



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500281-DR-25

Development

Front, side and rear extension on ground floor, first floor extension, rooflights, relocate vehicular entrance, erect new timber fence along front and side boundary walls to max height of 2m., with associated works

Location

6, Wilson Crescent, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Dublin, A94E4X0

Planning Authority

Dún Laoghaire Rathdown Co. Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D25A/0674/WEB

Applicant(s)

Raymond and Anne Stokes

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Refusal

Type of Appeal

First

Appellant(s)

Raymond & Anne Stokes

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

15th January 2026.

Inspector

Ann Bogan

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History	6
5.0	Policy Context	7
6.0	EIA Screening	9
7.0	The Appeal	9
8.0	Assessment.....	10
9.0	AA Screening	14
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	14
11.0	Recommendation	15
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	15
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	17

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located at No 6 Wilson Crescent, Mount Merrion, and is a corner site, with a side boundary onto Wilson Road. It is an established residential area with a predominance of single storey detached dwellings, some with dormer windows.
- 1.2. The site is 0.065 Ha. in area and bounded by a low wall to front and side, with shrubs and trees also providing screening along parts of the boundary. There is an existing house and a free-standing garage on the site, and it has a vehicular entrance and driveway and a separate pedestrian entrance. The house is single storey with a hipped roof, and a single dormer window to the front elevation serving an upstairs bedroom.
- 1.3. The open space serving the dwelling is to the sides and front, with no rear garden, and there is a narrow path to the rear of the dwelling, which backs onto the side elevation of No 9 Wilson Road.
- 1.4. The existing dwelling matches the overall form and appearance of the streetscape in the adjacent area. The neighbouring houses in Wilson Crescent are single storey with dormer windows, although they vary somewhat in size and design. Most of the houses along Wilson Road are single storey and of largely consistent design.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal involves extensions, stated to be 66sqm in area, and remodelling of the existing 141sqm bungalow, to create a 4 bedroom dormer dwelling, with 3 ensuite bedrooms at first floor level. Proposed works include:
 - Remove existing shed/garage
 - Relocate vehicular entrance, to create new entrance 3.5metres in width
 - Erect new timber fence along front and side boundary wall to maximum height of 2 metres
 - Erect new front, side and rear extensions with bay window to front,
 - New front extension and internal refurbishment on ground floor consisting of sitting room, family/kitchen room, 1 bedroom and ensuite

- New first floor extension with dormer and apex roofs comprising of 3 bedrooms
- New roof windows to rear of existing roof
- New doors and windows to side elevations
- All associated site works

2.2. The development will be served by existing water and sewerage services and surface water is proposed to be disposed of via the public sewer/drain.

3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. **Decision**

Refuse permission for the following reason:

Having regard to the zoning of the site 'A', the scale and massing of the proposed extensions, it is considered that the proposed design would read as awkward and visually obtrusive at this prominent location, and will have a negative visual impact on the receiving environment and would therefore set an undesirable precedent for other similar scale developments. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not accord with Section 12.3.7.1(ii) and the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. **Planning Reports**

- The Planning Officer's report considers the principle of an extension to the dwelling to be compatible with the Development Plan zoning objectives for the area; and the rear and side ground floor extensions and proposed bay windows are considered acceptable. The Planner did not have concerns in relation to overlooking resulting from the proposed windows in the first floor extensions or from proposed rooflights.
- Concerns were expressed re appearance of the two storey extension; two different designs (both gable and hipped roof) at either end of property, read as visually

awkward, particularly due to sites prominent location, and not in keeping with Development Plan policies on extensions. Report states this will be dealt with by further information requesting a revised design to ensure a more cohesive appearance.

- Proposed boundary fence would result in total boundary height of 2m, it would enhance privacy and usability of amenity space by providing screening but report has concerns regarding visual impact of the fence along entire boundary given sites prominent location
- AA: It has been determined that proposed development would not significantly impact on a Natura 2000 site
- EIS Considered no real likelihood of significant effects on environment therefore need for EIA excluded at preliminary examination
- Conclusion of report recommends refusal of permission for reason outlined in Section 3.1 above (rather than a request for further information, as referred to earlier in report).
- (I note reason for refusal refers to Development Plan 2016-2022 in error, rather than current Development Plan 2022-2028).

