



Inspector's Report

PL-500933-DR-26

Development	280sqm first floor extension to school sports hall building. Site is within curtilage of a Protected Structure. (RPS 1745).
Location	Holy Child Secondary School, Military Road, Killiney, Co. Dublin, A96XP82 (Protected Structure)
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25A/0982/WEB
Applicant(s)	Board of Management c/o Deirdre Hickey
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Paula Kearns & Anthony O'Meara
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	06 th May 2026
Inspector	Bernadette Quinn

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.810ha and is located within the grounds of Holy Child Secondary School located on the western side of Seafield Road in Killiney. The overall school site comprises the main school buildings to the north of the site which includes Killacoona House, a Victorian Tudor style dwelling which is a protected structure, RPS 1745. To the south of the main school buildings is a sports field and further south again is the appeal site which comprises a part single and part two storey sports hall in front of which is a grassed area.
- 1.2. The western boundary of the appeal site contains mature trees and beyond the west site boundary there is a development of detached dwellings 'Ashurst'. To the south there is a tennis court beyond which the southern school boundary contains mature trees and beyond the southern boundary there is a detached house on a large site. To the southeast of the appeal site is a grassed area with mature and semi mature trees and shrubs comprising the southeast boundary of the school grounds. Beyond the southeast boundary there is a detached dormer dwelling 'Colza'.
- 1.3. The existing sports hall building on the appeal site has a stated floor area of 900 sq.m. and has a flat roof over the single storey element and a mono pitched roof over the first-floor element and is finished in render.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development has a floor area of 280 sq.m. and comprises a first-floor extension to the existing 900sqm sports hall building to provide for a fitness Lab/Gym, classroom, WC, store and new escape stairs.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated 16th February 2026 Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council issued notification of decision to grant permission subject to 4 conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

Condition 2: Prior to commencement of development on the site, the Applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority, details of the additional screen planting along the boundary with 'Colza'. The agreed planting details shall be permanently maintained and should the wither or die, shall be replaced within the next planting season with specimens of similar characteristics.

Reason: In the interest of visual and residential amenity.

Condition 3 requires submission of a Construction Management Plan and Arboricultural Survey.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The planning officers report dated 16/02/2026 can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal is acceptable in principle.
- Development Plan Objective SLO130 sets out limitations on development in terms of impact on the environmental sensitivities in the area and/or visual impact. The proposed first floor extension would not have an impact on environmental sensitivities in the area or a visual impact, nor would it generate additional traffic.
- The site is set away from the protected structure and the PA does not consider that the proposal would have a negative impact on the ACA.
- Parks & Landscape Services requirements can be addressed by condition.
- The proposed fire escape is located c. 34m from the boundary with the adjoining property which is lined with mature trees and would not result in undue overlooking on existing dwellings to the west.
- The rear boundary wall of Colza is located c. 24m from the proposed extension with the closest first floor window of the extension c. 30m from the mutual boundary and c. 29m from the fire escape staircase. There is existing buffer planting which is proposed to be supplemented. Details of proposed supplementary planting can be requested by condition.
- Given the limited glazing at first floor, the separation distances to existing residential properties and the fact the extension is within the existing footprint

of the building, there will be no adverse impacts on the amenities of existing adjacent residential properties by way of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing appearance and satisfies the relevant provisions of the Development Plan.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Environmental Health Officer: No objection subject to conditions

Parks & Landscape Services: Further information required in relation to submission of a construction management plan and an arboriculture survey.

Drainage Planning: No objection

Conservation Division: The Planning Officers report states that the Conservation Division report states no objection. I note that there is no Conservation Division report on the file.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None on file

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

Two no. third party submissions received are summarised in the Planning Officer's report.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. The following recent planning history is relevant to the proposal:

D19A/0449: Permission granted by the PA for refurbishment of classroom and former PE hall blocks.

D13A/0160: Permission granted by the PA for development of a new sports hall.

D02A0032: Permission granted for new single storey extension for 6 classrooms and sports changing facilities.

