



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500880-DF-26

Development

Demolition of roof, construction of roof and extension with all associated site works

Location

Deebert, Brookstone Road, Baldoyle, D13RW14

Planning Authority

Fingal County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

F25A/0989E

Applicant(s)

Aidan Haran

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission

Type of Appeal

Third Party Appeal

Appellant(s)

Michaela Francis

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

19th May 2026

Inspector

Shane McGlynn

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0	Planning History.....	5
5.0	Policy Context.....	6
6.0	EIA Screening.....	8
7.0	The Appeal	8
8.0	Assessment	11
9.0	AA Screening.....	18
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	19
11.0	Recommendation.....	19
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	20
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	21

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of c. 0.055 ha, comprises a single storey detached dwelling at on the northern side of Brookstone Road, Baldoyle, D13RW14. The site is located in the established residential area of Baldoyle on the northeastern fringe of Dublin City.
- 1.2. The site is c. 250m southwest of Baldoyle town centre. The site is in close proximity to St. Laurence's National School and Seagrang Park, both located opposite the site on the southern side of Brookstone Road. Brookstone Road (R809) is a single carriageway east-west road with a 50km/h speed limit, connecting Baldoyle with Clare Hall. The row of properties on the northern side of the road of which the appeal site forms part comprise a mix of dwelling types and styles. All are single storey dwellings, many of which have been extended through roof alterations.
- 1.3. The subject property is accessed from Brookstone Road via a c. 2.4m wide vehicular entrance. The existing dwelling is a bungalow with hipped roof. The dwelling is served by a rear garden which extends c. 15.8m in length to the rear of the dwelling.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises: the part demolition of the existing roof and the construction of a new mansard style first floor consisting of 4 new bedrooms (1 ensuite) and a bathroom. Construction of a small ground floor extension to the front to extend the existing side entrance hallway. Construction of a new canopy to the front and alterations to existing front door. Alteration of existing bay windows to the front. Minor internal alterations to ground floor. External insulation to existing walls. Widening of existing vehicular entrance. All associated landscaping and boundary treatment works, drainage, ancillary site works and services.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Fingal County Council decided to GRANT permission for the proposed development subject to 9no. conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Summary of issues raised in the initial planning report (dated 11th December 2025) and the second planning report (dated 27th January 2026):

- Proposal acceptable in principle on basis of site's 'RS – Residential' zoning.
- Coherence of streetscape and established roof profile along road maintained.
- No issue of overlooking as no first floor side windows.
- No issues of overbearing or overshadowing on adjacent dwellings as separation distance and orientation of subject dwelling sufficient.
- Proposed modern design is in line with Objective SPQHO43 (Contemporary and Innovative Design Solutions).
- Dwelling screened from road by vegetation and front setback distance.
- Demolition of boundary wall requires to be justified due to impacts on adjoining property.
 - Further Information submitted illustrates reduced width of lobby which satisfactorily demonstrates no impact to boundary.
 - Notes issues of encroachment or oversailing are civil matters.
- There is no requirement for appropriate assessment or environmental impact assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Water Services Department: No objections subject to standard conditions.
- Transportation Planning Section: Seeks for widening of vehicular entrance to be increased from 3.2m to 4m. Matter addressed by Further Information, no objection subject to standard conditions.
- Parks and Green Infrastructure Section: Notes removal of planted rear garden boundary may be required. No objection subject to standard conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None requested.

3.4. Third Party Observations

The Planning Authority have stated that 1no. third party observations was received on the application and a further observation from the same observer (the appellant) was received on the further information. The concerns raised are broadly in line with the grounds of appeal and include:

- Demolition of existing chimneys of dwelling and common boundary fence with appellant's property would be required but these works have not been applied for or illustrated.
 - Difficult therefore to assess impact on architectural character of existing house.
- No consent sought or provided by appellant for demolition of boundary fence.
- Height of front extension is excessive relevant to appellant's property.
- No shadow and daylight studies to demonstrate impact on appellant's rear garden.
- Potential overlooking from new first floor rear bedroom window.
- Overbearing impacts and character impacts on area arise, similar to previously refused proposal at appeal site.
- Modern design is not appropriate as proposal is out of character with neighbouring houses and streetscape.
- Further information provided does not address appellant's concerns.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject Site

P.A Ref. F24A/0831E / ACP Ref. ABP-321359-24: Permission REFUSED for conversion of the existing three bedroom detached single storey bungalow to a two-storey four bedroom detached house and all associated site works, through the construction of a new additional first floor storey to the existing single storey house with a new pitched roof over.

