



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501042-DR-26

Development

Demolition of extension, construction of part two storey and single storey extension to side and rear with associated works.

Location

Corrigville, Corrig Avenue, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin, A96AT25

Planning Authority

Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D26B/0003/WEB

Applicant(s)

Clara Maguire

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission + Conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party Normal Planning Appeal

Appellant(s)

Fred Verdier

Observer(s)

None

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.....	6
5.0	Policy Context.....	6
6.0	EIA Screening.....	8
7.0	The Appeal	8
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.....	19
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	22

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located at 'Corrigville', Corrig Avenue, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin. The site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof profile and a two-storey gable fronted bay to the front. The dwelling is set back from the public road and there is off-street parking to the front of the dwelling. The dwelling has a single storey flat roofed rear extension and a front and rear garden. 'Rochelle' Corrig Avenue, the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, is to the south of the property and 'Glisan Darach' Corrig Avenue is to the north. No's 26 and 27 Northumberland Avenue are to the rear of the property. The site has a stated area of 0.048 hectares.
- 1.2. The site is in a mature residential street characterised by a mix of residential dwellings, extensions and roof finishes. External finishes are a mix of brick and render. The site is well served by local services and amenities and is less than 0.5km from Dún Laoghaire centre.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The proposed development is described as follows:

- Demolition of single floor rear extension,
- Two storey side extension,
- Part two storey and part single storey rear extension,
- Associated internal and external alterations.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council (DLRCC) issued notification of a decision to grant permission on the 25th of February 2026 subject to 10 conditions.
- 3.1.2. Conditions No.'s 2, 3 and 4 are of note:
- Condition 2: The dwelling shall be used as a single dwelling unit to prevent unauthorised development.

- Condition 3: All first floor bathroom/ensuite windows on the northern side elevation shall have opaque or frosted glass in the interest of residential amenity.
- Condition 4: All external finishes shall harmonise with the existing dwelling in the interest of visual amenity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The planning report can be summarised as follows:

- The site is zoned objective A 'residential' and residential development is permitted in principle.
- Demolition works are considered acceptable where development is compatible with policies and objectives.
- Any impacts during the demolition phase can be managed by construction and environmental control practices.
- Development should have regard to climate action objectives of the Development Plan regarding the use of materials and energy efficiency.
- The two storey side extension responds well to the site context and character of the area.
- The design is consistent with extensions in the area and will not give rise to a terracing effect.
- Having regard to the set back from the front elevation, modest width and roof form, the two storey side extension will not give rise to significant overbearing impacts on adjoining property.
- The stepped profile of the rear extension, the central placement of the two storey element and the confining of boundary side development to single story elements limit the potential for undue enclosure.
- The set back from the northern boundary ensures the proposal does not materially diminish the outlook available from the northern neighbour garden.

- While the third party submission refers to site levels difference, the BRE daylight and sunlight assessment confirms development does not give rise to unacceptable loss of daylight, sunlight or increased enclosure because of level difference.
- No appreciable overshadowing impacts are anticipated.
- The setback at ground level improves boundary conditions regarding the single story element for the northern neighbour compared to the current situation.
- The central placement of the rear two storey element reduces its visual presence.
- Separation distances mitigate the visual increase in height.
- Windows do not give rise to additional overlooking impacts.
- Bathroom and ensuite windows on the side elevation should be fitted with obscure glazing to protect residential amenity and privacy.
- A condition should be included in any grant of permission for material and finish to harmonise with the dwelling.
- Proposed alterations to the existing dwelling will enhance layout and functionality without resulting in any negative impacts on the amenity of adjoining properties.
- Open space provides an adequate level of amenity in excess of minimum private open space requirements.
- The proposal is acceptable in terms of residential amenity and visual impact and in accordance with 12.3.7.1 (ii) and (iii) of the Development Plan.
- There are no proposed changes to access and parking and the proposal will not result in impacts on same.
- Surface water conditions should be incorporated.
- The report notes discrepancies on the site location map, site notice and that certain dimensions were not stated. The application was considered to meet statutory requirements for validation.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

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

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. One third party submission was 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

- No recent planning history.

