



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501092-DR-26

Development

Demolition of garage and construction of a two-storey extension to the rear of the existing two storey dwelling together with all associated site works.

Location

Knockadoo, Glenalua Road, Killiney, Dublin, A96 KF66

Planning Authority

Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D26A/0028/WEB

Applicant(s)

Patrick & Peter Evans

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permisison

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Lorraine Smith

Trisha Randall O'Connell

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

6th June 2026

Inspector

Barry Diamond

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	4
2.0	Proposed Development	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	5
4.0	Planning History	6
5.0	Policy Context.....	7
6.0	EIA Screening.....	9
7.0	The Appeal	9
8.0	Assessment.....	13
9.0	AA Screening.....	22
10.0	Water Framework Directive	23
11.0	Recommendation	24
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	24
13.0	Conditions	24

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is circa 0.113ha and comprises an existing one and a half storey dwelling known as 'Knockadoo' which is accessed off Glenalua Road. The dwelling is finished in a painted render and has a gabled roof which is finished in a flat tile. A single storey flat roof garage projects from the front elevation of the dwelling. The site slopes from the south to the north and also to the northwest and has private garden areas to the rear and northeastern side of the dwelling.
- 1.2. Areas of hardstanding for car parking are located to the front and to the southwestern gable of the dwelling. An access laneway runs across the front of the site which accesses two dwellings to the south which are known as 'The Lookout' and 'Brugh Na Carraige'
- 1.3. The application site is located within a residential area and has dwellings on all four sides. There is no consistent development pattern in the area with a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties of varying heights and plot sizes.
- 1.4. The site is also located within the Killiney Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development seeks permission for the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of an extension and other alterations to the existing dwelling. The development consists of a number of different elements including:
 - Construction of a two storey extension with partial lower ground level to the side of the existing two storey dwelling, with a total gross floor area of approximately 96.4 sqm;
 - Minor alterations to the existing dwelling to accommodate the extension;
 - Provision of revised landscaping, boundary treatments, and associated site works;
 - Connection to existing public water mains, foul and surface water drainage networks; and
 - All ancillary development works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 9th March 2026 the Planning Authority issued a decision to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

2. The glazing within the east facing windows of the Kitchen/Living Dining Area at ground floor level 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. A solid obscure panel of no less than 1.7 m shall be permanently fitted along the east side of the balcony/terrace at ground floor level.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenities.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The decision of the planner reflects the decision to grant planning permission. It includes the following points:

- The site is within the Killiney Conservation Area (ACA);
- The extension would not unduly impact the visual amenity of the existing dwelling or the neighbouring properties;
- There are concerns with overlooking from the northeast facing fenestration at ground level in relation to the properties to the east which can be addressed by imposing a condition requiring obscure glazing and a 1.7 metre high solid panel to the northeast side of the balcony/terrace;
- A condition restricting the use of the extension and the existing dwelling as a single dwelling unit can address concerns raised by third parties regarding the use of the extension;
- The works to the main house are considered relatively minor and will not affect neighbouring properties;
- The proposed works do not give rise to overshadowing nor would it be out of character with the area;
- The proposal would have a material impact on Killiney ACA;

- The Arborist Report identifies that 7 trees of low quality will need to be removed to accommodate the development;
- Although the third parties state that the proposal is contrary to SLO13 of the Development Plan, a map based objective, the application site is not within, nor does it abut the area to which this objective relates.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Water Services Section: no objection subject to conditions.
- Transportation Planning Section: no objection subject to conditions.
- Conservation Division – No response

Prescribed Bodies

- An Taisce – No response
- Heritage Council - No response
- Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage – No response
- Fáilte Ireland - No response
- The Arts Council/An Chomhairle Ealaíon - No response

3.3. Third Party Observations

The two third party appellants reside in dwellings close to the application site and raised observations during the processing of the planning application which is attached to the file. I consider that the issues raised are also mirrored and expanded upon in their submissions to the Coimisiún and are not replicated in this section.

