



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500355-DR-25

Development	Garage conversion, side and rear extensions with ancillary and associated works.
Location	36, Drummartin Park, Goatstown, Dublin 14, D14R982.
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown Co. Co.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25B/0503/WEB.
Applicant(s)	Patricia Friend-Perreira & Barry Kelly.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Permission with conditions.
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	James & Jacinta Kane.
Observer(s)	None on file relating to appeal.
Date of Site Inspection	22 nd January 2026.
Inspector	Des Johnson

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in Goatstown, Dublin 14. Drummartin Park is an established housing estate, to the north east of and with access from Kilmacud Road Upper.
- 1.2. No.36 is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with single-storey garage to the side. The dwelling on the adjoining site to the north has a converted garage and porch extension in a single-storey extension to the front. Other houses on Drummartin Park have converted garages and two storey extensions to the side. To the rear, there is a single-storey extension across most of the width of the dwelling. The rear garden is at a lower level, and is accessed from a raised wooden decking area by steps. The dwelling on the adjoining site to the north has a single-story extension to the rear with kitchen window in close proximity to the party wall with the appeal premises.
- 1.3. No.36 and No.38 front to the north-west, with rear garden facing south-east.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal is for the following:
 - Conversion of existing garage to side of existing dwelling
 - Bay window and external covered porch to front of existing dwelling
 - New flat roof and new fenestration to existing single-storey rear extension
 - Construction of single-storey rear extension
 - New first-floor side extension over existing garage
 - Associated internal alterations.
- 2.2. The stated gross floor area of existing development is 102.66sqm, and of the proposed development is 15.18sqm. The site area is 0.035ha. It is proposed to connect to existing services.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority granted permission subject to 4 conditions.

3.1.1. **Conditions**

The conditions relate to the following:

1. Standard compliance
2. Entire dwelling to be used as a single dwelling unit
3. External finishes
4. Disposal of surface water

3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- One objection was submitted relating to shadowing. The site is in an area zoned 'A' with the objective *to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities*. Under the zoning, the proposed development is acceptable in principle and compatible with overall policies and objectives of the Development Plan. The proposed garage conversion or the bay window would not be overbearing or give rise to overshadowing. The proposed new fenestration and doors would not have a detrimental visual impact. The first-floor extension is visually acceptable and would not give rise to any overlooking. The proposed rear single-storey extension would not be overbearing, or cause undue overshadowing. The extension would be set down at a lower level to the existing rear extension by 355mm. The lower height and stepped design help mitigate visual dominance. Overall, the proposed development accords with Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwelling in the Development Plan.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Report has no objection subject to conditions (attached to permission).

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

One observation from an adjoining neighbour relating to overshadowing and loss of amenity to dwelling and rear garden.

4.0 Planning History

D19B/0489 – Permission for 1st floor extension to front and side, including extension to main roof, rooflights to main roof at front and side and construction of single-storey extension to rear, at 32, Drummartin Park.

D21A/0570 – permission for single-storey room in rear garden, dormer window to main roof to rear and application of render to front façade, at 32, Drummartin Park.

D20B/0131 – Permission for demolition of garage and utility room and construction of a part two-storey, part single-storey extension to side and rear with associated amendments to elevations, skylights, boundary treatment and associated works.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

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

Section 12.3.7.1 refers to Extension to Dwellings. It states that 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. Front extensions, particularly at first floor level, should reflect the roof shape and slope of the main dwelling. First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable.

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.

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

None relevant to this appeal.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

South Dublin Bay SAC & pNHA – c.3.2 km to the north east.

South Dublin Bay & River Tolka Estuary SPA 0 c.3.2 km to the north east.

