



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500411-DR-25

Development	Extension to front, side and rear, vehicular access alterations with associated works.
Location	24 Annville Park, Dundrum, Dublin 14.
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25A/0724/WEB
Applicant(s)	Daniel Sessions & Orla McBreen.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission.
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Daniel Sessions & Orla McBreen.
Observer(s)	Ciara McManus & John O'Carroll.
Date of Site Inspection	19/02/26.
Inspector	Anthony Abbott King

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. Annaville is a network of residential cul-de-sacs comprising twentieth-century semi-detached houses accessed from the Dundrum Road.
- 1.2. No. 24 Annaville Park is located at the end of the northern streetscape on Annaville Park.
- 1.3. The house is a two-storey two-bay end of streetscape semi-detached house located to the west of the house is the access road to the cul-de-sacs to the north including Annaville Grove.
- 1.4. The houses in Annaville Park are similar in form and appearance. A number of these properties have been extended. The prevalence of single-story front / porch extensions is noted.
- 1.5. The site area is given as 0.030 hectares.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development comprises 2 storey front extension, extension to the side over existing converted garage, which will wrap around the back on both levels to connect with existing sunroom, new roof over existing sunroom, new Velux windows to front side and rear of the existing roof, widening existing vehicular access gate and move existing side access further down the rear of the garden.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Refuse planning permission for the following reason:

- 3.1.1. (1) *The Planning Authority considers that the proposed development does not comply with Section 12.3.7.1 (i) Extensions to the Front, (iii) Extensions to the Side, and (iv) Alterations to Roof/Attic Level of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed front extension projects significantly beyond the established building line, reducing the driveway depth below the minimum standard of 5.5 metres, and introducing excessive bulk that disrupts the architectural character of*

Annaville Park. The side extension, positioned directly onto the site boundary adjoining the public realm, would result in overbearance, overshadowing, and a canyon-like effect that is uncharacteristic of the streetscape, with potential for intrusive overlooking. The flat roof design further undermines the rhythm and coherence of the area. Collectively, the scale, massing, and siting of the development would set an undesirable precedent for similar boundary-facing and visually dominant extensions, contrary to the intent of the Development Plan policies which seek to protect residential amenity, streetscape character, and the quality of the public realm.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

The decision of the CEO of Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown county Council reflects the recommendation of the planning case officer.

The planning case officer concluded that collectively, the scale, massing, and siting of the development would set an undesirable precedent for similar boundary-facing and visually dominant extensions.

The front extension would project beyond the front building line of the street and would introduce excessive bulk that would disrupt the architectural character of Annaville Park, which would result in a reduced driveway depth below the minimum standard of 5.5 metres.

The side extension positioned directly onto the site boundary adjoining the public realm would result in overbearing and overshadow impacts creating a canyon-like effect that is uncharacteristic of the streetscape with potential for intrusive overlooking.

The flat roof design would further undermine the rhythm and coherence of the area.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- The Transport Planning Report requests further information:

The applicant is requested to submit revised/additional drawings/details demonstrating that the provision of car parking for the proposed development complies with Section 12.4.8.1 of the County Development Plan 2022-2028 (each car parking space shall have a minimum length of 5.5 metres depth and a minimum width of 3 metres) and the individual movements for a vehicle to enter and exit the proposed car parking from/to

Annaville Park, and/or a reduced proposed front extension, as required. The applicant shall show the above detailed layout drawing by using Computer Aided Design (CAD) software such as Autoturn or similar computerised design software.

The Transport Planning Division also provided a suite of conditions if a positive recommendation was to be recorded by the planning case officer.

- Drainage Division has no objection subject to condition.

