



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500761-DN-26

Development

Single and two storey side and rear extension, single storey front porch, new and enlarged window on first floor gable, detached single storey games room/garden shed, alterations to boundary wall including height increase, removal of vehicular access and parking and new pedestrian access.

Location

37 Vernon Avenue, Clontarf, Dublin 3

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB5175/25

Applicant(s)

Conor McCarthy and Sophie Connolly.

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Mr Trevor Lonegran.

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

31st March 2026.

Inspector

Una Smyth

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	16
10.0	Water Framework Directive	16
11.0	Recommendation	17
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	18
13.0	Conditions	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	21
	Appendix 2: Standard AA Screening Determination Template 2 Error! Bookmark not defined.	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located at 37 Vernon Avenue, Dublin 3 containing a two-storey semi-detached dwelling finished in grey block at ground floor and grey pebble dash to first floor. The roof is dark slate. The site, with a given area of 0.032Ha is located at the junction of Vernon Avenue and Vernon Gardens, with a small front garden and pedestrian access to Vernon Avenue and rear garden, vehicular access and parking area, bounded by block wall on Vernon Gardens.
- 1.2. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature, with a row of similar semi-detached dwellings nos. 29 to 43 Vernon Avenue and the northern section of Vernon Gardens. Opposite the site is a row of two storey red brick dwellings. The wider area has a mix of residential dwellings and commercial units peppered along Vernon Avenue, which leads in a southerly direction towards Dublin Bay.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal involves the erection of a part single storey flat roof (3.6 m high and 5.9m long) and part two storey pitched roof (6.8m high and 3.65m long) eastern/rear extension which protrudes 1m beyond the southern gable. A new window for a home office is proposed in the first-floor gable as well as increase in size of existing stairway/landing window. A single storey front porch 2.25m wide and 1.4 long, and a single storey detached games room/garden shed in the rear garden measuring 5m long, 6.5m wide and 3.2m high are also proposed. The application includes alterations to boundary wall along Vernon Gardens which involves some demolition to facilitate the extension, a new pedestrian access and an increase in height of the existing boundary from 1.6m to 2.4m. It is also proposed to remove the existing vehicular access and parking. No alternative parking provision is proposed.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 20th of January 2026, Dublin City Council issued a decision recommending the granting of permission for the development sought subject to conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

- The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans, particulars and specifications lodged with the application, as amended by the Further Information received on 16/12/2025.
- A development contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities in the sum of €2, 644.20 shall be paid to the Planning Authority.
- The materials, finishes and design details of the development shall be as outlined.
- The developer shall comply with the requirements set out in the Codes of Practice /Standards from the Drainage Division, Transportation Planning Division and Noise & Air Pollution Section.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Two planning reports were issued by the Council. The first report, dated 6th November 2025, substantially formed the basis for consideration, but requested additional information in the way of 1) detailed proposals for surface water drainage management for the entire development and 2) revised, consistent drawings clearly showing the position and height of the proposed rear garden room/shed in relation to the site boundaries. In consideration of the proposed development, the Planning Officers report included the following comments:

- The principle of an extension to the existing residential property is considered acceptable in terms of residential and visual amenity.
- The single and two storey extension with the pitched roof will not result in dominance of adjacent property, orientation is favourable to prevent loss of sunlight and daylight and overshadowing will be minimal. Such overshadowing and overbearing is to be expected due to the compact urban grain and pattern of development in the area. A similar extension has been approved for No 43 Vernon Avenue.
- The windows on the side gable are acceptable. The increase in the size of the stairway/landing window will not result in overlooking of No 35, Vernon Avenue, but will increase passive surveillance onto Vernon Gardens.

- The porch will not represent a significant break of the building line, as it extends only 0.7m forward of the front façade. The scale is modest and materials match existing dwelling.
- Inconsistencies in the drawings indicating the positioning of the games room/shed building and drainage from the building need clarification.
- The increase in the height of the boundary wall is considered minor and the site is not located within an Architectural Conservation Area or Z2 zoned area.
- Removal of the vehicular access and new pedestrian access resulting in removal of the parking space, despite high demand for parking is acceptable as located in 'Accessible Location' due to proximity to a planned high frequency bus service on Clontarf Road.