D98A0656: Permission granted for new all weather synthetic grass hockey pitch with floodlighting.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the relevant Development Plan for the area. The site is zoned objective SNI which seeks to protect, improve and encourage the provision of sustainable neighbourhood infrastructure and whereon 'Education' use is permitted in principle.
- 5.1.2. Chapter 4, section 4.2.1 and Policy Objective PHP2 refers to Sustainable Communities and Neighbourhood Infrastructure. Policy Objective PHP7 refers to Schools and seeks to support the provision of school facilities and the development/redevelopment of existing schools for educational and other sustainable community infrastructure uses.
- 5.1.3. Chapter 11 Heritage and Conservation includes Policy Objective HER8 relating to works to protected structures and Policy Objective HER13 - Architectural Conservation Areas. Section 11.4.2 states: While the purpose of ACA designation is to protect and enhance the special character of an area, it should not be viewed as a means of preventing new development but rather to help guide and manage change to ensure developments are sympathetic to the special character of the ACA.
- 5.1.4. Chapter 12 refers to Development Management wherein Section 12.3.2 outlines standards relating to Sustainable Neighbourhood Infrastructure and states the retention and/or improvement of existing facilities and services will be required insofar as possible in accordance with Policy Objective PHP2, Chapter 4.
- Section 12.3.2.5 states that in assessing planning applications for extensions of existing schools, the Planning Authority will have regard to, inter alia, School extensions should be located having regard to adjoining amenities and amenities within the school site.
- 5.1.5. Appendix 4: Record of Protected Structures: RPS 1745 Killacoona (Society of Holy Child Convent School) is located within the school grounds and approx. 85m from the northern boundary of the appeal site.
- 5.1.6. The appeal site is located within the Killiney Architectural Conservation Area.
- 5.1.7. There are two no. map based objectives 'To protect and preserve Trees And Woodlands' situated to the west of the appeal site.

5.1.8. The site is within the boundary of Map Based Objective 130: To ensure that development within this objective area does not (i) have a significant negative impact on the environmental sensitivities in the area including those identified in the SEA Environmental Report, and/or (ii) does not significantly detract from the character of the area either visually or by generating traffic volumes which would necessitate road widening or other significant improvements.

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

The Provision of Schools and the Planning System, A Code of Practice for Planning Authorities (2008).

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The site is not located within a designated area; the closest sites are Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code: 003000) located 1.5km east of the subject site and Dalkey Islands SPA (site code: 004172) located 2.7km northeast of the subject site.

5.4. **EIA Screening**

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

One appeal received from Paula Kearns and Anthony O'Meara can be summarised as follows:

- The appeal includes a copy of the observation to the planning authority in relation to the proposal.
- The appellants property 'Colza' and adjoining properties are located at a substantially lower level than the application site. Proposed windows are

located at elevated positions, and standard separation distances do not provide equivalent privacy protection.

- The proposed extension presents from the appellants' property as a structure equivalent to a multi-storey building positioned directly above and overlooking a residential dwelling.
- The elevated position of the proposal will result in overlooking into the appellants' garden and a bedroom in the neighbouring dwelling and this overlooking is from a regularly occupied institutional use rather than occasional residential viewing.
- The Commission has consistently recognised the impact of overlooking from higher ground which results in dominant surveillance from above. The PA failed to adequately assess this in granting permission.
- The proposal is a departure from the original sports hall which incorporated design measures to safeguard neighbouring privacy, including high-level glazing. The current proposal introduces clear glazed classroom and gym windows at eye level, a glazed fire escape door at first floor and openings directly orientated towards adjoining residential lands which due to the elevated siting offer views over neighbouring properties.
- No architectural measures have been included to mitigate overlooking resulting in the proposal being materially injurious to residential amenity.
- Reliance on screen planting cannot address overlooking impacts and previous planting along the boundary has not functioned as an effective privacy screen.
- The proposal conflicts with objectives in the Development Plan to protect residential amenity.
- The proposed classroom and gym are designed as fully independent structures with potential for third party use resulting in exacerbation of existing traffic problems. An alternative layout could integrate with the existing sports hall and reduce overlooking impacts and these alternatives were not examined.