4.0 Planning History

Site

None

Setting

D24A/0362 - Permission was granted in July 2024 for 1) Demolition of the existing kitchen extension; 2) Construction of a new extension and remodeling of the existing facade and windows at the rear; 3) Thermal upgrade, renovation, and internal alterations of the existing house; 4) Replacement of existing windows and doors at

the front; 5) Landscaping and associated site works at 12 Glenalua Terrace, Glenalua Road, Killiney, Dublin, A96DE78

D15A/0537 - Permission was granted in December 2015 for the renovation and extension of existing single storey to front, two storey house to rear, works will include a two storey extension, including new balcony to the rear, new single storey extension to front accommodating new study, entrance porch and wc together with new window and folding door to kitchen/dining area. Provision of new replacement low pitched roof to entire building together with revised car parking area, pedestrian entrance and single storey store to front and all associated site works at Tenerife, Glenalua Road, Killiney, Co Dublin.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The relevant Development Plan is the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. The site is zoned 'A' with the objective to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities. Residential development, including alterations to existing dwellings, is permitted in principle under this zoning.

Chapter 3 Climate Action

Section 3.4 Achieving Sustainable Planning Outcomes

Section 3.4.1.3 Policy Objective CA7: Construction Materials.

Chapter 4 Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place

Section 4.3.1.2 Policy Objective PHP19 – Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation

Section 4.3.1.3 Policy Objective PHP20 – Protection of Existing Residential Amenity

Chapter 11 (Heritage)

Section 11.4.2.1 Policy Objective HER13: Architectural Conservation Areas - Ensure that any new development or alteration of a building within an ACA or immediately adjoining an ACA is appropriate in terms of the proposed design, including scale, height, mass, density, building lines and materials.

Section 11.4.2.2 Policy Objective HER14: Demolition within an ACA - It is a Policy Objective to prohibit the demolition of a structure(s) that positively contributes to the character of the ACA.

Chapter 12 (Development Management)

Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings

- (i) Front extensions, at both ground and first level will be considered acceptable in principle subject to scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. A break in the front building line will be acceptable, over two floors to the front elevation, subject to scale and design however a significant break in the building line should be resisted unless the design can demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the proposal will not impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings. Excessive scale should be avoided.
- (ii) 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.
- (iii) Ground floor side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity.
- (iii) First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. However, in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front façade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.
- Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles - changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/ 'A' frame end or 'half-hip' for example – will be assessed against a number of criteria including:
 - Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
 - Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
 - Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
 - Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence

Section 12.4.5.1 Parking Zones

Section 12.4.5.2 Application of Standards

Section 12.8.7 – Private Amenity Standards – Quality Standards.

Section 12.8.7.1 – Separation Distances.

Section 12.8.7.2 – Boundaries.

Killiney Proposed Architectural Conservation Area 2010 - New development should contribute to the visual enhancement and vibrancy of the area whilst respecting its existing physical character and all new buildings should be to the highest standards of architectural design.

The Council will seek to encourage appropriately scaled extensions and alterations to properties within Killiney ACA that are generally sensitive to the main structure and subsidiary (to the main structure).

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines (where relevant)

‘Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities’, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, (2024)

Best Practice Guidelines for Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities 2007.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located on or within proximity to any designated Natura 2000 site. The subject site is situated c. 1.9km to the southwest of the Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code SAC 003000) and the Dalkey Islands SPA (site code SPA 004172).

6.0 EIA Screening

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 requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of my report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.2. The appellants (No. 2 Willowmount Cottages) grounds of appeal were submitted by MDO Architects and can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed extension is south south west of No. 2 Willowmount and has a significant overshadowing effect;
- The proposal will give rise to overlooking from the entrance balconies and ground floor windows;
- The proposed screen to the balcony required by Condition 02 is not high enough and may contain gaps and joints allowing overlooking;
- The position of the extension close to the boundary will have a dominant and overbearing impact;
- The removal of trees will reduce privacy and screening;
- Section 12.8.11 of the Development Plan specifically requires new developments to be designed to retain vegetated site boundaries;
- A full landscaping and screening proposal is required to properly assess the proposed development;
- A financial bond should be imposed to ensure the protection of retained trees during construction;
- There are concerns over the construction impacts including noise, dust and general disturbance as the appellant has health concerns;
- Concerns over heavy vehicle movements along the narrow laneway causing damage to boundary walls and landscaping;
- The wording of condition 06 is vague and a condition requiring a CEMP should be imposed.
- No cross section of the proposed development to No. 2 Willowmount has been provided;
- The proposed development is 4-5 metres above the ground level of No. 2 Willowmount.

