



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500312-CC-25

Development	Extension and dormer window and all associated site works.
Location	11 Glashaboy Woods , Sallybrook , Glanmire
Planning Authority	Cork City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2543881
Applicant(s)	Robert O'Driscoll
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Robert O'Driscoll
Observer(s)	Orla Murphy
Date of Site Inspection	23rd December 2025
Inspector	Bernadette Quinn

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in the Glashaboy residential estate in Glanmire, approximately 10km northeast of Cork city. The site has a stated area of 0.0257ha and contains a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a floor area of 113.3 sqm. The appeal site forms part of a row of semi-detached and detached dwellings located on the north side of a cul de sac which faces onto an area of public open space. To the rear of the appeal site is Millbrook, a residential estate of single storey dwellings. The dwelling on the appeal site comprises two storeys on its front elevation and slopes to a dormer at the rear with velux windows on the rear roof. The adjoining semi-detached dwellings are of similar design.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the construction of a part single storey and part 2 storey rear extension and first floor dormer window to the rear of the existing dwelling. At ground floor the proposed rear extension will provide for a living area which will extend the full width of the existing rear elevation and will have a depth of 4.090m. The ground floor extension will have a flat roof. At first floor the proposed extension will provide for a bedroom and will have a depth of 4.090m, a width of 3.8m and will be located towards the western boundary. The first floor extension will have a pitched roof with an eaves height of 5.2m and a ridge height of 7.452m. The existing dwelling has a ridge height of approx. 7.8m and a rear elevation eaves height of approx. 3.9m. The existing dwelling has a floor area of 113.3 sq.m. and the proposed extension has a floor area of 35 sq.m.
- 2.2. Following a request for further information the proposed first floor element of the extension was reduced in scale with the depth reduced by 1m to a depth of 3m, reduction in width to approx. 3.7m and a reduction in the proposed ridge height to approx. 6.25m with an eaves height of 5.2m. The first-floor extension will be set back approx. 2.8m from the boundary with No. 12 to the east, 1m from the side boundary to the west and 2m from the side elevation of the dwelling at No. 10 to the west. A new window is proposed on the first-floor western side elevation which will serve a bathroom.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On 29th October 2025 Cork City Council (CCC) issued notification of decision to grant permission subject to 9 conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planning Officers report dated 04/07/2025 can be summarised as follows:

- Under the parent permission for the overall development rear elevations of dwellings were laid out in dormer style so as to minimise the impact on the single storey dwellings to the north of the site. This arrangement also allows for the tight and narrow rear open spaces to the northern side of each of the row of dwellings to be useable and open to direct sunlight at all times of the year.
- The proposed first floor window located on the northern elevation of the extension may allow for direct overlooking of adjacent third party property to the north. The proposed dormer window is to be set further back and with the proposed separation distances from the existing rear wall of the dwelling to the northern boundary wall it may not give rise to direct overlooking.
- The two-storey element of the proposed extension would have a negative impact on the adjacent third party properties located to the west and the east of the site which may include loss of direct light to the adjacent third-party properties. A shadow impact assessment is required to address this issue.
- Further information is required to carry out a complete assessment.

The report of the Senior Executive Planner recommends a request for further information.

Following a request for further information, the Planning Officer's report dated 28/10/2025 can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed extension has been reduced in height, width and depth.

- The overall ridge height of the proposed first floor pitched roof extension has been reduced from 7.4m to 6.2m and the roof redesigned so that it is shallower than the original proposal. The depth of the first-floor pitched roof extension has also been reduced so that it is now set back from the proposed rear wall of the proposed ground floor extension. The proposed dormer window has been reduced in area and size.
- The revised design is considered more proportionate to the existing dwelling and site as well as the adjacent dwellings and sites that are located to the east, the west and the north and is considered acceptable.
- A shadow impact study has been submitted which shows that the revised extension design will have a minimum impact on the adjacent rear private open space of adjacent third-party dwellings to the east and west and is acceptable under the BRE guidance.

