



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500412-DF-25

Development	Construction of extension with all associated site works.
Location	7 "The Green", Mulhuddart Wood, Dublin 15
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	FW25A/0402E
Applicant(s)	Michael Mason.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant subject to condition.
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Michael Mason.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	04/02/2026.
Inspector	Anthony Abbott King.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. "The Green" comprises a cul-de-sac of semi-detached houses in a network of residential cul-de-sacs (including "The Green", "The Court" & "The Avenue") and an access road – "The Drive" – all comprising Mulhuddart Wood.
- 1.2. "The Drive" is accessed from the south side of the Navan Road just west of Mulhuddart Village and gives access via "The Hill" to the cul-de-sacs located to the east ("The Green") and to the west ("The Court" & "The Avenue") of "the Drive".
- 1.3. No. 7 is a two-storey semi-detached house located on the west side of "The Green". The abutting semi-detached house is no. 5 "The Green".
- 1.4. A small number of houses in Mulhuddart Wood have front extensions.
- 1.5. Site area is given as 0.017 hectares.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The construction of a single-storey flat-roof front extension, incorporating a roof light, and a rear single-storey flat-roof extension.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Grant permission subject to 7 conditions.

- 3.1.1. Condition 2 is relevant and states:

The applicant shall omit the proposed front extension. Revised floor plans and elevations showing the omission of the proposed front extension shall be submitted for the written agreement of the Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The decision of the CEO of Fingal County Council reflects the recommendation of the planning case officer - please see Section 8 (assessment) of this report for elaboration.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- No objection subject to condition.

3.3. Third Party Observations

There are two submission on file (appeal site and adjoining property owner at no. 5), which are summarised below:

- Tenant uncertainty in the matter of occupation of the applicant dwelling house. The proposed works have not been the subject of consultation with the tenant. It is claimed that the works will have an adverse impact on the occupancy of the tenant.
- The proposed front extension would block the light and street view of the neighbouring semi-detached property. The front extension would have a negative impact on the pair of semi-detached houses and the streetscape.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. There is no recent relevant planning history on site.

4.2. I note older planning permission(s) for front extension to houses in Mulhuddart Wood.

The following planning history is relevant in the matter of front extension at the Mulhuddart Wood estate, including as cited by the appellant:

- Under reg. ref. FW13B/0031 permission for single-storey extension to the side as a family flat was grant at no. 2 "The Green" (September 2013). I note that the side extension authorised by this permission follows the established front building line. The front extension appears to pre-date the side extension, as it is shown as existing in the submitted drawings (existing plans and proposed plans dated 5/13).
- Under reg ref. F00B/0564 retention permission for a front porch and ground floor bay window was granted permission at no. 2 "The Green" (October 2000).

- Under reg. ref. FW03A/0979 planning permission was granted for a single storey extension to the front, gable and rear of 25 “The Green” to create a granny flat (2003).
- Under reg. ref. F99B/0763 a pitched roof extension to the front, side and rear of no. 24 “The Court” was granted planning permission (December 1999), as amendments to previously approved application (Ref. F99B/0546).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

I have set out below the relevant policies and objectives of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 for the information of the Commission.

Zoning

The relevant land-use zoning objective is ‘RS’ (Map Blanchardstown South – Sheet 13): *Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity.*

- Chapter 13 (Land use Zoning) states the vision for the objective is to ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenities.

The proposed development is a permitted in principle use.

Chapter 3 (Sustainable Placemaking & Quality Homes) is relevant including the following policies:

Policy SPQHP41 is relevant and states:

Support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

Policy SPQHO45 (Domestic Extensions) is relevant and states:

Encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area.

Chapter 14 (Development Management Standards) - Residential Extensions

Chapter 14 (Development Standards) Section 14.10. (Additional Residential Accommodation in Built-up Areas) in particular Section 14.10.2 (Residential Extensions) is relevant. It states that the need for housing to be adaptable to changing family circumstances is recognised and acknowledged. The planning authority will support applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend as the needs of the household change, subject to specific safeguards, in particular the protection of adjoining properties

Section 14.10.2.1 (Porch Extensions) is relevant and 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 contemporary design approach may be considered. Front extensions will be assessed in terms of their scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. Significant breaks 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. Sufficient depth to the forecourt is required to ensure off-street car parking is not impacted.

