



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL501014-SD-26

Development	Retention Permission for alterations to previously approved planning application No. SD21B/0205. The retention application includes alterations to the front elevation for the retention of a ground floor entrance door to an existing side extension to facilitate access to a ply room/boot room
Location	12 Mountdown Road, Terenure, Dublin 12
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD25B/0720W
Applicant(s)	Gary Connoly
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Retention
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Gary Connoly
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	11 th May 2026
Inspector	Andrew Hersey

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1 The subject site is situated on the south-eastern side of Mountdown Road within a well-established residential neighbourhood. It contains a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a pitched roof, incorporating a two-storey side extension as visible from the roadside elevation.
- 1.2 The property is accessed via a vehicular entrance from Mountdown Road and provides off-street parking to the front, together with private amenity space to the rear. The front elevation is finished in a combination of brick and render at ground-floor level, with a rendered finish at first-floor level.
- 1.3 The surrounding streetscape is characterised by semi-detached dwellings of a broadly similar scale, form and appearance, although the external finishes vary from those of the subject property.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The development comprises the retention of a ground-floor entrance door on the front (street-facing) elevation, serving a playroom/boot room, which differs from the arrangement previously permitted under Planning Register Reference SD21B/0205

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

- 3.1 **Decision** – Refuse Permission for the following reason:

The granting of retention permission for the as-constructed subject development would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments which would, in themselves and cumulatively, be harmful to the residential amenities of the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2 Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1 The case planners report raises the following issues;

- That Planning permission was previously granted under Planning Reg. Ref. SD21B/0205 for a two-storey side extension, an attic conversion incorporating front and rear dormer windows, and a ground-floor bay projection.
- That the current application seeks retention permission for alterations to the front elevation, specifically the retention of a ground-floor entrance door serving an existing playroom/boot room within the side extension. As indicated on the submitted drawings a window and entrance door have been installed in place of the ground-floor window previously permitted on the front elevation of the side extension. The proposed door provides an additional means of access from the front elevation of the dwelling.
- It is noted that the ground-floor plans approved under Planning Register Reference SD21B/0205 provided for two internal access points between the main dwelling and the side extension. The report further notes that the plans submitted under retention application SD25B/0316W, which was subsequently refused, indicated that no internal access was provided between the main dwelling and the previously approved side extension. Those plans identified the extension as being in use as a "family flat". The report states that no planning history has been identified indicating that permission was granted for the provision of a family flat at the subject property.
- In addition, the report observes that the particulars submitted with the current application make no reference to a family flat use. The floor plans accompanying the current application, which relate solely to the ground-floor level, indicate that the constructed side extension is connected internally to the main dwelling by a single access point.
- It is stated that the proposal would, if permitted, set an undesirable precedent for similar developments, which would in themselves and cumulatively, be harmful to the residential amenities of the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. This element of the subject proposal cannot, therefore, be favourably considered by the Planning Authority and should be refused retention permission.

3.2.2 Other Technical Reports

None on file

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None on file

3.4. Third Party Observations

None received

4.0 Planning History

There are three previous applications on this site as follows:

- 4.1 Planning Re. Ref. SD25B/0316W for *Alterations to the front elevation including the addition of a new entrance door to facilitate access to a family flat, new roof canopy over the main entrance door & alterations to the front bay window with associated works.*

Spilt decision issued to Grant Retention for the retention of new roof canopy over the main entrance door & alterations to the front bay window with associated works subject to conditions and Refuse Retention for the retention of alterations to the front elevation including the addition of a new entrance door to facilitate access to a family flat. The reason for refusal is as follows:

Having regard to the as-constructed nature of the development subject to this application, and existing layout of the ground floor level of the previously permitted side extension element, the addition of a new entrance door to facilitate access to a family flat at the subject site would be contrary to the provisions of Section 12.6.8 of the CDP regarding Family Flat development, and if permitted, set an undesirable precedent for similar developments, which would in themselves and cumulatively, be harmful to the residential amenities of the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- 4.2 Planning Re. Ref. SD23B/0070 granted retention permission for a pedestrian gate from the rear garden of the property onto Limekiln Close for *Alterations to the front elevation including the addition of a new entrance door to facilitate access to a*

family flat, new roof canopy over the main entrance door & alterations to the front bay window with associated works.

- 4.3 Planning Re. Ref. SD21B/0205 granted permission for ground and first floor extension to side; first floor extension to rear; new ground floor bay window to front; attic conversion with dormer windows to front & rear & associated site works.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

5.1.1 The South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the statutory development plan in force in the area at present.