The report of the Senior Executive Planner recommends a grant of permission.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Area Engineer: No objection subject to conditions

Contributions Report: Total Contributions €0.00

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None on file

3.4. Third Party Observations

A number of submissions were received in relation to the planning application and a submission was received in relation to the further information. The issues raised are similar to the issues raised in the third party appeals.

4.0 Planning History

4.1.1. Appeal Site:

14/6314 / PL 04.244855: Permission granted by CCC and An Coimisiun Pleanala (ACP) for a residential development comprising the demolition of an existing

farmhouse and outbuildings and construction of 35 no. dwelling houses, 2 no. residential serviced sites and all associated ancillary development works.

4.1.2. Surrounding Area:

2543919 / ACP-323717-25: Permission granted by CCC and by ACP following a third-party appeal for construction of ground and first floor extension and new windows at 13 Glashaboy Woods, Sallybrook Glanmire, Cork.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The site is situated in an area zoned as ZO 01 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods with the objective to protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses.

In relation to this zoning objective, paragraph ZO 1.1 states that the provision and protection of residential uses and residential amenity is a central objective of this zoning. Paragraph ZO 1.2 states that development in this zone should generally respect the character and scale of the neighbourhood in which it is situated.

Chapter 11 outlines guidance relating to Placemaking and Managing Development and includes the following sections of relevance in relation to the assessment of extensions and alterations to dwellings:

Paragraph 11.95 relates to daylight, sunlight and overshadowing wherein Objective 11.4 states the potential impacts of the proposed development on the amenities enjoyed by adjoining properties will need to be assessed in relation to all major schemes and where separation distances are reduced below those stipulated. Cumulative impacts of committed schemes will also need to be assessed.

Paragraph 11.97 states that a daylight analysis will be required for all proposed developments of more than 50 units and in relation to smaller applications where there are impacts on habitable rooms and the nature of the impact is not clear (e.g. if simple rules of thumb cannot be effectively applied to determine daylight levels on adjacent properties).

Paragraph 11.100 recognises that privacy and overlooking are important for quality of life.

Paragraph 11.141 states that in order to ensure that existing homes are utilised by occupation Cork City Council supports the retention and adaptation of the existing housing stock to suit the evolving needs of society.

Paragraph 11.142 states that the design and layout of extensions to houses should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards sunlight, daylight and privacy. The character and form of the existing building should be respected, and external finishes and window types should match the existing.

Paragraph 11.143 indicates that extensions should: 1. Follow the pattern of the existing building as much as possible; 2. Be constructed with similar finishes and similar windows to the existing building so that they would integrate with it; 3. Roof form should be compatible with the existing roof form and character. Traditional pitched roofs will generally be appropriate when visible from the public road. High quality monopitch and flat-roof solutions will be considered appropriate providing they are of a high standard and employ appropriate detailing and materials; 4. Dormer extensions should not obscure the main features of the existing roof, i.e. should not break the ridge or eaves lines of the roof. Box dormers will not usually be permitted where visible from a public area; 5. Traditional style dormers should provide the design basis for new dormers; 6. Front dormers should normally be set back at least three-tile courses from the eaves line and should be clad in a material matching the existing roof; 7. Care should be taken to ensure that the extension does not overshadow windows, yards or gardens or have windows in flank walls which would reduce the privacy of adjoining properties.

5.2. Ministerial Guidelines

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024 set out policy and guidance in relation to the planning and development of urban and rural settlements, with a focus on sustainable residential development and the creation of compact settlements and are of relevance in relation to site specific standards and amenity protection. SPPR 1 requires a separation distance of at least 16 metres between rear opposing windows above ground floor level. Separation distances below 16 metres may be considered where

suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme to prevent undue overlooking of habitable rooms and private amenity spaces.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The closest designated sites to the appeal site are Great Island Channel SAC (Site Code: 001058) located approx. 5.1km southeast of the site and Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code: 004030) located approx. 2.8km south of the site.