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, prepared by Kevin Tiernan, Planning Consultant / Architectural Designer, on behalf of the appellant, are summarised below:

- The appeal is against Condition 2 of the notification of decision by the planning authority to grant planning permission for the proposed development, which requires the omission of the proposed ground floor front extension.
- The proposed front extension is modest in scale below first-floor window level, has a flat roof, is proportionate to the dwelling and exhibits complementary finishes. The extension is contemporary yet simple and consistent with development plan policy for sensitive domestic extension of existing dwellings.
- The proposal aligns with Policy SPQHO41 (residential extensions of appropriate scale), Objective SPQHO45 (sensitive design respecting adjoining properties) and Section 14.10.2.1 (front extension guidelines with which the proposal fully complies).
- The appellant states that the planning authority's requirement to omit the front extension is not supported by the following: local precedent; development plan policy; a substantiated visual or residential amenity impact assessment and; any quantitative or spatial analysis (e.g. sunlight, massing, streetscape).
- It is claimed that the front extension is modest in height (3.2m) and projection (2m). There are strong precedents on the same road and within the immediate Mulhuddart Wood estate (some with larger front extensions than that proposed).
- Three examples cited of larger and multi-stage front extension in Mulhuddart Wood include: No. 2 The Green (F00B/00564) – retention established front extension on the street / FW13B/0031 – further extended the front projection in 2013); No. 2 The Court (substantial front and side extension / no planning history available) and; no. 24 The Court (F99B/0763 – pitch roof front, side & rear extension (1999) much greater mass and visual presence).

- It is claimed that front projections form part of the character of the Mulhuddart Wood estate.
- It is claimed that the planner's report incorrectly states that no precedent exists for front extension. It is further claimed that the planner's report does not provide a streetscape assessment, a quantification of visual harm and does not reference any section drawings, photomontages, or shadow impacts.
- Therefore, the finding that the extension is "dominant" or of "poor architectural merit" is not evidenced based.
- In regard to the third party submission by the neighbouring property owner, it is claimed that the concerns raised by the submission are not supported by planning evidence and in several respects are contradicted by the physical layout, scale of development and the established character of the estate.
- in matter of significant light loss it is claimed is overstated and unsupported by the scale of the proposal. The appellant claims that loss of morning light (east) would be extremely limited in duration.
- In the matter of overbearing (wall effect) a 3.3m parapet height single-storey extension with a 2m projection will not appear overbearing.
- In the matter of character / visual amenity (Eyesore), there are existing examples of larger and more visually prominent front extensions.
- Finally, the appellant claims that Condition 2 is disproportionate, unnecessary and unwarranted. Therefore, it is requested that the Commission remove in its entirety Condition 2.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority is not satisfied with the design response provided and request the Commission to uphold the decision to grant permission subject to Condition 2 (omission of proposed front extension).

The planning authority state that the proposed development was assessed against national, regional and local development plan policy and objectives.

It is considered that the scale of the front extension as proposed is likely to result in detrimental impacts to existing visual and residential amenities of the area.

The planning authority conclude that the design and finishes of the proposed front flat roof extension would be incompatible with the streetscape inconsistent with Section 14.10.2.1 (Front Porches) Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.

Finally, in the event the appeal is successful a financial contribution should be applied to the grant of planning permission.

7.3. Observations

None recorded to date.

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.
- 8.2. I consider that the only planning matter at issue in this case is Condition 2 of the notification of decision to grant planning permission and that no other planning matters need to be considered by the Commission. Condition 2 the subject of this appeal is assessed below.
- 8.3. Condition 2 provides for the omission of the front single-storey extension of the development in the interests of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 8.4. *Extension of existing dwellings*
- The development proposal *inter alia* includes the construction of a single-storey flat roof front extension to no. 7 "The Green" that would project 2m from the front elevation of the house.
- 8.5. The extension would have a parapet height of 3300mm and would be furnished with a roof light. The extension would have a width of 4030mm extending from the property boundary with the abutting semi-detached house at no. 5 "The Green" to the entrance threshold.
- 8.6. The relevant land-use residential zoning objective provides for residential development and the protection and improvement of residential amenity.

- 8.7. Section 10.4 (Additional Residential Accommodation in Built-up Areas) of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 provides for the extension of existing dwelling houses.
- 8.8. I also note Policy SPQHP41 (support the extension of existing dwellings with appropriately scaled extension) and Policy SPQHO45 (domestic extensions).

