



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501029-DR-26

Development

Modify and extend property to include a)
ground floor extension to rear of property
b) first floor extension to rear of property

Location

4, Wynnsward Drive, Clonskeagh, Dublin
14, D14F9R9

Planning Authority

Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D25B/0726/WEB

Applicant(s)

Conal Boland

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission + Conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party Normal Planning Appeal

Appellant(s)

David & Niamh Vickery

Observer(s)

Michael and Mary Kirby
Danny O'Brien
Barry & Marie Dillon

Date of Site Inspection

14th May 2026

Inspector

Michele Beirne

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0	Planning History.....	5
5.0	Policy Context.....	5
6.0	EIA Screening.....	6
7.0	The Appeal	7
8.0	Assessment	11
9.0	AA Screening.....	17
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	17
11.0	Recommendation.....	18
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	18
13.0	Conditions.....	18
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	20

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located at No. 4 Wynnsward Drive, Clonskeagh, Dublin. The site accommodates a two-storey dwelling, it was previously part of a semi-detached dwelling until permission was granted for the subdivision of the house into two self-contained units. The dwelling is set back from the public road and there is off-street parking to the front of the dwelling. The site adjoins No. 4A Wynnsward Drive to the east and No. 3 Wynnsward Drive to the west. The dwelling has a relatively large rear garden. There is a timber panel fence partly separating the rear gardens of No.'s 4 and 4A and a boundary wall separating the rear gardens of No.'s 4 and 3. There is a lane to the rear of the site that links UCD and Belfield Close to the Clonskeagh Road. The site has a stated area of 0.307 hectares.
- 1.2. The site is in an established residential area and Wynnsward Drive links Clonskeagh Road to the UCD campus. There are a mix of two-storey residential dwellings, extensions and roof finishes in the area. External finishes on Wynnsward Drive are predominately rendered, a mix of brick and render finishes are also evident. The site is well served by local services and amenities in the Clonskeagh area.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The proposed development is described as follows:
- Ground floor extension to rear of property,
 - First floor extension to rear of property.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.2. Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council (DLRCC) issued notification of a decision to grant permission on the 20th of February 2026 subject to 2 conditions.

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Reports

The planning report can be summarised as follows:

- The site is zoned objective A 'residential', an extension is permitted in principle where compatible with the Plan and proper planning and sustainable development.
- The site history is detailed to establish the authorised rear profile of the dwelling.
- The constructed dormer is acknowledged as an unauthorised element because it materially departs from the form granted permission under PA Ref. D16A/0079, ACP Ref. PL06D.246532.
- The constructed dormer is only considered as part of the existing physical context insofar as it contributes to the cumulative visual and residential amenity impacts of the proposed extension.
- There will be no undue overbearance or overshadowing impacts on No. 3 by virtue of the bulk and mass of the proposed extensions.
- No overlooking impacts are anticipated as there are no side windows on the proposed first floor extension or ground floor extension.
- No undue visual impacts are anticipated, the design would be harmonious with existing extensions to No. 4 and No. 4A.
- The proposed first floor and ground floor extensions are acceptable and accord with the Development Plan.
- For clarity, the unauthorised rear dormer remains outside the scope of the assessment.

3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage: No objection subject to conditions relating to surface water management and any changes to hardstanding areas.

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

None.

3.5. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.5.1. Four third party submissions were made to the Planning Authority, observations raised largely reflect the grounds of appeal set out in Section 7.

4.0 Planning History

4.1.1. Site

- PA Ref. D16A/0079, ACP Ref. PL06D.246532: Retention permission granted in 2016 for an extension to the front and permission granted for a new vehicular entrance, a dormer window to the rear and a roof light to the front.
- PA Ref. D16B/0166, ACP Ref. PL06D.246882: Retention permission granted in 2016 for a first-floor extension to the rear.
- PA Ref. D09A/0475: Retention permission granted in 2010 for the subdivision of a house into 2 self-contained units.

4.1.2. Prior to subdivision

- D06A/1956: Permission refused in 2007 at Lismore House, Wynnsward Drive for a new home office and garage.

4.1.3. Adjacent site No. 4A

- PA Ref. D16B/0074, ACP Ref. PLO6D.246661: Permission granted at No. 4A Wynnsward Drive in 2016 for a single and two storey extension and roof lights to the rear.
- D23A/0034: Retention permission refused in 2023 at No. 4A Wynnsward Drive for change of use from original garage use to habitable unit.

