



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501030-DS-26

Development

Protected Structure demolish of one storey extension replace with one storey, part two storey structure and all associated site works.

Location

8 Estate Cottages, Northumberland Road, Dublin 4, D04Y6H0

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council South

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

3150/25

Applicant(s)

Paddy & Rose Gough

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission + Conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party Normal Planning Appeal

Appellant(s)

Mary Stewart & William Stewart

Observer(s)

Philip O'Reilly

Date of Site Inspection

16 June 2026

Inspector

Sandra Eapen

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.....	6
5.0	Policy Context.....	7
6.0	EIA Screening.....	8
7.0	The Appeal	8
8.0	Assessment	12
9.0	AA Screening.....	18
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	19
11.0	Recommendation.....	19
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	20
13.0	Conditions.....	20
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	24

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is part of a terrace of single storey, artisan cottages off Northumberland Road. No. 8 Estate Cottages is a mid-terrace and is located towards the end of the cul-de-sac. The cottage has brick façade, slate pitched roof with a projecting bay to the front encasing the front entrance to the dwelling. The dwelling contains a modest rear garden which includes other garden buildings/sheds. The dwelling fronts directly onto the street at Estate Cottage.
- 1.2. The group of dwellings, No. 1-11 Estate Cottages, are listed in the Record of Protected Structures. The surrounding area consists of a mix of residential and commercial uses. The subject site is located 50m south of Grand Canal.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission was sought for the demolition of existing one storey extension to the rear of the property c.19.9sqm sqm and construction of part one, part two, storey structure to the rear c. 87.3sqm.
- 2.2. The proposal was amended at further information stage to omit the first-floor accommodation and other changes in design for retaining the original roof of the dwelling. Total floor area of revised rear extension would be approximately c.55sqm.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. A decision to grant permission was issued by Dublin City Council (DCC) on 25 February 2026 subject to 9 no. conditions.
- 3.1.2. The following conditions are relevant to the assessment:

Condition No. 2 – Development Contribution condition

Condition No. 3 – Conservation Division condition requiring agreement of details and materials used for repair and works.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Officer Report

The Planning Officer's **first report** notes other rear extension developments permitted along the terrace. The principle of the proposed development is acceptable on subject site zoning. The report notes that further clarification is needed on the surviving historical fabric. Applicant was also required to clarify whether the screened green roof is intended to be used as balcony. Serious concerns were noted on the 2-storey element of the proposed rear extension in relation to the possible impact to the form and legibility of the protected structure. Revised proposals were sought as Further Information omitting the partial 2 storey element and the roof terrace area. Further information was sought on the following:

- Omission of 2 storey element as it could result in serious adverse impacts on the conservation character and setting of the protected structure
- Revision of design of the green roof to ensure only access for maintenance purposes or omission in its entirety.
- Revised drawings clearly indicating demolition of any historical fabric including structures within the rear garden.
- Only allow access for maintenance of historic fabric. Existing service routes shall be reused where feasible.
- Omit the proposed front facing roof lights
- Provide a window survey showing all conservation repair, replacement of glazing within slim line double glazing units
- Details of existing and proposed floor structures with provisions to reuse floorboards
- A schedule of all proposed conservation repairs with accompanying method statements and specifications

The **second report** of the Planning Officer is the basis for the decision to grant permission. It notes that the floor plans have been satisfactorily amended as requested. The two-storey element has been omitted in the revised drawings submitted with only ground floor extension retained. The green roof/terrace has been amended to access for maintenance only. The applicant has submitted a cover letter

addressing conservation issues raised in the further information. Overall, the applicant had sufficiently addressed further information request. It was thereby recommended that permission be granted for the amended proposals with conditions included to agree final details in writing with the Planning Authority.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division Report (12 May 2025) No objection subject to standard conditions.

Conservation Officer's **First Report** (22 May 2025) Requests Further Information

- The initial proposal was considered to be too large in terms of height, scale and massing, significantly impact the character of the Protected Structure and set poor precedent for future developments.
- The demolition of modern kitchen/bathroom extension was supported in principle.
- Notes that application is not prepared by a qualified conservation grade architect. MEP services drawing has not been included. Window survey not provided.
- Installation of roof lights along the front slope of the house's principal roof is not supported.
- The Conservation Office requested reduction of height, scale and massing of extension and preservation of historic roof profile of the cottage.
- Details of repointing, replacement glazing, reuse of historic floorboards and glazing.

