



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500514-DR-25

Development

The development will consist of the construction of a new single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling and all associated internal alterations, drainage and siteworks

Location

18 St. Luke's Crescent, Milltown,
Dublin 14 D14CX80

Planning Authority

Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D25B/0571/WEB

Applicant(s)

Paddy Governy & Audrey Ferris

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse Permission

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Paddy Governy & Audrey Ferris

Observer(s)

Angela Warren

Margaret Murray

Date of Site Inspection

06th March 2026

Inspector

Conor Hughes

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	4
2.0	Proposed Development	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision.....	4
4.0	Planning History	7
5.0	Policy Context	7
6.0	EIA Screening	10
7.0	The Appeal	10
8.0	Assessment.....	12
9.0	AA Screening	17
10.0	Water Framework Directive	18
11.0	Recommendation	19
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	19
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	21

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is comprised of a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located in residential cul-de-sac approximately 50 metres west of the junction with the Dundrum Road.
- 1.2. The building is of masonry construction with a painted smooth render finish. It has a tiled roof with a brick chimney, uPVC windows, doors, timber fascia and uPVC gutters.
- 1.3. There is in-curtilage parking in front of the dwelling for at least two cars and a large private garden to the rear.
- 1.4. The boundary with the footpath in front of the dwelling is defined by block walls as are the boundaries to the rear and with the two properties either side of the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development comprises the construction of a new single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling with associated internal alterations, drainage and siteworks.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- On 25th November 2025 the Planning Authority issued notification of their decision to refuse planning permission for a new single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling and associated internal alterations, drainage and siteworks.
- The Planning Authority considered the rear extension, by reason of its excessive depth and footprint, would constitute overdevelopment of the site. They further considered its scale and height would create an overbearing impact on the adjoining properties, reducing residential amenity and outlook. The sloping topography of the site would further exaggerate its visual prominence when viewed from the public realm to the rear of the site.
- The Planning Authority therefore considered that the proposed development failed to comply with Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 (the Development Plan) and if permitted, would set

an undesirable precedent for similar forms of large-scale extensions contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- The planning report noted that the proposed development is within an Objective A zoning where an extension to an existing dwelling will be acceptable in principle subject to meeting the relevant policies and objectives of the Development Plan.
- The planning officer considered the rear extension unacceptable because of its excessive scale and depth. It was overdevelopment of a restricted site as the length of the proposed extension was disproportionate and not in keeping with the surrounding pattern of development.
- The planning report also identified that the proximity of the extension to the boundaries of the site would create a sense of enclosure and visual dominance impacting adversely on the residential amenity and outlook for the residents in the adjoining properties.
- The planning officer further considered that the elevated position of the proposed extension would appear visually intrusive when viewed from the neighbouring park and open space behind the site. This would set a precedent for similar development contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- Consequently, the planning report identified the proposed rear extension as contrary to Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) Extensions to the Rear which seeks to ensure this form of development is modest in scale and protects residential and visual amenity.
- The planning report noted the Drainage Planning Section of the Municipal Services Department had no objection in principle to the development subject to agreement of conditions in respect of the proposed drainage.
- The planning officer highlighted a concern about how the development would be serviced in the absence of a side passage connecting the rear of the site to St Luke's Crescent. The use of an access onto the existing open space at the rear of the site, particularly during the construction phase of the project, would be unacceptable to the Council.

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- Municipal Services Department - Drainage Planning: No objection subject to the requirements of two planning conditions.
- The first condition requires the surface water runoff generated by the extension shall not be discharged to a soakaway in accordance with Section 10.2.2.6 and Policy Objective EI6: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) of the County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- The second condition requires any changes to parking and hardstanding areas shall be constructed in accordance with the recommendations of the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study for SuDS and in accordance with Section 12.4.8.3 Driveways/ Hardstanding Areas of the County Development Plan 2022-2028.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- None

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

3.4. Third Party Observations

- In a letter of objection, a neighbouring resident at 17 St. Luke's Crescent raised concerns about the excessive size of the proposed extension and that it would be out of character with the existing pattern of development in the area.
- The objector was further concerned that the proposed extension would be overbearing and detract from the adjoining properties because of its bulk, scale and depth. It would also cause an additional loss of daylight which had already been impacted by a large extension constructed in 2017.
- In a letter of objection, a neighbouring resident at 19 St. Luke's Crescent raised similar concerns about the size of the extension, that it would be overbearing because of its proximity to the boundaries and elevated height. The objector also commented that the extension will result in a loss of amenity, an increased sense of enclosure and detract from the adjoining properties because of its bulk, scale and depth.