3.3. Third Party Observations

There is one third party submission on file from the adjoining property owner at no. 23 Annville Park. The adjoining property owner is the observer on this appeal. The submission is summarised below:

- The submission does not object to the principle of development rather the scale and presentation of the 2-storey extension is the concern of the neighbouring property owner.
- The submission requests the amendment of the development proposal by way of revisions/conditions to address these concerns. In specific the reduction in the scale of the front projection of the extension to align more closely with other properties in the street.
- The projection of the side extension 3.35m forward of the existing front building line is highly unusual within Annville Park and would be visually dominant. The usual projection beyond the original façade(s) where it is extant is between 1.5m-2m. The extension would be out of character with the established pattern of development in the area.
- The forward projection of the extension is inconsistent with the modest scale and uniform building line that defines Annville Park.
- The submitted shadow diagrams contain no scale bar or dimension references and are deficient to ascertain overshadowing and visual impacts. Accurately scaled and dimensioned shadow diagrams for the standard test times are requested.

- The introduction of a large stained art-glass feature window on the street elevation is entirely out of keeping with the established architectural character of Annville Park.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. The subject site has no previous relevant planning history.

4.2. The following planning history is noted for the extension of the abutting semi-detached house at no. 23 Annville Park.

- Under reg. ref. D23B/0552 planning permission was granted for a single-storey rear, front and side extension. It is noted that the first floor side / front extension was removed following a further information request.

4.3. The following planning history is noted for the redevelopment of the lands to the east across the roadway to the side of no. 24 Annville Park.

- Under reg. ref. ABP320912-24 planning permission was granted by the Commission for 934 residential units arranged in 9 blocks, between 2-8 storeys, subject to condition (overall site area 9.7 hectares).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the local planning policy document. The following policy objectives are relevant:

The area zoning objective is "A": *To provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.*

Retrofit & Reuse

- I note Section 3.4.1.2 Policy Objective CA6: Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings.
- Section 3.4.1.4 Policy Objective CA8: Sustainability in Adaption Design is relevant and states:

It is a Policy Objective to promote sustainable approaches to the improvement of standards for habitable accommodation, by allowing dwellings to be flexible, accessible and adaptable in their spatial layout and design.

Urban Consolidation

Chapter 4 (Neighbourhood-People, Homes and Place), Section 4.3.1.2, Policy Objective PHP19 (Existing Housing Stock-Adaptation) is relevant and states:

- *Conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaptation of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF.*
- *Densify existing built-up areas in the County through small scale infill development having due regard to the amenities of existing established residential neighbourhoods.*

Extensions

Chapter 12 (Development Management) Section 12.3.7.1 (Extensions to Dwellings) provides guidance with respect to porches, front extensions, side extensions, rear extensions, roof alterations, attic conversions and dormer extension.

- Section 12.3.7.1 (i) (Extensions to the Front) is relevant and *inter alia* states:

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.

- Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) (Extensions to the Rear) is relevant and *inter alia* states:

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.*
- *Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability.*
- *Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.*
- *External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.*

- Section 12.3.7.1 (iii) (Extensions to the Side) is relevant and *inter alia* states:

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.....

The proposed construction of new building structures directly onto the boundary with the public realm (including footpaths/open space/roads etc), is not acceptable and it will be required that the development is set within the existing boundary on site and shall not form the boundary wall. The provision of windows (particularly at first floor

level) within the side elevation of extensions adjacent to public open space will be encouraged in order to promote passive surveillance, and to break up the bulk/extent of the side gable as viewed from the public realm.

- Section 12.3.7.1 (iv) (Alterations at Roof / attic Level) is relevant and *inter alia* states roof alterations / expansions to main roof profiles 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.

Vehicular Entrances and Car Parking Standards

- Section 12.4.8 (Vehicular Entrances and Hardstanding Areas) requires vehicle entrances and exits to be designed to avoid traffic hazard for pedestrians and passing traffic. In general, for a single residential dwelling, the maximum width of an entrance is 3.5 metres.
- Section 12.4.5.1 (Parking Zones) & Table 12.5 (Car Parking Zones and Standards) provides car parking standards for residential development *inter alia* proximate to high level public transport. The maximum residential car parking standard is 1 car parking space for a house in zone 1 and in zone 2 for a (1-2 bed) house near public transport. The maximum standard for houses with 3 bedrooms or more is 2 spaces.

5.2. **Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines**

The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage 'The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Growth Guidelines for Planning Authorities', (15 January, 2024).