Conservation Officer's **Second Report** (17 Feb 2026) No objection subject to standard conditions.

- Revised proposals omitting first floor accommodation considered acceptable. The part demolition of original rear garden sheds and their integration within dining area considered acceptable.
- Mounting of fence on the rear boundary wall was considered to result in negative visual impact on the setting of Protected Structure and recommend its omission.
- Specialist contractors to be appointed for restoration works and Conservation Office to inspect site to check sample panels, steam cleaning and repointing works

- Recommends grant of permission subject to conditions for agreeing details.

3.3. Third Party Observations

3 no. third party observations were made at planning stage including the appellants and the observer. The issues raised are reflected in the grounds of appeal.

4.0 Planning History

- Reg. Ref. 4180/00 Permission **refused** on subject site for the demolition of single storey extension and erection of two-storey extension to the rear. The refusal reason cited excessive scale and height of the proposed extension which is out of character with the existing pattern of development in the area.

The following applications within site vicinity are relevant to this appeal

- Reg Ref EXPP 0126/19 **Split decision** was issued on Exempt Development Declaration for No. 7 Estate Cottages for interior works and rear extension to the dwelling.
- ABP-302174-18 (Reg. Ref. 2159/18) Permission **granted** on appeal at No. 7 Estate Cottages, for the partial demolition of rear extension, construction of single storey extension and dormer to the rear, internal alterations and associated refurbishment works.
- Reg Ref 3574/15 Permission **granted** at No. 4 Estate Cottages for permission for the demolition of an existing double pitched roof, single storey (36m²) ground floor extension to the rear and construction of a combination pitched and flat roof incorporating Velux roof lights and single storey extension to the rear (43m²) including internal alterations.
- PL29S.239284 (Reg Ref 2608/11) Permission **granted** at No 2 Estate Cottages for the demolition of a modern single storey extension and construction of a two-storey extension to the rear of a dwelling (105m²).
- Reg. Ref. 5928/06 Permission **granted** at No. 9 Estate Cottages for partial demolition, refurbishment and single storey extension of dwelling.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-28

The subject site is located within Z2 - Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) land use zoning with an objective “To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.” Residential extensions are accepted in principle under subject zoning. No. 1-11 Estate Cottages are also listed in the Record of Protected Structures.

The following policy objectives and sections are relevant to subject site:

- **Policy BHA2** -Development of Protected Structures -seeks to ensure that developments will conserve and enhance protected structures and their curtilage.
- **Policy BHA24**- Reuse and Refurbishment of Historic Buildings
- **Section 15.8** -Residential Development – states that “while the minimum standards set within these sections will be sought in relation to refurbishment schemes, it is acknowledged that this may not always be possible, particularly in relation to historic buildings, ‘living over the shop’ projects, tight urban infill developments and in the city regeneration area designated under the Living City Initiative. In such cases, the standards may be relaxed subject to the provision of good quality accommodation, and where the proposal secures the effective usage of underutilised accommodation. It must be satisfactorily demonstrated that the internal design and overall layout is closely aligned to the specific needs of the intended occupiers.”
- **Section 15.11.2** Aspect, Daylight / Sunlight and Ventilation
- **Section 15.11.3** Private Open Space - sets a minimum standard of 10sqm private open space per bedspace
- **Section 15.15.2.3** Protected Structures – requires that works to protected structures are carried out in accordance with the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and requires an Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment to be included in the application.

5.2. Ministerial Guidelines: Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2011

General Types of Development: Extensions

Section 6.8.1 *It will often be necessary to permit appropriate new extensions to protected structures in order to make them fit for modern living and to keep them in viable economic use....*

Section 6.8.2 *If planning permission is to be granted for an extension, the new work should involve the smallest possible loss of historic fabric and ensure that important features are not obscured, damaged or destroyed. In general, principal elevations of a protected structure (not necessarily just the façade) should not be adversely affected by new extensions.*

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

Subject site is located 50m south of Proposed Natural Heritage Area (NHA) Grand Canal (Site Code 002104).