- A query was raised by the objector about the proximity of an existing oil tank and boiler house in the site to their boundary and related safety concerns about its installation and use.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. Planning Authority Reference D25B/0560/WEB – application withdrawn for the construction of a new single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling and all associated internal alterations, drainage and siteworks.
- 4.2. Planning Authority Reference D25B/0388/WEB – permission refused for the construction of a new single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling and all associated internal alterations, drainage and siteworks.
- 4.3. The refusal reason stated that the proposed development by reason of its excessive size, depth (extending approximately 11 metres from the rear building line), and overall scale, would represent overdevelopment of the subject site. The extension would have a significant overbearing impact on neighbouring properties due to its proximity to shared boundaries and elevated height, resulting in a loss of residential amenity and an increased sense of enclosure. The proposal would set an undesirable precedent for similar forms of over-scaled development contrary to the Development Plan.
- 4.4. Planning Authority Reference D16B/0427 – permission granted for works consisting of demolition of existing single storey rear extension and shed; construction of new two storey and single storey extension to the side and rear of the existing dwelling; new single storey porch to the front elevation; conservation of existing attic to study/storage space with Velux rooflights to rear roof slope; all associated internal alterations, drainage and siteworks.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- The Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 (the Development Plan) is the relevant plan for the area and the site is zoned as Zoning

Objective A to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.

- The proposed development comprises a new single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling and associated internal alterations, drainage and siteworks. Section 12.3.7.1 provides guidance for extensions to dwellings in Existing Built-up Areas.
- Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) Extensions to the Rear states:

Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining. The extension should match or complement the main house. First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. 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 12.8.3.3 Private Open Space (i) Private Open Space for Houses states:
All houses (terraced, semi-detached, detached) shall provide an area of good quality usable private open space behind the front building as follows:

Table 12.10 Private Open Space

<i>House type</i>	<i>Private Open Space requirement (minimum)</i>
<i>1-2 bedroom</i>	<i>48 sq. m. *</i>

3 bedroom	60 sq. m.
4 bedroom (or more)	75 sq. m.

** may be acceptable in cases where it can be demonstrated that good quality usable open space can be provided on site.*

Any provision of open space to the side of dwellings will only be considered as part of the overall private open space calculation where it is useable, good quality space. Narrow strips of open space to the side of dwellings shall not be included within any of the above calculations.

In instances where an innovative design response is provided on site, particularly for infill and corner side garden sites, a relaxation in the quantum of private open space may be considered, however this is on a case-by- case basis. The provision of open space to the front and side of the site to serve the proposed dwelling may also be considered acceptable, subject to design, residential amenity, etc.

This Section should be read in conjunction with Development Management requirements i.e. infill, backland, side garden development, etc. (Section 12.3.7.1 and also Section 12.8.8 below on quality of private amenity space).

- It is stated at Section 10.2.2.6 Policy Objective EI6: Sustainable Drainage Systems that:

It is a Policy Objective to ensure that all development proposals incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Development will only be permitted where the Council is satisfied that suitable measures have been proposed that mitigate the impact of drainage through the achievement of control of run-off quantity and quality while enhancing amenity and habitat. In particular the requirements of the ‘SUDS Manual’ by the UK’s Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA) shall be followed unless specifically exempted by the Council. (See also Section 12.8.6.2 SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) and Appendix 7 Sustainable Drainage System Measures)

Any site-specific solutions to surface water drainage systems shall meet the requirements of the Water Framework Directive and the River Basin Management

Plan 2018 – 2021 any subsequent RBMP and ‘Water Quality in Ireland 2013 - 2018’ (2019), or any updated version of the document.

- It is stated in Section 12.4.8.3 Driveways/Hardstanding Areas that:

A minimum of one third of front garden areas should be maintained in grass or landscaped in the interest of urban greening and SUDS. In the case of smaller properties - such as small terraced dwellings this requirement may be relaxed. Each driveway, parking and hardstanding area shall be constructed in accordance with SuDS and include measures to prevent drainage from the driveway entering onto the public. Where unbound material is proposed for driveway, parking and hardstanding areas, it shall be contained in such a way to ensure that it does not transfer on to the public road or footpath on road safety grounds.