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. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal are summarised below:

- The appellant acknowledges the planning authority concerns regarding Section 12.3.7.1 of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown development Plan 2022-2028. However, the appellant respectfully submits that the planning authority assessment has been overly ridged (over conservative) and fails to account for the unique transitional nature of the appeal site (including the scale of adjacent permitted development on lands to the east - "Dundrum Central").
- The terminology used in the reason for refusal "canyon-like effect" is a disproportionate characterisation of a standard two-storey extension adjacent to a vehicular access road.
- It is claimed that the appellant has addressed the planning authority's primary technical concern regarding inadequate driveway depth (5.5m) by design revision. The appellant cites this matter as 'Ground no. 1' of the reason for refusal.
- The appeal statement is accompanied by a modified site layout plan Drawing (2503-A-04 dated 05/12/25) demonstrating a driveway depth of 5.5m, which it is claims fully complies with Section 12.3.7.1 (i) of the development plan allowing a standard family vehicle to park in the curtilage of the dwelling house.
- The appellant cites the projection beyond the established building line and the bulk of the front extension as 'Ground no. 2' of the reason for refusal. It is claimed that the revised development shown in Drawing (2503-A-04 dated

05/12/25) with a setback revision of 5.5m significantly reduces the projection of the front extension.

- The front extension is not a dominant mass rather a single-storey articulated entrance porch at ground level. It is claimed in the context of Annville Road the proposed addition is a modest as various porch styles are extant in the vicinity.
- It is claimed that the extension would provide coherent internal layout and a proper entrance hall vital to the modernisation of the dwelling ensuring architectural integrity.
- The appellant cites the “canyon-like effect” of the development on the side boundary being overbearing as ‘Ground no. 3’ of the reason for refusal. It is claimed that the terminology is misapplied *inter alia* as a ‘canyon effect’ typically describes a narrow street flanked by tall buildings on either side. The appellant rejects this categorisation.
- The placing of a two-storey elevation (approximately 6m in height) facing an existing 4m high boundary wall across a vehicular road (running for almost the length of the road) does not constitute a “monolithic” canyon appearance.
- The reason for refusal implies a blank oppressive wall as a side elevation, which is incorrect. The elevation onto the road would be articulated by deeply recessed windows breaking up the side facade providing shadow lines, depth and visual interest.
- The reason for refusal treats the vehicular roadway to the side of the development with the same sensitivity as a main residential street, which is unwarranted. It is claimed that the appellant would provide a stronger and more coherent urban edge to the road than the current hipped roof semi-detached profile.
- An appendix to the appeal attaches two photographs of a contemporary side extension to 54 Graville Avenue Upper onto Rathgar Road illustrating the before and after side view of the house from the public road.

- The planner has ignored the permitted Dundrum Central development (ABP31317622), which when constructed will be the dominant vertical element in the environs of the side roadway (3-6 storeys).
- The appellant cites the setback and side building line as 'Ground no. 4' of the reason for refusal. It is claimed that the end of terrace location requires a distinct treatment, as outlined in the design statement accompanying the application. Furthermore, a flush building line at the side allows the house to turn the corner effectively – a setback would weaken the architectural form onto Annville Grove.
- The appellant acknowledges that strict adherence to building lines is appropriate for mid-terrace infill but should be relaxed for corner / end of streetscape sites to allow for bookending.
- The appellant cites the flat roof design as 'Ground no. 5' of the reason for refusal. It is claimed that the flat roof was chosen specifically to keep the extension lower than the main ridge height of the pitched roof. A pitched roof to match the existing would be significantly higher and bulkier.
- Furthermore, the flat roof enables the proposed solar array. It is claimed that the receiving environment is not an architectural conservation area (ACA) and that the rhythm of Annville Road is sufficiently robust to absorb a high-quality contemporary termination point without being undermined.
- Finally, the appellant asks the Commission to consider a split decision, to grant permission for the side extension and internal alterations, if concerns regarding the front extension design or the side boundary positioning are not compliant with development plan policy.
- Alternatively the Commission is requested to omit or amend by condition the level 1 (first floor element) front setback rather than to refuse permission for the development in its entirety. The appellant is willing to accept a condition requiring the first floor to align with the existing building line of the street. Similarly, the positioning of the side extension first floor element to the boundary.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- The planning authority refer the Commission to the previous planner's report. The grounds of appeal do not justify a change of attitude.