- The proposal would seriously injure the residential amenities of adjoining properties and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- It is requested that the proposal is refused permission or an alternative design required to eliminate overlooking impacts.
- The proposal does not increase the number of students at the school and does not provide for neighbourhood infrastructure being exclusively for the use of existing school students.
- The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the special character of Killiney ACA, contrary to the Development Plan.
- There is an existing private foul/mixed drain serving the school lands which traverses the appellants property which was omitted from the original planning application for the sports hall and which should be assessed.

6.2. Applicant Response in the case

A response from the applicants' architect and planning consultant can be summarised as follows:

Overlooking:

- The proposal has been carefully designed to ensure no direct overlooking impacts arise. There is no reduction in separation distance with the proposal located a minimum of 23m from the site boundary and 34m from the neighbouring dwelling with no windows at these points. The separation distances between windows are greater again. The proposed fire escape door is orientated towards the school grounds.
- Windows are not directly orientated towards adjoining residential land, being located on the northern part of the eastern elevation which is further from the neighbouring dwelling located to the southeast to prevent adverse overlooking impacts. The closest window is approx. 42m from the nearest corner of Colza. No direct sightlines or views to windows will occur.

- Windows will include frosted glass from a height of 900mm to 1360mm above floor level which will screen views from students in a seated position and internal orientation is away from the appellants property.
- There is a separation distance of 40m between the proposed fire door and properties at Ashurst.
- An established and substantial landscaped buffer between the appeal site and the appellants' property coupled with level differences creates a robust visual barrier obscuring the sports hall from the lower-lying property with no loss of amenity.
- In addition to existing deciduous sycamore trees there is a secondary layer of evergreen planting providing a visual barrier in autumn and winter.
- In response to the concerns raised by the appellant it is proposed to remove the deciduous species and replace with an alternative evergreen boundary.
- An internal connection would result in a substantial loss of floor space. The external access provides a logical external access, and the layout ensures the facility is functionally viable.
- Concerns regarding third party use are speculative and planning conditions restrict third party use. The use proposed is part of the overall school and no other use is proposed.
- The hours of use of the proposed development oppose the normal hours of time spent at home. The school calendar means schools are closed during summer/early autumn when the rear garden is used most frequently. The times when overlooking could occur are limited.
- The omission from the application form of the sites location in an ACA is acknowledged however the design is inherently sympathetic to its conservation context and this administrative oversight is not a material ground for refusal. The PA accepted the application as valid and considered the ACA in their assessment.
- The proposal aligns with the zoning objective for the site and ensures alignment with the 'A' zoning objective on adjacent lands and complies with

Policy Objective PHP7 relating to schools and Development Management Standards in Chapter 12.

- There will be no additional bulk, scale, overbearing appearance or overshadowing on the appellants property and no loss of residential amenity in this regard.
- In relation to foul drainage concerns, the proposal will avail of an existing foul connection which does not discharge to the underground pipes referred to in the appellants' submission.
- Drawings are attached which show proposed glazing incorporating proposed screening manifestations to windows.
- A landscape plan is attached which indicates removal of existing deciduous trees and proposed evergreen planting.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

A response from the PA states no new matters raised which would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

6.4. **Observations**

None received.

6.5. **Further Responses**

A response received reiterates the grounds of appeal and includes the following additional concerns:

- The Commission is requested to require the applicant to submit additional information prior to a decision, including scaled cross sections showing finished floor levels, windowsill and head heights, and ground levels at the appellants property, and sightline diagrams plotting the cone of vision from the proposed glazing into the appellants garden and nearest bedroom windows.
- Ground level images submitted by the applicant underestimate sightlines from first-floor glazing. The Commission is requested to require the applicant to submit first-floor views to demonstrate the view from the proposed windows into the appellants property.