The second planning report dated 14th January 2026 considered the further information submitted. The clarified position of the garden room/garden shed was deemed acceptable, and drainage proposals were then subject to a condition. Approval of the scheme was recommended.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division: Report dated 30/10/2025 – Recommends seeking Additional Information. - Due to the lack of adequate information, it is not possible to state that satisfactory proposals for management of surface water can be provided for this development.
- Transportation Division: Report dated 24/10/2025 - No objection to proposed development subject to standard conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Éireann: No comment received

3.4. Third Party Observations

Four observations have been received from: -

Nicky Cox of 35 Vernon Avenue raised issues regarding the negative impact of the porch, overlooking from the new and increased gable windows and proximity of proposed gable wall to footpath out of character of area.

Trevor Lonegran and Mairead Martin of 39 Vernon Avenue raised issues regarding overshadowing and loss of light, 2 storey rear return out of character and the negative impact from porch extending beyond building line.

Donna Treleaven and Paul McCann of 2 Vernon Gardens raised issues regarding the accuracy of the drawings for the games room/shed, the increase in height of the boundary wall at their property and the further height of the games room building resulting in an asymmetrical entrance to their property, and lack of drainage management plans.

Hilary Caulfield Wright & David Wright of 17 Vernon Gardens raised concerns with the side wall directly abutting the footpath being out of character.

4.0 Planning History

None for site

No 39 Vernon Avenue, (Adjacent. attached) Ref 2648/21. The development consists of: 'Demolition of the existing single storey extension to the rear of the house and construction of a new two storey and single storey extensions to the rear; New windows to the side at ground and first floor levels; All associated siteworks, ancillary drainage and landscaping' Permission granted 4th August 2021.

No 41 Vernon Avenue Ref 4616/23. 'Construction of a part-one, part-two-storey extension to the rear of an existing semi-detached house. The proposed works will include a new kitchen extension at the ground floor level and a new bedroom at the first-floor level, and all associated landscaping, drainage, and site works' Permission granted 15 January 24.

No 43 Vernon Gardens – Reference 5317/08 Historic application for a 2 storey full width rear extension.

5.0 Policy Context

Development Plan. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is the statutory plan for the area. The subject site is located on lands zoned Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods – Z1.

Section 14.7.1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods – Areas Zone Z1 have a land use zoning objective ‘To protect, provide and improve residential amenities.’

Chapter 15 Green Infrastructure and Landscaping

15.6 Development Standards

15.6.13 Boundary Treatments- Walls impact on the visual character and the quality of a development. These should be selected so as to be an integrated part of overall design. In all instances, boundary treatments shall be of high quality, durable and attractive.

15.9.16.1 Daylight and Sunlight. A daylight and sunlight assessment should be provided to assess the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding properties and amenity areas. A best practice guide for the assessment and methodology of Daylight and Sunlight Assessments is set out in Appendix 16.

Appendix 16 Sunlight and Daylight

Appendix 18: Ancillary Residential Accommodation –

Section 1.0 Residential Extensions

Section 1.1 General Design Principles - Applications for extensions to existing residential units should not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling and not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight and achieve a high quality of design.

Section 1.2 Extensions to rear 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 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. Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking, along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries, orientation and usability, degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries and external finishes and design, should be considered.

1.3 Extension to side 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. External finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.

Side gable, protruding parapet walls at eaves/ gutter level of hip-roofs are not encouraged. 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 1.4 Privacy and Amenity- Extensions should not result in any significant loss of privacy to the residents of adjoining properties. Generally, windows overlooking adjoining properties should be avoided.

Section 1.5 Separation Distances In cases where the backs of dwellings face each other or where the side of one dwelling faces the rear of a neighbouring property, a certain degree of separation is required to avoid any overbearing effect of one dwelling upon the other.

Section 1.6 Daylight and Sunlight Large single or two-storey rear extensions to semi-detached or terraced dwellings can, if they project too far from the main rear elevation, result in a loss of daylight to neighbouring houses. Furthermore, depending on orientation, such extensions can have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight received by adjoining properties. On the other hand, it is also recognised that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable. Consideration should be given to the proportion of extensions, height and design of roofs as well as taking account of the position of windows including rooms they serve to adjacent or adjoining dwellings.