5.4. 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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

One no. third party appeal has been received from James Glasgow. The appeal includes copies of observations made in relation to the proposal to the PA, drawings submitted with the application, a shadow assessment, and details of the original permission relating to existing dwellings in the Glashaboy Woods. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Revised plans submitted in response to further information do not address the concerns raised by the PA in their initial assessment. No reasoning has been given for the reversal of the Councils position or conclusion that the loss of sunlight is minimal.
- The shadow study submitted by the applicant was prepared without external dimensions, independent measurement of height or depth, and with the incorrect north-point orientation. The results were not tested against BRE 209 Guidelines or the Development Plan and were accepted without analysis.

- An observation included photographs and diagrams demonstrating the impact of overshadowing on the adjoining property which was not addressed and represents a procedural and evidential failure.
- The approved development is excessive in height, depth, and massing, and is over-scaled, bulky and visually oppressive, and is contrary to the parent permission and surrounding pattern of development resulting in overshadowing and loss of light into the rear of adjoining properties.
- The proposed reduction in ridge height of 1.2m does not materially alter the mass or overshadowing effect of the proposal.
- The proposal is contrary to the development plan objective 11.3(d) and objective 13.6.7(c) relating to sunlight, overshadowing, overlooking and overbearing; objectives 11.3(d), 11.5 and 15.1 relating to the protection of existing residential amenities, section 13.40-13.43 relating to protection of privacy and outlook; objective 15.1 and 11.67 relating to the requirement for high-quality accurate design; and the ZO 01 zoning objective relating to protection of residential amenities; Sections 34(3)(a) and 34(10) of the Planning and Development Act, and BRE 209 Guidelines requirement for empirical analysis.
- The proposed extension contravenes the scale and height restrictions of the original estate design permitted under 14/6314 wherein houses were designed with lowered rear elevations to address concerns relating to scale and proximity of the proposed dwellings to existing single storey dwellings at Millbrook Close and to protect the amenities of these properties. The proposal represents inconsistent and non-confirming development contrary to the intent of this parent permission. The proposed two storey development materially undermines the integrity of the parent permission and is contrary to the design rationale of the original estate, including the requirement for reduced ridge heights, extended rear separation distances and restriction of two-storey massing.
- The declarations of the architect for the original estate relating to the design rational to address the relationship with Millbrook are relevant considerations

under Section 34(3)(a) which requires the PA and ACP to have regard to the provisions of any permission previously granted on the land.

- The same architect, DMNA, were responsible for the original estate design and the proposed development the subject of the appeal. This represents a professional and procedural inconsistency by the same architect whose original justification founded the grant of permission for the original estate.
- The design rational and mitigation measures forming the basis of a prior grant are material considerations which cannot be disregarded, and the proposal is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development.
- There are inaccuracies in the drawings submitted with the application including a misrepresented north point and an absence of measurable dimensions and finished floor levels or contour data preventing verification of vertical relationships. As a result, it has not been possible to properly assess the proposal, and the requirements of the Planning and Development Regulations have not been met.
- Drawings submitted by unsolicited further information materially changed the character and impact of the proposal. The failure to re-advertise the revised drawings deprived residents of their right to review and comment on the altered scheme.
- The incorrect north point on drawings has implications for the shadow assessment making it unreliable.
- The architect responsible for preparing the drawings, as a result of inaccuracies, has contravened the RIAI Code of Practice and misled the PA and third parties.
- The deficiencies in drawings amount to a material error of law and a breach of transparency, natural justice and proper planning and sustainable development. The permission granted by Cork City Council is procedurally invalid.
- The applicant may have intentionally inflated the scale of the initial proposal to allow for submission of a reduced scale in response to a further information request.

- First floor windows will result in overlooking of private open spaces and into rooms of adjoining properties and over the public road.
- The proposal is in breach of the P&D Regulations Articles 23(1)(c) and 35(1), Section 34(3)(a) and 34(10) of the P&D Act and the 2009 Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines and Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Guidelines (2007).
- It is requested that permission is refused on the above grounds.
- If permission is granted it is requested that ACP attach conditions specifying the exact height, width and depth, ridge and eaves levels and any setbacks or reductions required.

