



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500909-DR-26

Development	Demolition of existing single-storey conservatory and construction of two-storey brick-clad extension
Location	32 Redesdale Road, Mount Merrion, Co. Dublin, A94 R2R8
Planning Authority	Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25B/0680/WEB
Applicant	Eamonn Walsh
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	To grant permission with conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant	Conor Byrne
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	6 th May 2026
Inspector	Trevor Rue

Table of Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
6.0 EIA Screening.....	10
7.0 The Appeal	10
8.0 Assessment	13
9.0 AA Screening.....	16
10.0 Water Framework Directive	17
11.0 Recommendations.....	17
12.0 Conditions	18
Appendix A: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening	20

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is on the western side of a residential street about 5.5 kilometres to the west of the town centre of Dún Laoghaire. It has a stated area of 0.053 hectares and comprises the curtilage of a 1½-storey four-bedroom detached dwelling.
- 1.2. The existing dwelling has a pitched roof running perpendicular to the road with first-floor windows within the gable elevations to the front and back and roof lights in the northern and southern roof slopes. A garage attached to the southern side elevation of the dwelling abuts the southern site boundary. Behind the garage is a conservatory. There is a vehicular access, driveway and gravelled parking area in front of the dwelling and there is private open space to the rear.
- 1.3. The site is bounded to the north and south by detached dwellings and to the west by a semi-detached dwelling. No. 30 to the south is a smaller two-bedroom dwelling with a hipped roof. Its garage adjoins that of the application property. The northern elevation of No. 30 is about 2 metres from the shared boundary wall, which is about 2.2 metres in height. A modified 1½-storey detached dwelling, No. 21, is opposite and to the east of the site. Redesdale Road rises from south to north.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to:
 - demolish the conservatory;
 - add an L-shaped two-storey brick-clad extension to the southern side of the dwelling with large front- and rear-facing windows – the main part of the extension would be about 2.7 metres high and 600 millimetres from the southern site boundary and the rear portion would be about 6 metres high and set back from that boundary by about 2.6 metres;
 - alter the existing rear upper-floor window, cut back the overhang and introduce brick cladding on the rear elevation;
 - construct a dormer extension with zinc cladding and a high-level obscure-glass window on the northern side roof; and
 - carry out associated internal alterations.
- 2.2. Photomontages were submitted to illustrate the proposed front and rear elevations.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. On 6th February 2026, Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council decided to grant permission, subject to five conditions.

3.1.2. Condition 1 required adherence to the submitted plans, particulars and specifications. Condition 2 prohibited subdivision of the dwelling. Condition 3 required external finishing materials to be agreed prior to the commencement of development, expressed a preference for a plaster or smooth render finish, and said brick cladding was not to be used. Condition 4 required safeguarding measures during construction works. Condition 5 specified working hours during the construction period.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. A **planner's report** adopted on 5th February 2026 provided the reasoning for the authority's decision. The main points were as follows:

- Given their scope, the proposed works would not create undue negative impacts on energy use or performance. The proposed materials are acceptable in the context of the current high standards set out in the Building Regulations.
- While there are some dormer extensions and minor roof alterations along the road, there are no two-storey extensions in the vicinity. Brick cladding would not integrate satisfactorily with the prevailing finishes in the surrounding streetscape. To minimise visual impact and ensure a more coherent appearance when viewed from the public realm, the proposed two-storey extension should be completed in a rendered finish.
- The proposed new windows in the front and rear elevations of the proposed two-storey extension appear to be in keeping with existing windows. Due to the orientation of the extension and the rear garden space, there does not appear to be any cause for concern regarding overlooking into neighbouring dwellings. Due to the orientation of the site and the setting back of the extension from the side boundary, any overbearing or overshadowing would not be substantial.

- While the proposed two-storey side and rear extension would result in a change to the roof profile when viewed from the front, it would be well set back from the principal façade. This setback would reduce its prominence and mitigate any potential overbearing impact on the streetscape. The alteration is acceptable and consistent with the Development Plan.
- The proposed side dormer would be set down from the ridge and in keeping with the surrounding roof profile. The use of a high-level window would reduce any overlooking of neighbouring properties. The dormer would be well set back from the side boundary and well above the main gutter/eaves level. It would not have any undue overshadowing or overbearing impact and its visual impact would be acceptable.