Section 1.7 Appearance and Materials The materials used should complement those used on the existing building

Section 2.0 Detached Habitable Rooms The purpose of these rooms is to provide for additional space within the rear garden of an existing dwelling for study/ home office use or additional living/ children's playroom. These rooms shall only be used as ancillary residential accommodation.

Section 3.0 Porches. Porches will be considered where the design complements the existing building and provides for simple proportions and materials. The design should complement the main house.

Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

Sustainable and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities' (2024). – Table 3.8

5.1. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is located approximately 300m north of South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and approximately 2.6km north of the South Dublin Bay SAC.

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 no requirement for a screening determination. (Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.)

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

One Third Party appeal was received from Mr Trevor Lonegran of 39 Vernon Avenue, the attached dwelling to the immediate north. The appeal against the planning authority's notification of decision to grant permission can be summarised as follows: -

- The two-storey extension directly to the south will significantly overshadow the kitchen return and significantly reduce light into the ground floor dining room and kitchen.

- The design is excessively overbearing.
- The example provided by the PA – No 43 Vernon Avenue is not directly comparable as it sits to the north of the adjacent dwelling so has less light degradation.

7.2. Applicant Response

7.2.1. The first party response on behalf of Mr Conor McCarthy and Ms Sophie Connolly can be summarised as follows:

- The first-floor extension is modest, extending out only 3.65m from the rear wall.
- Flush eave design is used to eliminate need for a parapet which would be bulky in nature and height.
- The majority of the overshadowing would be as a result of the ground floor extension, which, at could be developed without planning permission as it is within exempted structures limits.
- Due to the compact grain and the pattern of development in the area, overshadowing and overbearing is expected and considered acceptable.
- Similar extension at No 43 Vernon Avenue.
- Given orientation and east facing rear garden, the proposal is not expected to cause significant reduction in sunlight and daylight.
- Generous gardens mitigate any minor loss of light.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

7.3.1. The Planning Authority's response to the grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows: -

- The PA request the Commission uphold its decision. If permission and retention is granted, a condition requiring a Section 48 development contribution should be attached, along with additional conditions on the planner's report.

7.4. Observations

None

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1.1. I have examined the application and conditions attached, appeal documents on file, undertaken an inspection of the site and have had regard to the relevant local development plans policies and guidance. I consider the issues of this appeal are not limited to those raised in the grounds of appeal. The substantive issues in this appeal relate to the following matters:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- New issues- Impact on Visual Amenity from side extension constructed on boundary and increase in height of boundary wall.

I will deal with each matter in turn.

8.2. **Principle of development**

8.2.1. The site is located within an area designated with zoning objective Z1, in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. Zoning objective Z1 seeks 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.' The principle of an extension and alterations to a residential dwelling in this zoning is considered acceptable subject to compliance with other policies.

8.2.2. The application involves various elements as follows: two storey and single storey side and rear extension, front porch, garden room/shed, alteration to existing window and new window on side gable, alterations to height and openings of boundary wall, and removal of vehicular access and parking area and new pedestrian access.

8.2.3. I am satisfied that additional information has addressed concerns regarding the position of the games room/shed, and drainage matters can be dealt with by an appropriate condition. Given separation distance, there is no issue on amended/new windows on the side gable, and I agree that these windows will promote passive surveillance.

8.2.4. The porch projecting beyond the front building line was raised as a concern in submissions to the application. It is of a minor scale and complements the existing building through simple proportions and materials. I note projecting porches on dwellings at 2 and 4 Vernon Gardens which do not detract from the overall character

of the dwelling house or street. The removal of the existing parking space and vehicular access and new pedestrian is acceptable to Transportation Planning Division. I consider these elements are all compliant with the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.