6.2. Applicant Response

A response received on behalf of the applicant can be summarised as follows:

- The shadow study was prepared using the industry standard method for the preparation of shadow studies and conforms to all Guidelines.
- The shadow study confirms minimal additional overshadowing of adjoining properties.
- The appellants shadow study is inaccurate.
- The scale and mass of the extension has been reduced with the floor area of the first floor reduced by 40%, the depth reduced by 1m, the width reduced by 175mm, the ridge is in excess of 1.5m below the ridge of the existing dwelling. These changes reduce any impacts on neighbouring properties.
- The existing garden is in excess of 16 metres long which is in excess of the minimum requirements set out in the Sustainable Residential and Compact Settlements Guidelines and the existing house does not overlook houses to the rear.
- It is accepted that floor plans showed an incorrect north point, however the site plan shows the correct orientation and Cork City Council deemed the application valid.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

None received.

6.4. Observations

One observation has been received from Orla Murphy. The issues raised are similar to the issues raised in the third party appeal and can be summarised as follows:

- The grounds of appeal are supported.
- Concerns raised were not adequately addressed by the PA in granting permission.
- The proposal is a departure from the original estate design.
- Excessive scale, bulk and height of proposed extension.
- Incomplete and misleading drawings.
- The proposed extension will be overbearing when viewed from No. 10 Glashaboy Woods, will result in loss of light, overshadowing and overlooking on the rear extension, rear facing rooms and rear garden at No. 10.
- The proposal will harm the residential amenity of No. 10 and set a precedent for similar developments.
- There are concerns that the proposal will fail the recommendations set out in BRE 209 guidance relating to daylight and sunlight in relation to overshadowing of gardens and loss of light to windows.
- A single storey extension would be more appropriate.
- The concerns raised by the PA in the initial planners report were not addressed. Cork City Council did not exercise due diligence in assessing the proposal.
- It is requested that the Commission carry out a de novo assessment and that permission is refused or that the first floor is omitted.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Residential and Visual Amenity Impacts
- Design
- Other Matters

7.2. This assessment relates to the layout submitted by the first party in response to the PA further information (FI) request.

7.3. Residential and Visual Amenity Impacts

7.3.1. The appeal site contains an existing semi-detached dwelling with a pitched roof which is two storeys on the front elevation. To the rear the roof profile slopes providing for a dormer style with roof lights serving first floor rooms on the rear elevation. A proposed ground floor rear extension will extend 4.090m from the existing rear elevation and will contain an extended living area. A first-floor rear extension is proposed towards the western boundary with a depth of approx. 3m from the existing rear façade, a width of 3.7m, a setback of 2.8m from the eastern boundary and a setback of 1m from the western boundary. The existing rear first floor eaves height is approx. 3.9m above existing floor level and existing ridge height is approx. 7.8m above floor level. The proposed eaves height of the first floor extension will be approx. 5.2m above existing floor level and the proposed ridge level is 6.25m above floor level. A pitched roof is proposed to the rear first floor extension, and a flat roof is proposed at ground level. At first floor a window is proposed on the rear elevation serving the proposed new bedroom and a new dormer window is proposed on the rear elevation to replace a roof light serving an existing bedroom. A new first floor window is proposed on the existing western side elevation which will serve a bathroom.