The Commission Order provides the following reason for refusal:

“The proposed development, by reason of its excessive height, design and appearance, relative to surrounding buildings would be incongruous with the character of the existing dwellings in the vicinity and the surrounding streetscape. It is considered that the proposed extension fails to respect the established pattern of development in the immediate area, would result in a visually discordant feature that would be detrimental to the streetscape and would adversely affect the amenity of adjoining properties. The proposed extension would, therefore, be contrary to Objective SPQH045 of the planning authority as set out in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

4.2. **Adjoining Site**

P.A Ref. F13B/0210: Permission GRANTED at Brookstone Lodge for refurbishment works to existing detached bungalow, and to make alterations to the existing front facade. Proposed replacement of the existing roof to accommodate two new dormer roofs to the front and rear to provide for two new bedrooms and associated works.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Fingal County Development Plan, 2023-2029 (as varied)**

The site is zoned Objective **RS – Residential** within the Fingal County Development Plan, 2023-2029 (hereafter, the County Development Plan) with the objective to *“provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity”*. The vision for this zoning objective seeks to *“ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity”*. Residential development is listed as a use that is *“permitted in principle”* under this zoning objective.

Section 3.5.13 Compact Growth, Consolidation and Regeneration

Objective SPQHO43 – Contemporary and Innovative Design Solutions: *Promote the use of contemporary and innovative design solutions subject to design respecting the character and architectural heritage of the area.*

Section 3.5.13.1 Residential Extensions

Policy SPQHP41 – Residential Extensions: *Support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.*

Objective SPQHO45 – Domestic Extensions: *Encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area.*

Section 14.10.2.4 First Floor Extensions

First floor rear extensions are to have no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. Of relevance to the subject proposal, the following factors are to be considered:

- Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking – along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries.
- Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.
- External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.

Section 14.10.2.1 Front Extensions

Of relevance to the subject proposal, this section sets out that front extensions should be of appropriate design and scale relative to the existing dwelling. The scale, height and projection from the front building line should not be excessive so as to dominate the front elevation. A contemporary design approach may be considered. Significant breaks in the building line should be resisted unless it has been demonstrated that no impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings arises.

Section 14.10.2.5 Roof Alterations including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions

Of relevance to the subject proposal are the following assessment criteria:

- Consideration and regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
- Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
- Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.

- Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures and prominence.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The appeal site is not located within or adjoining any designated site.

The nearest European Sites in closest proximity to the appeal site are as follows:

- c. 410m from Baldoyle Bay SPA (site code: 004016)
- c. 420m from Baldoyle Bay SAC (site code: 000199)
- c. 1km from North Bull Island SPA (site code: 004006)
- c. 1km from North Dublin Bay SAC (site code: 000206)
- c. 1.5km from North-West Irish Sea SPA (site code: 004236)
- c. 3.5km from Howth Head SAC (site code: 000202)
- c. 4.1km from Ireland's Eye SPA (site code: 004117)
- c. 4.2km from Malahide Estuary SAC (site code: 000205)
- c. 4.3km from Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code: 003000)
- c. 4.3km from Ireland's Eye SAC (site code: 002193)
- c. 4.9km from Malahide Estuary SPA (site code: 004025)

There are no Natural Heritage Areas within 5km of the appeal site.

6.0 **EIA Screening**

- 6.1. Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity/ the absence of any connectivity to any sensitive location, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

7.0 **The Appeal**

7.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

A third-party appeal was received from Strand Architects representing Michaela Francis, who resides at the adjacent dwelling Viburnum, Brookstone Road, located to the west of the appeal site. The following is a summary of the issues raised in the grounds of appeal.