Condition 2

- 8.9. The appellant claims that the proposed front extension is modest in scale below first-floor window level, has a flat roof, is proportionate to the dwelling and exhibits complementary finishes. It is claimed the extension is contemporary yet simple and consistent with development plan policy for sensitive domestic extension of existing dwellings.
- 8.10. The appellant claims that Condition no. 2 is disproportionate, unnecessary and unwarranted. Therefore, it should be removed in its entirety.
- 8.11. I acknowledge that the scale of the extension to be omitted by Condition no. 2 is modest. However, the subject extension is located to the front of the property in a location that is visible to the general public and is positioned within a streetscape of similar semi-detached houses.
- 8.12. Section 14.10.2.1 (porch / front extensions) of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029 *inter alia* states that front extensions will be assessed in terms of their scale, design and impact on visual and residential amenities.
- 8.13. Furthermore, significant breaks 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.
- 8.14. No. 7 "The Green" is a mid-streetscape property. The house forms a semi-detached streetscape block with no. 5 "The Green" abutting to the south similar in form and appearance.
- 8.15. I note that no.5 "The Green" exhibits a shallow projecting pitched roof canopy supported on brackets above the entrance threshold.
- 8.16. The planning authority considered that there were no planning precedents for a front extension that would extend 2m beyond the established building line along the street and that would have a flat roof design.

- 8.17. The planning authority also noted that the proposed render finish would not complement the existing finish of the dwelling house and that the height of the front extension would be higher than existing front porches on adjoining sites.
- 8.18. The planning authority concluded that that the proposed design of the extension to be of poor architectural merit, which would result in a visually overbearing and dominant feature on this pair of semi-detached houses.
- 8.19. Furthermore, the front extension by reason of its scale, height and orientation is likely to cause significant reduction in the skylight received by the ground floor window of the adjoining dwelling at no. 5 “the Green”.
- 8.20. I would in principle concur with the planning authority in the matter of the inappropriate projection beyond the building line (2m) of the front extension and the flat roof design of the extension.
- 8.21. The streetscape and the streetscapes in the vicinity are characterised principally by flush two-storey facades without projection or facades with shallow single-storey pitched roof projection.
- 8.22. I interrogate the matter of precedent and established streetscape character below in more detail.

Projection / overbearing and loss of light

- 8.23. The depth of the front extension is significant in context (2m). I note that a rooflight above the flat roof extension would be required to augment natural light penetration to the front reception room, which is located directly behind the extension.
- 8.24. In the matter of overbearing impacts on the adjoining property at no. 5 “the Green”, I consider that overbearing impacts would be significant given the sensitive receiving environment of the extension to the front of the established street building line, the significant height in context (3200mm) and the projection (2m) of the extension and the location of the side elevation (south) of the extension positioned on the shared property boundary.
- 8.25. Finally, I note that no. 5 “The Green” is located to the south of the proposed extension. I would agree with the appellant that loss of light would be limited to the morning and would be limited in duration given the location of the development to the north-east of the front facade of no. 5 “The Green”.

- 8.26. Therefore, I do not consider that the proposed front extension would have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining property at no. 5 “The Green” in terms of loss of sunlight / skylight.
- 8.27. However, I consider that the proposed front extension would have a significant visual impact on the receiving streetscape and would have significant overbearing impacts on no. 5 “The Green” given the sensitive location of the extension attached to the front façade. I concur with the planning authority it would be a dominant feature to the pair of semi-detached houses.
- 8.28. The subject streetscape and streetscapes in the vicinity as previously stated are characterised principally by flush two-storey facades without projection or facades with shallow single-storey pitched roof projection.
- 8.29. I conclude that the extension would be inconsistent with Section 14.10.2.1 in terms of its scale within context, projection beyond the established building line and overall design, which would be out of character with the established pattern of development.
- 8.30. I concur with the planning authority that the proposed front extension would have a significant adverse impact on the existing residential and visual amenities of adjoining dwellings. I conclude that Condition no. 2 is warranted.
- 8.31. *Precedent*
- 8.32. The appellant cites a number of precedents in the Mulhuddart Wood estate in support of the construction of the proposed front extension to no. 7 “The Green” claiming *inter alia* precedent as a justification for the removal of Condition no. 2.
- 8.33. The appellant *inter alia* cites no. 2 “The Green” a semi-detached house at the southern end of the eastern streetscape in support of the subject front extension. No. 2 “The Green” is located at the entrance to cul-de-sac on the opposite side of the street at the end of the streetscape.
- 8.34. The relevant element of the extension is that granted retention permission in October 2000 comprising the front porch and ground floor bay (F00B/0564).
- 8.35. The appellant also cites no. 24 “The Court” a semi-detached house at the northern end of a semi-detached streetscape within a cul-de-sac located to the west of “the Green”. I note that planning permission was granted for a pitched roof extension to the front, side and rear of the dwelling in December 1999 (F99B/0763).