4.1.4. Adjacent site No. 3

- PA Ref. D14A/0041: Permission granted in 2014 at No. 3 Wynnsward Drive for a side and rear extension, attic conversion, roof lights, minor modifications to the front elevation and the relocation of the vehicular entrance.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028:

Zoning:

5.1.1 The area is zoned 'A', the zoning objective is to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities. The proposed development is permitted in principle in this zone.

Summary of key policy:

5.1.2 Chapter 4 Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place:

- Policy Objective PHP19 Existing Housing Stock – Adaption: Conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption of homes (*part of PHP19*).

5.1.3 Chapter 10 Environmental Infrastructure and Flood Risk:

- Policy Objective EI6 Sustainable Drainage Systems: Ensure that all development proposals incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems.

5.1.4 Chapter 12 Development Management, in particular:

- 12.3 Neighbourhood - People, Homes and Place
 - 12.3.1 Quality Design
 - 12.3.7 Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas
 - 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings
 - (ii) Extensions to the Rear

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. The closest European sites are South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) and South Dublin Bay SAC (000210) located approximately 2.5km 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 and 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

A third party appeal was lodged on behalf of residents of No. 3 Wynnsward Drive regarding the decision to grant permission. The appeal is summarised as follows:

- The appeal highlights technical concerns with the application: It should have been invalidated, that the application form does not include all previous applications for No. 4, the rear elevation is planning non-compliant, the floor area is incorrect which has implications for contributions, insufficient detail on side elevations drawings has been provided and concern of a possible encroachment onto No. 3.
- DLRCC stated the dormer is a material deviation, granting permission would consolidate unauthorised development.
- The appellant cites case law highlighting how a case turned on whether deviation was or was not material¹, noting that unauthorised development cannot avail of planning exemptions,² that planning permission is indivisible³ and why we have planning law.⁴
- While expects Commission to refuse to invoke Section 35 of the Act, it is impossible to avoid addressing unauthorised development on the same elevation as the proposed development.
- Planning permission permits No. 4 as a single dwelling only, the property is in unauthorised use as a house in multiple occupation.
- The extension appears designed to facilitate occupation by paying tenants and undermines conditions of planning permission granted.
- The proposed design is piecemeal, ad hoc and visually incongruous, it would cause adverse residential and visual impacts and depreciate the value of No. 3.

¹ Cork County Council v Cliftonhill Ltd (2001)

² Fingal CoCo v Creaan and Signways Holdings Ltd (2001), Sligo County Council v Martin (2007), Cork County Council v Slattery Precast Concrete Ltd (2008), Cronin (Readymix Ltd) v An Bord Pleanála (2017)

³ Horne v Freeney

⁴ Wicklow County Council v Kinsella (2015) Meath County Council v Murray (2017)

- Case law is referenced to highlight it is not necessary to give very detailed information on how development would reduce the value of land significantly or adversely affect the enjoyment of land.⁵
- The property is already overdeveloped and proposed extensions cause additional overshadowing and impact No. 3 ground floor extension.
- The proposed development is contrary to the zoning and Section 12.3.7 Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas, it fails to improve or protect adjoining residential amenities.
- The appellants object to proximity of the extensions to the boundary with No. 3, the length of the ground floor extension and that it is projecting past the ground floor extension of No. 3.
- The external finishes and design are not in harmony with existing.
- The proposed development as submitted sets a poor precedent, is contrary to the established pattern and character of development in the area.
- Reasons for refusal are suggested based on the points above.
- The appeal includes an appendix with photographs of student tenant cars living at No.'s 4 and 4A parked on the footpath.

7.2. **Applicant Response in the case of a 3rd Party Appeal**

The applicant response to the appeal is as follows:

- The applicant confirms they are the owner of the property and submitted a copy folio and map showing ownership.
- The applicant provided planning context and submitted correspondence from DLRCC to the previous owner regarding the subdivision of a semi-detached house into an end of terrace and a mid-terrace house, enforcement proceedings and clarification on exempted development for each house.
- The applicant has submitted correspondence from their agent stating they are a registered architect retained by the applicant, they have provided a certificate of

⁵ Gleann Fia v An Bord Pleanála (2019)

compliance for development at No. 4 (PA Ref. D09A/0475; PA Ref. D16A/0079, ACP Ref. PL06D.246532; PA Ref. D16B/0166, ACP Ref. PL06D.246882) and that the previous owner got retention permission for the subdivision of 4 Wynnsward Drive into No. 4 and No. 4A.

