



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500135-DF

Development	Removal of existing house return and conservatory and the construction of proposed new part single storey – part two storey extension to side and rear of existing house, new rooflight to side of existing roof and all associated site works
Location	24 The Drive, Skerries Rock, Skerries, Co. Dublin K34VW96
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F25A/0754E
Applicant(s)	Aine Garland and Liam Keegan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Aine Garland and Liam Keegan.
Observer(s)	None.

Date of Site Inspection

14/01/2026.

Inspector

Deirdre Scully.

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.....	11
7.0	The Appeal	11
8.0	Assessment	13
9.0	AA Screening.....	19
10.0	Water Framework Directive	20
11.0	Recommendation.....	21
12.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	21
13.0	Conditions	21

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The appeal site is located at no. 24 The Drive, Skerries Rock, Skerries, Co. Dublin K34 VW96 and the site has a stated area of 0.29 hectares. The site accommodates a two-storey demi-detached dwelling, located at the end of short cul-de-sac, within the larger housing estate of Skerries Rock.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development, as described within the public notices, comprises of removal of existing house return and conservatory and the construction of proposed new part single storey – part two storey extension to side and rear of existing house, new rooflight to side of existing roof and all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Fingal County Council issued a notification of decision to refuse permission for the proposed development on the 1st of October 2025. The single reason for refusal stated:

The subject site is zoned 'RS' Residential under the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, the object which is 'to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity.' The proposed development by reason of its inappropriate height, design and finish is considered to be excessive, would result in an overbearing and visually intrusive form of development that fails to appropriately integrate with the existing dwelling or respect the existing character of the surrounding area. As such, the proposed development as designed would contravene Policy SPQHP41 'Residential Extensions' & Objective SPQHO45 'Domestic Extensions', would seriously detract from the visual amenity of the area and would be contrary to the aims and objectives of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

One planning report is filed for this application, dated 1st of October 2025 and contained within the Chief Executives Order of the same date. The following provides a summary of key points made in the Planners Report:

- The report considered the design of the extension under four points (i) the principle of the development; (ii) the visual and residential amenity of the area; (iii) screening for Appropriate Assessment and (iv) screening for Environmental Impact Assessment.
- The proposed development is located within an area zoned “RS- Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity” in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and the works in principle would be considered acceptable subject to the appropriate planning and design standards of the Development Plan.
- The site is located within an area designated as Highly Sensitive Landscape area within the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.
- Objectives and policies referred to relevant to the consideration of the application are listed (Policy SPQHP41, Objective SPQHO45, DMSO23) and general text regarding residential extension development in Section 14.10.2 of the Fingal Development Plan.
- The report refers to planning history of site (F16B/0127)- permission granted for part single part two storey extension; and to a development permitted in the area (F04B/0584, two storey extension at no.1 The Drive.)
- In the assessment of the visual and residential amenities the Planner Report states that the works to remove the existing extension to the rear are acceptable from visual and residential amenity perspective. Serious concerns are raised in the planners report with regard to the overall height and “unorthodox design” of the proposed two storey side extension. Concerns are focussed on the flat roof above the eaves, with the view taken this would be excessive and dominant; the external cladding as being a negative impact on

the visual amenity of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area and the fenestration being inconsistent with the existing dwelling and streetscape.

- The conclusion is reached that the proposed development would not be subservient to the existing dwelling, and is out of context, and therefore not acceptable in terms of visual amenity in this location; and that therefore it is contravening Objective SPQH41 'Residential Extensions' and SPQHO45 'Domestic Extensions'.
- The planners report outlined the following in respect of Appropriate Assessment: The proposed site is not connected with any European (Natura 2000) site and there is no realistic pathway between the proposed project and any European site. Having regard to the nature, scale and location of the proposed project, in comparison with the existing baseline, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on any European sites during construction or operation of the proposed project, and it is further considered that there are no other plans or projects that will act in combination with the proposed project, individually or in combination with another plan or project, will not have a significant effect on any European sites. This assessment was reached without considering or taking into account mitigation measures or measures intended to avoid or reduce any impact on European sites.
- With regard to Environmental Impact Assessment Screening, the Planners Report states that the proposed development is not listed in Schedule 5 (part 1 or part 2) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended nor does the proposed development meet the requirements for sub-threshold EIA as outlined in Section 103 of the Planning and Development Regulation 2001 as amended. No Environmental Impact Assessment is therefore required.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

Subject Site:

F16B/0127- Planning Permission granted for a part two storey/part single storey extension to the side of the existing dwelling at No. 24.