8.3. Impact on residential amenity – overshadowing and loss of light.

- 8.3.1. The third party does not object to the principle of development but the form it has taken. The applicant proposes to extend the existing dwelling house by way of a single and two storey side and rear extension. There have been no previous extensions to the dwelling. The 5.9m long ground floor extension proposed kitchen and dining area and the first 3.65m long first floor extension proposes 2 additional rooms. The layout of the ground and first floor are altered to complement layout in the new extension. Orientation of the properties are rear facing east. The host dwelling sits immediately south of its adjoined neighbour No 39.
- 8.3.2. Height of the proposed two-storey extension is to eaves of the host dwelling with pitched roof. The development is proposed immediately adjacent to the northern/party wall with No 39.
- 8.3.3. No 39 has permission for a single and two storey extension, approved in August 2021 but not yet constructed. Neither the PA nor the third party have referred to this permission. The approved first floor extension is 4m long, single room width, set back approximately 2m from the common boundary with No 37. It is similar in scale and design to the (handed) extension at No 41 Vernon Avenue, approved in January 2024.
- 8.3.4. At ground floor, immediately adjacent to the gable wall of No 37 is a proposed courtyard area, measuring 1.75m wide by 3.75m long, enclosed on four sides. West by existing rear gable, north by the proposed two storey extension, east by the proposed single storey extension and south by the existing party wall between Nos 37 and 39. The construction of the proposed full width two storey extension will result in an overbearing effect and loss of daylight to this approved courtyard area. No daylight or sunlight assessment has been submitted along with the application as required by Chapter 15 of the plan.
- 8.3.5. Section 1.6 of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan notes that ‘two-storey rear extensions to semi-detached or terraced dwellings can, if they project too far from the

main rear elevation, result in a loss of daylight to neighbouring houses. Furthermore, depending on orientation, such extensions can have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight received by adjoining properties. On the other hand, it is also recognised that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable.

- 8.3.6. Section 2.0 of the BRE 209 Guidelines, Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, a Guide to Good Practice (BR 209, 2022) (3rd Edition), relates to 'Light from Sky' and includes the 45-degree principle for domestic extensions. As noted in the Guidelines, living rooms and kitchens need more light than bedrooms. Bedrooms should be analysed but are less important.
- 8.3.7. Having regard to this 45-degree principle and the proposed relationship between the 2 properties, I am not satisfied that the proposed development meets the policy tests. While I consider the extension at No 37 would not have a demonstrable impact on light into the enlarged kitchen/dining/living area, proposed for No 39 due to a favourable orientation and rooflight windows on both north and south roof profiles, I consider the proximity to the two storey extension on the common boundary immediate adjacent to the proposed courtyard would result in a significant loss of daylight, and would be overbearing on this design feature.
- 8.3.8. I also have concerns that the proposed development, as presented, will serve to significantly reduce the extent of daylight entering the adjacent upper first floor rear bedroom window of no. 37, impacted by its own approved first floor extension to the north, then by the proposed first floor extension subject to this appeal to the south, resulting in a tunnelling effect. Although the BRE 209 Guidelines acknowledge that bedrooms are less important than living rooms/ kitchens and need less light, it is my view that the proposed extension at first floor level, is overly dominant and excessive in terms of its impact on no.39 and will result in an associated undue and excessive loss of daylight and tunnelling effect to the said bedroom window.
- 8.3.9. The extension approved at No 39 in August 2021 has not yet been constructed. Currently on site is a single storey rear return just under 7m in length set approximately 3.2m from the boundary with No 37 incorporating an L shaped kitchen and dining room. The kitchen is mostly contained in the rear return, while the dining room is positioned to the rear of the original dwelling house, benefiting from light from

two windows on the southern elevation. Solar panels have been placed on the southern facing roof plane of the rear return. The proposed two storey extension will result in a loss of light to the windows servicing the dining room, significantly reduce the direct light into the windows and more critically, the solar panels in the afternoon and evening, which I consider will unacceptably reduce the residential amenity of the occupants of no.39.

8.3.10. I consider the 3.65m first floor extension will result in the loss of daylight and sunlight to the occupants of No 39, and will be overbearing when observed from the proposed courtyard. The First Party has made reference to a full width two storey extension at No 43 Vernon Avenue. This was a 2008 permission, assessed under a different policy. The context for first floor extensions is set more by the single room width first floor rear extensions at Nos 39 and 41. The 2 storey extension on the common boundary is contrary to Appendix 18 of the Development Plan.