South Dublin Bay SAC/NHA (Site Code 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) is located c.1.75km east of subject 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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads. 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

This is a Third-Party appeal made by a resident and a member of public of adjoining dwelling located immediately east of subject site (No. 10 Estate Road):

- Incomplete information on demolition works proposed stated in the statutory notices. Demolition is only partially marked in red in submitted drawings.
- Positioning of site notice prevented other submissions from neighbours
- Refers existing house as 1 bedroom, whereas there are 2 bedrooms.
- A number of previous applications were invalidated. Previous refusal not noted by DCC in their assessment. Plot size appears to have increased from 109.14sqm to 120sqm from what was submitted in 2000 application.
- Submitted plans are not accurate - do not show historic garden sheds or historic boundary walls. Measurements (dimensions) are missing or illegible on most drawings. Areas referred keep changing in the submitted documents.
- Sheet 3a inaccuracies regarding door of shed – there is no wall there. Works to boundary wall could impact support for shed within adjoining dwelling.
- Chimney breast between No. 8 and No. 10 is missing from submitted plans, walls shared between units will be impacted by the proposed works.
- Removal of later addition rear extension could impact roof of adjoining dwelling as they are embedded at eaves level.
- Inaccurate representation of neighbouring dwelling to show additional extensions, and increased roof height (2.3m to 2.17m). Additional chimney and tree to the front of neighbouring dwelling.
- Wrong door numbers, spelling mistakes, and other inconsistencies in relation to measurements in further information drawings submitted - ridge height of house changed from 5m to 5.2m and eaves height changed from 2.7m to 3m.
- Unclear if the proposal is excavating the entire rear garden by 0.5m to accommodate the proposed increase in height
- Further information amendments should have been assessed as significant – material changes to roof type, new roof lights proposed overlooking adjoining dwelling, demolition of bedroom wall, large fence along the back wall.

- Amended proposal includes 'Cathedral roof' (5m tall) that will have same massing, resulting in overdevelopment, overlooking, overshadowing impacts. The proposed void at first floor level can be converted to accommodation use at later date.
- MEP drawings were not submitted as part of the Further Information – should have been considered crucial for the decision-making process.
- Planning Authority's assessment gave undue weight to the architectural aspects and impact to adjoining residential amenities were not given enough attention
- Detrimental impact on the property value and quality of life of neighbouring residents - exacerbation of health issues – the side cladding, support and roof is asbestos (could be hazardous)
- The age and condition of the boundary wall should have been considered – proposals interaction, distance to wall not accurately shown on submitted plans
- Unnecessary removal of historic fabric/sheds should not be allowed is against the conservation officer's recommendation – Structural engineering input required
- Development Plan policies should be prioritised –irrelevant reference to Australian standards i.e. The Burra Charter.
- Construction access impacts, duration of works and material delivery not assessed as part of the application. 7am -6pm construction time should be reconsidered – delayed start time.

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

Applicant response in relation to the third-party appeal was received on 20th April 2026, and can be summarised as follows:

- A specialist conservation consultant was also involved in preparing the amended proposals at Further Information stage. This response was considered acceptable by the Planning Authority.
- The conservation division of DCC was satisfied with the omission of two storey element, green roof in the amended proposals.

- Conservation best practice is to be followed in the proposed demolition, and repair works in line with the recommendation of the conservation consultant.
- Noise, pollution impacts have been addressed by DCC through conditions.
- Objections cited relate to the original proposal and not permitted scheme
- Works do not interfere with the chimney stack between units No. 8 and No. 10
- Amended proposals have much reduced footprint and therefore not required to be deemed significant
- The development would significantly improve the comfort and standard of living of applicants.
- Works proposed adheres to best conservation, planning, architectural and aesthetic practices, is of high standards and will enhance the area.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

No further comments on this application.

7.4. Observations

1 no. observation was made at appeal stage. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Several previous applications deemed invalid due to issues regarding submitted drawings.
- Inadequate location of site notice along corner of front window.
- No accuracy within submitted information regarding proposed demolition works
Application should have been made invalid given the level of inaccurate information submitted - data submitted is not compatible with previous application from 2000
- Inadequate private amenity area proposed - 2 bedroom dwellings should require 40 sqm of private amenity space.

- Height of the proposed extension same as initial proposal– Height should be reduced to avoid damage to setting and character of protected structure.
- Proposed development would overwhelm neighbouring properties given its size and height. Significant overshadowing of residential amenities of adjoining properties and impact original historic boundary walls – contrary to Z2 zoning
- Impacts to shared boundary walls, roof, and guttering– 150year old boundary walls are of architectural, historical and environmental interest
- Neighbouring properties have been inaccurately depicted, misrepresented, mislabelled, internal inconsistencies within documentation
- Unnecessary removal of historic fabric should not be entertained. Questions the qualifications of the conservation architects involved
- Restricted access to the site- only available through front door of dwelling
- Not more than 2 conservation grade roof light should be permitted
- Works along front elevation not appropriate for such a historic structure

8.0 **Assessment**

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the report of the local authority made at application stage, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Residential Amenity
- Built Heritage
- Procedural Issues
- Conclusion

8.1. **Principle of Development**

- 8.1.1. The proposed development includes refurbishment works, partial demolition and domestic extension to a single storey, artisan cottage next to the Grand Canal. The site is located within Z2 – Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Area) zoning within the Development Plan, with an objective “To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.” Residential extensions are acceptable in principle under the subject zoning. The Planning Authority in permitting the development supports the residential extension development on this site.