7.3. The appellants (Chalfont, Glenalua Road) grounds of appeal were submitted by Armstrong Planning Consultants and can be summarised as follows:

- Chalfont sits at a lower level than the application site and is less than 7.5 metres from the site boundary;
- There are concerns with overlooking of the rear windows of Chalfont from people entering and exiting the extension;
- The rear garden area of Chalfont only receives sunlight in the morning and the proposal which is located to the east may give rise to overshadowing;
- The proposal will affect views of Killiney ACA from the appellants house;
- The development will affect the value of the appellants house;
- The proposal is inconsistent with Section 12.3.7 of the Development Plan as the layout is indicative of a separate residential unit and the applicants pre-application report refers to a granny flat;
- The proposal is inconsistent with Section 12.4.8 (car parking standards) of the Development Plan;
- The proposal would not comply with Section 12.3.7.3 for a granny flat or Section 12.3.7.5 for an infill dwelling;
- The proposal will have a negative visual impact on Killiney ACA due to its elevated and removal of trees contrary to Policy Objective HER 13 of the Development Plan;
- The separation distance to No. 2 Willowmount is less than 16 metres contrary to SPPR 1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities', Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, (2024);
- The wording of Condition 02 is ambiguous;
- The height of the proposal on this elevated site will read as overbearing from Willowmount Cottages, Talbot House and the Stables and will also lead to a loss of light;
- The design of the proposal does not take its reference from the existing house;
- The application does not detail how the proposal complies with Section 12.4.8 of the Development Plan;

- The proposal may lead to a loss of light to the appellants solar panels;
- There is no sunlight and daylight assessment submitted with the application;
- The proposal will have a significant negative impact on Killiney ACA as it is a prominent and exposed site;
- The design is inconsistent with the character of the ACA as the proposal will result in the loss of trees which is a key element of the ACA's character;
- The flat roof extension is inconsistent with the pitched roofs in the area and is described as an 'alien form' within the ACA.

7.4. Applicant Response

The applicant for planning permission response was submitted by Foundation Management Consultants Ltd and can be summarised as follows:

- The application is for an extension to the existing dwelling which has a physical connection;
- Scale alone does not determine whether a development constitutes a separate planning unit;
- Condition 04 restricts the subdivision of the property;
- The site is characterised by level differences, oblique angles and boundary treatments with no direct overlooking;
- The extent of the measures required under Condition 02 is excessive having regard to the actual level of impact arising as the proposed openings are not directly aligned with adjoining habitable windows and the intervening distances while varied are moderated by level changes and oblique angles;
- The development will alter the relationship between properties, however, changes must be considered in the suburban context where extensions to dwellings are commonplace;
- A daylight and sunlight analysis is not a mandatory requirement;
- The conclusion that overshadowing will not occur is reasonable given the orientation of the site, the positioning of the extension and the absence of directly opposing facades in close proximity;

- The scale and massing of the extension are consistent with a two storey residential form and does not represent a departure from the prevailing pattern of development;
- The scale of development is appropriate given the size and configuration of the site, the backland location of the extension and the absence of direct impact on the streetscape;
- The removal of trees is not uncommon to facilitate development;
- The proposal includes the retention of existing boundary treatments where feasible, new landscaping and enhanced screening through condition;
- Construction impacts are inherent in all development and are a temporary disturbance managed through standard planning controls.

7.5. **Planning Authority Response**

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

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 policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Residential Amenity
- Architectural Conservation Area
- Parking
- Other Matters

8.1 **Principle of Development**

8.1.1 The site is located on lands which are subject to 'Existing Residential (A)' under the Development Plan, the objective of which is "to provide residential development and

improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.” I also note that the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 (DLRCDP) is supportive of residential extensions. In this regard Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings supports applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend existing dwellings subject to specific safeguards. The site is also located within the Killiney Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) which does not preclude development. I consider that the principle of a residential extension is acceptable subject to issues of design, neighbour amenity and other relevant factors.