Overshadowing, Loss of Light & Overbearing

- 7.3.2. Concerns are raised regarding overshadowing and loss of light inside and outside the rear of the appellant's and observer's properties at no. 12 to the east and no. 10 to the west as a result of the proposed extension. The proposed extension will be located to the north of the existing dwelling with dimensions as outlined in Section 7.3.1 above. The ground floor extension will extend to the boundary with no. 12 to the east and the first floor extension will be setback 2.8m from this boundary. The ground and first floor extension will be setback 1m from the western boundary and 2m from the existing dwelling at No. 10. The existing dwelling at No. 10 to the west contains a ground floor rear extension. There are no extensions to the rear of No. 12 whilst the property at No. 13, located to the immediate east of No. 12 has recently been granted permission for a rear two storey extension.
- 7.3.3. Objective 11.3 of the Development Plan outlines Housing Quality and Standards and states that the design of developments should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new and surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, whilst, minimising overshadowing and maximising the useability of outdoor amenity space. Objective 11.4 refers to Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing and states that the potential impacts of the proposed development on the amenities enjoyed by adjoining properties will need to be assessed in relation to all major schemes and where separation distances are reduced below those stipulated. Cumulative impacts of committed schemes will also need to be assessed. Paragraph 11.142 relates to extensions and states that the design and layout of extensions to houses should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards sunlight, daylight and privacy. Objective 11.5 refers to private amenity spaces for houses. Section 11.67 states that it is an objective of Cork City Council to secure excellence in the design quality of all developments in the city, including residential developments.
- 7.3.4. Having regard to the content of the Development Plan as outlined above I am satisfied that a detailed technical assessment of daylight and sunlight impacts is not required, noting the scale of development and separation distances proposed. In the context of the subject Appeal, it is considered appropriate to refer to the principles of 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A guide to good practice (Building Research Establishment Report, 2022) i.e. BRE209. Section 3.3 of BRE 209

considers the impact of development on sunlight to existing amenity spaces such as private gardens. Section 3.3.7 recommends that at least half of the amenity space should receive at least two hours of sunlight on March 21st.

- 7.3.5. I note that rear gardens are north facing and that overshadowing of rear gardens would occur from existing dwellings as a result of the north facing orientation of the rear elevations. In response to the PA's FI request the applicant submitted a Shadow Study which shows the impact of overshadowing with the proposed development on 20th March, 21st June and 22nd September for various times of the day. The assessment shows a limited additional impact on overshadowing of rear amenity space serving the adjoining properties to the east in the morning and the property to the west in the evening as a result of the proposed development. Based on the Shadow Study submitted I am satisfied that at least half of the rear gardens on the appeal site and adjoining properties will continue to receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March and will continue to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year, in line with the recommendations contained in the BRE guidelines.
- 7.3.6. I have reviewed the shadow assessment attached to the third-party appeal and I note the first party response which raises concerns that this study is inaccurate, noting that the shadows indicated for the proposed extension are disproportionate to the shadow cast by the existing dwelling. I share the concerns raised by the first party in this regard and am not satisfied that the third-party shadow assessment provides for an accurate representation of the proposed extension.
- 7.3.7. Concerns are also raised by appellants in relation to loss of daylight inside the rear of adjacent properties at No. 10 and No. 12. The proposed first floor extension is located towards the western side boundary beyond which is No. 10. The rear elevations of No. 10 contains a single storey pitched roof extension which projects beyond the proposed extension on the appeal site. The rear of No. 12 contains double glass doors and a window on the rear elevation and does not contain any rear extension. Having reviewed the drawings I note that the proposed first floor extension does not breach the 45 degree test set out in Section 2.2 of BRE209 for the ground floor rooms to the rear of No. 10 and No. 12. Furthermore, I note the scale and extent of the proposed first floor extension and the setback of 1m from the shared boundary and 2m from the dwelling at No. 10 and the presence of an existing rear extension at No. 10 which extends beyond the proposed rear elevation of the

proposed extension on the appeal site. I also note the proposed first floor extension has a separation distance of 2.8m from the rear of No. 12. Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that this separation distance along with the scale of the extension will not give rise to undue impacts on daylight levels to the ground floor and I am satisfied that undue loss of light is unlikely to occur as a result of the proposed development.