Site to Rear:

F98B/0792 – Planning Permission granted for porch and single storey extension, 10 The Heights, Skerries Rock.

Sites within the Skerries Rock estate:

F01A/1045 – Planning Permission granted for single storey extension for use as a playschool at 1 The Grove, Skerries Rock.

F04B/0584 – Planning Permission granted for a two-storey extension to dwelling at No.1 The Drive, Skerries Rock.

F06A/1184- Planning Permission granted for two-storey dwelling adjacent to 14 The Crescent, Skerries Rock.

F14A/0428 – Planning Permission granted for a new house on corner site of 15 Skerries Rock.

F22A/0592- Planning Permission granted for construction of new gable wall to form new roof profile, conversion of attic and roof lights at 30 The Grove, Skerries Rock.

F25A/0225E- Planning Permission granted for construction of single storey extension to rear, enlargement of window and new window on side gable, new dormer at 59 The Park, Skerries Rock.

F25A/0236E- Planning Permission granted for conversion of attic, including modification of roof gable and dormer to rear at 12 The Rise, Skerries Rock.

F25A/0285E- Planning Permission granted for single storey extension to side and rear of 2 the Walk, Skerries Rock.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029

Zoning

5.1.1 The site is zoned for Objective RS – Residential purposes within the Fingal Development Plan with the objective to “provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity”. The vision for this zoning objective seeks to “ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity”. Residential development is listed as a use that is “permitted in principle” under this zoning objective.

5.1.2 Section 3.5.13.1 of the Plan relates to Residential Extensions and outlines that: *“The need for people to extend and renovate their dwellings is recognised and acknowledged. Extensions will be considered favourably where they do not have a negative impact on adjoining properties or on the nature of the surrounding area”*.

Policies and Objectives

5.1.3 The following provisions of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 are of relevance:

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.*

Objective SPQHO43: Contemporary and Innovative Design Solutions:
Promote the use of contemporary and innovative design solutions subject to design respecting the character and architectural heritage of the area.

Development Management Standards

5.1.4 Development Management Standards are set out within Chapter 14 of the Development Plan. Section 14.10.2 of the Development Plan relates to residential extensions and outlines that: The following text is of relevance to the proposal:

“The need for housing to be adaptable to changing family circumstances is recognised and acknowledged and 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. In particular, 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. The following section provides guidance in relation to, front extensions, side extensions, rear extensions, first floor rear extensions, roof alterations including attic conversions and dormer extensions.

14.10.2.2 Side Extensions: Side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on residential amenity. First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. In certain cases, a set-back of the extension’s front facade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape and avoid a ‘terracing’ effect. External finishes shall generally match the existing.

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.”*

Also relevant with regard to design is the following guidance for infill housing in existing areas:

14.10.1. The development of infill housing on underutilised infill and corner sites in established residential areas will be encouraged where proposals for development are cognisant of the prevailing pattern of development character of the area and where all development standards are observed.. Contemporary design is encouraged and all new dwellings shall comply with Development Plan standards..”

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located in or adjacent to any site designated for Natural heritage. The nearest designated sites to the appeal site are approximately 0.5km to east- the North-West Irish Sea SPA (004236), Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (003000),

Skerries Islands SPA (004122), Skerries Islands NHA (001218) and Rockabill SPA (004014).

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal has been submitted by the owners of the subject property, through their architect, Newmark Architects. The following provides a summary of the grounds of appeal

- The Commission is requested to grant permission in recognition that the design of the extension is compliant with the objectives of the Fingal County Development Plan; particularly SPQHO43 in promoting contemporary design and recognise the design proposed for the side extension is subordinate to the main house, with similar precedents set in the area, and for these reasons is not of an inappropriate height, design and finish as stated in the reason for refusal and thus in accordance with the Fingal County Development Plan.

Location

- The point is made that the location of this proposed development is at the end of an existing cul-de-sac and as such can have no significant impact of the visual amenity of the area. Whilst the lands are designated as being within a “highly sensitive landscape area”; this is a generally applied objective to the whole of Skerries and surrounding land.