3.2.2. The Council's Municipal Services Department, **Drainage Planning**, had no objection.

3.3. **Third Party Submissions**

3.3.1. The Council received a submission from Conor Byrne, the substance of which was, for the most part, restated in his grounds of appeal. The submission also included the following points:

- The gentle slope upwards on Redesdale Road means that the proposed development would create an exaggerated impact on his house at No. 30 especially as the affected aspect is north-facing and so receives no direct sunlight. On all but the longest days of summer, the affected [sitting] room is already quite dark and cool due to the lack of natural light. The proposed boundary wall would be directly opposite the single window and is likely to make the room much darker and colder as well as providing an unappealing vista.
- Applying the 45° rule commonly used by planning authorities, the relevant line projected from the top of the proposed extension would intersect with the property at No. 30 above the height of the garage. It is estimated that the crossing point would be approximately 2.3 metres above ground level; 2 metres is the height restriction commonly used in conjunction with this rule. The affected window would be in the shadow of the 45° line.

- The front-view photomontage is taken at such an angle that it does not clearly show the impact of the proposed development on No. 30, which is to the left when seen from the road. The rear-view photomontage clearly shows the potential for overlooking but doesn't show how adjacent the extension would be to the boundary wall.
- The proposed external brick finish displays no empathy with existing local properties.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Application Site

4.1.1. None

4.2. Adjacent Properties

- 4.2.1. **D21A/0291:** On 8th July 2021, the Council granted permission for demolishing the existing side garage, garden sheds and chimneys; a single-storey side and rear extension; two bay-window front extensions; attic dormer extensions; and widening the vehicular entrance, at 21 Redesdale Road.
- 4.2.2. **D22A/0151:** On 2nd June 2022, the Council granted permission for changes to the development previously approved at 21 Redesdale Road, including construction of a side garage, a smaller single-storey rear extension and replacement of existing concrete roof tiles with new slate tiles.
- 4.2.3. **D23A/0449:** On 28th September 2023, the Council granted permission for a single-storey rear extension, and retention permission for a wider vehicular access, at 19 Redesdale Road.
- 4.2.4. **D24B/0428:** On 16th January 2025, the Council granted retention permission for an ancillary detached timber-framed garden room to the rear of 18 Redesdale Road.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. Land Use Zoning Map 2 of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 indicates that the application site is subject to Objective A, which seeks to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities. Table 13.3.2 of the Plan indicates that residential [accommodation] is permitted in principle.
- 5.1.2. Policy Objective CA7 of the Plan is to support the use of structural materials in the construction industry that have low-to-zero embodied energy and CO₂ emissions. This is repeated in Section 12.2.1.
- 5.1.3. Policy Objective PHP19 of the Plan includes conservation and improvement of existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF [which has been replaced by National Policy Objective 44 of the Revised National Planning Framework of April 2025].
- 5.1.4. Section 12.3.1.1 of the Plan states that the objective of the Council is to achieve high standards of design and layout to create liveable neighbourhoods. One of the criteria that will be taken into account when assessing applications is levels of privacy and amenity, the relationship of buildings to one another, including consideration of overlooking, sunlight/daylight standards and the appropriate use of screening devices.
- 5.1.5. Section 12.3.7(iii) states that 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. First-floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. However, in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front façade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a "terracing" effect. External finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.
- 5.1.7. Section 12.3.7(iv) states that roof alterations / expansions to main roof profiles will be assessed against a number of criteria including:

- Careful consideration and special 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. **Project Ireland 2040: National Planning Framework, First Revision**

- 5.2.1. National Policy Objective (NPO) 20 of the Revised National Policy Framework states that in meeting urban development requirements, there will be a presumption in favour of development that can encourage more people and generate more jobs and activity within existing cities, towns and villages, subject to development meeting appropriate planning standards and achieving targeted growth.
- 5.2.2. NPO 44 is to support the provision of lifetime adaptable homes that can accommodate the changing needs of a household over time.