8.4. New Issue – Side extension and construction on boundary.

8.4.1. The two-storey rear element of the extension projects beyond the original side gable wall and is proposed to be constructed directly abutting the footpath replacing the original boundary. This projection sits forward of the existing and defined building line of the corner house, which I note is mirrored by the property opposite -35 Vernon Avenue, a house type identical to No 37. No 35 has a single storey rear extension, built flush with the gable wall. Appendix 18, Section 1.3 Extension to side refers specifically to such development stating, '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'.

8.4.2. I consider the two-storey side protrusion beyond an established building lines at this corner site would be visually obtrusive, out of character with the established pattern of development in the area and would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area, contrary to Dublin City Council Development Plan policy.

8.5. New issue - Increase in height of Boundary wall.

8.6. Section 5.6.13 Boundary Treatments-of Chapter 15 Green Infrastructure and Landscaping set the policy context for boundary walls, stating that they impact on the

visual character and the quality of a development and should be 'attractive'. The Planning Officer considered the increase in height from 1.6m to 2.4m minor. The existing 1.6m boundary wall adjacent to Vernon Avenue, is identical to the boundary wall opposite at No 35 Vernon Gardens. The boundary walls at these two corner dwellings provides some symmetry and an attractive character to the street entrance which I consider is an important feature to retain.

8.6.1. The proposed increase to 2.4m in a leafy residential street is excessively high and will detract from the established pattern of development of the street and would appear over dominant and out of character in the streetscape. I do not consider the height increase as minor given the impact it will have on the character and symmetry of the area and will not appear as 'attractive'. I understand the need for privacy and security, particularly at a corner site, but the solution is not the construction of a high boundary feature which detracts from the character of the area and is contrary to the objectives of the Development Plan.

8.7. These are new issues, and the Commission may wish to seek the vies of the parties. However, having regard to the other substantive reasons for refusal set out below, it may not be necessary to pursue the matter.

9.0 **AA Screening**

I have considered the proposal for extensions and alterations to dwelling, erection of outbuilding and alterations to boundary walls in accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and the South Dublin Bay SAC or any other European site in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The proposed works are modest in scale and are domestic in purpose

- The subject site is not located within, adjoining or directly adjoining any designated site with the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA approximately 300m South and the South Dublin Bay SAC approximately 2.6KM South
- No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning application or appeal.

10.0 **Water Framework Directive**

- 10.1. The subject site is located approximately 300m north of Dublin Bay and the Tolka River Estuary.
- 10.2 The proposed development is the erection of a rear extension, front porch, alteration to gable for insertion of new window and enlargement of an existing, the erection of a garden room/shed and alterations to the boundary wall along with all associated site works.
- 10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning application or appeal.
- 10.4 I have assessed the proposal 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 bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 10.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows
- the modest nature, limited scale and domestic use of the development sought
 - the distance from the nearest water body
 - the nil concern from the LPA
- 10.2. I conclude that 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 a split decision to GRANT permission for the following elements of the proposal: 1. Single storey front porch 2. Detached single storey games room/garden shed 3 New window and enlarged window on first floor gable 4 Removal of parking space and new pedestrian access. for the reasons and considerations marked (1) hereunder and the conditions set out below.
- 11.2. REFUSE permission for the following elements of the development in accordance with the reasons and conditions marked (2) 5. Construction of a single and two-storey side and rear extension 6 Increase in height of boundary wall. I note that alterations to the boundary wall and side extension on boundary are new issues in terms of the appeal. The Board may wish to issue a s.137 notice in relation to these matters.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations (1)

- 12.1. Having regard to the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and in particular to the Z1 zoning pertaining to the site and the provisions of Appendix 18 it is considered that the porch, garden room/shed, alterations to the boundary to facilitate a new pedestrian access and removal of the existing vehicular access, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, would not significantly detract from the residential or visual amenities of the area and would be acceptable on planning grounds. The proposed development would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 12.2. **Conditions**

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the relative plans and particulars lodged with the application, in relation to the porch, garden room/shed and new pedestrian access. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2.	The existing dwelling and the proposed garden room/shed shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the outbuilding shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

	Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity
3.	<p>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.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.</p>
4.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 and 1900 from Mondays to Fridays, inclusive, between 0800 and 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
5.	<p>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, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to 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 An Coimision Pleanala to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme</p>

