



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500824-DN-26

Development

Demolition of garden shed for the construction of a mews dwelling and all associated site works.

Location

19, Hollybrook Road, Clontarf, Dublin 3, D03YE09.

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council North.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB 2772/25.

Applicant(s)

Paula McCarthy.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission with Conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

David & Hilary Van Dessel.

Observer(s)

.

Date of Site Inspection

19th May 2026.

26th May 2026.

Inspector

Des Johnson

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located at 19, Hollybrook Road, Clontarf, and is c. 3km northeast of Dublin City Centre.
- 1.2. The surrounding area is predominantly residential. No.19 is a two-storey semi-detached, redbrick dwelling. The garden shed is at the end of the rear garden attached to No.19, is single-storey and has a pitched roof. It has a ridge height of 4.7m and has a garage door facing on to the adjoining laneway which runs along the rear of the houses on the western side of Hollybrook Road.
- 1.3. The laneway is c.3835mm wide adjoining the mews site. It varies in width and condition along its length. It is c.300m in total length. At its northern end, for approximately 90m in length, the laneway is 7m wide with footpath. There is a short potholed section between this section and the remaining laneway.
- 1.4. There is a three-storey apartment development to the western side of the laneway.
- 1.5. No.19 is served by a pedestrian access only from Hollybrook Road. There is on-street metered car parking available.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal is for the demolition of the existing garden shed and construction of a new detached two-storey, one bedroom and office mews dwelling with a pitched roof, to the rear garden of the existing dwelling at 19 Hollybrook Road. The development is to include pedestrian & vehicular entrance with off-street car port accessible from the adjacent laneway 'Hollybrook Mews' (between Hollybrook Park & Hollybrook Court Drive); first-floor terrace to the front of the dwelling (facing Hollybrook Mews), 3no. skylights, 1no. to the front west facing roof plane and 2no. to the rear flat roof above the ground floor; solar panels to the west and east facing roof planes; along with all associated site and landscaping works.
- 2.2. The garden shed measures 6750mm by 6740mm.
- 2.3. The gross floor area existing is stated to be 45.5sqm and the gross floor area proposed is stated to be 82.30sqm. The site area is 0.014ha. It is proposed to connect to public services.

2.4. On 23rd September 2025, the planning authority requested Further Information relating to the following:

1. Drainage information which demonstrates that the proposed development can adequately manage surface water. Revised plans to be submitted to ensure that all issues related to surface water management are addressed.

2. The applicant is requested to review the impact of the development on the neighbouring property to the north, i.e. No.20 Hollybrook Road, and assess whether further measures can be taken to reduce the impact on their rear garden and to clarify if the first floor window for the utility, which is not a high level window, is to be fitted with obscured glazing. Details of the nature of the proposed boundary treatment between the application site and the retained rear garden area to No.19 Hollybrook Road and measures that would be incorporated to maintain privacy and amenity.

2.5. Further Information was submitted and received on 19th December 2025 and included the following amendments:

- Fully hipped pyramidal roof reducing visual impact and scale of the mews
- Reduced ground floor level floor to ceiling height from 2800mm to 2650mm
- Lower roof parapet facing No.20 by 300mm
- 1.8m high wall proposed between the proposed mews and main dwelling

The Further Information included a Consulting Engineers report addressing the foul network, surface network, water supply network, and a flood risk assessment (FRA). The FRA finds that the site is in Zone C, that there is minimum flood risk from coastal and fluvial sources, but that there is medium probability risk identified from pluvial sources. Mitigation measures are proposed.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority granted permission subject to 9 conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

The conditions of the permission granted by the planning authority relate to the following:

1. Clarification of permission granted
2. Financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities
3. Finishes to be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority
4. Transportation requirements
5. Drainage requirements
6. Times for site and building works
7. Noise control
8. Adjoining street to be kept clear of debris etc.
9. Naming and numbering.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The initial planning report states that the site is Zoned Z2 (Residential Neighbourhoods - Conservation Areas) with the objective *to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas*. The principle of the development is acceptable subject to compatibility with other provisions of the Development Plan and national guidelines. Compact growth, sustainable densities, residential consolidation and intensification are all promoted by the relevant national guidelines and the Development Plan. The acceptability in principle of this form of development in Hollybrook Road is reinforced by the planning history. The proposed dwelling would extend to 82sqm of floorspace over two floors with a ridge height of 7.4m. These dimensions fall comfortably within the range of values around which other mews dwellings to the rear Hollybrook Road have been constructed. The provision of 33sqm of private rear amenity space would exceed the national standard. The proposal is not a discordant feature within this streetscape and is acceptable in planning terms. The first-floor footprint (33sqm) is significantly smaller than that of the ground floor (48sqm) and this is considered to satisfactorily address the sense of overbearance that might be experienced in the rear garden area of the property to the north of the application site as a result of the proximity to the shared side boundary of the two storey side elevation of the mews dwelling. The scale of the proposal would give rise to some concern in

relation to sunlight and daylight impacts, particularly on the property to the north of the application site and their rear garden. Three submissions were received referring to the following: contravention of planning policy, overbearing impact, adverse impact on residential amenity, loss of light and overshadowing, visual impact, overlooking and loss of privacy, inadequate provision of private open space, laneway access not sufficient to accommodate the proposed development, and poor coherency and proper planning of mews development. Further Information (as detailed in Section 2.3 of this report) is recommended.

- Planning report 2, following the submission of Further Information, states that details of surface water and foul drainage arrangements have been addressed along with water supply arrangements and a site flood risk assessment. The Drainage Division have no objection subject to conditions. The amended proposals are considered to be acceptable in planning terms. Proposed amendments to the scheme include a fully hipped pyramidal roof to the mews dwelling, a reduction of the floor to ceiling height at ground floor level by 150mm and a lowering of the parapet alongside the neighbouring property by 300mm. The sunlight assessment submitted with Further Information concludes that after the development is completed 69.2% of the neighbouring rear garden would receive more than 2 hours of sunlight, measured on 21st March. This would exceed BRE recommendations. A 1.8m wall is proposed, separating the host property from the proposed mews dwelling. It is considered that the proposal adequately addresses the maintenance of privacy and amenity for neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division report (following submission of F.I.) raises no objection subject to conditions.
- The Transportation Planning Division raise no objection subject to condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No submissions on file

3.4. Third Party Observations

Three submissions were made during consideration of the application by the planning authority.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. **Ref: ABP 318625** – Permission refused at 19, Hollybrook Road for demolition of garden shed and construction of 2-storey, 1-bedroom detached mews dwelling with pitched roof and balcony to front, and all associated site and landscaping works. There was a single reason for refusal stating, in summary, that the mews dwelling would constitute an unacceptable form of development at this location by reason of overbearance in relation to adjoining property and by reason of a poor disposition, form and quality of amenity space for the mews dwelling. The proposed dwelling would provide an unsatisfactory standard of residential amenity for future occupants and would seriously injure the amenities of the adjoining property.
- 4.2. **Ref: PL-500155-DN** – Permission granted at 21, Hollybrook Road for development comprising subdivision of existing site, and demolition of existing single storey garage in rear garden. The erection of a detached two-storey one-bedroom pitched roof dwelling (165 square metres) in rear garden, together with four number rooflights, an integral carport with vehicular and pedestrian access off the rear lane (Hollybrook Mews), and all associated site works.

PA Reg. Ref: WEB1268/23: - Permission granted on 12, Hollybrook Road for demolition of garage and the erection of a two storey one bedroom mews dwelling in the rear garden of 12 Hollybrook Road, Clontarf, Dublin 3.

PA Reg. Ref: WEB1128/23: - Permission granted at 13, Hollybrook Road for demolition of existing garden shed and construction of a new detached two storeys one bedroom mews dwelling in the rear garden This permission has been implemented on site.

PA Reg. Ref: WEB1801/21: Permission granted at 17, Hollybrook Road for the demolition of garden shed and erection of a detached two storey one bedroom mews dwelling in the rear garden

ABP 307789-20 (PA Reg. Ref: 4770/19) - Permission granted at 25 Hollybrook Road for permission to construct a three-storey mews house with front and rear roof terraces and a vehicular access off the rear lane to rear of existing property.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is the statutory plan for the area.

The site is zoned 'Z2' with the objective *to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.*

The site is within an Architectural Conservation Area.

Section 14.7.2 refers to Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) Zone 2.