8.2 Design

8.2.1 The proposal includes alterations to the existing dwelling and the development of an extension to the northeastern side elevation of the existing dwelling.

8.2.2 The application includes the enlargement of two of the dormers to provide for additional head height. In addition, the south facing open terrace at first floor level is to be replaced with a Juliet balcony, finished within a new dormer detail to match the redesign of the adjacent 2 no. dormers at the same level. A flat roof canopy is also proposed over the main entrance door on the front elevation of the house which is to be finished in a dark metal cladding. In my view these changes to the main dwelling are relatively minor and do not make any fundamental changes to the design or appearance of the dwelling. I also note that the third parties do not raise any issues with these proposed changes.

8.2.3 The main component of the application includes the demolition of an existing single storey flat roof garage which extends from the front elevation of the existing dwelling and the construction of an extension to the northeastern side elevation of the dwelling. The extension measures 6.75 metres in height over two floors and is set off the main dwelling at an angle which includes a physical link between the extension and the main dwelling.

8.2.4 There is a steep fall in the topography of the site to the northeast of the dwelling, which results in the proposed two storey extension having a lower ground floor component in relation to the existing dwelling while the upper floor component of the extension is similar to the finished floor level of the ground floor of the existing dwelling. The proposed extension has a flat roof and sits 3.76 metres below the ridge level of the existing dwelling. I consider that the proposed extension is subordinate in height to the existing dwelling.

- 8.2.5 The extension is finished with a light grey brick to the elevations with a door opening to the front elevation. There are a number of window openings on the northeaster side elevation of the extension at both floor levels, while the rear elevation has large glazed areas over both floors. The upper floor has a glazed balcony area which sits over a portion of the lower ground floor roof.
- 8.2.6 The use of a flat roof to the extension has been raised as a concern by third parties in the area, however, I note that while there is a predominance of gabled roofs in the area, there is an existing flat roof garage on the site which is to be demolished in order to facilitate the development. In addition, a flat roof exists at Talbot Cottage to the northeast of the site, while flat roof elements exist at No. 1 Willowmount Cottage to the north, with a shallow ridged roof existing at 'The Lookout' to the southeast of the site. I am of the opinion that the flat roof component is acceptable in the context of the site and the surrounding area.
- 8.2.7 The proposed extension is to have a light grey brick finish with large expanses of glazed areas to the rear of the proposed extension. The buildings in the area have a high solid to void ratio with there being a predominance of render finish. In some regard the proposed extension does not respond to the character of the area, however, there are a number of mitigating factors.
- 8.2.8 The dwelling is set back off the Glenalua Road (which it accesses onto) and the Talbot Road which runs to the east and north of the site. In my view, although the site is elevated, there are a number of intervening buildings which restricts views of the site, resulting in the proposed extension not being visible from the surrounding road network and would only be visible from limited viewpoints from the private shared laneway which accesses the site. I also note that 'The Stables' (Talbot Road) which abuts the sites eastern boundary is finished in a brown brick and 'The Lookout', located to the south has large expanses of glazing. Given the limited viewpoints of the extension and the design of the nearby dwellings, I am of the view that the expanses of glazing to the rear of the extension and the use of light grey brick is acceptable.
- 8.2.9 The application site contains vegetation to the majority of the site boundaries with the exception of the northwestern (front) boundary. An Aborists Report was submitted which indicates that several trees will have to be removed in order to accommodate the development. The trees are indicated to be in poor condition with at least three being heavily lopped. Given that the majority of the existing vegetation

is to be retained along a number of the site boundaries and within the elongated rear garden area of the site, I do not consider that the loss of trees to facilitate the development would have a significant detrimental impact on the area.

8.2.10 The extension includes a kitchen/living area, a shower room, W/C and two bedrooms, which brings the total number of bedrooms in the dwelling to five overall. Section 12.8.3.3 of the DRDCDP states that the private open space for a dwelling with four or more bedrooms is 75 sqm. Following the completion of the proposed development, there will remain adequate useable amenity spaces to the side and rear of the dwelling which I consider to be acceptable.