5.3. **Guidance on Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight**

- 5.3.1. The Third Edition of the Building Research Establishment good practice guide “Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight” (BRE 209) was published in 2022. Chapter 2 considers light from the sky (daylighting), while Chapter 3 considers sunlighting.
- 5.3.2. Section 2.2.1 of BRE 209 explains that the quantity and quality of daylight inside a room will be impaired if obstructing buildings are large in relation to their distance away. Section 2.2.4 states that loss of light to existing windows need not be analysed if the distance of each part of the new development from the existing window is three or more times its height above the centre of the existing window. Section 2.2.23 says that if any part of a new building, measured in a vertical section perpendicular to a main window wall of an existing building, from the centre of the lowest window, subtends an angle of more than 25° to the horizontal, then the diffuse daylighting of the existing building may be adversely affected.
- 5.3.3. Section 2.2.16 of BRE 209 states that for domestic extensions that adjoin the front or rear of a house, a quick method, the 45° approach, can be used to assess the diffuse skylight impact on the house next door. However, this method is not valid for windows which directly face the extension, or for buildings opposite.

5.3.4. Section 3.2.13 of BRE 209 states that if a living room of an existing dwelling has a main window facing within 90° of due south, and any part of a new development subtends an angle of more than 25° to the horizontal measured from the centre of the window in a vertical section perpendicular to the window, then the sunlighting of the existing dwelling may be adversely affected. Figure 27 indicates that developments wholly due north of the window need not be checked.

5.4. **Natural Heritage Designations**

5.4.1. The application site is not in any Natura 2000 site of European nature conservation importance. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are:

- South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC), about 4.3 kilometres to the east, designated for mudflats and sandflats, annual vegetation of drift lines, annuals colonising sand and mud and embryonic shifting dunes;
- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area [for birds] (SPA), about 4.3 kilometres to the east;
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, about 9 kilometres to the east, designated for harbour porpoise;
- Dalkey Islands SPA, about 9 kilometres to the east;
- Ballyman Glen SAC, about 10.7 kilometres to the south, designated for petrifying springs and alkaline fens;
- Knocksink Wood SAC and Nature Reserve, about 10 kilometres to the south, designated for petrifying springs, old sessile oak woods and alluvial forests; and
- Wicklow Mountains SAC, about 7.5 kilometres to the south west, designated for oligotrophic waters, natural dystrophic lakes and ponds, heaths, grasslands, blanket bogs, siliceous scree, rocky slopes, old sessile oak woods and otter.

5.4.2. Table 8.3 of the Development Plan lists six proposed National Heritage Areas which are not SACs or SPAs in the area served by Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council – Booterstown Marsh; Dalkey Coastal Zone and Killiney Hill; Fitzsimons Wood; Loughlinstown Woods; Dingle Glen; and Ballybetagh Bog

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment Screening

6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. The statement submitted on behalf of the appellant, who lives at 30 Redesdale Road, may be summarised as follows:

- The critical issue is the unacceptable impact that the proposed two-storey side extension would have on the appellant's residential and visual amenity. The existing dwelling at No. 32 is set back over 2.5 metres from the boundary with the appellant's home. The existing roof falls to meet the top of the boundary fence and is not overbearing. The proposed development would involve a 6-metre high wall 4.57 metres in length just 0.6 metres off the boundary. The main living space of the appellant's property would have its only north-facing window looking directly at that wall. The entire rear element of the extension would be 7 metres long and would be overbearing.
- If the applicant had undertaken an assessment in accordance with the BRE report, this would have indicated a serious loss of daylight to the main living space of the appellant's home. The angle between the window to be affected and the top of the proposed side extension would far exceed 25° and would be closer to 60°. Therefore without any further analysis it is reasonable to conclude that the diffuse daylighting of the existing building may be adversely affected.
- The proposed first-floor rear windows would be incongruous due to their large scale and dimensions and would unnecessarily overlook the appellant's home and rear garden. The two new windows closest to No. 30 would denude his privacy.