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Environment Section: recommends conditions re noise management, and requiring a Construction Environmental Management Plan and Public Liaison Plan
- Drainage report: Further information recommended on how surface water run-off is to be infiltrated within the property, with no overflow to public sewer and to show that hardstanding areas are permeable

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

One observation submitted requesting that height of proposed boundary fence of 2m be reduced as it is not in keeping with the area, would detract from the sense of community

and set precedence for others to follow. Also notes the adjacent house on Wilson Road is No 9 Wilson Road and not number 6 Wilson Road as shown on drawings

4.0 Planning History

Subject site: None

Nearby:

No 1 Wilson Crescent

PL06D/246758: Permission refused for family flat ancillary to house, omitting link corridor conditioned under D14B/0299

No 3 Wilson Road

ABP 320488-24: Permission refused on appeal for alterations to roof to create new extension as proposed development, by reason of design scale and visual appearance, would be out of character with the existing property and existing residential properties in the vicinity and would conflict with Section 12.3.7.1 of the County Development Plan which requires new extensions to harmonise with existing structure and adjacent structures and have regard to impact on streetscape.

No 11 Wilson Road

D23B/0081 Retention permission granted on 18th April 2023 for raised stepped roof on single storey side extension

D22A/0375: Permission granted on 22nd July 2022 for single storey extension to side and front.

No 15 Wilson Road

D24B/0072 Split decision on 16th April 2024: Permission granted on for removal of unauthorised development but refused for provision of two side dormer structures on either side of the dwelling due to concerns re visual appearance

D24B/0514 Permission granted 27th January 2025 for pitched part mansard type roof with new front dormer to replace existing roof with existing side dormer removal of chimney and provision of rooflights

No 26 Wilson Road

ACP 322898-25: Permission refused on appeal for rear/side extension, attic conversion with rooflights, as proposed development by reason of the fenestration arrangements alongside boundaries and separation distances to adjoining properties, would seriously in residential amenity due to overlooking and result in poor levels of daylight and sunlight in the dwelling

No 13 Wilson Road

D18A/0925: Permission granted for roof light, single storey rear and side extension and widen rear vehicular entrance

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The relevant Development Plan is the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, which came into effect on 21st April 2022.

The site is zoned 'A' with an objective 'to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities'.

Section 4.3.1.2 Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation: It is a Policy Objective to: Conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF.

Section 4.3.1.3 Policy Objective PHP20 – Protection of Existing Residential Amenity

Policies relating to house extensions:

12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings The following Section provides guidance with respect to porches, front extensions, side extensions, rear extensions, roof alterations, attic conversions and dormer extension.

(i) Extensions to the Front: Porch extensions, other than those deemed to be exempted development, should be of appropriate design and scale relative to the design of the original house. The scale, height, and projection from the front building line of the dwelling should not be excessive so as to dominate the front elevation of

the dwelling. The porch should complement the existing dwelling, and a more contemporary design approach can be considered.

Front extensions, at both ground and first level will be considered acceptable in principle subject to scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. A break in the front building line will be acceptable, over two floors to the front elevation, subject to scale and design however a significant break in the building line should be resisted unless the design can demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the proposal will not impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings. Excessive scale should be avoided. Front extensions, particularly at first floor level, should reflect the roof shape and slope of the main dwelling. A minimum driveway length of 6 metres should be maintained.

(ii) Extensions to the 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. The extension should match or complement the main house.

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.

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

(iv) Alterations at Roof/Attic Level: Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles - changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/ 'A' frame end or 'half-hip' for example – will be assessed against a number of criteria including:

- Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.

- Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
- Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
- Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The subject site is c. 2 km from South Dublin Bay proposed NHA, and Booterstown Marsh proposed NHA and the following European sites: South Dublin Bay SAC & South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA.