8.2. Residential Amenity

- 8.2.1. The permitted development will see the construction of a single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling providing for a new bathroom, kitchen, living and family room area (approx. c.55sqm). The L- shaped extension is to be located along the eastern and rear boundary walls of the site. The extension is proposed to include a double storey, pitched roof, element, at a roof ridge height of c.5.2m with 4 no. roof lights. The development would include flat roofed elements, where the extension joints the existing dwelling and along the rear boundary wall at a parapet height of c.3m. The remaining rear garden is to be retained as a paved courtyard to serve the residents (c.18.8sqm). The flat roof element to the rear is to provide for a new family room utility and pantry for the dwelling.
- 8.2.2. Residential Amenity provided: Currently the dwelling provides for 2 no. bedrooms within the original dwelling, c.6.6sqm and c.7.6sqm in area. The existing bedroom sizes falls well below the minimum room sizes set within the *Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities: Design Guidelines, 2007*. In the proposed arrangement, the existing modern extension providing for kitchen and bathroom is to be removed and the existing bedrooms are to be amalgamated into one room measuring c.11.8 sqm. The amalgamated new bedroom will meet the double bedroom standards set in the Guidelines. The overall proposal will now result in a 1 bed unit. The appellants have raised concerns regarding the reduced private amenity area proposed in the extended dwelling. As per SPPR 2 of *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines 2024*, the minimum private open space for a 1-bedroom house is 20sqm. At c.18.8sqm the proposed central patio/courtyard would adequately meet the minimum private open standards. Given the protected status of

the site and other restrictions applicable, the subject development would qualify for the relaxation of space standards. I consider the extended dwelling to provide for comfortable dwelling standards for future residents.

- 8.2.3. Visual Impact/ Overlooking: The proposals would not have any material visual impact to the front elevation of the dwelling along the public corridor, as the extension maintains the ridge height of the existing dwelling. In addition to the 4 no. roof lights within the proposed pitched roof element, additional rooflights/glazed elements are being proposed along the flat roof sections of the rear extension. The appellant has raised concerns regarding the number and scale of roof light elements proposed stating possible overlooking issues. Given the single storey nature of the accommodation, I do not consider the roof light to result in any overlooking impacts onto neighbouring dwellings. I note the concerns raised by third party appellants regarding the possibility of future conversion of the high ceiling area into additional habitable spaces. Standard conditions will be included in the permission to ensure that the works are carried out as per the submitted drawings. If breached, any relevant parties can pursue the matter as an enforcement issue.
- 8.2.4. Demolition and Excavation: The appellant has claimed that the proposed demolition of single storey rear extension (16.5sqm) and garden sheds (11.9sqm), would have structural impacts on adjoining dwellings. Currently the roof of the modern rear extension (proposed to be demolished) has an independent flat roof extending from the eaves level of the original dwelling. The proposed removal of existing rear extension will not impact No. 10 Estate Cottages and will allow for the creation of a central courtyard/patio to the rear of the original structure, addressing the side elevation of No. 6 Estate cottages. The historic sheds along the rear boundary of the site have lean to roofs attached to the back wall of the property. The applicant has proposed partial demolition of these sheds with the incorporation of some elements into the proposed rear extension. With the implementation of good construction practices, I do not consider the removal of the front wall of the sheds to impact the structural stability of the retained section of the back wall or structures within adjoining sites.
- 8.2.5. The appellants have raised concerns regarding the proposed excavation of rear garden to accommodate the proposed rear extension. The drawings denote that the

floor level of the extension is c.0.5m below the existing finished floor level of the house. Given the limited scale of the interventions proposed, the change in level difference is considered acceptable as it would also limit the impact of the new structures onto neighbouring residential amenities.

