



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL – 500358 – DN - 25

Development	Two storey domestic extension.
Location	74 Glassmeen Road, Tolka Estate, Glasnevin, Dublin 11.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB2233/25.
Applicants	Stephanie Power.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission subject to conditions.
Type of Appeal	First Party v. condition.
Appellant	Stephanie Power.
Observers	None.
Date of Site Inspection	4 February 2026.
Inspector	B. Wyse

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. No.74 Glassmeen Road is an end of terrace two storey house in the mature Tolka Estate. The adjoining house to the east is No.73 and side entrances separate No. 74 from No. 75 to the west, the first house of the next terrace.
- 1.2. The rear gardens of these houses are quite generous and a number of the houses in the vicinity have been extended. No.73 has been extended to the rear, comprising a part two storey, part single storey extension.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises; a two storey rear extension; a single storey extension and new porch to the front; and internal alterations and remodelling of house and associated site works.
- 2.2. The rear extension would extend 7.623m from the existing rear wall of the house. It would extend the full width of the existing house save for a small offset from the party boundary with No.73. The extension would provide for an open plan kitchen/dining/living room at ground floor level and two bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor level and associated spaces. As originally proposed the pitched roof would be a separate element to the roof of the existing house and the ridge would be slightly higher. The design includes large, floor to ceiling, windows to the new first floor bedrooms.
- 2.3. Further information submitted in response to the planning authority concerns about the height and depth of the rear extension and its potential impact on the availability of daylight/sunlight to adjacent properties, particularly No.73 to the east and a ground floor window in that property that might serve a habitable room, and in relation to drainage matters, included:
 - A revision to the roof of the extension, such that the it integrates with the roof of the existing house and has the same ridge height.
 - A shadow analysis.
 - Details of drainage proposals.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The decision to grant permission is subject to 9, mostly standard, conditions.

Condition 3 is under appeal and it states as follows:

The proposed development shall be amended as follows:

- (a) The first floor extension shall be reduced in depth to a maximum of 5.5m.*

Reason: In the interest of visual and residential amenity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports (dated 17 July and 29 October 2025)

Basis for planning authority decision. Include:

- At c. 7.45m the first floor extension is significant in depth. Whilst the precedent of the adjoining extension at Number 73 to the east is noted (it is however 4m in depth as opposed to the subject depth of 7.45m), having regard to the additional projection from the subject development beyond the first floor of No. 73, the Planning Authority is concerned regarding the impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining properties, particularly in respect of the availability of light to the ground floor rear window of No. 73 which is likely to serve a habitable room based on the layout of the existing subject dwelling which is likely replicated throughout the terrace. As such the applicant will be requested to demonstrate there will be no impact on the daylight to this window and to consider a reduction in the depth of the extension if required.*
- The (revised) plans indicate that the adjoining property has a dual aspect home office at ground floor with a single aspect first floor bathroom adjoining the subject site. The shadow diagrams indicate that there would be a small level of additional shadowing in the evening based on the 16.00 Summer Solstice diagram. Notwithstanding this, however, the Planning Authority remains concerned that the overall depth of the first floor extension remains excessive and will likely still have some impacts on the residential amenities of No. 73. It*

is considered appropriate that a condition of permission reduces the depth of the first floor to a maximum of 5.5m.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Engineering Department – Drainage Division (dated 8 July and 29 October 2025)

Revised proposals deemed acceptable subject to standard conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Uisce Eireann – no response.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None.

4.0 **Planning History**

None on subject site.

Nearby sites

PA Ref. WEB1298/15, ABP Ref. 29N.245889

This is a 2016 grant of permission for a two-storey extension to the rear of No.77 Glassmeen Road, a mid-terrace house three houses to the west of the subject property. The extension, which has been constructed extends approximately 5.5m from the rear of the original house. It features a rear hipped roof profile as required by a condition of the Boards decision.

PA Ref. 3640/18

This is a 2018 grant of permission for a single storey extension to the rear of No.73 Glassmeen Road – the adjoining house to the east of the subject property. The single storey extension has been built and extends beyond a pre-existing two storey extension to the rear of No.73.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Development Plan**

Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

Appendix 18 - Ancillary Residential Accommodation

Section 1.1 General Design Principles

The design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular, the need for light and privacy.

Applications for extensions to existing residential units should:

- Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling*
- Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight*

Section 1.2 Extension to rear

First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the planning authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:

- Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries*
- Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries*

Section 1.6 Daylight and Sunlight

Large single or two-storey rear extensions to semi-detached or terraced dwellings can, if they project too far from the main rear elevation, result in a loss of daylight to neighbouring houses. Furthermore, depending on orientation, such extensions can have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight received by adjoining properties. On the other hand, it is also recognised that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable. Consideration should be given to the proportion of extensions, height and design of roofs as well as taking account of the position of windows including rooms they serve to adjacent or adjoining dwellings.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

- 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.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