- The use of the site has intensified materially altering the relationship between the school and adjoining houses resulting in an unacceptable loss of amenity and a departure from previously agreed safeguards.
- The southeast slope of the Killiney ACA is defined by low-density landscape dominated residential character with generous spacing between buildings which is relevant when considering the loss of privacy and amenity.
- It is requested that the Commission refuse permission. If the Commission decides to grant permission, draft conditions are outlined which are requested to be attached. Conditions relate to obscure glazing, fire escape vision panel, landscaping, restriction on third-party use and hours of use, and drainage verification.
- The Commission is requested to confirm whether ACA and curtilage of the protected structure were fully considered in the PA's assessment, and any missing heritage analysis should be submitted.
- The Commission is referred to decision ABP-312993-22 as an example where opaque glazing and design responses were required to prevent overlooking into adjoining residential properties.
- The development does not provide any public amenity, and this must be balanced against impacts on immediate neighbours.
- Photographs are attached taken from the appellants garden showing the relationship between the existing gym and the appellants property.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Impacts on Residential Amenity
- Visual Impacts and Built Heritage
- Drainage

- Other Matters

7.2. Impacts on Residential Amenity

- 7.2.1. The proposed development seeks to extend the first floor of the existing sports hall above the existing ground floor element on the eastern elevation. The main elements of the extension will incorporate a gym area, a classroom, escape stairs, terrace and access to existing stairs to the north of the building. The proposal will extend the existing 900 sq.m. sports hall by an additional floor area of 280 sq.m. The proposal will increase the height of the existing eastern section of the sports hall from an existing height of approx. 4.6m to a proposed height of 10.46m. The height of the proposed extension will be below the height of the western section of the existing hall and a flat roof is proposed. The proposed development contains first floor windows on the northern section of the eastern elevation and glazing on a fire escape door on the south elevation towards its east end. A terrace is proposed on the north elevation. Material finishes comprise render, metal and aluminium panels and glazing.
- 7.2.2. The appellants property 'Colza', located to the southeast of the proposed development, is a part dormer and part two storey dwelling and contains a dormer window in the northern roof slope and first floor windows on the western elevation, with both of these elevations orientated towards the appeal site. The closest dwellings at Ashurst are located in excess of 40m to the west and a dwelling is located approx. 90m to the south.
- 7.2.3. The appellants raise concerns in relation to overlooking and overbearing on neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed development, noting the scale of the proposal and the level difference between the appeal site which is at a higher level than adjoining properties. Overlooking concerns arise from glazing to a fire escape door and windows serving the proposed extension.
- 7.2.4. The first party response to the appeal outlines that the proposed fire escape door is orientated towards the school grounds and does not face the appellants property, and that windows serving the classroom and gym are not directly orientated towards adjoining residential land, being located on the northern part of the eastern elevation with the closest window approx. 42m from the nearest corner of Colza and with no direct sightlines to windows. The first party response to the appeal includes a drawing incorporating frosted glass to windows from a height of 900mm to 1360mm above floor level which will screen views from students in a seated position and notes that internal orientation is away from

the windows. It is outlined that an established and substantial landscaped buffer between the appeal site and the appellants property coupled with level differences creates a robust visual barrier obscuring the sports hall from the lower-lying property. Proposals are included with the response to the appeal to remove the deciduous trees at the sites southeastern boundary with Colza and replace with an alternative evergreen boundary.

- 7.2.5. In assessing the proposal the Planning Officer noted that given the limited glazing at first floor, the separation distances to existing residential properties and the fact the extension is within the existing footprint of the building, there will be no adverse impacts on the amenities of existing adjacent residential properties by way of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing appearance.
- 7.2.6. In assessing the proposal the Planning Authority considered the use of the fire escape and proposed first floor windows to the extension would not result in any undue overlooking due to the separation distances from surrounding properties, the presence of existing buffer planting and proposals to supplement existing planting and recommended the inclusion of a condition requiring details of supplementary planting.
- 7.2.7. Concerns raised in relation to overlooking refer to a proposed clear glazed fire escape at first floor on the south elevation. I note that this south facing door will be located in excess of 40m from the rear elevation of Colza to the southeast and glazing will not be orientated towards Colza, over 90m from the closest property on Seafield Road to the south and over 70m from the nearest property in Ashurst to the southwest. The western, southern and southeastern boundary of the school site separating the proposed development from these properties comprises mature trees and hedgerows. Having regard to the south facing orientation of the fire escape which is not directly facing the appellants property to the east, to the separation distances and the presence of dense mature trees along the west, south and southeast boundary of the school site, I do not consider the proposed fire escape is likely to give rise to overlooking into surrounding properties.
- 7.2.8. In relation to proposed first floor windows serving the extension, the first party response to the appeal includes proposals to incorporate frosted glass in windows from a height of 900mm to 1360mm above floor level which it is stated will screen views from students in a seated position. It is also outlined that internal orientation of the classroom will be away from the appellants property.