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.
--

13.0 Reasons and Considerations (2)

13.1. Having regard to the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and in particular to the Z1 zoning pertaining to the site and the provisions of Chapter 15 and Appendix 18 it is considered that the proposed 2 storey side and rear extension would appear overbearing and would result in an undue negative impact on the established residential amenity of the adjacent dwelling by way of overshadowing and loss of light. The increase in the height of the boundary wall and the position of the two-storey extension, protruding beyond the established gable building line and directly abutting the public footpath, would have a significant negative impact on the character of the surrounding area and therefore would be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

Una Smyth

April 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500761-DN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Single and two storey side and rear extension. 2. Single storey front porch. 3. New window and enlarge existing window on first floor southern elevation 4. Detached single storey games room/garden shed in rear garden alterations to boundary wall including increase in height 6. Removal of vehicular access and parking and new pedestrian access along Vernon Gardens
Development Address	37 Vernon Avenue, Clontarf, Dublin 3
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	

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?	
<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. No Screening required.	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
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input type="checkbox"/> 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)	
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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: Una Smyth

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Standard AA Screening Determination Template 2

Test for likely significant effects

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects				
Case Reference Number: PL-500761-DN-26				
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics				
Brief description of project	The proposal seeks the erection of a single and two storey rear extension, a single storey front porch, a new window and enlarge existing window on first floor southern elevation, a detached single storey games room/garden shed in rear garden and alterations to boundary wall including increase in height. The proposal involves the removal of vehicular access and parking and provision of a new pedestrian access along Vernon Gardens			
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	The proposed development site is an existing two storey semi-detached dwelling, located at a road junction in a medium density urban area. The subject site is approximately 0.28km North from the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and circa 0.9km from the North Dublin Bay SAC..			
Screening report	No –Dublin City Council screened out the need for an AA			
Natura Impact Statement	No			
Relevant submissions	None			
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections²	Consider further in screening³ Y/N
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA 004024	Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) [A046]	300m	No direct connection	N

	<p>Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130] Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) [A137] Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141] Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143] Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144] Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149] Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157] Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162] Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179] Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) [A192] Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193] Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p>			
South Dublin Bay SAC 000210	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]	Approx. 2.6KM	No direct connection	N

	Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]			
--	---	--	--	--

1 Summary description / cross reference to NPWS website is acceptable at this stage in the report

2 Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species

³ if no connections:

Further commentary/discussion

Despite proximity to European sites, due to the modest nature and scale of the project and the screening report of the LPA, I consider, 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.

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA 004024 Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) [A046] Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130] Ringed Plover (Charadrius hiaticula) [A137]	Indirect: Negative impacts (temporary) on surface water/water quality due to construction related emissions including increased sedimentation and construction related pollution.	The minor nature of the proposed development, the contained nature of the serviced development site and lack of direct ecological connections or pathways make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SPA or SCA. There would be no significant disturbance to any species. Conservation objectives would not be undermined.

<p>Grey Plover (Pluvialis squatarola) [A141]</p> <p>Knot (Calidris canutus) [A143]</p> <p>Sanderling (Calidris alba) [A144]</p> <p>Dunlin (Calidris alpina) [A149]</p> <p>Bar-tailed Godwit (Limosa lapponica) [A157]</p> <p>Redshank (Tringa totanus) [A162]</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179]</p> <p>Roseate Tern (Sterna dougallii) [A192]</p> <p>Common Tern (Sterna hirundo) [A193]</p> <p>Arctic Tern (Sterna paradisaea) [A194]</p> <p>Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p> <p>South Dublin Bay SAC 000210</p> <p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]</p> <p>Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]</p> <p>Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310]</p>		
--	--	--

Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]		
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
Step 4: Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site		
<p>I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on the Dalkey Islands SPA or the Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European sites. No further assessment is required for the project.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.</p>		
<p>Screening Determination</p> <p>Finding of no likely significant effects</p> <p>In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and the South Dublin Bay SAC or any other European site in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.</p> <p>This determination is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed works are modest in scale and are domestic in purpose • The subject site is not located within, adjoining or directly adjoining any designated site with the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA approximately 300m South and the South Dublin Bay SAC approximately 2.6KM South • No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning application or appeal. 		