4.1.2. Adjacent site and adjoining semi-detached 'Rochelle' Corrig Avenue

- D16A/0131: Permission granted in 2016 for demolition of a rear two storey return and shed and the construction of a two storey side extension, part single/part two storey rear extension, house alterations and widened vehicular access.
- D95A/0499: Permission refused in 1995 for change of use of a garage to kitchen/store for home-based employment.

4.1.3. Adjacent site 'Glasan Darach' Corrig Avenue

- D20A/0433: Permission granted in 2020 for the demolition of rear shed and replacement with a detached habitable room, single storey rear extension, covered side store passage; attic conversion with front and rear dormer windows and widened driveway.

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*).
- PHP2- Protection of Existing Residential Amenity

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
 - 12.3.1.1 Design Criteria
 - 12.3.3 Quantitative Standards for All Residential Development
 - 12.3.4.2 Habitable Rooms
 - 12.3.7 Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas
 - 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings
 - (ii) Extensions to the Rear
 - (iii) Extensions to the Side
 - 12.3.4.2 Habitable Rooms
 - 12.8.2 Open Space Categories for Residential Development

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

5.2.1. The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024:

5.2.2. The Guidelines set out guidance on sustainable residential development, compact settlements and development standards for housing. The standards provide guidance on daylight considerations and Specific Planning Policy Requirements (SPPRs) on separation distances, provision of open space, car parking and cycle parking.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. The closest European site is South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) located 1.3km northwest of the site. Dalkey Coastal Zone and Killiney Hill pNHA (001206) is located 0.5km 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 the residents of 'Glisan Darach' Corrig Avenue, the property to the north of the site. The appeal is summarised as follows:

- The house numbering is incorrect on the site location map, site layout plan and in Digital Dimensions assessment.
- The planning authority uses an incorrect figure and underestimates the scale of development. The floor area increase from 195sqm to 320sqm (64%) is not modest.
- The difference in site levels is incorrect, it is estimated at 1.5 metres not 1 metre.
- The planners report fails to refer to the difference in site levels other than in relation to the daylight and sunlight assessment.
- The conclusion that the rear extension would not result in overbearing impact and loss of outlook does not give due regard to size and difference in site levels.
- An 8.5m high extension (compared to the adjoining site level) extending 6.45m from the rear building line of the existing house would result in serious injury to residential amenity as a result of overbearing impact, even with a separation distance of 2.5m.

- The proposed development would result in serious injury to residential amenity because of loss of sunlight to living room and kitchen windows.
- The proposed development would result in loss of sunlight reaching the private amenity space in the part of the rear garden used most intensively.
- Solearth Design Analysis produced a daylight and sunlight assessment to support the grounds of appeal, it recommends reducing the two storey rear extension in height or relocating it further from the boundary.

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

7.2.1. The applicant response is as follows:

- The applicant states there is no serious injury to residential amenity because it this is demonstrated by the sunlight and daylight assessment and because the design has minimised any overbearing visual impact and loss of outlook.
- There is an error on the application form but not the plans. The existing house is 194.50sqm and the total area will increase from 194.5 to 215.3sqm. The net increase of approximately 21sqm is modest.
- The planning authority considered the appellants concerns and concluded that the increased setback from the property to the north in respect of the single-storey element, the central positioning of the two-storey element and stepped massing, would reduce its impact.
- The differences in levels are illustrated in the drawings and were considered.
- The arrangement of the rear extension windows was not clear at the time of assessment. Digital Dimensions 'Addendum to Sunlight Assessments' has assessed these windows. Over the year the windows will have good access to sunlight. They will have low levels during the winter period that are reduced below the BRE recommendations. This area has rooflights which also provide sunlight. Any potential loss will be minor or negligible.
- The applicant notes the rear garden of No.18B contains a detached structure that divides the rear garden into two zones. The structure casts its own shadow across the patio, its presence is the factor that defines the patio area. The access pathway

and boundary treatment reduce usable ground area and amount of garden receiving unobstructed sunlight.