As indicated the appeal is against Condition 3 of the planning authority decision only. The main grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The further information request in relation to the impact on No.73 was attended to sufficiently with confirmation that the room on the ground floor of No.73 acts as a home office and it was demonstrated that there would be no additional over shadowing or loss of sunlight due to the proposed development.
- The submitted sun study showed no loss of sunlight in the direction of the neighbouring building before 13.00.
- The shed at the neighbouring property is situated in front of the home office and has a much greater effect on the home office than the proposed development.
- The evidence refutes the planning officer contention that there will be a small level of additional shadowing in the evening.
- There was no objection to the proposal submitted during the planning process.
- The home office in question is dual aspect.
- The 1.5m reduction (appears to be in error – the required reduction would be of the order of 2.5m) would make no difference to the residential amenities of no.73.
- The neighbouring first floor extension is 5.5m in depth.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. This is an appeal against Condition 3 only of the planning authority decision. Given the nature of the condition, the details of the application and the content of the appeal submissions, I am satisfied that the determination of the application as if it had been made to the Commission in the first instance is not warranted. The Commission can

proceed to deal with the appeal in accordance with Section 139 of the Act and this assessment is carried out accordingly.

- 8.2. The main issue in relation to the said condition 3 is the potential impact of the proposed rear extension on the adjoining No.73. The reason for the condition, as stated, refers to visual and residential amenity. It is clear from the planning authority planners reports, and the request for additional information, that the main concern is the degree of overshadowing that might result from the proposed first floor element of the extension onto the rear of No.73, and, in particular, to the immediately adjacent ground floor room.
- 8.3. The shadow diagrams submitted as additional information indicate the main impact of the extension would be some additional overshadowing during afternoons in the summer time. As the diagrams only illustrate the effects in the horizontal plane, and not the vertical plane, the precise increase in shadowing to the affected ground floor room is difficult to judge. However, the planning authority appear to be satisfied that the increased shadowing would be slight and I am inclined to agree with that. I do not agree with the applicants that there would be no additional overshadowing. It appears that the room in question is dual aspect so this is a mitigating factor.
- 8.4. Notwithstanding the conclusion of only slightly increased overshadowing the planning authority planners report proceeds to express concerns that the depth of the proposed extension is excessive and that it would give rise to adverse effects on the residential amenity of No.73. Reducing the depth of the extension to a maximum of 5.5m (a reduction of approximately 2.5m) would not have any impact on the degree of overshadowing of the adjacent ground floor room in No.73. The reference, therefore, to residential amenity must refer to something else, perhaps overbearance and visual amenity, the latter being cited in the reason for the condition.
- 8.5. The proposed depth of the extension, at about 7.5m, when taken together with the fact that it extends across almost the full width of the house, is quite significant. The extension, at 100sqm floor area, is greater than that of the existing house, at 71sqm.
- 8.6. I do not consider the issue of visual amenity to be significant. This leaves overbearance, meaning the degree to which the immediate neighbour, No.73 in this case, might feel overwhelmed or hemmed in by the extension.

- 8.7. As indicated at Section 4.0 above the most relevant extensions in the general vicinity, and which might act as a guide for comparison purposes, are those at No.77 Glassmeen Road and at the adjacent No.73. The extension at No.77 is two storey and extends approximately 5.5m from the rear wall of the original house and it is not quite as wide as the current proposal. In its decision to grant permission the Board required a hipped roof profile to the rear. The extension at No.73 is part two storey, part single storey. The two storey element appears to me to extend about 4.5m from the rear wall of the original house and again it is not as wide as the current proposal.
- 8.8. Reducing its depth by about 2.5m would clearly have very significant implications for the interior design and layout of the extension and likely require some fundamental re-thinking of the entire proposal. The question, therefore, is whether or not requiring such a reduction is absolutely necessary to mitigate excessive overbearance and so protect the residential amenity of No.73. In my view, reducing the depth of the two storey element of the extension by 2.5m would not make any appreciable difference to the impact on No.73. However, a rear hipped roof profile, instead of the gable end as proposed, and as required at No.77, would be a useful adjustment in mitigating the impact on No.73 and should, in my view, be required.
- 8.9. I conclude, therefore, that the appeal should be substantively upheld and that the said condition 3 should be amended/replaced accordingly.

9.0 **Appropriate Assessment Screening**

- 9.1. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project within an established and serviced urban area, and taking account of the screening determination of the planning authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.2. 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. Appropriate Assessment, therefore, is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. I have assessed the 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.
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project in a serviced urban area, 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.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that the Commission should direct the planning authority to replace Condition 3 with the following condition:

The roof of the rear extension shall be modified to include a rear facing hipped roof in place of the proposed gable end. Revised drawings illustrating this change shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority prior to the commencement of the development.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of properties in the vicinity.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the scale and design of the proposed extension, the absence of any significant negative effects on properties in the vicinity and the form and scale of existing extensions in the area, it is considered that the imposition of the said Condition 3 as drafted by the planning authority would be excessive and is not warranted. The reworded Condition 3 is considered a reasonable response to the concerns raised.

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.

B. Wyse
Planning Inspector

9 February 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	Domestic extension.
Development Address	74 Glassmeen Road, Tolka Estate, Glasnevin, Dublin 11.
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.
(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)	
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.	
<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><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	
<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ B. Wyse Date: __9 February 2026