7.2.9. I note the appellants concerns relating to level differences between the appeal site and the appellants property and that standard separation distances do not provide adequate privacy protection. In this regard I note that separation distances within the development plan require 22m between rear opposing first floor windows and that SPPR1 of the Compact Settlements Guidelines requires a distance of 16m which the response to the appeal states has been exceeded. I note that these requirements relate to directly opposing windows serving residential units above first floor level and are not applicable to the proposed development. However, I also note that separation distances between the proposed development and surrounding residential properties substantially exceed these requirements. Whilst I note the appellants concerns relating to level differences between Colza and the appeal site, I note that proposed windows are not directly orientated towards adjoining residential land, being located on the northern part of the eastern elevation which is further from the appellants dwelling. The closest window is approx. 42m from the nearest corner of Colza with proposed windows facing east. Having regard to the orientation of proposed windows and existing windows serving the appellants property I note that no direct sightlines or views to windows will occur. Having regard to the separation distances and presence of mature planting between the proposed development and the appellants property, and to the proposal to incorporate frosted glass to eliminate potential undue overlooking from the classroom and gym into the appellants property, I am satisfied that undue overlooking will not arise. I do not consider it necessary to require the applicant to submit additional drawings and views demonstrating the extent of overlooking as outlined by the appellant.

7.2.10. I note the first party response to the appeal outlines proposals to provide further screening between the school site and Colza and a landscape plan is attached which includes a proposal to remove 9 no. existing Acers located on the southeast boundary of the school site and replace these with a double row of Cherry Laurel evergreen planting. Having regard to the existing landscaping in place, the separation distances, the proposal to incorporate obscure glazing into proposed first floor windows and the absence of direct overlooking, I do not consider it necessary to remove the existing trees on the southeast boundary and I am satisfied that supplementary landscaping can be provided in addition to existing landscaping. I consider this matter can be addressed by a condition if the Commission decides to grant permission.

- 7.2.11. I do not agree with the appellants concerns that the intensity of use will give rise to unacceptable overlooking and I am satisfied that the proposal does not conflict with Development Plan objectives to protect residential amenity. I consider the proposal complies with Section 12.3.2.5 which states that school extensions should be located having regard to adjoining amenities and amenities within the school site.
- 7.2.12. I note the concerns raised that the proposal will give rise to overbearing impacts on the appellants property and that the appellants property is at a lower level than the appeal site. Noting the presence of an existing sports hall and the proposal for an extension which is below the height of this existing sports hall, the separation distance between the proposed extension and the boundary of the appellants property which is approx. 24m, and to the scale of development proposed, I do not consider the proposal will result in unacceptable overbearing impacts on the appellants property.
- 7.2.13. The appellants refer to the departure from the original sports hall which incorporated design measures to safeguard neighbouring privacy. I have reviewed the planning history relating to the site and I am not aware of any conditions restricting further development of the sports hall and I am satisfied that the design measures proposed will ensure that the proposal does not give rise to unacceptable residential amenity impacts on neighbouring properties and that the proposal complies with Section 12.3.2.5 of the Development Plan relating to school extensions.
- 7.2.14. I note the proposal incorporates a terrace at first floor on the northern elevation overlooking the sports grounds and orientated towards the main school buildings. Having regard to the modest floor area of the terrace and its orientation on site, I do not have concerns in relation to overlooking arising from the use of the terrace.
- 7.2.15. Having regard to the above, I do not agree with the appellants concerns that the proposal would seriously injure the residential amenities of adjoining properties and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

7.3. Visual Impact and Built Heritage

- 7.3.1. The appellant raises concerns in relation to the impact of the proposed development on Killiney ACA and their response to the appeal refers to the sites location within Killiney ACA and the curtilage of a protected structure and questions whether this has been adequately assessed by the PA. The Planning Officer's report states that the site is set

away from the protected structure and the PA does not consider that the proposal would have a negative impact on the ACA.