7.3. Observations

There is one observation on this appeal from the adjoining property owner at no. 23 Annaville Park. The observation is summarised below:

- The previous submission, dated 23 October, 2025, to the planning authority raised concerns in the following matters: (1) front & side extension projecting beyond the front building line resulting in overbearing impacts causing loss of openness and enclosure; (2) inadequate shadow diagrams and; (3) adverse impact on streetscape character by reason of excessive bulk and the introduction of incongruous architectural features.
- The planning authority refusal notes issues relating to front projection, side boundary proximity, potential overshadowing and overall impact on streetscape character.
- The appellant's appeal and revised drawings address technical compliance for driveway depth and propose minor adjustments to the front and side extensions.
- The amendments proposed do not address the fundamental concerns raised in the original third party submission to the planning authority.
- The combined two-storey forward projection of the two-storey extension significantly increases the bulk along the boundary resulting in overbearing and overshadowing impacts on the observer's property.
- The scale and massing of the front projection remain out of character with Annaville Park.
- Shadow and daylight impacts have not been substantiated with accurately scaled diagrams.
- The two-storey forward projection of the extension reduces sightlines along the narrow land (Annaville Grove) adjacent to the property increasing the risk of vehicular conflict.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. I have 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 having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant planning policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Zoning / principle of development
- Impact on the receiving streetscape.
- Existing residential amenity of the adjoining properties
- Vehicular widening
- Other matters

8.2. Zoning / principal of development

The site is zoned to provide for residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.

8.3. Section 3.4.1.4 Policy Objective CA8 (Sustainability in Adaption Design) of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 *inter alia* states that it is important that the design of individual buildings facilitate a good quality of life for residents.

8.4. The policy allows dwellings to be flexible, accessible and adaptable in their spatial layout and design.

8.5. Policy Objective PHP19 (Existing Housing Stock-Adaptation) of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 supports the improvement of the existing housing stock by improvement and adaption.

8.6. Section 12.3.7 (Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas) of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 recognises the need for people to extend and renovate their dwellings.

8.7. The proposed development would remodel the existing dwelling house on site. The applicant objective is to create a sustainable and architecturally distinguished family home suitable for modern living requirements.

- 8.8. The development proposal in principle is to construct a first floor above an existing single storey side extension and to extend the property to the front and rear. The rear extension would replace an existing north facing sun room.
- 8.9. The gross floor area of the existing dwelling house is 115 sqm. The proposed works would provide an additional floor area of 64 sqm.
- 8.10. Section 3.4.1.2 Policy Objective CA6: Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 is noted.
- 8.11. There is no demolition element to the remodelling of the existing dwelling house on site.
- 8.12. The development incorporates sustainable design principles through green infrastructure and renewable energy integration.
- 8.13. The application is accompanied by a design statement, which details that the extension of the dwelling house adopts a contemporary architectural language that respects the existing building in fabric and scale.
- 8.14. Residential development is a permitted in principle use. I conclude that the proposed development to upgrade and extent residential accommodation on site by remodelling the existing dwelling house is acceptable in principle.

Impact on the receiving streetscape.

- 8.15. The planning authority refused planning permission principally on the grounds that the extended dwelling house would not satisfy the provisions of the development plan regulating extension to the front, side and roof of a dwelling house, as provided for in Section 12.3.7.1 (i) (front), (iii) (side) & (iv) (roof) of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028.

Revised drawing

- 8.16. The applicant has included a Drawing (2503-A-04 dated 05/12/25), showing a modified site layout plan. It is claimed the revision proposed addresses the planning authority's primary technical concern regarding inadequate driveway depth (5.5m).
- 8.17. The site layout drawing shows a setback revision of 5.5m (5500mm) from the front boundary to the proposed front extension. It is claimed the revision significantly reduces the projection of the front extension.