- The side extension would create a terracing effect due to its proximity to the boundary with No. 30 and would be highly prominent in the street. The over-scaled front window would be an incongruous feature in the streetscape and set an unacceptable precedent. There are no similar roof variations in the area. Redesdale Road has a range of single-storey and dormer-type dwellings, some of which have been modified. The majority of side dormers are modest, the one exception being at No. 68, which faces a park.
- The proposed development would have a negative impact on the value of the appellant's property. If the Commission grants permission, it should require significant modifications to the scheme. Only a dormer-type extension should be permitted above ground level. The window serving the walk-in wardrobe should have obscure glazing and the Bedroom 1 window should be high-level.

7.2. Applicant's Response

7.2.1. The applicant's response may be summarised as follows:

- The appellant is one person. There are no other objectors. He cannot claim to represent others and/or that there would be collateral damage. The Council has objectively assessed the application on behalf of all adjoining properties and its decision to grant permission was correct.
- The applicant is the father of a growing family. The purpose of this project is to provide additional accommodation within an existing low-density residential property. The proposals are acceptable in principle under the "A" land-use zoning and are designed to comply with the Development Plan.
- The property is served by a rear garden over 60 square metres in size and the proposed development would not reduce the quantum of private open space below minimum standards. This is a neighbourly project proposed at a time when national, regional and local policies all encourage more sustainable use of existing well serviced suburbs such as Mount Merrion. The appeal is delaying a significant improvement to the accommodation offered by this home.
- The appellant's property, 30 Redesdale Road, is sited to the south of the application site and, by way of its original design, causes some slight

overshadowing to the applicant's home and its front and rear gardens throughout each day. This was accepted when the applicant purchased No. 32. No. 30 has a rear extension while No. 32 does not presently have one. There is currently a fair balance in amenity terms between the two properties; neither adversely impacts on the other.

- Any house extension represents a change. An argument that extensions should be restricted to the footprint of the existing dwelling does not make sense. Nos. 30 and 32 are not Protected Structures and this is not an Architectural Conservation Area. The road is not a museum exhibit.
- If the Commission grants permission, the appellant will continue to live alongside a two-storey dwelling with the second storey set back from the boundary. Second-storey dormer extensions to one- and two-storey dwellings are common in Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown, though not on this road. Nothing in Development Plan policy or national guidelines precludes a second-storey extension. The proposed extension would maintain a lesser scale, bulk and massing and be less overbearing than many other developments. It would not result in any terracing effect; Nos. 30 and 32 are already conjoined by garages. A grant of permission would not set an adverse precedent.
- The brick finish is a minor matter which the Council has addressed by imposing a condition. There are many houses in this area which are finished in brick and the Commission could grant permission without this condition. A white render finish would not integrate better with the existing building than would brick.
- The development would not adversely affect the appellant's property in any manner other than causing a slight alteration to the existing view from a window that faces No. 32. There is no right to a view over an adjoining property. The focus of the rear of the appellant's property is westward. People facing the sun in the rear garden would not have any reason to look northward. While the appellant clearly dislikes the proposed extensions, they would not be unduly overbearing; no third-storey element and no change from the established building height are proposed.

- The appellant does not understand the BRE guidelines. Proposed developments sited wholly to the north – as here – need not be analysed. Overshadowing of any window in the appellant’s dwelling is not possible.
- The proposed development would not overlook the appellant’s property. The proposed west-facing windows would serve a bedroom and a walk-in wardrobe. When in use these rooms would mostly have curtains drawn. Bedroom 1’s front-facing window would cause no overlooking.
- The proposed extensions would have a negligible to slight impact on the appellant’s existing or perceived amenities. Every effort would be made to mitigate the anticipated temporary construction-phase impacts of the scheme on the appellant’s property.
- Research shows that investment in properties causes values to rise as it confirms the neighbourhood is in demand and enhances the visual amenity of everyone nearby. High-quality work next door sets a new standard for style and functionality which can raise buyer expectations. It is estimated that this project would increase the value of the appellant’s property by 2% to 5%.