- 7.3.2. The appeal site is located within Killiney ACA as indicated on the Development Plan map for the area. I refer to the document 'Killiney Proposed Architectural Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Recommendations'¹ wherein the appeal site is located in Character Area 11 – Ashurst 20th Century. Page 33 of the ACA document refers to Character Areas 11-13 20th Century Infill and states that 'these areas contain typical detached modern estate development with moderate sized plots. The predominance of 20th century development that effectively severs the 19th century sites adjacent to Seafield Road from the area of similar character to the north reduces the case in favour of including the whole area in the Killiney ACA. However they are included due to their location and not as a result of their architectural significance'. Section 10 of the ACA document outlines policy objectives relating to new development within the ACA. These include that the Council will seek to ensure that any development including modifications and/or alterations or extensions affecting structures within the Killiney ACA, are designed and sited appropriately and are not detrimental to the character of the structure or its setting and context within the ACA; and Character Area's 11-13 are 20th Century estates which do not contribute to the architectural character of the ACA. Consequently, the Council will adopt a less rigid approach to development proposals in these areas.
- 7.3.3. I refer the Commission to Development Plan Policy Objective HER13 - Architectural Conservation Areas which seeks to protect the character and special interest of ACA's and ensure that development proposals are appropriate to the character of the area having regard to the Character Appraisals and that new development or alteration of a building is appropriate in terms of the proposed design, including scale, height, mass, density, building lines and materials.
- 7.3.4. Having regard to the existing sports hall development on the appeal site and the overall development on the school grounds, to the content of the Killiney ACA Character Appraisal as outlined above, and to Development Plan Policy Objective HER13, I consider the proposed extension to the existing sports hall is appropriate to the character of the area and is appropriate in terms of design, including scale, height and materials. I am therefore

¹ [Architectural Conservation Areas | Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council](#)

satisfied that the proposal is acceptable and I am satisfied that there is sufficient information on the file for the purposes of this assessment.

7.3.5. The overall school site comprises the main school buildings to the north of the appeal site which includes Killacoona House, a Victorian Tudor style dwelling which is a protected structure, RPS 1745. This Victorian Tudor style dwelling is located within the school grounds and approx. 85m from the northern boundary of the appeal site and is separated from the appeal site by school buildings and a sports field. I note that the Planning Officers report refers to the PA Conservation Division report that notes no objection to the proposed development. I refer the Commission to Development Plan Policy Objective HER8 which seeks to protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance. Having regard to the existing development on the appeal site, and to the nature and scale of the proposed extension, I do not consider the proposal will negatively impact the special character and appearance of Killacoona and I am satisfied that there is sufficient information on the file for the purposes of this assessment.

7.3.6. Having regard to the above I consider that the proposed development will not result in unacceptable impacts on Killiney ACA or RPS 1745 Killacoona.

7.3.7. Map based objective SLO130 sets out limitations on development in terms of impact on the environmental sensitivities in the area and visual impact. In assessing the proposal, the Planning Officer was satisfied that the proposed first floor extension would not have an impact on environmental sensitivities in the area or a visual impact.

7.3.8. Having regard to the scale and design of the proposed development, and to the existing development on the appeal site and overall school site, as well as the surrounding pattern of development, I consider the proposal is acceptable with regard to visual impact and I am satisfied that the proposal complies with map based objective SLO130.