- 8.18. I note that the footprint of the front extension is reduced to a projection of 1800mm forward of the established building line.
- 8.19. It is unclear if the proposed revision is a setback of both the ground and first floor or if the applicant envisages a cantilevered first floor projecting above a reduced ground floor footprint.
- 8.20. The drawing is not accompanied by elevation, section or floor plan (first floor) drawings that would accurately identify the material changes to the development of the proposed modification.
- 8.21. I note the inclusion of the indicative drawing (2503-A-04 dated 05/12/25). However, I advise the Commission that my assessment below is based on the plans and particulars submitted with the application to the planning authority.

Domestic extension of an existing dwelling house

- 8.22. Section 12.3.7 (Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas) provides guidance in regard to porch, front extensions, side extensions, rear extensions and roof alterations.

Front extension

- 8.23. Section 12.3.7.1 (i) (Extensions to the Front) *inter alia* 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.
- 8.24. It is noted that 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.
- 8.25. Furthermore, in the matter of porch extensions 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.
- 8.26. Finally, porch extensions should complement the existing dwelling. However, a more contemporary design approach can be considered.

- 8.27. The applicant design statement *inter alia* states that the extension generally reflects the established building line and scale relationships while introducing contemporary architectural elements that enhance the street's visual interest.
- 8.28. The applicant claims that the development contributes positively to the streetscape through architectural quality and landscape integration.
- 8.29. The resident of the adjoining house at no. 23 Annville Park (observer on appeal) *inter alia* states that scale and massing of the front proposed extension is out of character with Annville Park
- 8.30. I note that the abutting semi-detached house at no.23 Annville Park has an existing single-storey front / porch extension that projects 1.5m from the established building line.
- 8.31. The front extension / porch would accommodate an entrance hallway with cloakroom and a multi-purpose room at ground floor level. The first floor of the front extension would accommodate part of a master bedroom suite (Bedroom 4).
- 8.32. The proposed front extension to no. 24 Annville Park would externally comprise a two-storey porch projection positioned to the front of the existing entrance door integrated with the forward projection of the proposed two-storey side extension.
- 8.33. The two-storey porch and two-storey south elevation of the side extension would in combination create a new building line to the front of the existing dwelling house projecting 3339mm forward of the established front building line of the receiving streetscape.
- 8.34. It is noted that the ground floor of the front extension is marginally recessed below the projection of the first floor of the extension. The internal dimension of the ground floor extension is given as 2400mm. The internal dimension of the first floor of the front extension is given as 3000mm.
- 8.35. The paired semi-detached houses in the streetscape on the north side of Annville Park are similar in form and appearance. A number of houses have single-storey porch extensions. However, there are no two-storey forward projecting front extensions in the streetscape either on the north side of the street or on the south side of the street.
- 8.36. I note that there is single-storey porch extension and two-storey side extension to no. 32 Annville Park on the south side of the street. However, the two-storey side extension is

marginally recessed behind the front building line of the streetscape respecting the established front building line.

- 8.37. The appellant argues that the end of streetscape location of the appeal site creates an opportunity for a unique design statement at the eastern extremity of the streetscape.
- 8.38. The appeal statement notes the evolving context in the vicinity, including the multi-storey scale and massing of the authorised development on the lands to the east across the access road at the side of no. 24 Annville Park (redevelopment of the Central Mental Hospital lands at Dundrum – total site 11.4 hectares).
- 8.39. It is claimed that the front extension is a contemporary designed bookend to the receiving streetscape that would enhance the existing dwelling house and area.
- 8.40. The planning case officer considered that the projection of the front extension is unacceptable as it reduces the driveway depth to below the 5500mm requirement, would exceed established precedents in the area (porch projection maximum of 1.8m) and would adversely impact the streetscape in breaking the uniform building line.
- 8.41. I concur with the planning case officer. I consider that the proposed front extension would represent a significant break in the front building line of the streetscape that would be excessive in scale within context.
- 8.42. However, I consider that the omission of the first floor of the front extension and the setback of the ground floor of the porch / side extension would significantly mitigate the impact of the proposed development on the receiving streetscape.
- 8.43. I note that the appellant is willing to accept a condition requiring the first floor to align with the existing building line of the street.
- 8.44. The Transport Planning Division have requested that the applicant demonstrate that a minimum depth of 5500mm is retained to the front of the existing dwelling house to facilitate in-curtilage car parking in accordance with Section 12.4.8.1 (vehicular entrances general specifications) of the development plan. On balance a reduced front extension is advised.
- 8.45. I consider that a driveway depth of 5500mm can be accommodated on site by the reduction of the front extension to a projection of 1800mm. The appellant has indicatively shown the revised configuration on drawing (2503-A-04 dated 05/12/25) submitted with the appeal statement.