- The full rear garden of the property to the north is the appropriate amenity assessment area under BRE 209 (2022). Digital Dimensions assessment correctly used the full garden area and demonstrated compliance with BRE criteria.
- The constrained patio configuration gives rise to the appellant's amenity sunlight figures and should not be attributed to the proposed development.

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. None.

7.5. Further Responses

- 7.5.1. The appellants further response is summarised as follows:

- The Commission is urged to consider the detailed grounds of appeal set out in the submission demonstrating serious injury to residential amenity.
- It is acknowledged that the application form has incorrect floor area figures.
- The planner's assessment is critical to the appeal. The difference in levels between the 2 sites is greater than one metre on drawing no. 0480/P03 and is estimated at 1.5 metres.
- The addendum report is not accepted: It makes an unsubstantiated assumption that two roof lights will compensate for sunlight loss and fails to reflect BRE 209 methodologies are applied per window and not per space or room basis. Table 1 of an addendum demonstrates that windows fail to receive adequate probable sunlight hours during the winter season.
- The actual outdoor private amenity space has not been adequately considered.
- The statement referring to the patio configuration giving rise to amenity sunlight figures is not accepted and inappropriate.

- The impact of the proposed development on residential amenity of an adjoining property must be based on the actual state of the property.
- The response on behalf of the applicant fails to provide substantive arguments to counter the grounds of appeal.
- Solearth Design Analysis provided a Statement of Response on the abovementioned issues.

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, the ‘A’ zoning objective for the area in the Development Plan and the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024. I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Residential amenity impact on property to the north,
- Other matters.

8.2. **Residential amenity impact on property to the north**

8.2.1. The site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey rear extension. The proposed development involves demolition of the extension and the construction of a two storey side extension and a part two storey part single storey rear extension. The site is to the north of the property ‘Glisan Darach’, which is sited at a lower level to the dwelling. 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 will

assess the impact of the proposed development having regard to visual prominence and scale, overlooking and daylight/sunlight impacts.

Visual prominence and scale

- 8.2.2. The proposed side extension reaches a maximum height of approximately 7.7m, which is less than the overall height of the existing dwelling at 8.8m and has a separation distance of 1m from the northern side boundary. The part two storey / part single story rear extension is stepped. The two storey element has a hipped roof profile and is positioned centrally, it extends approximately 6.4m to the rear of the site, is approximately 6.9m in height and 2.8m from the side boundary with the property to the north. The proposed rear extension includes a single storey flat roof extension at the southern side of this two storey element and a single storey extension on its northern side. The single extension on the northern side is largely located in the area of the existing extension, it is set back 0.8m from the boundary with the adjoining property in contrast to the existing extension.
- 8.2.3. The appellants state the planning authority used an incorrect figure and underestimated the scale of development, that a floor area increase from 195sqm to 320sqm (64%) is not modest and the difference in levels between the 2 sites is greater than one metre at approximately 1.5m. The planning authority's conclusion that the rear extension would not result in overbearing impact and loss of outlook does not give due regard to size and difference in site levels.
- 8.2.4. The applicant's response states that careful design and massing has minimised any overbearing visual impact and loss of outlook and there is an error on the application form relating to the size of the proposed development. They state the existing house is 194.50sqm, the total area will increase to 215.3sqm and the net increase of approximately 21sqm is modest. I have assessed the proposed floor plan drawings and I am satisfied that this figure is correct. I note this error is acknowledged by the appellants.
- 8.2.5. Regarding site level differences, I note that the proposed front elevations show the site level difference at approximately 1m at the public road. I observed during my site inspection that the level at the public road is lower than the rear of the dwellings. The applicant's response states the application and supporting documentation considers the boundary wall heights and level changes provided by the planning application for

the adjoining property (Planning Ref: D20A/0433). I have reviewed the size, form and bulk of the proposed development in relation to the site's orientation, levels, existing development on site and in the adjoining property. It is my view that the increase in setback of the single storey element improves boundary conditions in comparison to the existing single storey extension alongside the boundary. I also consider that the degree of set back of the two-storey element to a central position and the stepped massing of the proposed extension respects the sites context, it is not such as to overbear the adjoining property and the design reduces potential impacts.