The overall quality of the area and layout is such that requires special care assessing development proposals which affect structures, both protected and non-protected. The general objective for such areas is to protect them from unsuitable new developments or works that would have a negative impact on the amenity or architectural quality of the area.

Chapter 11 refers to Built Heritage and Archaeology and Chapter 15 refers to Development Standards. These chapters detail the policies and objectives for residential conservation areas and standards, respectively. The principal land-use encouraged in residential conservation areas is housing but can include a limited range of other uses.

Policy SC 11 refers to promoting compact growth and sustainable densities through the consolidation and intensification of infill and brownfield sites.

Policy QHSN6 – promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification through applications for infill development, backland development, mews development, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.

Policy BHA7 – refers to ACAs. Development within ACAs must contribute positively to the areas character and distinctiveness and protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area. New development should be complementary and/or sympathetic to the areas context and sensitively designed in terms of scale, height, mass, density, building lines and materials. Contemporary design is encouraged.

Policy BHA 14 – promote the redevelopment and regeneration of mews lanes.

Section 15.3.5.1 states that the distance between the opposing windows of mews dwellings and the main houses shall ensure a high level of privacy and potential overlooking is minimised. Private open space is to be provided to the rear of the mews building, and adequate amenity space should be provided for both the original and proposed dwellings.

Section 15.3.5.2 states that new buildings should complement the character of the mews lane and the main building with regard to scale, massing, height, building depth, roof treatment and materials.

Section 15.9.7 refers to Private Amenity Space. Private amenity space shall be provided in the form of terrace, balcony or private garden and should be located off the main living area in the apartment. The minimum areas for private amenity are set out in Appendix 1 and Section 3.35 to 3.39 of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2020). The 2022 Version of this document requires 5 sqm provision for 1 bed apartment and 6 sqm for 2 bed (3 person) apartment.

Section 15.13.5.4 states that mews laneways must provide adequate accessibility in terms of private vehicular movements, emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles. A minimum carriageway of 4.8m in width (5.5m where no verges or footpaths are provided) is required. In circumstances where these widths cannot be provided, safe access and egress for all vehicles and pedestrians must be demonstrated.

5.2. **Relevant National Guidelines**

The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (January 2024).

SPPR 1 – Separation Distances

Statutory Development Plans shall not include an objective in respect of minimum separation distances that exceed 16m between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses above ground floor. There shall be no specific minimum separation distance at ground floor level or to the front of houses in statutory development plans and planning applications shall be determined on a case-by-case basis to prevent undue loss of privacy.

SPPR 2 – Minimum Private Open Space Standards for Houses

Policy that proposals for new houses meet the following minimum private open space standards:

1	bed house	20sqm
2	2 bed house	30sqm
3	3 bed house	40sqm

SPPR 3 – Car Parking

Policy that in city centres and urban neighbourhoods of the 5 cities defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.1 and Table 3.2) car parking provision should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated. The maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development at these locations, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 1 no. space per dwelling.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

South Dublin Bay & River Tolka Estuary SPA & pNHA – c. 350m to the east

North Dublin Bay SAC – c. 2.5km to south-east

North Dublin Bay SPA & pNHA – c. 2.5km to the south-east.

6.0 **EIA Screening**

- 6.1. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

7.0 **The Appeal**

7.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The Third-Party grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- Further Information was sought but was not deemed ‘Significant’ and the appellants were not able to submit a further objection. The revised submission is at a scale that is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the appellants’ property and amenity and will likely reduce the property value.

- The proposed mews is less than 6 metres from the appellants' rear windows and their main family kitchen/living/dining space. It will be overbearing and have a dramatic and adverse effect on residential amenity. The proposed scale and design are inappropriate
- A mews at the rear of No.21 is currently subject to a Third-Party appeal and if both developments were to be permitted, they would overwhelm the appellants' private amenity making it unusable and seriously devaluing property value
- This development could set a precedent for similar inappropriate type development
- The proposal adversely impacts on the setting of the ACA, particularly from the appellants' property. The proposed design is not complimentary to the original properties in the ACA
- The grounds of appeal attach copy of the Objection submitted to the planning authority during consideration of the application. In summary, this contended that the proposal contravened planning policy, was overbearing, loss of light and overshadowing would result in loss of residential amenity, overlooking and loss of privacy, substandard private open space provision, and substandard access arrangements.

