



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500140-SD

Development	Two storey extension
Location	9 Fernwood Avenue, Springfield, Tallaght, Dublin 24
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD25B/0276
Applicant(s)	Binu & Jose Seena
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Arkadiusz Grzyb and Marta Grzyb
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	16/1/26
Inspector	Ronan Murphy

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site which has a stated area of 0.0188ha and is located within an established residential area to the west of Tallaght Village.
- 1.2. The appeal site comprises of an existing end of terrace two storey dwelling with a single storey extension to the rear. The appeal site includes a small rear garden which includes a single storey shed.
- 1.3. The appeal site is primarily bounded to the north by No.11 Fernwood Avenue to the east and No. 7 Fernwood Avenue to the west and the back garden of No. 1 Fernwood Park to the north.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises of a two-storey extension to the rear of an existing dwelling.
- 2.2. At ground floor level the proposed extension would have an external depth of c.7m and an external width of c.5.6m. The proposed ground floor element would have a flat roof with a height of c.2.8m.
- 2.3. At first floor level, the proposed extension would have an external depth of c. 3.1m and an external width of c.5.5m. The first floor would have a height of 6m from ground floor and would have a pitched roof.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1 By order dated 3/10/25 the planning authority decided to grant planning permission subject to 5 conditions. The conditions are standard for the developments of this type.
- 3.1.2 Condition 2 requires that the development incorporate a setback (minimum 0.5m) of the first-floor rear element from the shared boundary with No. 7 to the east.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.1.2 There are two planning reports on file. The first planners report dated 4/7/25 states that the proposed development is permitted in principle under the zoning. The area planner states that there are concerns with respect to the height and depth of the proposed rear extensions. The concerns relate to adverse overshadowing impacts on No.11 to the east of the site and to the loss of light to the glazed doors on the rear elevation.

3.2.1.3 Concerns are also highlighted with respect to the use of obscure glazing for the bedroom at first floor level and the garden area to be retained. Having regard to these concerns Further Information was requested.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None of file

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None on file

Further information

3.4 The applicant responded to the Further Information request on 15/9/25. The response included the following:

- Drawing No. 603/PD/602-Site Plan
- Drawing No. 603/PD/06-Rear and side Elevations
- Drawing No. 603/PD/07- Contiguous Elevations
- First Floor Plan

3.5 The second planning report on file, dated 3/10/25 considers that the applicant's response to the Further Information is acceptable and recommends that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

4.1 There is no planning history pertaining to the appeal site.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The *South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028* is the operative plan for the area. The appeal site is within the 'Res' zone which has the objective '*to protect and / or improve residential amenity.*'

The following policies and objectives are pertinent:

QDP7(High Quality Design): which seeks to Promote and facilitate development which incorporates exemplary standards of high-quality, sustainable, and inclusive urban design, urban form, and architecture.

QDP11 (Materials, Colours and Textures): Which seeks to promote high-quality building finishes that are appropriate to context, durable and adhere to the principles of sustainability and energy efficiency.

H14 (Residential Extensions): which seeks to support the extension of existing dwellings subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

H14 Objective 1: To favourably consider proposals to extend existing dwellings subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities and compliance with the standards set out in Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring and the guidance set out in the South Dublin County Council House Extension Design Guide, 2010 (or any superseding guidelines).

Section 12.6.8- Extensions which states that the design of residential extensions should have regard to the permitted pattern of development in the immediate area alongside the South Dublin County Council House Extension Guide (2010) or any superseding standards.

5.2 Other Relevant Guidance

South Dublin County Council House Extension Design Guide (2025)

The updated House Extension Design Guide 2025 contains the following general guidance on house extensions and specific guidance on rear extensions: *'the scale of a rear extension should be proportionate to the scale of the existing house or its plot. The roof form and height of rear extensions adjoining party boundaries should be considered and parapet height should always be minimised'* in addition to this, *'First floor or two storey rear extensions require careful consideration, as depending on the design, this type of extension can have serious adverse effects on the residential amenities of neighbours.'*

With regard to garden space it states *'The quantum of garden space remaining following an extension should be of a usable scale. In this regard, the provisions on rear garden space standards to specific planning policy requirement (SPPR) 2 of the current Compact Growth Guidelines'*

Section 5.5 sets out a combined checklist for decision makers, with BFP3 as set out in Section 5.5.5 relating to Rear extensions.

5.3 Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1 The appeal site is not located on or within any designated Natura 2000 site(s) or Natural Heritage Area(s). The Wicklow Mountains SAC (Site Code: 002122) is located c. 3.4km to the south of the site. In addition to this, the Wicklow Mountains SPA (Site Code: 004040) is located c. 3.7Km to the south of the site.