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposal is for the conversion of garage, and side and rear extensions with ancillary and associated works. The development proposed is not of a Class for the purposes of Schedule 5. As such, the development is excluded as pre-screening stage.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The 3rd Party grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- The appeal is against the decision to grant, but specifically to the provision of a single-story rear extension.
- By virtue of its height, depth, scale and location, the rear extension would have an unacceptable negative impact on the appellants' dwelling, causing severe shadowing of their home and garden
- The single-storey extension would be obtrusive and overbearing due to its siting and bulk. The shared boundary wall is 1740mm high, and the proposed extension is 3919mm in height and 4200mm in length. It would be 900mm from the appellants' kitchen window causing a loss of sunlight

The submission is accompanied by a commissioned Sunlight Impact Report which concludes that the extension will have an extreme effect on the sunlight to the appellants' kitchen, and amenity sunlight to their rear garden from autumn to spring and particularly in the summer.

Sunlight Impact Report

Guidance documents consulted were as follows:

The Building Research Establishment's (BRE) Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to good practice (BRE 209) 3rd edition/2022 edition

British Standard BS EN 17037:2018 – Daylight in Buildings

European (and Irish) standard EN 17037:2018 aka IS EN 17037 (the European standard)

The report is accompanied by a series of shadow images for 09.00, 12.00, and 15.00 on 21 December, 21st March, 21st September, and for 16.00, 17.00, and 18.00 for 21st June. The report states that the development at No.36 has a considerable impact on sunlight access to the appellants' kitchen return and private garden throughout the year. The impact is most chronic during the 4 months centred on the equinoxes (March-April and September-October), being most acute from May-August and with most impact experienced in the months around mid-summer. At these times new overshadowing extends well into the evening. New development will prevent the sunlight access currently experienced and will have a tangible detrimental impact on the amenity of No.38 (appellant). No mitigation measures are proposed to offset the impacts of the development such as shortening the length of the rear return towards the boundary, setting it back from the boundary, reducing its height, and sloping the section of the return downward

7.2. Applicant Response

This may be summarised as follows:

- The appeal submission is similar to that made to the Planning Authority during the observation period for the application
- The floor level has been dropped by 355mm.
- The length of the proposed rear return has been kept to a minimum
- The entire ground floor level of the house has been lowered to reduce the differential in level between the two houses
- The position of the proposed single storey extension has been placed as forward as possible with appropriate separation from the existing sewage line that separates the appellants property and neighbouring houses.
- Mature hedging on the party wall has been cut down by the appellant.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

The grounds of appeal do not raise any new matters which would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

7.4. Observations

None on file relating to appeal.

7.5. Further Responses

7.5.1. None

8.0 Assessment

Introduction

There are several elements to this proposal namely:

- (1) Conversion of existing garage to side of existing dwelling
- (2) Construction of single-storey rear extension
- (3) New first-floor side extension over existing garage
- (4) New flat roof and new fenestration to existing single-storey rear extension
- (5) Bay window and external covered porch to front of existing dwelling, and
- (6) Associated internal alterations.

The Planning Authority granted permission subject to 4 conditions relating to (1) Standard compliance (2) Entire dwelling to be used as a single dwelling unit (3) External finishes and (4) Disposal of surface water.

The appeal is against the decision to grant. The grounds of appeal relate substantially to the proposed single storey extension to the rear. It is contended that the extension, by reason of its height, depth, scale and location, would cause severe overshadowing of the adjoining home and garden to the north. It is argued that the extension would be obtrusive and overbearing, being 3919mm in height and 4200mm in length. It would be 900mm from the appellants' kitchen window. The grounds are accompanied by a Sunlight Impact Report which concludes that the impact is most chronic during the 4 months centred on the equinoxes (March-April and September-October), being most acute from May-August and with most impact experienced in the months around mid-summer. At these times new overshadowing extends well into the evening.

I consider that the key issues to be addressed are as follows:

- Policy
- Visual amenities

- Residential amenities
- Appropriate Assessment

Policy

The site is in an area zoned 'A' in the current Development Plan, with the objective *to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities*. The proposed development is permissible under this zoning subject to being compatible with other policies and objectives of the Plan.