8.2.11 I am of the opinion that the design and layout of the extension will not detract from the visual amenity or character of the area and is acceptable in accordance with the policies for rear extensions in the DLRCDP.

8.3 **Residential Amenity**

8.3.1 The amendments to the main body of the existing dwelling increase the size of the rear window openings at first floor which look towards a dwelling known as 'The Lookout' which is a split level dwelling, however, it is single storey property on its front elevation. No new additional window openings are proposed on the application dwelling and given the existing windows, the oblique angle formed by the first floor windows, along with the orientation of the buildings and the separation distance of 13.5 metres, I do not consider that the increase in the size of the windows at the rear of the dwelling would add to any significant adverse impact on neighbouring dwellings.

8.3.2 The proposed extension is to be constructed over two floors and there are window openings in the northeastern elevation on both floors which face towards No.2 Willowmount Cottages. In addition, there is a balcony proposed on the rear elevation of the extension which faces towards 'The Stables' and 'The Lookout', however, as the balcony is not enclosed along its northeastern elevation, there is also the potential for views towards No. 2 Willowmount Cottages.

8.3.3 The view from the rear of the proposed balcony towards 'The Stables' does not raise any significant concern as there is a significant height difference between the application site and the neighbouring dwelling which means that any views would be across the roof of the property and there would be no overlooking onto any windows

or into private amenity spaces. Views are also restricted by the existing boundary vegetation along the shared boundary.

- 8.3.4 Some views from the proposed balcony would be achievable of the side gable of 'The Lookout', however, there are no windows on this gable save for one wrap around window which is located on the corner of the gable and the front elevation. Given the orientation of the building and the sole window on the gable with no view into the room, I do not consider that there would be any overlooking of this neighbouring dwelling.
- 8.3.5 In relation to both properties given the separation distances of 11.4 metres to 'The Stables' and 18.4 metres from 'The Lookout', and their siting to the east (The Stables) and the south (The Lookout) I do not consider that the extension would have any significant impacts of overshadowing or loss of light.
- 8.3.6 No.2 Willowmount is a single storey dwelling which fronts onto the application site and sits approximately two metres below the finished floor level of the lower ground floor of the extension. The dwelling is separated from the application site by an access lane which serves the property. The laneway is defined by a two metre high close boarded fence with some trees and hedgerows set within the shared boundary between the application site and No.2 Willowmount. There is a separation distance of 15.58 metres between No. 2 Willowmount and the nearest part of the proposed extension.
- 8.3.7 A set of glazed patio doors with a small terraced area are proposed on the lower ground floor of the proposed extension while two areas of glazing and the balcony are proposed on the upper floor. The patio doors on the lower ground floor serve a bedroom while the windows on the upper floor serve the kitchen/dining area. The second window is a wraparound window which serves a living area which then opens out onto the balcony.
- 8.3.8 Section 12.8.7.7 of the Development Plan states that adequate separation distances, between directly opposing rear first floor windows, should be provided when extending existing dwellings at first floor level, to ensure the retention of adjoining residential amenity while SPPR1 of the 'Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities', Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, (2024) states that a minimum separation distance of 16 metres is applicable.