- The applicant notes the footprint of No. 4 is significantly smaller than No. 3.
- The existing ground floor rear extension measures 28sqm and the proposed ground floor extension is less than 12sqm.
- The applicant states the appeal is erroneous in fact and libelous in content.
- No. 4 is no longer a student house but the applicant's home.
- Inaccurate comments are stated about oversailing and encroachment. A mediation agreement defining the boundary to the rear of No. 3 and No. 4 has been submitted.
- Photographs of student tenant cars living at No 4 and 4a parked on the footpath referenced in the appeal is a false statement.
- The applicant highlights that Wynnsward Drive is a main entrance into UCD, they are also frustrated about cars on the road and have written to DLRCC Roads Department on the matter.
- The applicant queries how a modest extension can be overbearing and compares it with the extension granted at No. 3.
- The 2m boundary wall at No. 4's side gives privacy to No. 3 and adds to the value of this property.
- The applicant's courtyard is overlooked by No. 3 from a first floor bay window. A photograph has been submitted.
- There is no overshadowing, the rear of the houses face south and No. 3 is more westerly than No.4.
- The applicant notes that plans for the extension at No. 3 included trees along the boundary.
- A photograph showing the rear of No. 4 and garden has been submitted to support the application.

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

7.3.1. The Planning Authority stated the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

7.4. **Observations**

7.4.1. Three observations were received, two from residents of Hacienda Wynnsward Drive and No. 6 Wynnsward Drive and one from a chartered surveyor on the boundary between No. 3 and No. 4. They are summarised as follows:

Observations from residents of Wynnsward Drive

7.4.2. Observations largely reflect the following aspects of the appeal on the following:

- Overdevelopment
- Piecemeal development
- Commercial property
- Unauthorised development on site
- Contrary to the Development Plan
- Parking concerns
- Poor precedent

Additional points raised include:

- The commercial/multi-occupant use of the property has insufficient parking and creates risks to pedestrians and road users.
- The multi-use of the property raises health and safety concerns.

Observation on boundary between No. 4 and No. 3

7.4.3. An observation was made by a chartered surveyor on the boundary between No. 3 and No. 4. It is summarised as follows:

- The rear boundary of No. 3 and No. 4 Wynnsward Drive was subject to a boundary dispute resolved through mediation.
- The chartered surveyor acted on behalf of No. 3 to assist the mediation process and has reviewed the application under appeal.

- Following mediation, the boundary wall was conceded and agreed as the midpoint between rear extensions and it was agreed that a new boundary wall would be constructed on the No. 4 side of the line commencing at the rear of the extension to No. 4.
- The boundary wall was erected in accordance with this agreement.
- The proposed plans indicate a dashed red line going through the party wall and centre of the chimney from the front façade to the rear boundary, with the 100mm from the rear extension noted on both drawings.
- It is noted that the proposed extension adheres to the mediation boundary agreement.

7.5. **Further Responses**

None sought.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. 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, having inspected the site and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the principle of the proposed development is in accordance with Policy Objective PHP19 Existing Housing Stock – Adaption and the ‘A’ zoning objective for the area in the Development Plan. I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Use of property and dormer window,
- Design, residential amenity and visual impact,
- Other matters.

8.2. **Use of property and dormer window**

8.2.1. Concerns are raised about the use of the dwelling for student accommodation and health and safety concerns arising from this use of the property. The appellants

stated that the extension appears designed to facilitate occupation by paying tenants, undermining planning permission granted. I note that a condition relating to occupancy of the dwelling as a single residential unit was included in retention permissions granted in 2016 and 2010 (PA Ref. D16B/0166, ACP Ref. PL06D.246882 and PA Ref. D09A/0475). The applicant has submitted proof of ownership and has stated it is used as a home. Having regard to the above and the nature of the proposed ground and first floor extensions, I do not consider that a condition to control use is necessary in any grant of permission.

8.2.2. The appellants stated the rear elevation is non planning compliant, that planning history identifies a material deviation represented by the as constructed dormer and that the DL RCC planners report confirms a material deviation. They state granting permission would consolidate unauthorised development, set an undesirable precedent for similar type properties and represents overdevelopment. I note that the appellants highlight case law to support the grounds of appeal and measures under Section 35 of the Act to refuse permission based on past conduct. The applicant has submitted correspondence from their agent stating that in their opinion planning permission is in compliance with planning orders and the Development Plan. I also note the planning history and that the planners report acknowledges the constructed dormer window as an unauthorised element because it materially departs from the form granted permission under PA Ref. D16A/0079, ACP Ref. PL06D.246532.