- 8.36. Finally, the appellant cites no. 2 “The Court”, which exhibits a similar front porch and side extension to no. 24 “The Court” at the southern extremity of the streetscape. There is no available planning history for the development at no. 2 “The Court”.
- 8.37. The relevant policy framework at the time of the grant of planning permission for the cited permissions is a legacy development plan published prior to the Fingal Development Plan 2005-2011, which is the oldest development plan available online.
- 8.38. Furthermore, I note that the projection from the established front building line of the front extension (circa.1m) at no. 2 “The Green” is significantly less than the proposed 2m projection of the ground floor front extension to no. 7 “The Green” omitted by Condition no. 2.
- 8.39. I also observe on the day of my site visit that no. 1 “The Green” located to the south of the appeal site at the end of the streetscape has a single storey shallow pitched roof canopy above the front façade and side extension of the property.
- 8.40. Finally, I observed on the day of my site visit a single-storey front porch and bay window extension / canopy to the front of no. 5 “The Drive” Mulhuddart Wood (a cul-de-sac to the west of “The Green”).
- 8.41. I note that the extension (pitched roof canopy) is shallow in dept. I could find no planning history online in regard to development at no. 5 “The Drive”.
- 8.42. I consider that the front extension of properties in Mullhuddart Wood is limited. The authorised front extensions at no. 2 “The Green” and no. 24 “The Court” are attached to end of streetscape properties and exhibit pitched roofs. These cited authorised extensions are legacy developments.
- 8.43. Furthermore, the mid streetscape front extension that I observed at no. 5 “The Drive” has a shallow projection from the front building line and exhibits a pitched roof.
- 8.44. Notwithstanding that the proposed development is assessed on its own merits, I conclude that there is no established pattern of front extension to the semi-detached houses in Mulhuddart Wood that would support a flat roof single storey extension that would project 2m from the established front building line of the streetscape.
- 8.45. I would concur with the planning authority that there is no planning precedent for any similar front extensions in the appeal site vicinity that depart significantly from the established building line.

- 8.46. In conclusion, the proposed single storey front extension would be inconsistent with Section 14.10.2.1 (Porch Extensions) of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029 principally by reason of its 2m projection in front of the established front building line of the streetscape and overbearing impact on the abutting semi-detached house at no. 5 "The Green".
- 8.47. I concur with the planning authority that the omission of the front extension is desirable in the interests of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 8.48. I conclude that the proposed single-storey extension by reason of the 2m projection of the extension beyond the established front building line of the streetscape, its height and flat roof design would represent an incongruous and dominant element in the streetscape and should be omitted from the development.

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 of a 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.

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 minor 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

I recommend retention of Condition number 2.

Having regard to the nature of the condition the subject of the appeal, the Commission is satisfied that the determination by the Commission of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and, based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to attach condition number 2 and the reason therefor.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential zoning objective, the pattern of development in the area, which is characterised by flush front facades or facades with shallow projections, and the policy framework for additional residential accommodation provided by the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, I consider that the proposed single-storey front extension projecting 2m beyond the established building line of the street would represent a dominant and incongruous element on the facade of the pair of semi-detached houses at nos.5 & 7 "The Green", similar in form and appearance, and would result in significant overbearing impacts on no. 5 "the Green", given the sensitive receiving environment to the front of the pair of semi-detached houses and the location of the extension positioned on the shared property boundary, inconsistent with Section 14.10 2.1 (front porches / extensions) of Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. Therefore, the planning authority's condition number 2 is warranted.

13.0 Conditions

2. The applicant shall omit the proposed front extension. Revised floor plans and elevations showing the omission of the proposed front extension shall be submitted for the written agreement of the Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development.

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

12 February 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL500412-DF-25
Proposed Development Summary	Single-storey extension of existing dwelling house
Development Address	No. 7 The Green, Mulhuddart Wood, Dublin 15.
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	

<p>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p> <p>N/A</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>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: A. ASBURY Date: 12/01/2026