6.0 **EIA Screening**

- 6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Act). See Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 **The Appeal**

7.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

- DLRCCC should have requested further information if they felt the design was too big and applicant could have altered design
- Do not agree that design would set a precedent in area as there are a lot of dwellings as big if not bigger than proposed design
- The dormer dwellings which have been extended are similar size to proposed, including No1 Wilson Crescent, the two dwellings on Wilson Road and dwellings on Roebuck Avenue
- Four new 3 storey houses at bottom of Wilson Road and new apartments at the 3 Sisters are also higher density than proposal
- No objections to proposal from neighbours apart from No 3 Wilson Crescent re boundary wall heights

- Proposed timber on top of boundary walls is necessary for privacy as there's no rear garden, could be dealt with by negotiation of screening with hedging, as is the case with the 3 Sisters apartments
- Believe house is not excessive, would enhance neighbourhood, existing house needs updating
- Proposes compromise to reduce bay window extensions back from 2m to 1m if board wished

7.2. **Planning Authority Response**

- Refers to Planners Report and states 'it is considered the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which in the opinion of the Planning Authority would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development'.

7.3. **Observations**

- None

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the appeal documentation, the report of the local authority, having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues to be considered in this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Character of the Area
- Residential Amenity
- Visual Amenity

8.2. **Principle of development**

8.2.1. The area is zoned 'A' with an objective 'to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities'. Policy objective PHP19 aims to 'conserve and improve existing housing stock through

supporting improvements and adaption of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF'. Therefore, I am satisfied that the principle of the proposed extension and upgrading of the existing dwelling development is acceptable in principle, subject to the other considerations assessed below.

8.3. Character of the Area

- 8.3.1. The appeal submission cites a number of examples and provides images of other dwellings in Wilson Crescent, Wilson Road and Roebuck Avenue which the applicants contend illustrate that the scale of the proposed dwelling is not excessive and would not set a precedent in the area. In that context I note the reason for refusal focused on the nature of the design as well as the scale of the development. It is also important to note that each application has to be considered on its own merits, and in the context of the character and circumstances of the surrounding area.
- 8.3.2. (Note the illustration labelled as 1 Wilson Road is incorrectly labelled and is actually 1 Wilson Crescent and that a dwelling labelled 2a Wilson Road is labelled as Roebuck Road in another illustration).
- 8.3.3. The site is located at the corner of Wilson Crescent and Wilson Road and regard must therefore be had to the character of the streetscape in both these streets in assessing the proposed development.
- 8.3.4. Wilson Road consists mainly of single storey hipped roofed houses of relatively uniform design but with some variation in type and scale of roof level dormers. An illustration of a group of newly developed dwellings at the eastern end of Wilson is included with the submission. It is some distance from the site and developed on a large site at the opposite end of the road. It is of a scale and in a location such that a change of character can be accommodated and I believe is not directly relevant in terms of precedent for the current application for extension of a dwelling. Similarly, while the illustrations from Roebuck Road may demonstrate that there are larger and varied dwellings in the wider area, they are not directly relevant to this particular location.
- 8.3.5. Wilson Crescent consists of single storey dwellings, some with dormers, but the dwellings have less uniformity of design than Wilson Road and there is a varied building line. I accept this provides scope for a level of flexibility in terms of the

redesign and extension of the subject dwelling. However, having inspected the site and its surroundings I did not observe any other buildings in the vicinity which have been altered to create dwelling of comparable design, scale and massing, including very significant alterations in roof profile, as proposed in this application. I believe it deviates substantially from the character of the existing dwelling and adjacent dwellings and of the wider streetscape of the area. This is further considered in terms of impact on residential and visual amenity in Sections 8.4 and 8.5 below.

8.4. Residential Amenity

- 8.4.1. The proposed development involves extensions of the existing dwelling at ground and first floor levels and rearrangement of the existing floor plan. Significant changes are also proposed to the roof design and pitch. The ground floor level will accommodate the kitchen, living room, bathroom and 1 ensuite bedroom, while three ensuite bedrooms will be provided at first floor level.
- 8.4.2. A two storey extension, approximately 42.6sqm in area, is proposed on the southern side of the existing dwelling. It incorporates a door and window at ground floor level and window at first floor level in the southern elevation. The extension will be approximately 5.4m from the from the southern site boundary and a total of circa 8.6m from the side elevation of the neighbouring dwelling at No 5 Wilson Crescent, which is set back from the building line of the subject dwelling. Taking account of the distance between the dwellings, the fact that there are already windows in the south elevation of the existing dwelling at ground and first floor level, the relative building lines of the dwellings and the potential for providing screening to the side boundary, either by fencing or vegetation, I am satisfied that the proposed windows would not result in a an increase in overlooking such as to have a negative impact on residential amenities.
- 8.4.3. The proposed two storey extension in the front elevation projects forward of the existing front elevation and provides for a large living room at ground floor level and a master bedroom at first floor level. A large glazed door in the north elevation at ground floor serving the living room and a new first floor window serving the master bedroom face the side garden and Wilson Road and I concur with the planning authority view that it would not result in overlooking of the neighbouring property at 9 Wilson Road or other nearby properties. Similarly, I am satisfied that the proposed roof lights to the

rear of the dwelling would not result in overlooking of the neighbouring dwelling, such as to impact on residential amenity.