8.2.3. The constructed dormer window has no bearing on the proposal before me. Planning legislation provides for an enforcement process to address unauthorised development. It is my view that unauthorised development is a matter for the Planning Authority to address through the enforcement process and outside the remit of the Commission. I do not consider that measures under Section 35 of the Act apply in this case.

8.3. **Design, residential amenity and visual impact**

8.3.1. The dwelling was previously part of a semi-detached dwelling until permission was granted for the subdivision of the house into two units. The rear of the dwelling has previously been extended at ground, first floor and attic level. The appellants state

that the proposal would be overdeveloped, piecemeal, ad hoc and set a poor precedent. External finishes and design are not in harmony with existing. It would increase overshadowing, create adverse residential and visual impacts, depreciate the value of the property and is contrary to the zoning objective. I note the appellants reference case law to highlight it is not necessary to give very detailed information on how development would reduce the value of land or adversely affect the enjoyment of land. The applicant highlights that the footprint of No. 4 is smaller than No. 3, that the extension is modest, rear gardens faces south and the boundary wall gives privacy to the adjoining property. In assessing the proposed development, I note measures in Chapters 4 and 12 of the Development Plan to conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption (Policy Objective PHP 19) and to protect the amenities of adjacent properties. I also note the planning history set out in Section 4 and that the planning report for this application stated the constructed dormer is only considered as part of the existing physical context insofar as it contributes to the cumulative visual and residential amenity impacts of the proposed extension.

Ground floor extension

- 8.3.2. Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) Extensions to the Rear states '*Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining. The extension should match or complement the main house*'.
- 8.3.3. The floor area of the proposed ground floor extension is approximately 11m². The extension includes a sliding door that faces directly onto the rear garden, which has a depth of approximately 24m. External finishes are to match existing and the proposed extension is of similar design to the existing flat roof ground floor extension of No. 4 and No. 4A. I also observed a mix of extension types in the area on my site inspection. The appellants object to proximity of the ground floor extension to the boundary, that the extension projects past No. 3 and are concerned about residential and visual impacts and a possible encroachment onto their property. The length and height of the proposed ground floor extension aligns with the length and height of the existing extension. I note that the rear building line of the proposed ground floor extension aligns with the rear building line of No. 4A which is constructed up to the

boundary with No. 4, and that there is a boundary wall between No. 4 and No. 3. In relation to possible encroachment, the applicant has submitted the mediation agreement defining the boundary between these two properties. An observation from a chartered surveyor states the boundary wall was erected in accordance with this agreement and notes that the proposed extension adheres to the mediation boundary agreement. I have assessed the plans submitted, the layout plan and elevations show the proposed development within the site boundary. I am satisfied that the proposed development is within the boundary and can be accommodated on site.

- 8.3.4. Having regard to the size, form and mass of the proposed ground floor extension, that it complements the main house in design and external finishes, the presence of extensions of similar design in the area, the level of intervisibility between dwellings and the remaining usable rear private open space, I am therefore satisfied that the proposed ground floor extension accords with criteria set out in Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) of the Development Plan, would not unduly impact residential or visual amenity and therefore would not depreciate the value of property or detract from the character of the area. I note that any encroachment on property is a civil matter to be resolved between the parties, having regard to the provisions of s.34(13) of the 2000 Planning and Development Act.

First floor extension

- 8.3.5. Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) of the Development Plan states first floor extensions will be considered on their merits and in determining applications the following factors include *‘Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, including height, and length along mutual boundaries; Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability; Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries; External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing’*.
- 8.3.6. The proposed first floor rear extension extends an existing extension to accommodate an en-suite for a bedroom. It is flat roof similar to the existing first floor extension and external walls are to be a smooth finish to match the existing dwelling. This accords with the requirements of Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) which requires external finishes to be generally in harmony with existing. The proposed first floor extension infills space above the existing extension and is situated partly to the front of an

existing bedroom window. An area above the ground floor extension remains undeveloped in front of the bedroom window and between the two properties. Having regard to the size, form and mass and the degree of set-back from the boundary of approximately 1.9m, I do not consider that No. 3 will be unduly impacted by overbearance. With regard overlooking, the proposed first floor extension has no windows on the side gable facing No 3. The window is for a non-habitable room and fronts directly onto the rear garden. I note the number of windows permitted on the rear elevation results in a degree of intervisibility and that the applicant states overlooking exists from No. 3 first floor windows onto their property. Having regard to the above, I consider that the proposal would not result in any additional overlooking concerns or unduly impact amenities. The appeal also states that the property is overdeveloped and proposed extensions cause additional overshadowing. The rear of No. 4 and No. 3 face south and the applicant highlighted that No. 3 is more westerly. Considering the location and orientation of both dwellings, the position of the proposed first floor extension to the east of No. 3, the modest size of the extension and the setback of 1.9m from the side boundary, marginal shadow would occur in the mornings. In my opinion, the nature and extent of overshadowing would not unduly impact the residential amenity of the adjoining property.