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

- None

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

- The site is approximately three kilometres west of the South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC:000210) and the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA:004024).

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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 **The Appeal**

7.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

- Bright Design Architects advise in the grounds of appeal that the appellants have lived at this address since 2006. Despite extending the property to the side and

rear in 2016/17 their personal circumstances have changed and the dwelling needs to be extended again to allow an extended family member to move in.

- There is a previous history of refusal for a larger single storey extension in September 2025. In pre-application discussions (PAC/48/25) that followed Bright Design Architects argue that the Planning Authority did not raise any of the concerns about the issues that are now the subject of this appeal.
- In respect of the concerns raised by the Planning Authority about the scale and mass of the proposed extension it is highlighted in the grounds of appeal that although the overall length of the proposed extension is 9.4 metres this is broken up to mitigate the impact of developing on the boundaries with the two neighbouring properties.
- It is further suggested that a condition could be imposed moving the side walls of the proposed extension off the boundaries with the two neighbouring dwelling by up to 0.75 metres and provide landscaping to aid integration.
- The appellant also argues because of the orientation of the extension there would be little effect on the neighbouring property to the south.
- In respect of the concerns raised by the Planning Authority that the extension has a disproportionate footprint relative to the original dwelling. Whilst the principles of '*subservience and integration*' are noted the properties in St. Luke's Crescent have significant back gardens. It is argued that there is no '*principal or condition*' that limits a building to a percentage of the garden size. It is the appellants view that the proposed design is appropriate to the scale of the appeal site.
- In respect of the concerns raised by the Planning Authority about the depth of the extension, its proximity to shared boundaries and related impacts on neighbouring properties. The appellant refers to 11 St. Luke's Crescent as an example of where a large structure extends in depth into the garden and is precedence for this proposal.
- The location of the appeal site relative to dwellings recently permitted by An Bord Pleanála is also cited but no detail to explain why this decision is important.
- In respect of the concerns raised by the Planning Authority about the visual impact of the proposed extension when viewed from the open space and park to the rear of

the site. It is set out in the grounds of appeal that there will still be a significant area of garden between the extended building and the boundary with the open space.

- It is argued that the existing boundary walls mask the proposed extension as detailed in the supporting photomontage. It is also highlighted that the neighbouring development at Chandos Lane is much closer in comparison to the proposed single storey extension.
- In respect of the other issues raised by the Planning Authority about how the site will be accessed during the construction phase of the project. It is explained in the grounds of appeal that the rear of the property was previously used as a construction access. The appellant is happy to liaise with the Parks Department to secure the necessary permissions and pay a bond if required.

7.2. **Planning Authority Response**

- No further comment.

7.3. **Observations**

- The objector at 17 St. Luke's Crescent reiterates the points of objections previously set out at Section 3.4 of this report. No new observations are made.
- The objector at 19 St. Luke's Crescent encloses with her observation the original letter of objection submitted to the Planning Authority on 07th November 2025. Similar objections are raised to those previously set out at Section 3.4 of this report.
- An additional observation is made by this objector. Due to personal circumstances the objector is largely housebound and the proposed extension will harm their amenity as a result of additional noise pollution or disturbance.

8.0 **Assessment**

- 8.1. Having examined the application details and all the other documentation on file, including the submission received to appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regards to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered as follows:

- The principle of development
- The need for the additional accommodation in a new rear extension
- Size, scale, depth and the impact on residential amenity
- The impact of extending the building to the rear on visual amenity
- Other considerations

The principle of development

- 8.2. The site is subject to zoning Objective A in the Development Plan which has the purpose of improving residential amenity while protecting existing residential amenities.
- 8.3. I agree with the Planning Authority that an extension to the dwelling is acceptable in principle subject to being in accordance with the requirements of the policies and objectives of the zoning and consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The need for the additional accommodation in a new rear extension

- 8.4. The appellant in their grounds of appeal argue that the additional floorspace is required to allow an extended family member to move into the property. I note that the submitted floorplans include a downstairs bedroom and a large walk-in wardrobe in lieu of the TV room and living area off the open plan kitchen dining area. Only a relatively small area of living accommodation is lost to meet the additional accommodation requirement for a downstairs bedroom.
- 8.5. The former kitchen dining room altered to become a lounge, a store and second utility room. While I acknowledge the need to replace the TV room and living area with a lounge it is not explained why the store and second utility are necessary to meet the needs of the household. The proposed extended kitchen, dining and living area will also occupy a much larger footprint than in the original extension despite there being only one additional occupant in the property.
- 8.6. I also note the proposed extension is not to meet any site-specific personal or domestic circumstance and the size of the extension is not justified on the need for disabled facilities such as a wet room or equipment storage for medical devices.