- Proposed design is similar to that of previously application ref. F24A/0831E (ABP-321359-24), which was refused by both the Planning Authority and the Commission on appeal.
 - Conclusions of Inspector's report regarding impact on pattern of development, character, streetscape, overbearing impact on residential amenity remain applicable to current proposal.
 - Form and floor area of first floor element are unchanged, therefore overbearing impact remains.
 - Mansard style roof proposed is significantly steeper than previous pitched roof design and would therefore have similar impacts (overbearing, overshadowing, loss of light) on appellant's property, even though the overall roof height is now lower.
- Proposal does not represent a sensitive extension to a dwelling.
 - Largely erases existing architectural character of dwelling.
 - A more sympathetic extension is possible as there are many examples of this being achieved in respect of older houses in the County.
 - Discordant with established pattern of development.
- Modern design is inappropriate and not in harmony with character of existing house.
 - Existing dwelling could be described vernacular mid to late twentieth century Irish architecture and is not pastiche, contrary to Planning Authority's statement.
 - Planning Authority's conclusion that the proposed modern design is consistent with Objective SPQHO43 given variety of dwellings on street contradicts previous Inspector's statement that there is an established pattern of residential development along Brookstone Road.

- Design does not include any particularly innovative features (e.g. sustainable technologies), contrary to Planning Authority's consideration that it complies with Objective SPQHO43.
- Northwest facing element of first floor extension by reason of its scale and dimensions is a large blank elevation which is overbearing on the appellant's property, in particular when compared with existing dwelling and other properties on the road.
 - External heights provided for elevation are not accurate as they are taken from internal rather than external ground level.
 - Gives rise to overshadowing and loss of daylight in appellant's garden.
- Proposed ground floor level front extension would increase loss of daylight and overshadowing in appellant's garden due to its height and close proximity to boundary.
 - States no full northwest elevation including the front extension was provided with application.
 - Construction of this element does not appear feasible without partial demolition of appellant's boundary fence, including due to likely extent of foundation works to support wall, and appellant has not agreed to this.
- A sketch section is provided by the appellant to illustrate the concerns raised.

7.2. **Applicant Response**

None.

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

The response from the Planning Authority requests that the Commission support the Planning Authority's decision in this instance. The Planning Authority request that conditions requiring a financial contribution and tree bond are attached, where relevant, in the event that the Commission is minded to grant permission.

8.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file in relation to the appeal, the report of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the policies and objectives of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development.
- Design, Height and Scale
- Other Matters

The grounds of appeal submit that the proposed development is substantially similar to that subject of a previously refused application at the site, reg. ref. F24A/0831E (ACP ref. ABP-321359-24) as detailed in Section 4.1 above. The following is a comparative overview of the current proposal and previously refused proposal:

- The massing, layout and floor area for both proposals is similar. The previous proposal had a total floor area of c. 267 sq.m, while the current has a reduced floor area of c. 225 sq.m (as stated in the respective Planning Application Forms).
- The previous proposal comprised a 2-storey pitched roof dwelling with front gable elements, whereas the current proposal achieves the first floor extension through provision of a mansard-type roof. The resulting ridge height has thereby reduced by c. 0.8m from c. 6.9m to c. 6.1m above ground level.
- The layout of both proposals is similar, however the massing and floor area has been reduced as set out above.

8.1. Principle of Development

The site is zoned 'RS – Residential' with an objective to *"provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity"*. Extensions are permitted to existing residential dwellings within this zoning objective, and as such the proposed development is acceptable in principle subject to compliance with relevant guidelines and standards.

8.2. Design, Height and Scale

The existing dwelling comprises a single storey pitched roof dwelling with existing side and rear extension elements. It has an overall floor area of c. 144 sq.m and a height of c. 5.4m above ground level. The dwelling is located on a site of c. 0.055 ha including a front garden with maximum depth of c. 13.2m and rear garden with depth of c. 15.9m.

The proposed development includes the demolition of the existing pitched roof and attic space in order to provide a first floor extension at roof level. The first floor extension is contained within the footprint of the existing dwelling and would functionally extend the dwelling to 2 storeys in height. A front porch and front canopy at ground floor level are also proposed. The resulting dwelling has a floor area of c. 225 sq.m with a slightly increased footprint by virtue of the front porch element. The first floor is designed as a mansard type roof with an overall height of c. 6.1m above ground level.