- 8.3.7. Having regard to the size, form and mass of the proposed first floor extension, the degree of setback from the side boundary, that external finishes and design are generally in harmony with existing, the level of intervisibility between dwellings and the remaining usable rear private open space, I am therefore satisfied that the proposed first floor extension accords with criteria set out in Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) of the Development Plan, would not unduly impact residential or visual amenity and would therefore not depreciate the value of property or detract from the character of the area.

8.4. **Other matters**

- 8.4.1. *Surface water:* Although not raised in the grounds of appeal, I note the Drainage Department had no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions relating to surface water run-off and the driveway/hardstanding area. Condition 2 of the decision to grant permission required for all surface water to be managed on site with no discharge to the public sewer and for any changes to parking and

hardstanding areas to be constructed in accordance with Section 12.4.8.3 of the Development Plan. There is no proposed change to existing access or parking arrangements on site. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, the relatively large rear garden, the footprint of the ground floor extension at approximately 11m² (total proposed extensions at approx. 14.4), I am satisfied that surface water runoff can be accommodated on site. Policy Objective E16 requires all development proposals to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems. I consider that this can be reasonably complied with by way of condition.

- 8.4.2. *Traffic and safety:* Concern was raised about insufficient parking and that the commercial / multi-occupant use of the property creates risks to pedestrians and road users. I note that the applicant stated No. 4 is no longer a student house but their home and has submitted proof of ownership. Permission was granted for a new vehicular entrance for No. 4 under PA Ref. D16A/0079, ACP Ref. PL06D.246532. This entrance has been agreed in writing with the planning authority as required by a condition of permission (DLRCRR Compliance with Condition Ref: D16A/0079/C1). As stated in 8.4.1, there is no proposed change to existing access or parking arrangements on site. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development would not adversely impact the road network in terms of traffic generation or safety.
- 8.4.3. *Technical concerns:* The appellants stated the application should have been invalidated, that the application form does not include all previous applications for No. 4, the rear elevation is planning non-compliant, the floor area is incorrect which has implications for contributions, insufficient detail on side elevations drawings has been provided and concern of a possible encroachment onto No. 3. Unauthorised development and the possible encroachment are addressed in Sections 8.2 and 8.3. I consider that sufficient information was provided on other matters to facilitate a balanced and reasoned assessment and did not materially impact on the assessment.
- 8.4.4. *Contribution:* I note no contribution was sought by DLRC in the decision to grant permission.

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 2.5km west of South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) and South Dublin Bay SAC (000210).
- 9.3 No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.4 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 nature of the development proposal.
 - The location of the development in a serviced area.
 - The distance to the Natura 2000 network and the absence of pathways to any European Site.
- 9.5 I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. 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.
- 10.2. 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.

- 10.3. 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.
- 10.4. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

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

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 12.1. Having regard to the residential land use zoning of the site in the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, support in the Development Plan for improvements to and adaptation of existing homes, the criteria for extensions to the rear in Section 12.3.7.1(ii) of the said Plan, the location of the development, the prevailing pattern of development in this serviced urban area, the proposed development and its relationship to adjacent properties, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenity of the area and therefore would not depreciate the value of property or detract from the character of the area. The proposed development is in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted with the planning application except as may be otherwise required by the following conditions.
----	--

	REASON: To clarify the plans and particulars for which permission is granted.
2.	The external finishes shall harmonise in colour and texture with the existing finishes on the dwelling. REASON: In the interest of visual amenity.
3.	Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. REASON: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

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.”

Michele Beirne
Planning Inspector

17th June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501029-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Modify and extend property to include a) ground floor extension to rear of property b) first floor extension to rear of property
Development Address	4, Wynnsward Drive, Clonskeagh, Dublin 14, D14F9R9
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 Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified 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 Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	

☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. 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
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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☐	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____