8.5. Visual Impact

- 8.5.1. I believe the main issue of concern in relation to the proposed development is the visual impact of some elements of the proposal which have the potential to detract from the amenity and character of the building and the wider streetscape.
- 8.5.2. The existing house has a hipped roof with a 35 to 40 degree pitch and a dormer window to the front. In the redesign of the building, to achieve the desired increase in floor space and altered layout, the hipped roofs on each of the side elevations have been replaced by two storey gable walls. The proposed roof has a collection of different pitches, with the rear pitch circa 35 to 40 degrees, while the front pitch of each gable has a shallow pitch of circa 10 to 15 degrees. In addition, the front elevation incorporates three contrasting elements: a full two storey section with shallow pitch roof, a central dormer window with a 40 degree pitch, and a third roof element, the design of which is unclear, (as the side (south) elevation drawing and front elevation drawings are inconsistent with each other.
- 8.5.3. In my opinion the scale and massing of the proposed extensions, the varying roof profiles and the lack of cohesion in the design of the front elevation, would result in a building with an incongruous visual appearance in this prominent location, and would be out of character with the existing building and other buildings in the vicinity. I believe the proposed development would have a negative visual impact of the streetscape in the area, contrary to Section 12.3.7.1 of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, which seeks to ensure that proposed extensions and modifications to existing dwellings do not have a negative impact on the residential and visual amenities of the area. I concur with the planning authority decision to refuse planning permission, rather than seek further information, as the extent of redesign required would be difficult to achieve by way of a further information request.
- 8.5.4. In addition, I believe the fence proposed to top the existing wall, creating a 2m high boundary along the entire front and sides boundaries, would be out of character with the pattern of boundary fencing in the area, which consists largely of low walls, backed in some cases by hedges and other vegetation. In my opinion, raised fencing along the entire boundary as proposed would have a negative visual impact on the character

of the area and would not be acceptable. A short section of raised wall or fence along the southern side boundary, to rear of the building line, to provide screening between the subject site and No 5 Wilson Crescent may be appropriate.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. I have considered the proposed domestic extensions in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at Wilson Crescent, Mount Merrion, Dublin, in a well-serviced urban settlement. It is c. 2 km from European sites South Dublin Bay SAC & South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA. The proposed development comprises the construction of front, rear and side extensions on ground floor, first floor extension, rooflights, relocate vehicular entrance, erect new timber fence along boundaries to maximum height of 2m, with associated works. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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

- Nature of work
- Location in an established, serviced residential area
- Lack of connections to nearest European sites

9.3. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The subject site is located at Wilson Crescent, Mount Merrion, Dublin and the nearest waterbodies are the Dublin Bay and the River Tolka. The proposed comprises the construction of front rear and side extensions on ground floor, first floor extension,

rooflights, relocate vehicular entrance, erect new timber fence along boundaries to maximum height of 2m, with associated works. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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

10.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale and nature of the development
- The distance from nearest water bodies and lack of hydrological connections

10.4. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. Refusal of permission is recommended

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development by reason of its design, scale and visual appearance would be out of character with the existing dwelling, and other properties in the vicinity, and the overall streetscape in the area. It would, therefore, seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would not be in accordance with Section 12.3.7.1 of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would 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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Ann Bogan
Planning Inspector

9th February 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500281-DR-25
Proposed Development Summary	Front rear and side extensions on ground floor, first floor extension, rooflights, relocate vehicular entrance, erect new timber fence along boundaries to maximum height of 2m, with associated works.
Development Address	6 Wilson Crescent, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources) 	
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.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	

<p>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in 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 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>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</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>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</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: Ann Bogan _____

Date: 09/02/2026 _____