5.3.2 The Dodder Valley pNHA (Site Code: 000991) is located c.2.4km to the south-east of the site.

5.3.3 A screening exercise for Appropriate Assessment will be undertaken in Section 8 below.

5.4 EIA Screening

5.4.1 See completed Form 2 attached by way of appendix to this report. Having regard to the nature, size, and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that

there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

5.5 Water Framework Directive

5.5.1 The purpose of the EU Water Framework Directive is an initiative aimed at improving water quality throughout the European Union. The Directive was adopted in 2000 and requires governments to take a new approach to managing all their waters; rivers, canals, lakes, reservoirs, groundwater, protected areas (including wetlands and other water dependent ecosystems), estuaries (transitional) and coastal waters.

5.5.2 An Coimisiún Pleanála and other statutory authorities cannot grant development consent where a proposed development would give rise to a reduction in water quality.

5.5.3 The CAMAC_030 (IE_EA_09C020310) is c. 1.04km to the northwest of the site. This waterbody is classified as poor ecological status. The DODDER_040 (IE_EA_09D010620) is c.1.05km to the south of the site. This waterbody is classified as poor ecological status. This is illustrated on the EPA mapping (<https://gis.epa.ie/EPAMaps/>).

5.5.4 I have assessed the proposal 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.

5.5.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The minor nature of the development, and
- The fact that the appeal site is connected to the public foul sewer and stormwater infrastructure.

6 The Appeal

6.1 Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 A third party appeal against the decision of South Dublin County council to grant planning permission has been received from Arkadiusz Grzyb. The appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed rear extension has the potential to cause unacceptable overshadowing of neighbouring properties, especially No.11 to the east.
- The application does not include an overshadowing analysis. The planning authority had concerns in relation to this, but no analysis was provided and the design was not reduced to reduce the negative impact.
- The height and depth of the extension is disproportionate to in relation to neighbouring properties.
- The proposed extension does not harmonise with the existing structure in terms of design, materials and visual impact and would create a noticeable visual disruption with the streetscape and would have a negative impact on the character of the area.
- The planning authority requested revised plans requested a setback of 0.5m for the first-floor element from the shared boundary with No.7. The revised plans still fail to address the massing and scale of the development.
- If external insulation is proposed, then the drawings will have to reflect that by making the drawings smaller in scale as external insulation may encroach over property boundary.
- Drainage proposals are not adequate and would not comply with Building Regulations. The surface water design is shared with neighbours and if damaged would have an extremely adverse effect. Without a detailed explanation of how surface water runoff and foul sewers will be managed, this could have an adverse effect on the local environment especially flooding risks or inadequate drainage capacity.

- The water from the roof will shed into the adjoining property which is against building regulations.
- Conditions in relation to noise and dust are not sufficiently robust to prevent disruption to local residents.
- The proposed development is likely to result in additional traffic and parking pressures in the area. There has been little consideration of the cumulative effect on local roads and parking availability.
- The Planning Authority has not adequately taken the concerns of locals into account in its final decision.
- The proposal does not comply with local development plan, particularly in relation residential amenity space, design standards, and the protection of neighbouring properties from adverse impacts such as overshadowing.

6.2 Applicant Response

6.2.1 A response has been received from Watson Fitzpatrick and Associates dated 28/12/25 on behalf of the applicants. The response can be summarised as follows:

- The roof profile of the first-floor extension has been modified by way of response to Further Information. The modifications reduce the overall ridge height and would lessen any impacts on No.11 and other adjoining properties.
- Drawing No. 603/PD/02 shows that the projection of the first floor is 3.1m.
- The first-floor layout has been modified by setting back the side wall of the extension by 500mm from the adjoining property at No.11 which reduces the impact.

6.3 Planning Authority Response

6.3.1 Letter dated 24/11/25 stating that the planning authority confirms its decision and that the issues raised in the appeal have been covered in the Chief Executive Order.

6.4 Observations

6.4.1 There are no observations on file.

6.5 Further Responses

6.5.1 There are no further responses on file.

7 Assessment

7.1 Having examined the appeal details and all other documentation on file, including the reports of the local authority and inspected the site. I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on Visual and Residential Amenities.
- Private Amenity Space Provision.
- Flood Risk.
- Other matters.
- Appropriate Assessment.

7.2 Principle of Development

7.2.1 The appeal site within the RES zone which has the objective '*To protect and / or improve residential amenity.*' Residential' development is 'permitted in principle' within this zoning objective.