7.2. Applicant Response

This may be summarised as follows:

- The applicant seeks to downsize while remaining in the area
- The grounds of appeal largely repeat arguments made at the application stage and were assessed by the planning authority
- The site is in an area zoned Z2 – Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) and the Dublin City Development Plan supports sensitive mews developments, compact growth in urban areas, high quality infill development, and appropriate modern design within Architectural Conservation Areas. There are recently permitted schemes at Nos.12, 13, 17, 21 and 25.
- The proposal was redesigned to reduce the scale and mitigate visual impact. Through Further Information the boundary wall height was reduced by 300mm, the ground floor height was reduced by 150mm, and a hipped roof was introduced to reduce the perceived visual impact of the mews when viewed from the rear and side.

The approved development is shorter at both ground floor and first floor than the permitted scheme at No.21, and the claim of overbearance is unsubstantiated.

- A Daylight and Sunlight Assessment was submitted with Additional Information and this clearly demonstrated compliance with the Guidelines. There would only be a 4.2% change from existing conditions
- The proposal is consistent with other permitted schemes on the Lane. There is an established pattern of contemporary mews implemented under Dublin City Council and Commission approvals
- The point raised in relation to overshadowing is not supported by technical evidence
- Clear design measures avoid overlooking.
- The actual separation to the parent house rear windows is 19 metres. All rear first floor windows are high-level and no overlooking arises
- Total private open space exceeds the 20-30sqm required under the Development Plan. The proposal has 33.5sqm rear garden and 7.3sqm first floor terrace
- Responding to the planning authority Transportation Division, the proposed front façade is set back to deliver 5.5m width along the laneway, ensuring that the car-port access does not impede laneway movement.
- Mews development on the laneway is not ad hoc
- The appellants' concerns regarding materials and finishes are unfounded.
- The response includes a letter from the applicant supporting the application.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- The planning authority requests the Commission to uphold the decision to grant. In the event of permission being granted, a condition requiring a Section 48 Development Contribution should be attached.

7.4. Observations

- None on file relating to appeal.

7.5. Further Responses

- In response to a Commission request for submissions or observations, the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, having considered the Architectural Conservation Areas Policy in the Development Plan and the Hollybrook Road ACA Report, Character Appraisal and Policy Framework, concluded that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character and setting of the Architectural Conservation Area. The submission recommends the retention of the condition requiring material finishes be retained.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. This is a Third-Party appeal against the decision of the planning authority to grant permission subject to 9 conditions for the demolition of an existing garden shed and the construction of a two-storey mews dwelling and all associated site works. The decision to grant followed the submission of Further Information in response to a request by the planning authority, and it is a condition of the permission that the development be carried out in accordance with the plans, particulars and specifications lodged, as amended by the Further Information submitted. The Further Information included design changes, including the roof profile, which significantly reduce the visual impact and overshadowing impact on adjoining property.

8.2. I have read the file documentation and all submissions made in relation to the appeal and inspected the site (on two occasions as I could not get access to the appeal site on first visit). I consider that the key issues to be addressed are as follows:

- Policy
- Planning History
- Visual impact
- Residential amenities
- Other Issues

Policy

8.3. The site is in an established residential area zoned Z2 (Residential Neighbourhoods - Conservation Areas) with the objective *to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas*. The proposed development is permissible in principle

within this zoning, subject to compatibility with the other policies and objectives of the Development Plan and National Guidelines.

- 8.4. Compact growth, sustainable densities, residential consolidation and intensification are all promoted by the relevant national guidelines and the Development Plan. The proposed development accords with these policies.

Planning History

- 8.5. In June 2024, under Ref: ABP 318625, permission was refused by An Bord Pleanála for demolition of garden shed and the construction of a two-storey mews dwelling with pitched roof on the subject site. The reason for refusal stated, in summary, that the proposal would constitute an unacceptable form of development by reason of its overbearance in relation to adjoining property, and by reason of a poor disposition, form and quality of amenity space for the proposed dwelling would result in an unsatisfactory standard of residential amenity for the future occupants and seriously injure the amenities of the adjoining property.
- 8.6. In February 2026, permission was granted by An Coimisiún Pleanála on a site to the rear of No.21, Hollybrook Road for a detached two-storey, one-bedroom pitched roof dwelling with a floor area of 165 sqm. The development includes an integral carport with both vehicular and pedestrian access off the adjoining laneway (Hollybrook Mews).
- 8.7. Further permissions for mews developments were granted to the rear of No.25 (ABP in November 2020), No.17 (DCC in November 2021), No.13 (DCC in October 2023), and No.12 (DCC in January 2024).