5.1.2 Within the plan the site is subject to zoning objective 'RES' which seeks to *protect and/or improve residential amenities*

5.1.3 The South Dublin County Council House Extension Design Guide 2025 applies to the proposed development. In particular, Policy BPF1 – *All Extensions and Alterations to Houses* requires that proposed extensions to existing dwellings should:

- Respect the appearance and character of the existing house and the surrounding streetscape/local area.
- Avoid appearing overly dominant in relation to the existing dwelling by reason of scale, massing or position.
- Provide a high standard of internal accommodation and adequate usable external amenity space.
- Incorporate energy-efficient measures where practicable.
- Avoid adverse impacts on adjoining properties, including undue visual intrusion or overbearing effects.
- Not result in significant additional overshadowing of neighbouring properties.
- Avoid overlooking or increasing opportunities for overlooking of adjoining properties. Where new windows have the potential to result in overlooking or loss

of privacy, alternative design solutions should be considered, including the repositioning of windows, the use of high-level windows (with a sill height of at least 1.7 metres above internal floor level), angled windows, or obscure glazing.

- Give appropriate consideration to the selection of external finishes, including the use of light-coloured materials on elevations facing neighbouring properties.
- Ensure the retention of adequate private amenity space.

5.1.4 Policy H15: Family Flats; seeks to '*Support family flat development subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.*' Objective 1 states '*To favourably consider a family flat development where the Council is satisfied that there is a valid need for semi-independent accommodation for an immediate family member or members, subject to the criteria outlined in Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring*'

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- The Grand Canal pNHA (Site Code 002104) is located 3.6km to the north of the site
- The Dodder Valley pNHA (Site Code 000991) is located 3.0km to the southwest of the site
- The South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024) is located 8km to the east of the site
- South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) is located 8km to the east of the site

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1 The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning & Development Regulations 2001, as amended. 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 A first party appeal was lodged on the 19th March 2026. The appeal in summary raises the following issues;

- That the retained entrance door represents only a minor alteration to an approved side extension, replacing a previously permitted picture window without changing the size, scale, form or appearance of the development.
- That the appellant submits that the extension remains physically and functionally integrated with the main dwelling and continues to operate as part of a single residential unit. It is contended that no family flat, separate dwelling or subdivision has been created or proposed, and that the Planning Authority's concerns in this regard are unsupported by the evidence before it.
- The appellant further argues that the refusal is based on speculation regarding a potential future subdivision rather than any actual planning harm or conflict with planning policy.
- It is maintained that an existing condition attached to the parent permission already provides an effective safeguard against any future subdivision, rendering the refusal of retention permission unnecessary and disproportionate.
- The appellant further contends that secondary entrance doors are a common and established feature of residential development in the locality. The appeal statement identifies a number of comparable properties in the surrounding area and argues that the retained door is consistent with the prevailing character of the neighbourhood and would not give rise to any undesirable planning precedent.
- It is stated that the retained entrance door is consistent with the prevailing pattern of development in the area, noting that No. 10 Mountdown Road, adjoining the appeal site, historically incorporated a similar secondary entrance arrangement. On this

basis, it is argued that the proposal reflects an established feature of the streetscape and would not constitute an undesirable precedent.

- The appellant further notes that the property historically benefited from a secondary side entrance door and submits that the retained door effectively reinstates a longstanding access arrangement rather than introducing a new or unfamiliar feature to the dwelling
- Reference is made to planning permission SD24B/0089, which the appellant considers to be indicative of the Planning Authority's acceptance of similar secondary access arrangements. The appellant submits that this permission provides a relevant planning context and supports the contention that the retained door would not give rise to an undesirable precedent

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- 7.3.1 A response from the Planning Authority was received on the 20th April 2026 and states that the Planning Authority confirms its decision and that the issues raised in the appeal have been covered in the Chief Executives Order

7.4. Observations

- 7.4.1 No observations were received

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1.1 I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file and I have inspected the site and have had regard to relevant local development plan policies and guidance.
- 8.1.2 I am satisfied the substantive issues arising from the grounds of this third party appeal relate to the following matters;
- Principle of Proposed Development/Development Plan Policy