Visual Amenities

There are other houses on Drummartin Park with garage conversions, and various designs of single-storey extension to the front, and with two-storey extensions to the side. Having regard to the established pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the proposal for garage conversion, and the scale and design of proposed bay window to the front with external covered porch, first-floor extension over existing garage, new flat roof, and new fenestration to existing single-storey extension to the rear, and proposed single storey extension to the rear are visually acceptable and compatible with other housing in the area.

I note that the rear first-floor extension would be set down at a lower level to the existing rear extension by 355mm, and I concur with the planning authority view that the lower height and stepped design help mitigate visual dominance. I conclude that the extension would not be visually overbearing or obtrusive.

Residential Amenity

The appeal is against the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission. The grounds of appeal substantially relate to the impact of the proposed single-storey extension to the rear on the adjoining dwelling and garden, No.38. It is stated that by virtue of its height, depth, scale and location, the proposed extension would have an unacceptable negative impact on the appellants' dwelling, causing severe overshadowing of the home and garden. The shared boundary wall is 1740mm high, and the proposed extension is 3919mm in height and 4200mm in length. It would be 900mm from the appellants' kitchen window and would cause a loss of sunlight

In response, the applicant states that the length has been kept to a minimum, the floor level has been dropped by 355mm, and the positioning of the extension has

been placed as far forward as possible with appropriate separation from an existing sewage line.

The shadowing diagrams, submitted on behalf of the appellant, show overshadowing of No.38 kitchen window at midday on the 21st March extending to a second window mid-afternoon. On June 21st at midday overshadowing would begin and would extend to a small section of the rear garden by mid and late afternoon. The rear of No.38 appears to be shadowed by the main dwelling at 15.00 onwards into the afternoon. The shadowing report, concludes that the shadowcast images show that the development at No.36 has a considerable impact on sunlight access to the rear window of the No.38 return and to its private rear garden throughout the year. It concludes that the impact is most chronic during the four months centred on the equinoxes, and grows more acute from May to August with most impact experienced in the months around mid-summer.

I submit that this is a suburban location, and the 1st Party and appellants dwellings face to the north-west with rear gardens facing south-east. This influences the extent of sunlight access throughout the year to the rear of the dwellings and rear ground floor windows, and the amenity sunlight to the rear garden. Having regard to the size of the rear garden, and its configuration, which appears to include a decking area next to the dwelling on its south-eastern side, I conclude that the proposed development, including the proposed rear single-storey extension, would not give rise to undue overshadowing and would not be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of the appellants property. I consider that the shadowing images submitted do not demonstrate a 'chronic' or 'acute' impact on the appellants property in the suburban location.

AA Screening

- 8.1. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated for further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European site either individually or in combination with other plans or projects. The reason for this conclusion is having regard to the nature and scale of the development, location in an established residential area, and the distance from and absence of connectivity to European sites.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

9.1. The subject site is located in an established residential area. The proposed development relates to the conversion of a garage, and the construction of domestic extensions with ancillary and associated works. No water deterioration concerns are raised in the appeal. I have assessed the development in the context of the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment as there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend that planning permission be granted.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposal, the residential zoning, and the established pattern of the development in the area, it is considered that the proposed development, subject to compliance with the following conditions, would be visually acceptable, would not give rise to undue overshadowing or be seriously injurious to the amenities of residential property in the area, and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out in its entirety in accordance with the plans, particulars and specifications lodged with the application to the Planning Authority, save as may be required by the other conditions attached.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The entire dwelling shall be used as a single dwelling unit and shall not be sub-divided by way of sale or letting or otherwise.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.</p>

3.	All external finishes, including roofing, shall harmonise in material, colour, and texture with the existing dwelling. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.
4.	The disposal of surface water shall be in accordance with the requirements of the planning authority. 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.

Des Johnson
Planning Inspector

9th February 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500355-DR-25
Proposed Development Summary	Conversion of garage and side and rear domestic extensions
Development Address	36, Drummartin Park, Goatstown, Dublin 14, D14R982.
	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:</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) 	<p>Yes, it is a 'Project'.</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>No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1.</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>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 style="text-align: center;">No Screening required.</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)?

No	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____