Visual Impact

- 8.8. The site is within an Architectural Conservation Area. No.19 is not a Protected Structure. Section 14.7.2 of the Development Plan refers to Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas). In such areas special care is required in assessing development proposals which affect structures, and the general objective is to protect the areas from unsuitable new developments or works that would have a negative impact on the amenity or architectural quality of the area. The garden shed proposed for demolition is not listed for protection and is not within the curtilage of a Protected Structure, and I consider that its demolition is acceptable and would not impact negatively on the Architectural Conservation Area.

8.9. The subject development (as amended by way of Further Information) has a hipped pyramidal roof measuring 7472mm to ridge. The front section of the mews is two-storey and the proposed front façade is set back to deliver 5.5m width along the laneway and ensuring that the car-port access does not impede laneway movement. The two-storey section adjoining No.20 is 6540mm deep. The single-story section adjoining No.20 is an additional 4750mm deep and 3200mm in height to parapet. Proposed finishes include brick to front façade, and smooth render to rear elevation. A metal roof is proposed. I consider that the subject development is acceptable, would complement the existing pattern of development in the area, and would not detract from the character and appearance of the Architectural Conservation Area

Residential Amenity

- 8.10. The subject mews development is reduced in scale relative to the previous proposal refused permission by the Commission under Ref: ABP 318625. This had a pitched roof with an east-west orientation whereas the mews development the subject of this appeal has a pitched pyramidal roof. The roof profile was significantly altered by way of the submission of Further Information resulting in significantly reduced visual impact and overshadowing. The depth of the two-storey section is reduced and the single-storey section is reduced in both height and depth. The grounds of appeal contend that the subject mews would be visually overbearing from the appellants' adjoining property. I contend that the permitted mews, by reason of its design and scale, would not be visually overbearing when seen from the adjoining site or other property in the vicinity.
- 8.11. The grounds of appeal contend that the permitted mews would give rise to overlooking. The appellants' property has a large extension to the rear. The windows in the rear elevation of the two-storey section of the permitted mews are all at high level and serve a bedroom, bathroom and office. I conclude that there would be no undue overlooking from any of these windows or any of the ground-floor windows. The first-floor balcony to the front overlooks the adjoining laneway.
- 8.12. The appellants argue that the permitted development would give rise to loss of light. I consider that there is no convincing evidence submitted which would support this contention. Having regard to the design and siting of the permitted mews, I conclude that there would be no significant loss of light to adjoining property.

8.13. The grounds of appeal contend that the permitted development would give rise to overshadowing of their property, which adjoins to the north of the appeal site. The applicants submitted a Shadow Analysis to the planning authority with the application and also by way of Further Information. The Further Information shows that the garden shed to be demolished, by reason of its orientation and siting to the west end of the rear garden on No.20, gives rise to overshadowing of the west end of the rear garden of that property at 1100 hrs, 1300hrs and 1500 hrs, on the spring and autumn equinoxes. The amended roof profile, as submitted by way of Further Information to the planning authority (compliance with which is subject to Condition 1 of the planning authority decision) would give rise to a small increase in overshadowing at 1300 hrs and 1500hrs on the spring and autumn equinoxes. There would also be a marginal increase in overshadowing at times during the summer solstice. Based on the evidence on file, I conclude that the increase in overshadowing would not be such as to be seriously injurious to the amenities of No.20 or any other property in the vicinity.

Other Issues

8.14. It is proposed to provide a private amenity space to the rear (east) of the permitted mews. This has a depth of 4300mm and an area of 33.5sqm. The proposed balcony to the front (west) elevation has an area of 7.3sqm. The proposed private amenity space exceeds the 20sqm required for 1-bedroom houses as a set out in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (January 2024) to which planning authorities and the Commission must have regard in the performance of their functions and is compatible with Development Plan standards. The subdivision of the garden of No.19 would leave a private amenity space depth of 6243mm from the single storey extension to that dwelling and a further 9733mm from the main rear elevation of that dwelling. There would be a 1.8m high wall dividing the mews site from the rear garden of No.19. On this issue, I conclude that the proposal for private amenity space for both the mews and the main dwelling is acceptable.