- 7.3.8. Having regard to the scale and height of the proposed ground floor extension, which has a flat roof and an eaves height of approx. 2.9m above floor level, I do not consider any significant overshadowing or loss of light impacts will arise on adjoining properties from the single storey element of the proposal.
- 7.3.9. I note the concerns raised in relation to the potential cumulative impact of the extension to the appeal site and a proposed extension to the rear of No. 13 Glashaboy Woods. No. 13 is the neighbouring property located to the east of No. 12. Cork City Council and ACP granted permission for a rear ground and first floor extension under permission reference 2543881 (ACB reference PL-500312-CC-25). I note the first floor extension permitted at No. 13 is situated towards the western side of the rear of No. 13 and directly adjoins the rear of No. 12, and that the first floor element has a depth of 3.5m and a width of approx. 3m. Having regard to the scale of both the permitted development at No. 13 and the proposed development at No. 11, along with the separation distance between No. 12 and the proposed first floor extension at No. 11, I am satisfied that the proposed development currently under assessment will not give rise to unacceptable cumulative impacts in relation to loss of light and overshadowing.
- 7.3.10. Having regard to the scale and massing of the proposed first floor extension which I consider is modest in scale and appropriately designed, I do not consider the proposal will give rise to overbearing impacts on neighbouring properties.
- 7.3.11. Having regard to the above I do not consider the proposal will be visually obtrusive or give rise to a tunnelling effect and based on BRE considerations I do not consider a significant loss of daylight or overshadowing will arise on adjoining properties as a result of the proposed extension.

Overlooking

- 7.3.12. Concerns are raised in relation to overlooking from proposed new windows. I note that a first-floor window is proposed on the existing west elevation to serve a new bathroom. No details of glazing proposed to this window are outlined. If the Commission decides to grant permission I recommend the inclusion of a condition requiring the use of obscure glazing to proposed bathroom windows in order to ensure that no undue overlooking will arise from this window. A first-floor window is proposed on the north (rear facing) elevation of the proposed extension which will serve a bedroom and a dormer window is proposed to replace an existing roof light window which serves an existing bedroom.
- 7.3.13. The existing rear elevation is located approx. 16m from the rear boundary wall which separates the appeal site from single storey dwellings to the rear at Millbrook. The proposed first floor rear facing window will be at a distance of approx. 13m from the rear boundary. The proposed dormer window will be approx. 16m from the rear boundary. To the north of the appeal site beyond the rear boundary wall is a cul de sac road and private open space serving Millbrook. Having regard to the separation distance and the absence of directly opposing first floor windows to the rear, I do not consider direct overlooking into existing property to the rear will arise. I note the concerns raised in relation to overlooking into properties to the east and west of the appeal site. No windows serving habitable rooms will face these adjoining properties and any overlooking that will arise from the proposed first floor bedroom window and dormer window will be lateral and as such will not give rise to unacceptable levels of overlooking. In relation to concerns regarding overlooking onto public roads, I note the proposed extension is to the rear and that any overlooking onto a public road is not considered to give rise to residential amenity impacts.

Conclusion

- 7.3.14. Having regard to the above, I do not consider that the proposal represents a scale or form of development which would detrimentally impact on the residential amenity of adjoining properties. I consider that the development is acceptable from a residential amenity perspective and would not undermine the residential amenity of adjoining owners by reason of overshadowing, loss of light, overbearing or overlooking.