8.46. I consider that a single-storey front extension with a maximum 1800mm projection forward of the established building line that exhibits a contemporary design solution would on balance be acceptable in terms of visual amenity given the end of streetscape location of the dwelling house and the requirement for proportionality noting that the façade length of the combined porch and side extension is 6000mm.

Impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining properties

8.47. The observer is the resident of the abutting house at no. 23 Annville Park. The observer has expressed concern at the potential negative impact of the front extension on their existing amenity in terms of overshadowing, overbearing and visual impacts arising from the proposed two-storey massing and projection (3339mm) of the front / side extension beyond the established front building line.

8.48. I consider that there would be no significant overshadowing or overbearing impacts on the abutting semi-detached property resulting from a modified front extension given a requirement for single-storey massing by way of condition and the separation gap of 3609mm between the side elevation of the proposed front / porch extension and the shared property boundary with no. 23 Annville Park.

8.49. I conclude that the proposed front extension subject to modification to omit the first floor element and to amend the ground floor footprint would generally be in accordance with Section 12.3.7.1 (i) (Extensions to the Front) of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 and is acceptable in principle. This matter can be dealt with by way of condition if a positive recommendation is recorded.

Side extension

8.50. The side and front extensions are integrated. The appellant states that the proposed side extension flush with the boundary to the access road to Annville Grove would provide a stronger and more coherent urban edge to the road than the current hipped roof semi-detached profile.

8.51. The extension would provide reception and ancillary accommodation at ground floor level and bedroom and bathroom accommodation at first floor level.

8.52. Section 12.3.7.1 (iii) (Extensions to the Side) of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 *inter alia* states that first floor side extensions built over

existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable.

- 8.53. The extension would have a length of 14185mm along the side boundary of the appeal site with the access road to Annville Grove. The opposite side of the access road is defined by a 4m granite boundary wall enclosing the Central Mental Hospital lands, which is an LDA redevelopment site.
- 8.54. The extension is located onto the boundary and would define the back of the public footpath, which follows the access road on the west side of the road. The elevation finish would be render.
- 8.55. The appellant states that the side elevation onto the road would be articulated by deeply recessed windows breaking up the side facade providing shadow lines, depth and visual interest.
- 8.56. The planning case officer cites Section 12.3.7.1 (iii) of the development plan, which states *inter alia* that proposed construction of new building structures directly onto the boundary with the public realm is not acceptable and it will be required that the development is set within the existing boundary on site and shall not form the boundary wall.
- 8.57. I do not consider this provision of Section 12.3.7.1 (iii) is relevant to the appeal development, as the existing single-storey converted garage / side extension presently defines the back of the public footpath (approximately 7m in length).
- 8.58. I do acknowledge that the proposed side extension would increase the length of the dwelling house along the boundary (14m) and would introduce a two-storey elevation with fenestration onto the access road. The extension would have a flat roof and a maximum parapet height of approximately 6m.
- 8.59. A high garden wall encloses the rear garden defining the residual boundary with the access road presently. A pedestrian gate is located proximate to the rear elevation of the side extension. The appellant proposes to move the gate further north along the boundary.
- 8.60. The planning case officer considered that the bulk and massing of the extension combined with its flat roof design would result in a visually dominant and discordant addition that fails to integrate with the existing dwelling or neighbouring properties.