7.4. **Drainage**

7.4.1. The appellants raise concerns that an existing foul/mixed drain serving the school traverses the appellants property should be assessed. In response to the appeal the first party states that the proposal will avail of an existing foul connection which does not discharge to the underground pipes referred to in the appellants submission. I note that no alterations to existing site drainage are proposed as part of the application and the proposal does not give rise to an increase in student numbers and will use an existing

mains foul connection. I therefore do not consider the proposal gives rise to the need to assess the drain referred to by the first party.

7.5. Other Matters

- 7.5.1. The appeal outlines concerns in relation to potential for third party use and requests that a condition be attached restricting the use for the school. I note that permission reference D13A/0160 relating to the sports hall included a condition that the sports hall be for the exclusive use of the pupils and staff of the school and shall not be available for commercial use by others. I note that the PA did not attach such a condition to the decision to grant permission for the proposed extension. I do not consider it necessary or appropriate to restrict the use of the proposed extension.
- 7.5.2. In relation to concerns raised that the proposal does not increase the number of students at the school and does not provide for neighbourhood infrastructure being exclusively for the use of existing school students, I do not consider it a specific requirement that the proposal should facilitate an increase in student numbers. I note that education use is permitted in principle on SNI zoned lands and noting the existing educational use on the site I consider the proposal to provide additional facilities for existing students is acceptable in principle.
- 7.5.3. Concerns are raised in relation to the applicant's failure to indicate on the planning application form that the appeal site is located within an Architectural Conservation Area and that the application is invalid. The first party response to the appeal outlines that this was an administrative oversight and is not material to the assessment of the appeal. I note that the Planning Authority accepted the planning application as a valid application and I consider matters relating to validity are matters for the Planning Authority. I note that the Planning Officer's assessment refers to the site's location within Killiney ACA and I have considered the potential impacts of the proposed development having regard to its location within the ACA. I am satisfied that the proposal has been assessed with regard to its impact on the ACA and I do not consider that the proposal should be refused on this basis.
- 7.5.4. The appellants outline concerns relating to pressure for on-street car parking and congestion and that any third party use would exacerbate these problems. I note the response of the first party which states that the proposed extension is for use as part of the school and that no other use is proposed and that the proposal will not facilitate an increase in student numbers. I therefore do not consider the proposal has the potential to

exacerbate traffic congestion or give rise to an increase in parking demand and I consider the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

- 7.5.5. In relation to concerns that the proposed first floor extension is not internally connected, I note the first party response that an internal connection would result in substantial loss of floor space. I note that such an arrangement is not unusual for institutional or educational uses. Having regard to the use proposed and the first party's case that an internal connection would result in loss of floor space I do not consider it necessary to require an internal connection and I consider the proposed extension is acceptable in this regard.
- 7.5.6. The appellants outline conditions which are requested to be attached to any grant of permission. These conditions include requirements relating to obscure glazing, fire escape vision panel, landscaping, restriction on third-party use and hours of use, and drainage verification. I note the drawings submitted with the response to the appeal by the first party which outline measures relating to obscure glazing and I am satisfied that a standard condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the drawings submitted will address these matters. In relation to requirements relating to the fire escape, I have concluded in my assessment above that no overlooking will arise and I do not consider it necessary to attach a condition in this regard. I have addressed matters relating to drainage and landscaping in my assessment and I recommend the inclusion of a condition relating to landscaping as outlined in Section 7.2.10 above.
- 7.5.7. I note the report of the Parks and Landscape Services Report refers to the requirement for an arboricultural survey noting the existence of a map based objective 'To protect and preserve Trees And Woodlands' within the red line boundary. The PA attached condition No. 3 which required a detailed site-specific Construction Management Plan which should be informed by the undertaking of an Arboricultural Survey and submission of a Tree Protection Plan. If the Commission decides to grant permission I consider it appropriate that a condition be attached in this regard.

8.0 **AA Screening**

- 8.1. Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive.

I have considered case PL-500933-DR-26 in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The proposed development is

located within an existing school site and comprises the construction of an extension to an existing sports hall building. The closest European Sites are Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code: 003000) located 1.5km east of the proposed development and Dalkey Islands SPA (site code: 004172) located 2.7km northeast of the proposed development.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development 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 scale and nature of the development
- The location of the development in a serviced urban area, distance from European Sites and urban nature of intervening habitats, absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.
- Having regard to the screening determination of the PA.