7.2.2 Section 6.8.2 of the *South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028* relates to 'Residential Extensions' and contains supporting policies/objectives while Section 12.6.8 of the *South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028* relates to 'Residential Consolidation' and contains the assessment criteria for extensions to existing dwellings. Therefore, I consider that the extension to a dwelling is acceptable in principle – subject to compliance with the parameters set out in *the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028*.

7.3 Impact on Visual and Residential Amenities

- 7.3.1 The third party has outlined concerns that the height and depth of the proposed extension is disproportionate in relation to neighbouring properties, would not harmonise with the existing structure and would cause unacceptable overshadowing of neighbouring properties, especially No.11 to the east.
- 7.3.2 In response the first party states that the roof profile of the first-floor extension has been modified to reduce the overall ridge height and would be set back c. 500mm from the adjoining property at No.11 which reduces the impact.
- 7.3.3 Section 6.8.2 of the *South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028* and Policy H14 seeks to support the extension of existing dwellings, subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities. In addition to this, the *House Extension Design Guide (February 2025)* contains general guidance on house extensions and specific guidance on rear extensions.

Ground floor

- 7.3.4 I refer the Coimisiún to the drawings submitted with the response to Further Information. At ground floor level the proposed extension would project c. 7m from the existing dwelling and would have a height of c.2.8m with a flat roof.
- 7.3.5 Having considered the plans submitted at further information, I am satisfied that the ground floor element of the proposed extension is acceptable and would not have an undue impact on neighbouring properties to the east and west by way of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing development. I have come to this conclusion having regard to the modest height of the ground floor extension in combination with the flat roofed design. Therefore, I am satisfied that the ground floor element of the proposed development accords with Policy H14 (Residential Extensions), H14 Objective 1 and Section 12.6.8 of the South and the House Extension Design Guide 2025 of the *South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028*.

First floor

- 7.3.6 With regard to the first-floor element, I note that the height has been reduced from c. 6.8m as initially proposed to c.6.0 as shown on the plans submitted with the first-party appeal response. In addition to this, the plans submitted show that the proposed first

floor element would have an external depth of c.3.1m and would be set back c. 500mm from the boundary with No.11 Fernwood Avenue to the east of the site.

7.3.7 I note the concerns of the third-party with respect to potential overshadowing caused by the height, depth and set back of the proposed extension. I do acknowledge that the physical relationship between the appeal site and the appellants site to the east will change given that the proposed first floor element would project c.3.1m from the main rear elevation of No.9 Fernwood Avenue rather than the existing open sky which exists at the present time.

7.3.8 The rear garden of No.11 Fernwood Avenue has a north-south orientation. The arc of sunlight during the day would mean that development at No.9 Fernwood Avenue has the potential to impact afternoon sunlight into the back garden of No.11 Fernwood Avenue. While I acknowledge there may be some impact to light levels within the rear garden of No.11 Fernwood Avenue, I do not consider that such impacts would be undue and would be confined to late afternoon / early evening. I have come to this conclusion having regard to the amended design of the proposed first floor element which includes a reduction in height of the proposed first floor element from 6.8m to 6.0m and the set back from the shared eastern boundary of c.500mm as shown on the plans submitted with the first party appeal.

7.3.9 It is considered that the proposed development would be consistent with development plan policy for domestic extensions to the rear of a dwelling house. I am satisfied that the projection and height of the extension is not excessive.

7.4 Private Amenity Space Provision

7.4.1 The third-party has outlined concerns that the proposal does not comply with local development plan, particularly in relation residential amenity space.

7.4.2 I note that the existing rear private amenity space is compact and currently includes a shed to north-western corner. I refer the Coimisiún to the further information response of the first party which states that the existing shed within the garden would be demolished. I further refer the Coimisiún to the site plan submitted with the first party appeal response. This plan shows that the garden shed would be removed, leaving a garden area of 28m² to be retained.

7.4.3 With regard to garden space I refer the Coimisiún to Section 3.4.1 of the South Dublin County Council House Extension Design Guide (February 2025) states that the quantum of garden space remaining following an extension should be of a usable scale.

7.4.4 Having considered the plans submitted by the first party, I am satisfied that the proposed garden space is useable and acceptable for a dwelling within an urban area on a site which already has a compact rear amenity space such as the appeal site. I further note that there is a large area of public open space to the north and the south-west (Jobstown Park) of the site and several sporting pitches in the area all within walking distance of the appeal site. I am satisfied that this is an adequate compensation for a smaller private open space area because of the proposed development.

7.5 Flood Risk

7.5.1 have consulted the flood mapping system (www.floodinfo.ie) and I note that the subject land is within Flood Zone 'C'.

7.5.2 Having considered all the foregoing; I consider the proposed development would not result increase the risk of flood either within the site itself or the surrounding area. The proposal is acceptable from a flood risk perspective.