- 8.2.6. Overshadowing Impacts: The appellant has claimed that the proposed scale of extension will enclose the rear garden area of adjoining dwelling, resulting in overbearing and overshadowing impacts. As noted above the proposed buildings are located along the eastern site boundary. I note that there are currently single storey structures within the rear garden of No. 10 to the east of subject site and within No. 6 to the west of subject site. The existing rubble rounded top boundary wall is c.1.5m tall. As per the revised drawings submitted at Further Information stage, the eaves/parapet height of the proposed rear extension, will extend by approximately c.1m above the top of the retained boundary wall. Given the orientation of the site, the limited scale of proposed works and existing built elements on neighbouring sites, I do not consider the proposed works to result in any significant overshadowing or overbearing impacts to the adjoining dwellings or associated residential amenities.
- 8.2.7. Works are also proposed to the rear boundary wall, including increase in height by the installation of additional fencing, c1.4m tall, on top of these walls for added security. The total height of the back wall including the fencing will match the height of the original dwelling when viewed from subject site. The existing rear boundary wall currently addresses the existing communal surface car parking area to the north of the site and as per the submitted drawings would be c.4.8m tall. The Planning Authority's Conservation Officer's report notes concern regarding the visual impact of the proposed additional fencing to the top of the existing boundary wall. Given the existing height of wall, I do not consider additional security as a factor of concern at this location. It is recommended that this additional fencing along the rear elevation be omitted from the development. This can be done by condition.
- 8.2.8. Construction access and hours: Concerns have been raised with regard to the permitted construction hours and construction access to the site. Given the scale of proposed works, any construction impacts would be temporary and limited to the site proximity. I do not envisage the proposed level of construction works or hours to result in an unacceptable level of disturbance to neighbouring residential amenities.

- 8.2.9. Other matters: Although the appellants have claimed that the development would detrimentally impact property values for neighbouring dwellings. There is no basis to conclude that the proposed works would result in a significant negative impact to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

8.3. **Built Heritage**

- 8.3.1. No.s 1-11 Estate Cottages are listed in the Record of Protected Structures of the Development Plan. Part of this group of dwellings (subject site excluded) are included in the red hatch conservation area for Grand Canal. The buildings are currently not included in the NIAH survey records.
- 8.3.2. Minimal interventions are proposed to the original dwelling structure. The proposed works would see the removal of a modern partition dividing the 2 no. existing bedrooms within the original dwelling and the widening of an existing window opening serving existing bedroom to the rear into a doorway to allow direct access from the bedroom to the new bathroom within the extension. Positive restoration works are being proposed to the front elevation and main roof of the dwelling. Refurbishment of existing glazing is also being proposed as part of the works. The existing rear garden boundary walls are being retained in situ. Although partial demolition of the historic rear garden sheds are being proposed as part of the works, the proposal would see the integration of the remaining walls into the dining area of the extension and reuse of materials in the extension. Final details of the restoration works can be agreed post consent with the Planning Authority. The removal of 1 no. rear window is a small loss of historic fabric and can be considered acceptable given the changes do not impact the principal elevations of the dwelling or the special architectural character of the building, and that the works facilitate the continued use of the building. The works will still see 1 no. existing window along the rear elevation restored and retained along the rear elevation.
- 8.3.3. With regard to the partial demolition of historic sheds, the applicants Further Information response state that the small footprint and low headroom of the shed make it unsuitable to be repurposed as accommodation use. Part of the walls are to be incorporated into the proposed extension as an inglenook with seating for the proposed dining area. Concerns regarding fire hazard issues with the proposed

inglenook is unfounded as it is only serving a dining area. I would consider the new structure to improve the structural stability of the retained elements. The Planning Authority's Conservation Office has included a condition requesting meaningful reuse of any historic fabric salvaged from the proposed demolition of existing outbuilding. I agree with the Conservation Officers recommendation and suggest the inclusion of a condition in the permission to agree the final details post consent.

8.3.4. The appellants have raised concerns with regard to the reference to Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, The Burra Charter 2013 in the submitted response to Further Information requested. I note that the applicant's conservation statement also refers to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authority. The Planning Authority's Conservation Office has considered the response and recommended permission to be granted for the works. If permission is considered for the proposed development, I recommend that a condition is included for agreeing the details of the proposed restoration works and their methodology in writing with the conservation office, prior to construction works. I consider the proposed development to be in alignment with Policy BHA24 (Reuse and Refurbishment of Historic Buildings) of the Development Plan which encourages the refurbishment of historic buildings into sustainable and economically viable developments and the provisions of Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2011.