8.2.6. I observed a mix of extension types in the area on my site inspection. Having regard to Section 12.3.7 of the Development Plan which requires a level of visual harmony with the existing dwelling, I consider that the design of the proposed extension integrates cohesively with the existing dwelling and will not appear visually obtrusive. I note the planners report states the proposal is consistent with the pattern of contemporary side extensions in the wider area and will not give rise to a terracing effect. I also note that the decision to grant permission included for external finishes to harmonise with the existing dwelling in the interest of visual amenity. I consider this condition appropriate to comply with the requirements of Section 12.3.7 in any grant of permission.

8.2.7. Having regard to the orientation of the site, the difference in site levels, the size, form and mass of the proposed development, the degree of set-back from the boundary, that the design complements the existing dwelling and the presence of extensions of similar design in the area, I do not consider that the adjoining property will be unduly impacted by overbearance or that the proposed development will be visually incongruous or disrupt the character of the area. I have had regard to the appellants concerns about daylight and sunlight and they are addressed below.

Overlooking

8.2.8. Although not raised in the grounds of appeal, I note that there is currently a degree of intervisibility in windows at first and ground floor levels between the existing dwelling and the property to the north. The proposed development includes a bathroom window, side entrance and a larger kitchen window at ground floor level and three bathroom windows at first floor level facing the property to the north. I note that the decision to grant permission included a condition that bathroom and ensuite windows

be fitted with obscure glazing to protect residential amenity and privacy. I am satisfied that subject to this condition, there would be no additional overlooking concerns to those currently experienced.

Daylight and Sunlight

- 8.2.9. Section 12.3.4.2 Habitable Rooms of the Development Plan outlines that *‘Development shall be guided by the principles of Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A guide to good practice (Building Research Establishment Report, 2011) and/or any updated, or subsequent guidance, in this regard’*.
- 8.2.10. The planning application was supported by a daylight and sunlight assessment by Digital Dimensions and the appellants provided a comparative assessment by Solearth Design Analysis to support the appeal. The approach of both assessments is summarised in Section 5.4 of the appellants assessment. I note that the applicant’s assessment follows BRE 209 (2022) recommendations and the appellants follow British/European/Irish standards and BRE 209 (2022) recommendations.

Amenity space

- 8.2.11. The BRE 209 guide indicates that for an amenity space to have good quality sunlight throughout the year, 50% of the space should receive at least two hours of sunlight on March 21st. Figure 5 and Table 5 of the applicants assessment confirms amenity spaces retain two hours of sunlight over 50% or will not be reduced below 80% of existing levels. The appellants consider that there is a lack of consideration of actual private amenity space and the proposed development would result in loss of sunlight reaching the part of the rear garden used most intensively (See Section 7.3.3 of Solearth Design Analysis assessment which assesses the patio section of the rear garden). The applicants responded that Digital Dimensions correctly assessed the full garden. I note that under BRE 209 it is standard to assess the full rear garden and that the Development Plan describes private open space to ‘normally refers to balconies and/or private gardens, which are the responsibility of, and only accessible to, the individual resident’ (Table 12.7, Section 12.8.2 Open Space for Residential Development). Having regard to the above, I consider that the appellants assessment is limited as it assesses a portion of the rear garden only. I am satisfied that the applicant adequately considered private open space and demonstrated

compliance with the BRE 209 guide (2022) and there will be no significant adverse impacts.