8.2.1. Design

In relation to design, Section 14.10.2.5 (Roof Alterations including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions) of the County Development Plan requires that proposed roof alterations have regard to the character and size of the proposed roof structure, its position on the streetscape and existing roof variations on the streetscape. Section 14.10.2.4 (First Floor Extensions) requires that first floor extensions have no significant impact on visual amenities and that external finishes and design shall generally be in harmony with existing. Additionally, Section 14.10.2.1 (Front Extensions) requires that the design and scale of front extensions is appropriate to the existing dwelling and provides that contemporary design solutions can be considered.

The use of contemporary and innovative design solutions which respect existing character is also promoted generally for extensions under Objective SPQHO43 (Contemporary and Innovative Design Solutions), however I note that no criteria or specific guidance is provided in relation to this objective to determine whether a design solution is contemporary or innovative.

The appellant submits that the design of the proposed development, together with its height and massing, would erase the existing architectural character of the subject

dwelling and would be discordant with the spatial pattern of development in the area. They raise concern with the modern design of the proposal, which they consider is not in harmony with the character of the area.

I wish to highlight to the Commission at the outset that the appeal site is not located within an Architectural Conservation Area, that the subject dwelling 'Deebert' is not a Protected Structure and that there are no Protected Structures in the vicinity of the site. Additionally, there are no other built heritage designations or objectives applicable to the site or any lands in its vicinity.

I note the applicant has modified the proposed first floor extension in an attempt to address the decision to refuse permission in 2025 by the Planning Authority and the Commission (as set out in Section 4.1 above). The proposed mansard type roof results in a reduced ridge height of c. 6.1m above ground level, which I note is consistent with the height profile of Brookstone Lodge to the southeast and slightly above that of 'Viburnum' to the west, as illustrated on the contiguous elevation drawings submitted with the application. I consider that this provides a natural transition in height from east to west along the street and therefore that the proposed extension and roof alteration would not negatively impact on the streetscape by virtue of its size, as required under Section 14.10.2.5 (Roof Alterations including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions) of the County Development Plan.

There is no uniformity to the existing character or spatial pattern of development on Brookstone Road. The existing dwellings on the street are single storey, however I observed that roof alterations to provide additional living space at first floor level are prevalent on the street. As a result, there are a number of different roof styles visible on the street which vary significantly in terms of design and materiality. I note in particular that many incorporate projecting front dormer elements. I therefore consider that given there is no uniformity to the existing roof types on Brookstone Road, the proposed Mansard type roof would not be out of character in this context, in accordance with the provisions of Section 14.10.2.5 (Roof Alterations including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions) and Section 14.10.2.4 (First Floor Extensions) of the County Development Plan.

I note the appellant did not specifically raise concern with the design of the proposed front extension element. This element is confined to ground floor level, has a flat-roof

design and does not project beyond the building line established by 'Viburnum' to the west. I therefore consider the design and scale of this element is appropriate relative to the existing dwelling as required under Section 14.10.2.1 (Front Extensions) of the County Development Plan.

I consider that the current proposal for a dwelling with a mansard type roof, which has a reduced overall ridge height and has omitted the gable-fronted elements as previously proposed, is a more sympathetic solution which has sought to acknowledge the existing single storey context of the subject dwelling while also providing an innovative roof design suitable to the evolving character of the street. Given that there is no roof pitch extending above the first floor and that all elevations of the dwelling at first floor level are clad in roof tiles due to the mansard type roof design, I consider that the current proposal would not read as a 2-storey dwelling from the front, or from its eastern side (being partially visible on eastern approach from Brookstone Road as the subject dwelling is partially set in front of the building line of Brookstone Lodge).