- 8.61. I do not concur with the planning case officer. I consider that the overall extension to the dwelling house subject to condition has architectural merit and represents a contemporary design solution appropriate to the sensitive infill corner location.
- 8.62. The appellant has included a photograph of a contemporary side extension to 54 Graville Avenue Upper onto Rathgar Road illustrating the before and after side view of the house from the public road. I note the sensitive intervention to the receiving environment highlighted by the appellant.
- 8.63. Furthermore, I agree with the appellant that a flush building line at the side allows the house to turn the corner effectively. I also agree that a setback from the side boundary would weaken the architectural form proposed onto the access road with Annville Grove.
- 8.64. Finally, I consider that the setback of the side extension to sit flush with the front building line of Annville Park at first-floor level would mitigate the negative visual impacts of the side extension on the principal streetscape.
- 8.65. Section 12.3.7.1 (iii) (side extension) of the development plan also *inter alia* states that the provision of windows (particularly at first floor level) within the side elevation of extensions adjacent to public open space will be encouraged in order to promote passive surveillance, and to break up the bulk/extent of the side gable as viewed from the public realm.
- 8.66. There are 4 first floor window openings and 2 ground floor openings proposed to the east elevation of the side extension lighting in principal ancillary spaces within the remodelled dwelling house.
- 8.67. I consider that the side extension would provide a façade to the access road punctuated with fenestration (east elevation) that would provide visual interest and create animation to the public domain, introducing passive surveillance, on this stretch of isolated roadway, which is presently characterised by blank defining walls.
- 8.68. In conclusion, the side extension would be acceptable in principle and in detail subject to modification to provide for the setback of the extension to align with the front building line of the existing dwelling house at first floor level and the reduction in the footprint of the overall extension at ground floor level to provide for a maximum 1800mm projection forward of the front building line. This can be dealt with by way of condition.

8.69. I conclude that the side extension would in general be in accordance with Section 12.3.7 (Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas) and Section 12.3.7.1 (iii) (Extensions to the Side) of the development plan.

Roofscape

8.70. The planning case officer states that the roofscape of Annville Park is defined by a consistent pattern of hipped and gable valley roofs contributing to a coherent architectural character.

8.71. I acknowledge the coherent roofscape of the receiving environment. However, an extension or infill development that is defined in building form, roof profile and material finish as a contemporary intervention is valid.

8.72. The applicant design statement states that the extension of the dwelling house features a flat roof design with concealed parapet walls, integrating a hidden gutter system to ensure a clean architectural line.

8.73. I note that the side extension would in building form, roof profile and elevation modulation be visually distinct from the existing dwelling house. I conclude that the flat roof profile of the proposed extension is a defining characteristic of its contemporary design.

8.74. I note that the roof structure would be functional in terms of renewable energy supply supporting a solar array.

8.75. Finally, the applicant proposes to insert Velux roof lights into the front, side and rear roof plane of the existing roof. The roof lights would not alter the form and pitch of the existing roof and are acceptable in principle.

8.76. In conclusion, the flat roof profile of the proposed extension is acceptable in principle and in detail and the proposed development would be consistent with 12.3.7.1 (iv) (Alterations at Roof / attic Level) of the development plan.

Rear extension

8.77. The rear extension would replace an existing lean-to type sun room extension to the rear of the dwelling house with a single storey and part two storey rear extension.

8.78. The rear extension would accommodate an extended kitchen / dining room and living room at ground floor level and would extend for the full width of the garden. The first

floor element of the rear extension projects the two-storey side extension beyond the established first floor rear building line and would accommodate a double bedroom.

- 8.79. The ground and first floor rear extension would follow the existing rear building line (approximate 3m projection from the rear facade of the main house). The fenestration of the extension would have a north orientation.
- 8.80. Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) of the development plan *inter alia* states that 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.
- 8.81. The first floor element of the extension is modest in scale. I concur with the planning case officer that the build and massing of the extension would not be visually dominant.
- 8.82. I also concur with the planning case officer that no undue overbearing or overshadowing impacts would result from the massing of the two-storey element of the rear extension given the significant separation distance between the two-storey west elevation of the rear extension and the rear boundary with the abutting no. 23 Annville Park (approximately 5m).
- 8.83. I note that the west elevation would exhibit a blank wall without fenestration. There would be no overlooking of the rear amenity space of no. 23 Annville Park.
- 8.84. The rear extension would exhibit a render finish. The proposed material palette would harmonise with the existing dwelling house.
- 8.85. I consider that the proposed single-storey and part two-storey flat roof extension is acceptable in principle and in detail.
- 8.86. I conclude the proposed remodelling and extension of the dwelling house subject to the reduction in the footprint and massing of the front extension would have no significant adverse impact on the existing amenities of the abutting semi-detached house at no. 23 Annville Park (Observer) or of property in the vicinity.