8.15. The access arrangements are for a carport with a single car space and access from the adjoining laneway. The front of the mews development is to be set back to provide for a laneway width of 5.5m adjoining. The Transportation Planning Division of the planning authority has raised no objection to the proposed access arrangements subject to condition. There is an existing garage on the site with vehicular access on to the

laneway. In these circumstances, and having regard to the pattern of development in the vicinity, I conclude that the proposed access arrangements, provided to the requirements of the planning authority, are acceptable.

- 8.16. The mews development includes the provision of skylights and solar panels. I consider that these are acceptable and would not detract from the amenity of the area or negatively impact on adjoining residential amenity.
- 8.17. It is argued that the development would create an inappropriate precedent in the area. I do not agree. I consider that the proposal is compatible with the established pattern of development in the area.
- 8.18. It is contended that the development would have a detrimental effect on property values in the area. No evidence is submitted to support this contention. Having regard to the overall acceptability of the mews development, I conclude that the development would not have any adverse impact on property values in the area.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. 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 in an established residential area in Clontarf, Dublin 3, approximately 350m from the nearest European site. The proposed development comprises the demolition of a garden shed and construction of a mews, and all associated site works. 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 there is no conceivable risk to any European site.

The reason for this conclusion is the nature and small scale of the proposal, the location and separation distance from nearest European site and the lack of connection between the sites, I conclude that 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 subject site is part of a rear garden site of a semi-detached dwelling located in an established residential area. The proposed development relates to the demolition of a garden shed and construction of a mews, and all associated site works. No water deterioration concerns are raised in the appeal. I have assessed the development in the context of the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment as there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the land use zoning for the site as set out in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the scale, design and layout of the mews development, and the pattern of development in the surrounding area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the following conditions, the proposed mews development would provide for an appropriate form of development in this Architectural Conservation Area, would not adversely impact of the residential amenity of property in the vicinity, and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans, particulars and specifications submitted with the application, as amended by the Further Information submitted to the planning authority on 19th day of December 2025. except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of

development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Details of the following shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development:
 - materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes
 - details of the proposed resurfacing and upgrading of the adjoining laneway to the requirements of the planning authority
 - details of the vehicular and pedestrian accesses serving the development
 - the naming and numbering of the dwelling unit
 - measures to keep the laneway adjoining the site clear of debris, soil and other material during demolition and construction works

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity, orderly development and pedestrian and traffic safety.

3. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of the management of surface water runoff and flood risk arising from the development.

4. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into connection agreements with Uisce Éireann to provide for a service connection to the public water supply and wastewater collection network.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.

5. Site and construction works shall be restricted to between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays. Any deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

6. The development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The Plan shall provide details of intended construction practice, including noise management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.

7. 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 the commencement of development and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. The application of any indexation required by this condition shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine.

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.

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.

Des Johnson

Planning Inspector

15 June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500824-DN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of garden shed and construction of mews, and all associated site works
Development Address	19, Hollybrook Road, Clontarf, Dublin 3, D03YE009
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	

<p>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</p>	
<p><input 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 checked="" 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>S.5 P.2 10(b)(ii) construction of more than 500 dwelling units.</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	
<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500824-DN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of existing garden shed and construction of two-storey mews dwelling and all associated site works.
Development Address	Rear garden of 19, Hollybrook Road, Clontarf, Dublin 3, D03 YE09.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development	Demolition of existing single storey garden shed and construction of two-storey mews dwelling and all associated site works.
Location of development	<p>Established residential area in an Architectural Conservation Area. No.19 is a two-storey red brick detached dwelling with pedestrian only entrance on to Hollybrook Road. There is on-street parking on the road.</p> <p>There is a laneway running to the rear of the Hollybrook Road houses on this side, and a number of mews dwelling have been constructed on the laneway.</p> <p>At the end of the rear garden to No.19 is a single storey shed with pitched roof.</p> <p>The South Dublin Bay & River Tolka Estuary SPA is c.350m to the east.</p>
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	Demolition and construction noise. No potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in Section 171A of the Act.

Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	No real likelihood of significant effects.
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

This page is deliberately left blank.