Urban Design

- The appellants point to SPQHO43 of the Fingal County Development Plan which seeks to “promote the use of contemporary and innovated design solutions subject to design respecting the character and architectural heritage of the area”. They state that the design is clearly distinguished as a subordinate side extension through use of simple materials and a c.500mm set back; avoiding the creation of large matching extension which would break the symmetry of the existing semi-detached dwellings and continue the pattern of already “busy” elevation with a number of façade materials used.

Roof Height and Type

- The point is made that the use of a flat roof was to ensure that the side extension would read as a new contemporary addition to the house; and whilst the height is higher than the eaves by c.700mm, that needs to be read in conjunction with set back of c. 500mm, thus ensuring that the extension, clearly is not dominant in nature and cannot easily be seen beyond the immediate environs of the existing house. A higher ridge in keeping with existing roof would result in additional overshadowing of the garden, increasing the visual dominance of the extension.

Fenestration

- The positioning of the windows on the extension is based on the internal room layout and the need to serve the new spaces and also contributes to the contemporary design approach taken.

Precedent

- The appellant sets out a number of existing granted and complete examples within Skerries and proximate to the application site where a modern approach to extending existing “traditional” semi-detached housing and for new infill housing within traditional suburban housing has been granted permission. The examples given are:
 - Extension at 14 The Park, Skerries Rock, Skerries (F18B/0035)
 - Extension at 3 Balbriggan Road, Skerries (F10B/0145)
 - New infill house at 15a The Park, Skerries Rock, Skerries (F14A/0428)Photographs of each are included with the submission.

Conclusion

- The appeal outlines that the proposed extension is not contrary to the Fingal Development Plan in that contemporary design within existing suburbs is supported, with precedent already established; and that it meets the objectives regarding new extensions to existing dwellings in that the proposal would not “seriously detract from the visual amenity of the area” nor would be “contrary to the aims and objectives” of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 or proper planning and sustainable development. They request that the decision of Fingal County Council is overturned in recognition that the proposal is in compliance with the current Fingal Development Plan.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority made no further points in response to the appeal.

7.3. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file in relation to the appeal, the report of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the policies and objectives of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Residential Amenity
- Design
- Material Contravention

8.2 Principle of Development

The zoning objective RS “provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity” and Policy SPQHP41 which states to “support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities” are important to the context of establishing the principle of development in the assessment of the application. The planners report states that they consider that “the works in this location would be considered acceptable in principle subject to appropriate planning and design standards.” The Development Plan is supportive of works that both improve the residential amenity of both the adjoining properties and for the occupiers of the house through extensions and renovations. This is recognised in Development Management Section 14.10.2 relating to residential extensions which outlines that *“The need for housing to be adaptable to changing family circumstances is recognised and acknowledged and 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.”*

I consider that it is clear that the development proposed is in general supported by and in compliance with the Fingal Development Plan and therefore the principle of development to allow a house extend and adapt to the needs of the residents is acceptable in principle, subject to the appropriate specific safeguards.

8.3 Residential Amenity

The principle of development is qualified in policy and zoning objectives in that the development is acceptable only, inter alia, where residential amenity is protected. From an examination of the application, the planners report and the appeal statement the following was observed:

- The size of the overall extension as an increase in the existing house (minus the footprint of the existing extension proposed for demolition) is 51.5 sq.m.; with area of the remaining house footprint at 89.5 sq.m. the scale of the extension proposed is therefore subservient to the existing house in quantitative terms.
- The extent of the single storey rear extension is 1740mm further than the original extension, with a garden depth of 6785mm remaining. I do not have

any concerns regarding a negative impact on residential amenity to other properties from the extension.

- The side extension reduces the distance of the house from the boundary from 5145mm to 1295 at its narrowest. This side elevation of the house faces the rear gardens of the properties to the west and adequate separation distances are maintained. No first-floor windows are proposed facing west. I have no concerns regarding residential amenity with regard to the impact of the two storey extension on the adjoining properties, taking into account the separation distances and the omission of first floor windows.
- There is no commentary in the planners report pointing out any concerns regarding residential amenity from the extent and positioning of the proposed development.

In summary, the size and form of the development proposed does not impact negatively on the residential amenity of the adjoining properties and should not therefore be applied as a reason for refusing permission for a type of development form that is accepted in principle by the zoning objective for the area.