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

- 7.3.1. The planning authority referred to the planner’s report and stated that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in its opinion, would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. **Issues**

- 8.1.1. Having inspected the site and considered in detail the documentation on file for this third-party appeal, it seems to me that the main planning issues are:
- the acceptability in principle of the proposed development;
 - its effect on the visual amenity of the area; and
 - its effect on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

8.2. **Acceptability in Principle**

- 8.2.1. Residential accommodation is permitted in principle in this area under the County Development Plan. The National Planning Framework and the Development Plan both support improvement and adaptation of homes to meet the changing needs of households. It seems to me that the proposed development is acceptable in principle, but only if the visual and residential amenities of the area would not be unduly affected.

8.3. **Visual Amenity**

- 8.3.1. No one has made an objection concerning the visual effect of the proposed dormer extension on the northern side roof. Having regard to its size and positioning, I am content that it would be generally consistent with similar extensions in the area. In the event of permission being granted it would be necessary to attach a condition requiring precise details of the external finishes to be agreed with the planning authority.
- 8.3.2. The applicant helpfully submitted a photomontage image of the street view of the proposed two-storey extension to the southern side of the dwelling. Given the setback of the extension from the front building line, I do not accept that it would create a terracing effect. However, in my opinion, the extension and its front window would be disproportionately large relative to the existing dwelling and its existing fenestration. Irrespective of what finishes were chosen, the extension would be an obtrusive and incongruous feature in the street scene, out of keeping with the other dwellings in the vicinity. I consider that the extension would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area.

8.4 **Residential Amenity**

- 8.4.1. No one has expressed concern about the effect on residential amenity of the proposed dormer extension on the northern side roof, which would accommodate an *en-suite* bathroom. I agree with the planning authority that the use as proposed of a high-level window would reduce overlooking of neighbouring properties and that the dormer would not have any undue overshadowing or overbearing impact.
- 8.4.2. Overlooking is an expected feature of suburban housing. I established during my site inspection that clear views are available into the rear gardens of neighbouring

properties, including No. 30, from the large first-floor rear window of the applicant's dwelling. Clear views would still be obtainable from this window if it were altered as proposed. The proposed development would introduce two new rear windows on the first floor, both smaller and one set back, from which views towards the neighbouring gardens could also be had. However, given the extent of existing overlooking, I am not persuaded that the development would result in a significant additional loss of privacy to the appellant's property.

- 8.4.3. I carried out an internal inspection of the appellant's dwelling, No. 30. His sitting and television room relies for light on a single window, which is north-facing. The room is not served by any other windows. The existing window looks out across a passageway about 2 metres in width at a blank boundary wall about 2.2 metres in height, beyond which the pitched roof of No. 32 can be seen. If the proposed extension were built, the window would look out at a ground-floor wall of the structure about 2.6 metres away, 2.7 metres high and 4.6 metres wide; and beyond that to a first-floor wall of the structure about 4.6 metres away and 6 metres high. In my opinion, due to its proximity, verticality and height, the proposed extension would have a markedly overbearing effect on the appellant's sitting room, further restricting the outlook from that room.
- 8.4.4. BRE 209 recognises the distinction between daylighting and sunlighting and deals with each in a separate chapter. Daylight is the total diffuse light from the sky during the day, even in cloudy weather, and includes scattered light and reflections. It provides general illumination to interior spaces. Sunlight consists of rays directly from the sun and is heavily influenced by orientation.
- 8.4.5. The applicant has correctly pointed out that as the proposed development would be wholly to the north of No. 30, outside the arc within 90° of due south, overshadowing of any window in the appellant's dwelling is not possible. The appellant agrees with this. In his submission to the planning authority at application stage, he stated that the affected aspect of his dwelling is north-facing and so receives no direct sunlight. The concern he expressed in his appeal statement was not to do with sunlighting but with loss of diffuse daylighting to his living space.
- 8.4.6. Applying the initial test in Section 2.2.4 of BRE 209, it is evident that loss of light to the appellant's sitting room window merits analysis as the distance of each part of the new development from the window is much less than three times its height above the centre

of the window. However, the appellant's reliance in his submission to the planning authority on the 45° approach explained in Section 2.2.16 was misplaced because this method is not valid for windows which directly face the extension. The approach relevant to the geometry of the proposed development is that set out in Section 2.2.23.