8.3.5. If permission is considered, I recommend a condition requiring that a conservation expert to be employed on site to manage, monitor and implement works on site and for the written agreement on a finalised Conservation Method Statement, so as to ensure adequate protection for the retained historic fabric during construction works and to carry out works in accordance with best conservation practice as detailed in the application. It is recommended that permission be granted for the proposed development subject to conditions.

8.4. **Procedural Issues.**

The appellants have raised a range of issues with regard to the deficiency in information provided and quality of drawings submitted. The Planning Authority did not raise any issues with regard to the quality of drawings submitted. The drawings

submitted are scalable, dimensions of the site appear to be consistent with what was submitted with other sites and what was observed on site visit. I consider the application documents to be sufficiently detailed to make an informed decision on the proposal and its potential impact on the architectural heritage. I also note that as per Section 34(13) of the Planning Act a person is not entitled solely by reason of a permission to carry out a development and issues relating to ownership of land is a civil matter. The appellant has also raised objection on Planning Authority's consideration of Further Information as to be not significant. The consideration of further information as being significant is a function of the Planning Authority and cannot be revisited at appeal stage. I note that this conclusion of the Planning Authority in this regard did not preclude the appellant from making an appeal on the decision of the Planning Authority.

8.5. Conclusion:

- 8.5.1. Section 7.3.1 of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2011, recommends keeping a building in use as the best method of conserving a historic building. The Guidelines acknowledges the need to for new extensions in protected structures to make them fit for modern living conditions. The proposed works would involve minimal loss of historic fabric within the original dwelling structure and cause minimum interference to the special architectural character of the building. The proposed works are unlikely to result in undue overlooking or overshadowing impacts onto adjoining residential amenities. Having regard to the above, I consider the proposed residential extension to be acceptable and recommend that permission be granted for the proposed development subject to conditions.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2. The subject site is not located within a designated site. Subject site is located 50m south of Proposed Natural Heritage Area (NHA) Grand Canal (Site Code 002104). South Dublin Bay SAC/NHA (Site Code 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) is located c.1.75km east of subject site.

- 9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could no have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Scale and size of the proposed development within an existing urban setting.
 - The lack of connections to the SAC.
 - Connection to public water, drain and sewer.
- 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

I recommend that permission be GRANTED for the following reasons and considerations and subject to the following conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the protected status of the site, nature and scale of the proposed development and the Z2 – Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Area) zoning assigned to the site and the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 - 28, the proposed development is considered at this location. The development, subject to conditions, will not give rise to any undue, overlooking or overshadowing impacts on the residential amenities of neighbouring dwellings, would not adversely impact on the character or setting of the protected structure and would accord with Policy BHA2 of the Development Plan and section 6.8 of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2011 with regard to works on Protected Structures. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 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 the planning authority on 03/02/2026, 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 to omit the additional fencing proposed on top of rear boundary wall. 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 amenity.

3. Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.

4. 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.

5. Prior to the commencement of development, the following details shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority:
 - (a) A finalised Conservation Specification and Conservation Method Statement covering all works to be carried out and materials to be used in such works, prepared by an accredited Grade II Conservation Architect
 - (b) Details for the monitoring of the development by a suitably qualified architect with conservation expertise and accreditation
 - (c) Competent site supervision, project management and crafts personnel will be engaged, suitably qualified and experienced in conservation works.
 - (d) The Method Statement shall include, in particular details for reinstatement of previously removed decorative granite window architraves along the front elevation to restore the character of the structure, to accurate detail and supported by relevant information and samples if required.
 - (e) Before any development hereby permitted commences, the historic sheds at the rear shall be recorded on site by means of scaled architectural drawings, photographs and shall be removed and kept in storage so as to be reused in the proposed works. Details of the procedures to be followed in recording, storage and reuse shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority.

In the event of agreement not being reached between the developer and the planning authority, the matter may be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination, and

all works shall be carried out in accordance with any determination made resulting from such referral.

Reason: In the interest of the protection of architectural heritage in accordance with the provisions of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities.

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays 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.

7. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution of €1,743.30 in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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.”

Sandra Eapen

Planning Inspector

29 June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501030-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	Partial demolition and residential extension to a domestic dwelling which is also a Protected Structure
Development Address	No. 8 Estate Cottages, Dublin 4
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.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	

2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified 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.	State the Class and state the relevant threshold

Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	
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: Sandra Eapen

Date: 29 June 2026