address	4 Seamount Road, Malahide, Co. Dublin.
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 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 checked="" 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)	Part 2, Class 10(b)(iv) - Urban development – 10 hectares (built-up area). Site is c. 0.075ha and is therefore sub-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)?

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: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500045-LH
Proposed Development Summary	Reconfiguration of house, rear extension and site works.
Development Address	4 Seamount Road, Malahide, Co. Dublin.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	<p>The proposal is for the reconfiguration and extension of an existing house and associated site works on a site of c. 0.075ha. Demolition works are proposed. The development is significantly below the class threshold of 10 hectares (built-up area).</p> <p>The project due to its size and nature would not give rise to significant use of resources or production of waste during both the construction and operation phases.</p> <p>The proposed development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, and is not vulnerable to climate change.</p>
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic,	<p>The site is located on Seamount Road in the suburban hinterland of Malahide. There is a concentration of similar low-density housing in the area.</p> <p>The site is located in an area subject to a highly sensitive coastal landscape designation and, as such, is visually sensitive.</p> <p>The nearest Natura 2000 sites are the Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025) and Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205) – both approx. 1km to north and the North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236) – approx. 1.4km to east.</p> <p>The site is not within a designated ACA and there are no Protected Structures or watercourses on, immediately adjoining or within 1km of the site.</p>

cultural or archaeological significance).	Having regard to the above, and to the simple nature and limited scale of the proposed development, I am satisfied that impacts on environmental sensitivities can be adequately assessed in this case without the need for EIA.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Due to the small scale of the development, the construction stage will not be significant in terms of duration or complexity. The main operational impacts would be limited to traffic, residential amenity, and the potable water sourcing and wastewater (and surface water) emissions arising from the site. These elements would be subject to standard assessment/design. Whilst I have outlined concerns about the design of the extension, I am satisfied that this can be assessed without potential for significant environmental effects that would require EIA. There would be no significant cumulative impacts with other projects.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____
DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____
(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required.)

Appendix 2

Screening the need for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination

The appeal site is located at 4 Seamount Road, Malahide, Co. Dublin.

There are no watercourses on or in immediate proximity to the site. The nearest watercourse (Sluice River IE_EA_09S071100 - Poor status with its WFD risk under review) is located c. 1.5km to the west and site is underlain by the Dublin Groundwater Body (IE_EA_G_008, Good status with WFD risk under review).

The proposal comprises of the reconfiguration of an existing house, rear extension and 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 (described above) on this residential site at 4 Seamount Road, Malahide, 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 de-minimus small scale nature and scale of the proposal.
- The location-distance from nearest water bodies, intervening land use and/ or lack of hydrological connections.

Conclusion

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the development to be retained 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.