8.4.7. The median height of the affected window in No. 30 is roughly 1.5 metres above ground level. It can be established by trigonometry that when measured from the centre of that windows, the proposed extension would subtend an angle of at least 50° to the horizontal, the threshold for analysis being 25°. A daylighting assessment should therefore have been requested and submitted in accordance with BRE 209. However, even without the assistance of such an assessment, it is plain that the development would unacceptably reduce the amount of daylight reaching the appellant's sitting room.

8.5. Conclusion

8.5.1. Notwithstanding the general support in the Development Plan and national policy for the improvement and adaptation of homes, in light of my findings that the proposed two-storey extension to the southern side of the dwelling would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area; would have a markedly overbearing effect on the appellant's sitting room; and would unacceptably reduce the amount of daylight reaching that room, I conclude that that element of the proposed development should not be authorised. However, I find the proposed dormer extension on the northern side roof to be acceptable. That extension is not dependent on the proposed two-storey extension to the south and can proceed as a standalone development.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

9.1. Having considered the nature, location and small scale of the proposed development, the nature of the receiving environment as a built-up urban area, the nature of the foreseeable emissions therefrom, the availability of public piped services to accommodate the foul effluent arising therefrom, the distance from the nearest European site and the absence of any known hydrological link between the application site and any European site, I am content on the basis of objective information that the development is not likely to have a significant effect on any European site, either alone

or in combination with other plans or projects. I therefore conclude that the carrying out of an appropriate assessment under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The application site is located 1.4 kilometres from Priory Stream to the east and about 1.7 kilometres from Slang to the west. The proposed development comprises the demolition of a conservatory and the construction of a two-storey extension. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.2. I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 10.3. The reasons for this conclusion are the nature and small scale of the works, the distance from the nearest water bodies and the lack of known hydrological connections.
- 10.4. I conclude on the basis of objective information that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendations

- 11.1. I recommend to the Commission that planning permission be granted for the proposed dormer extension on the northern side roof for the following reasons and considerations, subject to the conditions set out at Section 12.0 below.

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, in particular Zoning Objective A and Sections 12.3.1.1 and 12.3.7, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed dormer extension on the northern side roof would not adversely affect the visual amenity of the area or seriously injure the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. That part of the development would therefore accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- 11.2. I also recommend that permission for the proposed two-storey extension to the southern side of the dwelling be refused for the following reasons and considerations.

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, in particular Zoning Objective A and Sections 12.3.1.1 and 12.3.7, and to the Third Edition of the Building Research Establishment good practice guide “Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight”, it is considered that the proposed two-storey extension to the southern side roof would adversely affect the visual amenity of the area and that it would overbear the adjoining property, 30 Redesdale Road, cause a reduction in the amount of daylight reaching its sitting room, and thereby seriously injure the residential amenity of that property. That part of the development would not, therefore, accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The dormer extension on the northern side roof shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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 commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
----	---

2.	<p>The proposed two-storey extension to the southern side roof shall not be constructed.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.</p>
3.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes of the proposed dormer extension shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to and agree in writing with the planning authority a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.</p>

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.



TREVOR A RUE

Planning Inspector

15th May 2026

Appendix A: Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	<i>PL-500909-DR-26</i>
Proposed Development Summary	<i>Demolition of conservatory and construction of two-storey extension</i>
Development Address	<i>32 Redesdale Road, Mount Merrion, Co. Dublin</i>
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? (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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.</i>
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</i>	
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"/> <i>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.</i>	<i>No Screening required.</i>
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)?	
<i>No</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3).</i>

Inspector: *Trevor A Rue*

Date: 15th May 2026

TREVOR A RUE