Dwelling

- 8.2.12. Tables 2 and 4 of Digital Dimensions provide an assessment of existing and proposed daylight and sunlight availability to the rear of the property. It concludes that windows assessed retain a vertical sky component (VSC) in excess of 27% or are not reduced below 80% of the existing VSC value, any reduction in available daylight from the proposed development will be negligible and the assessment meets recommendations of the BRE 209 guide. The annual probable sunlight hours assessment concludes that windows assessed exceed the target values set out for annual probable sunlight hours, there is a minor reduction to sunlight in these windows in the winter probable sunlight hours. The assessment notes there are two roof lights to the room which should still achieve target sunlight hours and concludes that the proposed development meets the recommendations of the BRE 209 guide. The appellants state the impact in the applicant's assessment is underestimated by the omission of two windows in the kitchen and living room areas and these windows fail to meet criteria (See Section 7 of Solearth Design Analysis assessment).
- 8.2.13. The applicant submitted an Addendum to Sunlight Assessments (April 2026) with the grounds of appeal assessing the two windows for sunlight. It concludes that over the year windows will have good access to sunlight though they will have low levels below the BRE 209 recommendations during the winter period. It highlights the rooflights which provide sunlight and states any potential loss will be minor or negligible. The appellants also consider that the constrained patio configuration gives rise to the appellant's amenity sunlight figures and should not be attributed to the proposed development.
- 8.2.14. This is not accepted by the appellant who provided a Statement of Response from Solearth Design Analysis (May 2026). I have had regard to the appellants points stating the assumption that two roof lights will compensate for sunlight loss is unsubstantiated and outlining BRE 209 methodologies. I note their point that Table 1 of the applicant's addendum demonstrates that these windows fail to receive adequate probable sunlight hours during the winter season and I accept the findings. I note the BRE 209 guide is 'purely advisory and the numerical target values within it

may be varied to meet the needs of the development and its location'. This means that the guide is not intended for rigid application. Given that the assessment indicates good access over the year and that low levels are in the winter period, I consider the nature and extent of impact to be low and will not unduly impact the residential amenity of the adjoining property.

8.2.15. Section 7 of Digital Dimensions assessment also compares sunlight on the March 21st at two hour intervals during the day. It demonstrates a level of existing shadowing and that additional overshadowing will occur from the proposed development. The comparative Solearth Design Analysis assessments demonstrate substantial additional shadow on the patio area (Section 7.3 of Solearth Design Analysis assessment and Statement of Response May 2026).

8.2.16. Having regard to the location and orientation of both dwellings, the difference in site levels, the size, form and mass of the proposed development, the degree of set-back from the boundary and the above mentioned assessments, it is my opinion that the nature and extent of overshadowing will not unduly impact the residential amenity of the adjoining property.

8.3. **Other matters**

8.3.1. *Technical considerations:* The appellants note that house numbering is incorrect on the site location map, site layout plan and in Digital Dimensions assessment. They also highlight that certain dimensions were not stated on drawings. I consider that sufficient information was provided to facilitate a balanced and reasoned assessment and it did not materially impact on the assessment.

8.3.2. *Subdivision of dwelling:* I note that the appellants did not object to the principle of an extension and that the decision to grant permission included a condition that the entire dwelling be used as a single dwelling unit and not sub-divided. I consider that this condition would be appropriate to protect residential amenities in any grant of permission.

8.3.3. *Contribution:* A contribution is required for the scale of this development under the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council Contribution Scheme 2023-2028.

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 1.3km southwest of South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024).
- 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 and side of dwellings in Sections 12.3.7.1 (ii) and (iii) of the said Plan, the location of the development, the pattern of development in the area and the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024, 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 would not detract from the character of the area. The proposed development is therefore 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 entire dwelling shall be used as a single dwelling unit and shall not be sub-divided in any manner or used as two or more separate habitable units. REASON: In the interest of residential amenity.
3.	The glazing to all first-floor bathroom and en-suite windows on the northern side elevation shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable. REASON: In the interest of residential amenity
4.	The external finishes shall harmonise in colour and texture with the existing finishes on the dwelling. REASON: In the interest of visual amenity.
5.	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.
6.	Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

	REASON: In order to safeguard the [residential] amenities of property in the vicinity
7.	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.
8.	The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution 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. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme. 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.”

Michele Beirne
Planning Inspector

24th June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501042-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of extension, construction of part two storey and single storey extension to side and rear with associated works.
Development Address	Corrigville, Corrig Avenue, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin, A96AT25
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
No ☐	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____