From an examination of the assessment in the planners report of the proposed development, the reason for deciding that the development required a refusal of permission is based on the modern design form applied in designing the proposed side extension. In making their assessment, the concerns expressed relate to the eave's height and flat roof, the staggered fenestration, dominance of the extension and the cladding finish. I will examine each of these considerations.

8.4 Dominance:

As outlined above, the footprint of the extension is appropriate for the site and will not have a negative impact on the adjoining properties. The front elevation of the side extension is 3700mm; with the front elevation of the existing house 5665mm. There is also a setback of approximately 500mm for the extension from the front elevation of the house. From a quantitative perspective, the extension is clearly subservient to the main existing house. The planners report only raises the issue of

dominance in relation to the eaves height of the extension and not in relation to any other aspect of the extension; which informs the summary overall conclusion reached that the “proposed development would not be subservient to the existing dwelling, would have a dominating impact” (page 7, 1st para). I will examine the eave height below separately. However, considering the scale, positioning, width and setback of the two-storey extension I consider that this extension quantitatively is subservient to the existing house and I do not consider that the size and scale of the extension proposed in itself would have a dominating impact.

8.5 Eaves height and use of a Flat Roof:

As referred to, the flat roof and the eaves height used for the roof are the main grounds for considering the extension as being dominant in the planners report.

The appellant makes the point that the roof height is driven by standard floor to ceiling heights with a minimal parapet to the roof boundary. The front elevation is set back by approx. 500mm, keeping the parapet just inside the existing roof profile of the house and at the rear elevation the first floor is significantly set back from the main rear elevation of the house, well within the roof profile. They make the point that the roof and the extension itself would be barely visible looking down into the cul-de-sac and that the design approach taken reduces the impact of the extension by not extending existing ridge roof, reducing shadow and allowing the extension be read as a separate addition to the house, reducing the visual bulk of the house with an extension if the approach was to match the existing front elevation and roofline.

In considering the height of the extension, and critically, the height of the extension alongside the total height of the house, I do not agree with the planners report that the impact of the parapet height; at this location, is inappropriate and thus creating a “negative impact on the visual amenity”. Whilst the extension extends 700mm from the eaves, the vast proportion of the roof height of the house is well in excess of the height of the extension. With the setback putting the parapet in line with the roof at the point it rises to meet the extension; I do not see how this could be read as being “excessive and dominant”. I agree with the appellant that this set back and small parapet allow the extension form to read as a separate form, with the small pop-up parapet height supporting this. A two-storey flat roof extension that was designed to be “in keeping” with the existing house footprint- i.e. flush with the front elevation and

in line with the eaves of the house would create a bulky and heavy built form for the entire house. Using a full ridge height roof would also be a much larger structure and cast a greater shadow onto the rear garden. The roof form taken is considered sensitive to the house and supporting the reading of the extension as subservient to the main building.

8.6 Design- fenestration and cladding

The planners report raises concerns in relation to the design which inform the decision for refusal. The design is considered in the report to be “*unorthodox*” and would “*detract unduly from the character and amenity of the area*”. The report states the development (by implication here referring to the design of the development) “*would create an undesirable precedent for similar development and thus be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area*”. The report describes the fenestration as inappropriate and as a concern, and the wood cladding as “*alien*” in this location- thus having “*a negative impact on the visual amenity of the existing dwelling and surrounding area*”.

The appellants make the case that the use of unaligned fenestration has been utilised in a number of existing house extensions permitted by Fingal County Council in Skerries (examples and photos are included); that the room layout has dictated the positioning of the windows and the approach taken aids the identification of the extension as a contemporary addition to the house.

They state that the wood cladding finish provides a calmer finish to the “busy” of the existing façade which incorporates a wide mix of materials alongside the protrusions of porch and bay window.

The window layout in combination with the plain finish of the cladding and the flat roof are the core elements of the modern design approach taken for this extension; and the question is therefore is a modern contemporary approach appropriate in a 1990s housing estate. It is clear in the proposed floor layouts that the window positioning proposed does benefit the internal residential amenity of the house itself. The design and choice of cladding materials on the existing housing in Skerries Rock is of its time, and these houses have greater level of material mix and “busyness” than a 1950s-70s era or more recent style housing schemes in the area. I do not

see how repeating this very visually busy style rigidly across new extensions is essential to preserve the “visual amenity”.