Having regard to the architectural character of Brookstone Road, I do not concur with the appellant's view that the proposed modern design is not a suitable design response to the existing character of the street. In my opinion, the dwellings on Brookstone Road do not present a coherent architectural design in relation to roof types (as set out above), size, form or materiality. I observed there is a mix of both modern and contemporary design styles along the street, with a number of dwellings (including Brookstone Lodge adjacent to the appeal site) featuring recent extension elements visible from the street which are of contemporary design. I consider that Brookstone Road has an evolving character and that the proposed development represents a contemporary design, which is unique to the street and an innovative means of providing additional floor area for a dwelling in this context. I therefore consider that the proposal accords with Objective SPQHO43 (Contemporary and Innovative Design Solutions) of the County Development Plan in this regard.

8.2.2. Height and Scale

Section 14.10.2.4 of the County Development Plan requires that first floor extension have no negative impact on residential amenities. Overbearance (with specific reference to height, proximity and length along mutual boundaries) is highlighted in

the policy guidance, as is the need to consider overshadowing impacts on adjacent properties.

As stated above, Section 14.10.2.5 (Roof Alterations including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions) requires roof alterations to have regard to the size and position of the proposed roof within the streetscape. I note in this regard that the applicant has modified the proposed first floor extension in an attempt to address the decision to refuse permission in 2025 by the Planning Authority and the Commission (as set out in Section 4.1 above). The proposed mansard type roof results in a reduced ridge height of c. 6.1m above ground level, which I note is consistent with the height profile of Brookstone Lodge to the southeast and slightly above that of 'Viburnum' to the west, as illustrated on the contiguous elevation drawings submitted with the application. I consider that this provides a natural transition in height from east to west along the street and therefore that the proposed extension and roof alteration would not negatively impact on the streetscape by virtue of its size, as required under Section 14.10.2.5 (Roof Alterations including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions).

Overbearance

The grounds of appeal submit that the northwest-facing element of first floor extension by reason of its scale and dimensions is a large blank elevation which is overbearing on the appellant's property.

I note the northwest elevation of the proposed first floor level extension is located c. 1.0m – 1.5m from the appellant's property boundary. This elevation is c. 11m in overall width and comprises a continuous tiled façade with no windows. The height from first floor level to the eaves is c. 1.7m while the height from first floor level to the roof ridge is c. 3.2m. I note the entire northwest elevation would address the rear garden of the appellant's property and would be within c. 7m of the east elevation of their house.

I consider that the northwest elevation would effectively appear from the perspective of the appellant's house and rear garden as a c. 3.2m high c. 11m wide continuous blank elevation above ground floor level. I consider this is a significant change to the existing context and vista to the rear of 'Viburnum'. Having regard therefore to the height, scale, bulk and massing of the proposed first floor extension, and to its

proximity to the appellant's house and boundary, I consider that it would appear dominating and overbearing and would thereby have a negative impact on the residential amenities of adjacent properties contrary to the requirements of Section 14.10.2.4 (First Floor Extensions) and Policy SPQHP41 (Residential Extensions) of the County Development Plan.

Overshadowing

The appellant submits that both the first floor and ground floor elements would give rise to loss of light at their property 'Viburnum'.

The dwelling 'Viburnum' is orientated north-south and is located west-southwest of the proposed first floor extension, while the rear garden of 'Viburnum', which extends c. 25m from the rear of the dwelling, is orientated northeast-southwest and is located to the west, northwest and north of the proposed extension. Given the position and orientation of the proposed extension relative to 'Viburnum' and having regard to the arc of sunlight during the day, I consider that there would be no material reduction in sunlight and daylight access to the main dwelling. Having regard to the overall size of the first floor extension (height c. 6.1m above ground level, depth c. 11m and width c. 12m) relative to the length, orientation and position of the rear garden of 'Viburnum', I note that while additional overshadowing and loss of light would occur within the rear garden, however this would not affect a majority of the garden at any one time and any loss of sunlight would not be significant (i.e less than 80% of previous extent), having regard to the guidance of BRE 209 (2022) Guidelines.

Having regard to its limited size (c. 3sqm), height (c. 2.9m above ground level) and flat-roof design, and to its position relative to the appellant's property, I consider that the ground floor front extension would not give rise to any significant overshadowing or loss of light.

I am also satisfied that the dwellings on Willie Nolan Road further to the north of site would not be overshadowed by the proposed development due to their distance from the dwelling (at least c. 35m) and the height of the proposal (c. 6.1m).