7.6 Other matters

Drainage

7.6.1 The third-party outlines concern with that the drainage proposals are not adequate and would not comply with Building Regulations and that as the surface water is shared with neighbours any damage would have an adverse effect. There is also concern that the application does not include a detailed explanation of how surface water runoff and foul sewers will be managed.

7.6.2 I refer the Coimisiún to the Notification of Decision to Grant Planning Permission which includes a condition which requires that the water and foul drainage supply comply with the requirements of Uisce Eireann and a separate condition which has a number of requirements in relation to the management of storm water and foul water. I am satisfied that the proposal is acceptable, subject to compliance with these conditions.

External insulation

7.6.3 The third-party highlights concern in relation that the submitted drawings do not include any external insulation is proposed, and any such external insulation may encroach over property boundary.

7.6.4 I note that the drawings submitted with the first party appeal response shows that the first-floor element of the proposed development would be set back c.500mm from the property boundary with No.11 Fernwood Avenue. I am satisfied that any external insulation could be applied without encroaching on the property boundary with No.11 Fernwood Avenue. In any case, this matter could be dealt with by way of condition requiring that no part of the proposed development can overhang the adjoining property should the Coimisiún be of a mind to grant planning permission.

Parking

7.6.5 Concerns are raised that the proposed development is likely to result in additional traffic and parking pressures in the area and that there has been little consideration of the cumulative effect on local roads and parking availability.

7.6.6 The site plan submitted with the first party appeal response shows two car parking spaces to the front of the dwelling. I refer the Coimisiún to Table 12.26 of the *South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028* Maximum Parking Rates (Residential Development) which shows that a maximum of 2 car parking spaces is required for houses with 3 or more beds. The plans submitted shows that the dwelling would have 3 bedrooms (one at ground floor and two at first floor). I am satisfied that the parking would comply with Table 12.26 of the *South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028*.

8 AA Screening

8.1 I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The application is for a two-storey extension to the rear of a dwelling in a residential area in Tallaght.

8.2 The appeal site is not located on or within any designated Natura 2000 site(s) or Natural Heritage Area(s). The Wicklow Mountains SAC (Site Code: 002122) is located c. 3.4km to the south of the site. In addition to this, the Wicklow Mountains SPA (Site Code: 004040) is located c. 3.7Km to the south of the site. The Dodder Valley pNHA (Site Code: 000991) is located c.2.4km to the south-east of the site.

- 8.3 There is no hydrological link between the subject site and the European sites.
- 8.4 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 effect on a European Site.

9 Recommendation

- 9.1 I recommend that planning permission be granted.

10 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1 Having regards to the grounds of appeal, the residential zoning objective, the established pattern of development in the area, the policy framework provided by the *South Dublin Development Plan 2022-2028* including the requirements of the *South Dublin County Council House Design Guide 2025*, it is considered that the proposed development would represent a reasonable improvement of accommodation on site, would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties including No.11 Fernwood Avenue and as such would be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11 Conditions

1. The proposed development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the documentation and particulars lodged with the Planning Application on 15/5/25 as revised by Further Information received on 15/9/25 and by response to the first party appeal dated 1/12/25 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 conducted and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. No development shall commence on the site until such time as the following have been agreed and complied with:
 - (a) Updated plans to show the set back of the first-floor extension of not less than 500mm from the eastern boundary of the land.
 - (b) Plans to show that no part of the development (including external insulation or any water goods) overhangs any abutting properties.
 - (c) A schedule of all external finishes
 - (d) A storm water drainage plan and storm water management plan including cross sections to comply with SuDS requirements to ensure that the development does have any detrimental impact on stormwater services in the area.
 - (e) Requirements of South Dublin County Council's Roads Department and Water Services Department are agreed in writing.
 - (f) Drainage arrangements, including the disposal and attenuation of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Full details shall be agreed with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development, and all works shall be completed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority prior to the occupation of any house within the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of the protection of the residential amenity of abutting properties, public health and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. The developer shall enter into water and wastewater connection agreements with Uisce Eireann, prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of public health

4. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity

5. Construction and demolition waste shall be managed in accordance with a construction waste and demolition management plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall be prepared in accordance with the 'Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects,' published by the Environmental Protection Agency in 2021.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable waste management.

6. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer, or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the

Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Ronan Murphy

Ronan Murphy

19 January 2026

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500140-SD
Proposed Development Summary	Two storey extension
Development Address	9 Fernwood Avenue, Springfield, Tallaght, Dublin 24
	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> <p>(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)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a ‘Project.’ Proceed to Q2.</p>
<p>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</p>	
<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><input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>	
<p>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?</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road</p>	

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

<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>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