8.7. I conclude that there is no substantive evidence of need that would on its own right justify an extension of this size to improve the residential amenity of the appellant.

Size, scale, depth and impact on residential amenity

8.8. The appellant set out in their grounds of appeal that this proposal takes account of the objections raised by the Planning Authority in respect of the size of the extension in an earlier application. They argue this is a large garden and as there is no restriction on the ratio of building to garden size it is large enough to accommodate this size of extension.

8.9. The appellant also argues that the bulk and mass of the block is broken up by minimising the depth of the extended building along the two boundaries and inserting a small courtyard. It is further advised in the grounds of appeal that none of the objections raised now were identified in the pre-application discussions that followed the previous application.

8.10. However, both the Planning Authority and objectors consider the depth and width of the proposed extension to be excessive in size and overdevelopment of the site. Its proximity to mutual boundaries with both 17 and 19 St. Luke's Crescent means it is overbearing and dominant. Consequently, this harms the residential amenity of the two dwellings on either side of the site.

8.11. The appellant argues that a planning condition could be attached to a decision to grant planning permission bringing the walls on the boundaries by between 0.5 and 0.75 metres with the two neighbouring properties to allow planting in between will break up the scale and mass and further reduce the impact of the proposed extension.

8.12. Having regard to the submitted plans, the photomontages supplied in support of the proposal and based on my observations from the site visit I consider the concerns raised by the Planning Authority and objectors in respect of the size and depth of extension and its proximity to the boundaries to be well founded.

8.13. The dwellings either side of 18 St. Luke's Crescent have modest single storey extensions that project back from the rear elevation by three to four metres.

8.14. On the northern boundary when this extension is added to the earlier side and rear extension the dwelling will extend along the boundary with 19 St. Luke's Crescent for more than 16.5 metres.

- 8.15. To the south it will extend along the boundary with 17 St. Luke's Crescent for just under twelve metres and while the mass of this wall is broken up by the insertion of a small courtyard it only is stepped back by 2.5 metres and will still read in my view as part of the extended mass of the proposed extension.
- 8.16. Cumulatively the depth of the extended dwelling will harm the amenity of both neighbours due to the excessive length of the building and the perception this gives of dominance.
- 8.17. I also observed that the boundaries with the two neighbouring properties is open because the land falls away to the west and the garden to 18 St. Luke's Crescent is terraced to take account of the change in level. An outbuilding at the rear of the site sits approximately one metre below the level of the extended dwelling and is sensitively designed to take account of that level change.
- 8.18. The proposed extension does not step down to the level of the first terrace below. The change in level is accommodated in a taller floor to ceiling height within the building and the parapet wall carries through at the existing higher level. This increases the mass of the gable wall and therefore adds to the perception that the proposed is over bearing on the two properties either side of the site.
- 8.19. If the proposed extension was built, I estimate there would be approximately 100 square metres of garden area remaining including the proposed courtyard and the outbuilding and deck on the lower terrace. A garden of this size is in accordance with the guidance in Section 12.8.3.3 of the Development Plan for dwellings with four or more bedrooms.
- 8.20. Whilst there is still adequate private amenity space and the appellant correctly observes there is no restriction on the ratio of building to garden size this does not mean that the proposal is acceptable.
- 8.21. I agree that the rear extension, by reason of its excessive depth and footprint, would constitute overdevelopment of the site. The length and height of the proposed extension will create an overbearing impact on the adjoining properties, reducing residential amenity and outlook. This is contrary to Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) of the Development Plan.
- 8.22. I do not agree with the appellant that setting the extension back off the boundary by up to 0.75 metres will address the impact that a building extended to this depth has on the

neighbouring properties. The proposed extension would still be dominant and overbearing for the same reasons outlined in the preceding paragraphs.