Vehicular access alterations

- 8.87. Finally, the applicant proposes to widen the existing vehicular access.

- 8.88. The Transport Planning Division have no objection to the proposal subject to the maintenance of a 5500mm setback from the front boundary in order to satisfactorily accommodate in-curtilage car parking.
- 8.89. The reduction in the footprint of the front extension to a maximum projection of 1.8m would satisfy the in-curtilage car parking depth, as indicated on Drawing (2503-A-04 dated 05/12/25) submitted with the appeal statement.
- 8.90. I concur with the planning case officer that the proposed widening of the vehicular entrance does not represent a significant departure from the existing design.
- 8.91. The indicative Drawing (2503-A-04 dated 05/12/25) shows a maximum entrance width of 3.5m, as required by the Transport Planning Division of the planning authority.
- 8.92. I conclude that the widening of the access is acceptable in principle subject to condition.

Other matters

- 8.93. The Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council Development Contribution Scheme 2023-2028 provides for a contribution for domestic extensions per square metre in excess of 40 sqm.
- 8.94. The attachment of a development contribution is appropriate, as the proposed development would extend the dwelling house by 64 sqm.

9.0 **AA Screening**

I have considered the proposed development in-light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

The subject site is located within an established suburban area and is connected to piped services and is not immediate to a European Site. The proposed development comprises the extension & remodelling of an existing dwelling house.

No significant nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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 given the small-scale nature of the development.

I conclude 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.

- 9.1. 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 site is located in a suburban location. It is not proximate to a visible watercourse.

The development comprises extension & remodeling works to an existing dwelling house.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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. 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.

The reason for this conclusion is the small scale and nature of the development.

I conclude based on objective information, the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration of 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. I recommend a grant of planning permission subject to condition for the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential zoning objective, the pattern of development in the area and the policy framework of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, including Objective PHP19 (Existing Housing Stock-Adaptation), which supports the improvement and adaptation of the existing housing stock, and Section 12.3.7 (Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas), it is considered that the proposed remodelling of the dwelling house on site would subject to condition provide a reasonable level of residential accommodation consistent with Section 12.3.7.1 (i)(ii) (ii) and (iv) of the development plan, would not depreciate the amenities of adjoining properties or detract from the receiving streetscape and, as such, would be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development to be retained shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application 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 interest of clarity

2. Prior to the commencement of development the applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the planning authority revised floor plans, elevation & section drawings restricting the footprint of the front extension to a 1.8m projection beyond the established building line of the streetscape on Anneville Park and for the omission of the first floor extension to the front of the established building line from the development. The front elevation (south) of the side extension shall be flush with the front elevation of the existing dwelling house.

Reason: In order to protect the coherence and uniformity of the streetscape on Annville Park in compliance with Section 12.3.7.1 (i) (Extensions to the

Front) of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028.

3. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit a revised site plan for the written agreement of the planning authority in compliance with the recommendation of the Transportation Planning Division of the Planning Authority to provide a minimum length of 5.5 metres depth and a minimum width of 3 metres for each car parking space and a maximum vehicular entrance access width of 3.5m .

Reason: In the interests of orderly development and in compliance with Section 12.4.8.1 of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 .

4. The site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 800 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. The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage

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

application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to the Board to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000 that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme.

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.



Anthony Abbott King
Planning Inspector

27 February 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500411-DR-25
Proposed Development Summary	Extension and remodelling of dwelling house.
Development Address	24 Annaville Park, Dundrum, Dublin 14.
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.	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?

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.
No Screening required.

Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.
EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required

State the Class and state the relevant threshold
N/A

Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.
Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)
OR
If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)

State the Class and state the relevant threshold
N/A

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)?

Yes Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)

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

Inspector: A. [Signature]

Date: 27/02/2016