8.2 Principle of Proposed Development/Development Plan Policy

- 8.2.1 The proposed development site is located within an area designated under the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022–2028 (hereinafter referred to as "the Plan") with zoning objective 'RES' – "To protect and/or improve residential amenity". Residential extensions are generally permissible in principle within lands subject to this zoning objective, subject to compliance with the relevant policies, objectives and development management standards of the Plan.
- 8.2.2 The proposed development comprises the retention of a second entrance door on the front elevation at ground floor level of a side extension previously permitted under Planning Register Reference SD21B/0205. The permission granted under that application provided for a two-storey side extension with a window at the location where the entrance door has subsequently been constructed.
- 8.2.3 The entrance door for which retention permission is being sought serves a boot room/playroom located within the side extension. While this room has access to an adjoining WC, the WC also serves the family room, which is directly connected to the principal accommodation of the dwelling. Accordingly, the boot room/playroom does not function as a self-contained unit and remains physically integrated with the main dwelling through the family room. The internal layout and circulation arrangements are therefore consistent with the use of the side extension as ancillary accommodation associated with the principal dwelling rather than as a separate residential unit.
- 8.2.4 I note that the planning authority's concerns, as expressed in the assessment report and reason for refusal, relate primarily to the possibility that the retained entrance door could facilitate the future subdivision of the dwelling. In this regard, I note that a previous retention application at the site (Reg. Ref. SD25B/0316W) proposed a family flat arrangement which did not provide for an internal connection between the side extension and the principal dwelling.
- 8.2.5 Notwithstanding the foregoing, the plans submitted with the current application indicate that the side extension remains physically connected to the principal dwelling and does not comprise self-contained accommodation. While I have some reservations regarding the practical purpose of the retained entrance door, I am not

satisfied that the retained door, of itself, results in the subdivision of the dwelling or the creation of an independent residential unit.

8.2.6 I have carefully considered the reason for refusal, which states that the granting of retention permission would set an undesirable precedent for similar developments which would, in themselves and cumulatively, be harmful to the residential amenities of the area. However, neither the planning authority's assessment nor the reason for refusal identifies any specific harm arising from the retained entrance door in terms of visual amenity, residential amenity, privacy, overlooking, access, parking arrangements or the character of the streetscape. Rather, the concern appears to be based on the possibility that the retained entrance door could facilitate a future subdivision of the dwelling.

8.2.7 I further note that I have not identified any specific policy or objective of the Plan, nor any provision of the South Dublin County Council House Extension Design Guide, which would render the provision of a secondary entrance door on the front elevation of a dwelling unacceptable in principle. While each proposal must be assessed on its own merits, I do not consider that the retention of the entrance door in the circumstances of this case would establish an undesirable planning precedent or give rise to any identifiable injury to residential amenity.

8.2.8 To the extent that concerns remain regarding the future use of the extension, I am satisfied that such matters could be adequately addressed by way of an appropriately worded condition restricting the use of the extension to purposes ancillary to the principal dwelling and prohibiting its occupation as a separate residential unit. A condition of this nature was previously imposed under Planning Register Reference SD21B/0205. In these circumstances, I am not satisfied that the reason for refusal is supported by the particular facts and circumstances of the case.

8.2.9 For the reasons outlined above, I consider that the reason for refusal has not been substantiated and that the proposed development would not materially injure the residential amenities of the area or otherwise conflict with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. I therefore recommend that the Commission overturn the decision of the Planning Authority and grant permission for retention, subject to appropriate conditions

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2 The subject site is located
- 3.5km to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024)
 - 3.5km to the west of the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210)
- 9.3 The proposed development comprises of the retention of a door on the front elevation of a residential house in a suburban area. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.4 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, and its location in a suburban area, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site
- 9.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The relatively small scale nature of the works proposed
 - The lack thereof of any hydrological connection from the proposed development to the Natura 2000 site.
 - Having regard to the screening report/determination carried out by the Planning Authority
- 9.6 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 9.7 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The proposed development is not located in close proximity to any surface water bodies
- 10.2 The proposed development consists of the retention of a front door on a residential house in a suburban area.
- 10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.4 I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 10.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The minor scope of the works and nature of the development
 - The distance to the nearest water body, the Dodder Valley and the lack of hydrological connections to the same.
- 10.6 I conclude that 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 Recommendation

- 11.1 I recommend that permission for the development be granted.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the information submitted with the application and the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would comply with the zoning objective for the site and policies with respect to residential extensions as set out in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, would not be injurious to the visual or residential amenities of the area or to adjoining properties, and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Conditions

1.	The development shall be retained 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. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2.	The entrance door hereby permitted shall not be used in connection with the occupation of any part of the dwelling as a separate residential unit, family flat, apartment or other form of independent living accommodation. Reason: To prevent the unauthorised subdivision of the dwelling and in the interests of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area
3	Apart from any departures specifically authorised by this permission, the development shall comply with the conditions of the parent permission Planning Register Reference No. SD21B/0205 unless the conditions set out hereunder specify otherwise. This permission shall expire on the same date as the parent permission Reason: In the interest of clarity and to ensure that the overall development is carried out in accordance with the previous permission(s)

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

Andrew Hersey
Planning Inspector

8th June 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL501014-SD-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of Front Door
Development Address	12 Mountdown Road, Terenure, Dublin 12
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX /OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	☐ 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 <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ 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
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	

☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☐ 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

Inspector: _____

Date: _____