7.4. Design

- 7.4.1. Concerns are raised by appellants that the proposal will contravene the original estate design wherein rear elevations were lowered to protect amenities of neighbouring properties in Millbrook Close. The PA planning officers report outlines that under the parent permission for the overall development rear elevations of dwellings were required to be lowered and laid out in dormer style so as to minimise the impact on the single storey dwellings in Millbrook Close to the north of the site. I note that permission was granted for the parent permission by An Bord Pleanála under reference PL 04.244855. No conditions were attached to that permission restricting any future development to the rear of house No. 11. I consider the design submitted in relation to the parent permission and assessed at that time does not in itself preclude same from being amended by a further grant of permission. The rear elevation of the proposed first floor extension is located approx. 13m from the rear boundary, beyond which is private open space and a cul de sac serving Millbrook Close. I am satisfied that the design and layout proposed is acceptable and will not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the visual and residential amenities of properties in Millbrook. I also note that the parent permission was granted in 2015 and that current Development Plan Policy and Section 28 Guidelines including Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (SRDCSG's) for Planning Authorities support compact development including reduced separation distances. As noted above I am satisfied that the visual and residential amenities of existing properties will not arise as a result of the proposal and as such I am satisfied that the amendment from the original estate design is in accordance with the Development Plan and is acceptable.
- 7.4.2. Having regard to the above, I do not agree with the concerns raised that the proposal is in breach of Section 34(3)(a) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as a result of failure to have regard to previous permissions and their conditions.
- 7.4.3. I note the concerns raised by an appellant that the design fails to comply with the development plan. I note in particular the guidance contained in paragraphs 11.142 and 11.143 relating to residential extensions. Whilst I note the eaves height will be above the existing eaves height, I also note that the proposed ridge height will be below the existing ridge height and that a pitched roof is proposed. Having regard to the scale of the existing dwelling on site and that of the proposed extension, and to

the material finishes proposed which match existing, and noting that the proposed rear extension will not be visible from the public road, I am satisfied that the proposed extension will not result in an overly dominant feature, will not impact adversely on the streetscape of the area and will not give rise to any significant level of overbearance on adjoining properties having regard to its limited scale. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal complies with the Development Plan provisions in relation to residential extensions.

- 7.4.4. I note the concerns raised in relation to the proposed development in the initial planners report and the appellants concerns that these initial concerns were not addressed in the further information response. I also note that the revised first floor extension is of a similar design to the initial proposal with a reduced depth, height and width. Having regard to my assessment above I am satisfied that the proposal is acceptable based on current development plan policy and SRDCSG's relating to protection of residential amenities. I therefore do not consider it reasonable or necessary that the proposal should be refused permission based on the findings of the initial PA planning officers report or the requirements of the original estate design. Having regard to the proposed design and layout and to my assessment above I do not agree with the appellants concerns that the PA decision to accept the proposal submitted in response to FI represents an unacceptable change from the initial assessment.
- 7.4.5. In relation to precedent, I consider that each applicant should be assessed on its merits and I am satisfied that the proposal will not give rise to an unacceptable precedent.
- 7.4.6. Concerns are raised that the proposal does not comply with 2009 Guidelines on Sustainable Residential Development and 2007 Guidelines Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities. I note the current Cork City Development Plan seeks compliance with the 2009 Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines or any updated versions that may be published over the life of the Development Plan. I note that the 2009 Guidelines have been replaced by Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024 which I have addressed in Section 7.4.1 above and I am satisfied that the proposal is acceptable with reference to these guidelines. Noting the proposal relates to an extension to an existing dwelling, I do not consider it necessary to demonstrate

compliance with the 2007 Guidelines Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities guidelines.

- 7.4.7. I note the appeal raises concerns in relation to non-compliance with Sections of the Development Plan, including Objective 13.6.7(c), 11.3(d), 11.5 and 15.1 11.67 section 13.40-13.43. Having reviewed the proposed development and the Development Plan, I am satisfied that the proposal complies with the Development Plan, including Sections 11.142 and 11.143 which relate to extensions to existing dwellings and that it complies with the zoning objective for the area having regard to my findings that the proposal will not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the residential amenities of the area.