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 **Water Framework Directive**

9.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body

status, as required under the Directive. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the zoning objective “SNI” for the site as set out in the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, to the existing educational use on site, to the nature and scale of the proposed development, to separation distances from neighbouring properties and the pattern of development in the area, and to Section 12.3.2.5 of the Development Plan, it is considered that the proposed development, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area, would not detract from the character of Killiney Architectural Conservation Area and would not negatively impact the character or setting of the Protected Structure (RPS 1745). The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by An Coimisiun Pleanala on 02nd April 2026 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.

Reason: in the interest of clarity.

2. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:
 - (a) First floor windows shall include frosted glass from a height of 900mm to 1360mm above floor level

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

3. The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This scheme shall include the following:

- (a) A plan to scale of not less than [1:500] showing –
 - (i) Retention of existing trees and hedgerows
 - (ii) The measures to be put in place for the protection of existing trees and hedgerows during the construction period
 - (iii) The species, variety, number, size and locations of all proposed trees and shrubs
 - (iv) Details of screen planting along the boundary of the neighbouring property to the southeast 'Colza'
- (b) A timescale for implementation.

All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

4. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times

will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: in order to safeguard the amenities of property in the vicinity.

5. The construction of 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 commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including:

- a) An Arboricultural Survey and submission of a Tree Protection Plan, showing the proposed line of protective tree fencing, with details of the proposed fencing and locations of materials storage and site compounds etc. in accordance with, BS 5837: 2012 | Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.
- b) Location of the site and materials compound(s) including area(s) identified for the storage of construction refuse;
- c) Location of areas for construction site offices and staff facilities;
- d) Details of site security fencing and hoardings;
- e) Details of on-site car parking facilities for site workers during the course of construction;
- f) Details of the timing and routing of construction traffic to and from the construction site and associated directional signage, to include proposals to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads to the site;
- g) Measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network;
- h) Measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network;
- i) Details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels;
- j) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater;
- k) Off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste and details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil;

- l) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains.
- m) A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan shall be kept for inspection by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of amenities, public health and safety.

6. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer or any agent acting on its behalf, shall prepare a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) including demonstration of proposals to adhere to best practice and protocols. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness, these details shall be placed on the file and retained as part of the public record. The RWMP must be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement prior to the commencement of development. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times

Reason: in the interest of proper planning and sustainable development.

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."

Bernadette Quinn
Planning Inspector

09th June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500933-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	280sqm first floor extension to school sports hall building. Site is within curtilage of a Protected Structure. (RPS 1745).
Development Address	Holy Child Secondary School, Military Road, Killiney, Co. Dublin, A96XP82 (Protected Structure).
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.	State the Class here

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold 10. Infrastructure projects (b) (iv) urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. The total site area is 0.81 hectares, the site is located within a built-up area and is in an area characterised by residential development.
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500933-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	280sqm first floor extension to school sports hall building. Site is within curtilage of a Protected Structure. (RPS 1745).
Development Address	Holy Child Secondary School, Military Road, Killiney, Co. Dublin, A96XP82 (Protected Structure)
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 (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The development has a modest footprint measuring 280 sq.m. located within the footprint of an existing structure, comes forward as a standalone project, does not require demolition works, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development)	Given the urban nature of the proposal with connection to public services for wastewater, water and surface water, there are no significant sensitivities in the immediate area.

<p>in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>The subject site is not located within a designated site, the closest are Dalkey Island SAC (site code: 003000) located 1.5km east of the subject site and Dalkey Islands SPA (site code: 004172) located 2.7km northeast of the subject site. The site is located within Killiney Architectural Conservation Area and proximate to protected structure RPS 1745.</p> <p>The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan.</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	
<p>Likelihood of Significant Effects</p>	<p>Conclusion in respect of EIA</p>

There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required. Include the following paragraph under EIA Screening (a separate heading) in the Inspectors report.
---	--

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)