The impact of extending the building to the rear on visual amenity

- 8.23. Notwithstanding what I have concluded in respect of the impact the proposal has on the amenity of the adjacent residential properties the site I further note the site is also elevated above and prominent when viewed from the adjacent open space and playpark at Windy Arbour on Patrick Doyle Road. This is in part as a consequence of little or no tree planting on the boundary with the park at the appeal site and the neighbouring property at 19 St. Luke's Crescent and means the two properties are in stark contrast to one another in terms of the ratio of building to garden size.
- 8.24. The property at 19 St. Luke's Crescent has a modest extension and a large garden and I observed from the site visit this is typical of the majority of dwellings in the terrace and adjacent terrace when viewed from the open space and playpark.
- 8.25. The same cannot be said of the rear extension to 18 St. Luke's Crescent which is significant in both scale and mass, not subordinate to the main dwelling or typical of the terrace. Whilst modern contemporary design is not precluded adding a further extension of the width and depth proposed will not match or complement the main house or the other buildings in the neighbouring terrace.
- 8.26. I agree with the Planning Authority that the sloping topography of the site and openness of the rear boundary would further exaggerate its visual prominence of the extended building when viewed from the public realm to the rear of the site. It is not justified when viewed in the context of the more sympathetic design approach taken elsewhere along the rear of the terrace and adjacent terrace.
- 8.27. I also agree that the development for all the reasons set out in the preceding paragraphs would set an undesirable precedent for similar large-scale extensions which is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and would not be in accordance with Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) of the Development Plan.

Other considerations

- 8.28. The appellant in their grounds of appeal identify precedence for similar extensions at 11 St. Luke's Crescent and other unspecified addresses in the same development. Having

examined the aerial photography supplied with the grounds of appeal I can only find one example of a large extension at 13 St. Luke's Crescent.

- 8.29. This one example should not be considered as a wide-ranging general precedent for large extensions. It is not clear that the extension has a planning permission or whether it was granted planning permission in the same development plan context. The site also has a different spatial relationship with the open space and park to the rear of St. Luke's Crescent. It cannot be regarded in my opinion as justification for an extension of the size proposed at 18 St. Luke's Crescent.
- 8.30. An Bord Pleanála decision to grant planning permission at a neighbouring development at Chandos Lane (ABP300519-17) for six dwellings is also cited as sharing the same visual context with the open space behind the appeal site.
- 8.31. That decision was made in a different policy context and is not justification for a large domestic extension for a single dwelling. The two proposals are distinguishable and the grant of permission for six dwellings on a neighbouring site. It does not match the proposed development nor could it be argued that the three-storey terraced housing at Chandos Lane complements the proposed extension in form, scale or mass and could be used as precedence for this proposal.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located approximately three kilometres west of the South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC:000210) and the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA:004024).

The proposal comprises the construction of a new single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling and all associated internal alterations, drainage and siteworks.

No 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 appreciable effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The site in an established residential area and the scale of the proposed development which is a domestic extension to a dwelling is small.
- The distance to the identified European sites and the lack of connection.
- Taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority.

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The rear boundary of the subject site is approximately 75 metres east of the River Dodder.

The proposed development comprises the construction of a new single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling and all associated internal alterations, drainage and siteworks.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and 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 wither qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The location of the site in an established residential area, the scale of the proposed development which is an extension to a domestic dwelling is small. Sustainable Urban Drainage can be used as mitigation and reduce the impact of surface/storm

water entering the drainage network if properly designed can be an acceptable form of mitigation.

I conclude on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that planning should be refused for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. The Commission is satisfied, based on the information provided that the proposed development by reason of its excessive depth, width overall size and proximity to the boundary, would constitute overdevelopment of the site. It would be dominant and overbearing on the adjoining properties, impacting adversely on residential amenity. The prominence and openness of the site means that when viewed from the neighbouring properties and open space/playpark to the rear the extension does match or complement the main dwelling or the other buildings in the neighbouring terrace. The development would set an undesirable precedent for similar large-scale extensions contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and would not be in accordance with Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028.

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.

Conor Hughes
Planning Inspector

13th March 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500514-DR-25
Proposed Development Summary	The development comprises the construction of a new single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling and all associated internal alterations, drainage and siteworks.
Development Address	18 Saint Luke's Crescent, Milltown, Dublin 14 D14CX80
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.
<p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources) 	
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><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>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 type="checkbox"/></p>	

Inspector: _____

Date: 13th March 2026