7.5. Other Matters

- 7.5.1. In relation to concerns relating to the PA's acceptance of revised drawings submitted by way of unsolicited additional information, I consider this is a matter for the PA and is not relevant to the assessment of the appeal.
- 7.5.2. I note concerns raised in relation to inaccuracies in drawings submitted and non-compliance with the Planning and Development Regulations. Having reviewed the drawings I note that the north point on drawings relating to plans, sections and elevations is inaccurate. I note that the site layout plan has correctly identified the north point. I am satisfied that a thorough and accurate assessment of the drawings can be carried out based on the information on the file. Furthermore I note that the PA was satisfied that the application was a valid application in accordance with the Planning and Development Regulations.
- 7.5.3. In relation to the appellants concerns that the architect responsible for the preparation of the drawings has contravened the RIAI Code of Conduct, I have addressed the concerns raised in relation to inaccuracies on drawings above. I am satisfied that the drawings are acceptable and I do not consider compliance with the RIAI Code of Conduct is a matter which is relevant to the assessment of the appeal.
- 7.5.4. The appellant and observer request that if permission is granted that a condition be attached outlining dimensions of the permitted extension. I am satisfied that the drawings submitted clearly outline the scale of development. If the Commission decides to grant permission I consider the inclusion of a standard condition requiring

the development shall be completed in accordance with the drawings submitted in response to further information is sufficient to provide clarity in terms of the development permitted.

- 7.5.5. I note there appears to be some discrepancies between the stated ridge height of the first floor extension. The drawings indicate a ridge height of 6.225m, reduced from an initial proposed ridge height of 7.452m. The first party response to the appeal states the initial proposed ridge height was 6.8m which has been reduced by 586mm. The Planning Officer's report notes that the proposed ridge height has been reduced from 7.4m to 6.2m. I am satisfied that the proposed ridge height following amendments in response to further information provides for a ridge height of 6.2m as indicated on drawings which I consider acceptable.
- 7.5.6. The appeal states that the proposal is a material breach of Section 34(10) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000. This section of the act relates to the requirement of the PA to state the reasons and considerations on which the decision is based and I note that the first schedule of the PA notification of decision set out reasons and considerations.
- 7.5.7. The appeal raises concerns relating to procedural failures by the PA, including not requiring public advertisement of revised drawings, acceptance of deficient drawings and failure to address concerns raised in observations. As noted above, I am satisfied that the drawings submitted are acceptable for the purposes of the assessment of the appeal. I also note that the PA did not require the revised drawings to be re-advertised and I do not consider the matters raised in this regard are relevant to the assessment of the appeal. In relation to concerns relating to procedural and professional irregularities by the applicant and the PA, I consider the details submitted with the planning application are sufficient to allow for an assessment of the proposed development. I do not consider the concerns raised that the applicant may have intentionally inflated the initial scale of the proposal are relevant to the assessment of the appeal.

7.6. **Water Framework Directive Assessment Screening**

- 7.6.1. The subject site is located approx. 230m east of the nearest water body comprising the Glashaboy river. The proposed development comprises the construction of an extension to an existing dwelling as outlined in section 2.1 of this report.

7.6.2. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & 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.

7.6.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale of development and the nature of works
- The location-distance from nearest Water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.

7.6.4. 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.

7.7. **AA Screening**

7.7.1. Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive

7.7.2. I have considered case PL-500312-CC-25 in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The proposed development is located within a residential area and comprises an extension to an existing dwelling and all associated site works. The closest European Sites are Great Island Channel SAC (Site Code: 001058) located approx. 5.1km southeast of the site and Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code: 004030) located approx. 2.8km south of the proposed development.

7.7.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and domestic nature of the development
- The location of the development in a serviced urban area, distance from European Sites and urban nature of intervening habitats, absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.

7.7.4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, to the location of the site in an established residential area, the residential zoning objective and to the nature, form, scale and design of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 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 03rd day of October 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.

Reason: In the interests of clarity.

2. The flat roof to the ground floor extension hereby approved shall not at any time be used as a roof terrace/amenity area.

Reason: in the interest of residential amenity.

3. The glazing to all proposed bathroom and en-suite windows 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.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

4. 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. 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. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health

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.

Bernadette Quinn

Planning Inspector

10th February 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

Case Reference	PL-500312-CC-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of extension and dormer window and all associated site works.
Development Address	11 Glashaboy Woods, Sallybrook, Glanmire, Cork
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
<p>4. 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>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2,	

<p>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>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: _____