Having regard to the above analysis, I consider that the extent of overshadowing and loss of light affecting the rear garden of 'Viburnum' constitute a minor impact which is acceptable within the built-up urban context in which the sites are located. I wish to highlight at this juncture that while I consider overshadowing to be acceptable given

the relative position and orientation of the properties, this is separate from the issue of overbearance, which relates to the scale, bulk and height of the proposed structure relative to adjacent properties as set out above.

The proposal therefore in my opinion would not give rise to undue overshadowing impacts of the appellant's property as per the requirements of Section 14.10.2.4 (First Floor Extensions) of the County Development Plan.

8.3. Other Matters

The Planning Authority in their response to the appeal have requested that a suitable financial contribution condition be attached in the event of a grant of permission. I note the development comprises a domestic extension with a total additional floor area of c. 81 sq.m, which exceeds the minimum threshold of 40 sq.m and is not otherwise exempt from payment of contributions in accordance with the Fingal County Council Development Contribution Scheme 2026-2030, therefore I recommend that a suitable condition is attached in the event the Commission are minded to grant permission.

The application includes for the widening of the existing c. 2.4m wide vehicular entrance. I note the Planning Authority sought Further Information to increase the proposed widening to 4m in order to improve pedestrian-vehicular intervisibility and the applicant's response addressed this to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority. Having regard to the existing speed limit and alignment of Brookstone Road, and the presence of speed control measures including raised table and line markings directly in front of the site, I consider the proposed widening of the vehicular entrance to 4m does not give rise to a traffic hazard and is therefore acceptable.

The grounds of appeal raise concerns that the proposed front extension would require the demolition of a portion of the common boundary fence between the appeal site and appellant's property, in order to facilitate construction works and foundations. The front extension was marginally set back from this boundary fence as part of the applicant's Further Information response and I note from the revised design that the front extension does not encroach on the appellant's property boundary. Given that there is no encroachment and having regard to the scale and nature of the works proposed, I am satisfied that the works can be suitably controlled through standard planning condition avoid undue construction phase impacts on

neighbouring properties. I would also highlight that issues of title do not preclude the Commission from granting permission in accordance with the provision of Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended).

9.0 AA Screening

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

The subject site is located:

- c. 410m from Baldoyle Bay SPA (site code: 004016)
- c. 420m from Baldoyle Bay SAC (site code: 000199)
- c. 1km from North Bull Island SPA (site code: 004006)
- c. 1km from North Dublin Bay SAC (site code: 000206)
- c. 1.5km from North-West Irish Sea SPA (site code: 004236)
- c. 3.5km from Howth Head SAC (site code: 000202)
- c. 4.1km from Ireland's Eye SPA (site code: 004117)
- c. 4.2km from Malahide Estuary SAC (site code: 000205)
- c. 4.3km from Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code: 003000)
- c. 4.3km from Ireland's Eye SAC (site code: 002193)
- c. 4.9km from Malahide Estuary SPA (site code: 004025)

The proposed development comprises an extension to an existing dwelling. 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 effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The simple nature and limited scale of the proposed works.
- The distance from the nearest European site and lack of connections.

- The outcome of the screening report/determination by Fingal County Council.

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 (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

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 & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of the project, site and receiving environment
- Location-distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

On the basis of objective information, I consider that the proposed development will not result in a likely 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 permission should be REFUSED for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development by reason of its form, height, bulk and massing, and due to its close proximity to site boundaries, would appear dominating and overbearing from the perspective of the adjacent dwelling 'Viburnum' and would thereby have a negative impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties contrary to the requirements of Section 14.10.2.4 (First Floor Extensions) and Policy SPQHP41 (Residential Extensions) of the Fingal County Development Plan, 2023-2029 (as varied) and would be contrary to the 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."

Shane McGlynn
Planning Inspector

24th July 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500880-DF-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of roof, construction of roof and extension with all associated site works
Development Address	Deebert, Brookstone Road, Baldoyle, D13RW14
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?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'.
	☐ No.
(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)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified	
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1.	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	

☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.	No screening required.
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	

Inspector: _____

Date: _____