The Fingal Development Plan does contain a number of statements and Objectives supporting contemporary design, including within existing housing areas.

*Objective SPQHO43: Contemporary and Innovative Design Solutions:
Promote the use of contemporary and innovative design solutions subject to design respecting the character and architectural heritage of the area.*

Also of consideration with regard to design is the following guidance for infill housing in existing areas:

For infill housing the Development Management chapter states “the development of infill housing on underutilised infill and corner sites in established residential areas will be encouraged where proposals for development are cognisant of the prevailing pattern of development character of the area and where all development standards are observed.. Contemporary design is encouraged and all new dwellings shall comply with Development Plan standards..”

In looking at the specific policy and objective related to house extensions, the question is considered can contemporary extensions can be permitted similar to a modern infill house?

Policy SPQHP41 – Residential Extensions seeks to: 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.

Neither of the above have a requirement that extensions must be in keeping with the existing house; only that a sensitive approach is taken.

The Development Management Standards includes guidance on extensions in general and specifically side extensions:

14.10.2 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.

14.10.2.2 Side Extensions: Side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on residential amenity. First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. In certain cases, a set-back of the extension's front facade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall generally match the existing.

The above give guidance as to how extensions will be assessed. It is noted that the paragraph states that external finishes shall generally (my emphasis) match the existing, but this is not an absolute; nor is this wording included in the above objectives and should also be considered in the context of Objective SPQHO43.

Whilst the material and windows are not exactly matching the existing house, there is a design "nod" to the house that places one rectangular window at each floor level but with a modern take; and the use of wood, in the context of the many materials used on the main dwelling, is a simple modern foil to the "busy" main elevation, using a natural material that is occurring on the main dwelling.

From a consideration the wording of the relevant policy and objective referenced in the refusal of permission I fail to see how the phrasing of such policy and objective can be interpreted to only permit absolute matching style extensions as the only acceptable design response. Therefore I consider that the policy and objective referenced in the reason for refusal do not support the grounds for refusal of permission.

9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed single and two storey extension to the dwelling in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located within a well serviced suburb of the town of Skerries and circa 0.5km from the nearest European Sites at the North-West Irish Sea SPA, Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, Skerries Islands SPA and Rockabill SPA. The proposed development comprises of (i) demolition of existing extension and (ii) building a part single storey part two storey extension to the rear and side of the

existing dwelling (See Section 2.0). 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 there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows

- The limited scale and nature of the works
- The location of the site within an established, serviced residential area
- Lack of connection to nearest European sites.

I conclude that 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 Framework Directive**

The subject site is located in Skerries Rock housing estate, a built-up suburb of Skerries town and is approx. 0.5m to the west of the Irish Sea. The proposed development comprises of demolition of an existing single-storey extension and construction of a new extension at single and first floor level to the existing dwelling; (see Section 2 above for description.) No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal or the planners report.

I have assessed the works proposed to the dwelling 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 & 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 are (i) the nature of the works proposed, which are modest in scale and also (ii) the lack of hydrological connection and distance from the nearest Water bodies.

Conclusion

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

I recommend that permission be granted for the proposed development subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and to the nature and scale of the proposed development on residentially zoned land, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the provisions of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 18th
---	---

	<p>day of August 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>The entire premises shall be used as a single dwelling unit apart from such use as may be exempted development for the purposes of the Planning and Development Regulations.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
3	<p>The glazing to the en-suite window 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>
4	<p>Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the 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 orderly development.</p>
5	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.</p> <p>Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p>

	Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.
6	<p>The site development works and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the adjoining streets are kept clear of debris, soil and other material and if the need arises for cleaning works to be carried out on the adjoining public roads, the said cleaning works shall be carried out at the developer's expense.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.</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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Deirdre Scully
 Planning Inspector

27th of January 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of proposed new part single storey – part two storey extension to side and rear of existing house, new rooflight to side of existing roof and all associated site works
Development Address	24 The Drive, Skerries Rock, Skerries, 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’. <input type="checkbox"/> No
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)?	
<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.	No, not a class for Part 1
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1.	
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	No, not a class for Part 2

<p>prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No, Schedule 7A information not provided.</p>

--	--

Inspector: _____

Date: _____