- 8.3.9 The site is defined along the shared boundary by a number of existing Spruce trees which are circa 6 metres in height and have been heavily topped. It is indicated that these trees will need to be removed in order to facilitate the with only the boundary fencing offering screening. In order to address concerns with overlooking given the limited separation distances to No. 2 Willowmount the Planning Authority stipulated a condition (02) on its decision notice requiring that the glazing within the east facing windows of the Kitchen/Living Dining Area on the upper floor to be fitted with opaque or frosted glass and a solid obscure panel of no less than 1.7 m to be permanently fitted along the east side of the balcony/terrace at ground floor level.
- 8.3.10 The third parties raised concern with the vagueness of the condition and the limited height of the screening on the balcony which may contain gaps while the applicants consultant stated that the condition was excessive.
- 8.3.11 The upper floor of the extension is located 3.6 metres from the shared boundary with No. 2 Willowmount and given the height of the extension and the difference in levels between the two properties I am of the view that the existing boundary fence will not screen views of the upper floor of the extension.
- 8.3.12 I am of the opinion that the use of obscure glazing to both windows on the northeastern elevation should be finished in obscure glazing. The windows are not the only window openings serving the room and therefore natural light and an outlook will be achievable from the secondary windows. The use of the balcony would also lead to overlooking of No. 2 Willowmount and in my view a permanent screen located along the side of the balcony will mitigate views from the proposed extension. The third party raised a concern with the limited height of the screen as the average height of persons exceeds 1.7 metre, Although this analysis relates to height as opposed to eye level I am of the view that raising the screening boundary to 1.8 metres and conditioning that it must be made of solid construction with no gaps will help ensure that overlooking of the front of No. 2 Willowmount does not occur.
- 8.3.13 A concern was raised with overshadowing and the overbearing nature of the proposed extension on No. 2 Willowmount. I am of the opinion that a level of overshadowing and dominance of the property is already experienced by the existing trees within the application site that are set off the boundary which are to be removed to facilitate the development. Given the separation distance of the extension from No. 2 and the limited ridge level of the extension, I do not consider

that the level of overshadowing or dominance from the proposed development would be significant.

- 8.3.14 The proposed extension faces onto 'Chalfont', a two storey dwelling which backs onto the application site and has windows at ground and first floor. The property has a block wall at the rear of the property which provides screening to the ground floor windows and rear amenity area. The windows at first floor are open to view and the front elevation of the extension has a separation distance of 12 metres from the rear of Chalfont at the nearest point. The front of the extension has a recessed porch with a single access door and a single window which is set behind vertical louvres.
- 8.3.15 A third party raises concern that the property will experience additional overlooking of their rear windows as persons enter and exit the proposed extension. In my opinion the first floor windows on the rear of the third party's property are already open to view from the front of the application dwelling and also from the access lane which passes along the rear of 'Chalfont' and serves the dwellings known as 'The Lookout' and 'Brugh Na Carraige' which are to the south and southwest of the application site. In my opinion given the existing level of overlooking which already exists and that the only additional view would be from the access door of the proposed extension, I do not consider that the neighbouring dwelling (Chalfont) would be adversely affected by the proposed extension.
- 8.3.16 A concern that 'Chalfont' would be affected by overshadowing and a loss of light was also raised. The proposed extension will have a ridge height of 3.75 metres above ground level where it fronts onto the rear of 'Chalfont' and a separation distance of 12 metres. Although the application site has a higher ground level, given the low ridge height of the extension, the separation distance, and the intervening wall on the rear boundary of 'Chalfont', I do not consider that the level of overshadowing would be significant. In addition, given the low ridge height of the extension relative to the neighbouring property and the separation distance I am of the opinion that the proposed extension would not have any significant overbearing impact on 'Chalfont'.
- 8.3.17 I consider that subject to conditions that the proposed development would not detract from the residential amenity of any of the neighbouring properties in terms of overshadowing/loss of light, dominance or overlooking.

8.4 **Architectural Conservation Area**

- 8.4.1 The application site is located within the Killiney Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). The site is located on the 'South Village Extension' area and the Killiney Architectural Conservation Area 2010 states that; 'Whereas this housing is set on a mixture of plot sizes all are invariably visible from the public road and are not protected from view by high walls as are those on the SE slope area.' The application site does not contain nor does it abut any Protected Structures or Record of Monuments.
- 8.4.2 Whereas the character appraisal refers to dwellings as being visible from the public road, this essentially refers to the Glenalua Road as opposed to the private shared laneway in which the application site is located. Policy Objective HER14 seeks to prohibit the demolition of a structure that positively contributes to the character of the ACA. In my view the demolition of the existing flat roof garage to the front of the existing dwelling does not add positively to the ACA and its demolition is acceptable. The third party states that the flat roof of the proposed extension is an 'alien form' as referenced in the character appraisal for the Killiney ACA, however, the site contains a flat roof structure which is to be demolished and there are a number of flat roof and contemporary structures located in close proximity to the site as stated earlier in the report.
- 8.4.3 Policy Objective HER13 seeks to protect the character and special interest of the ACA and therefore development which detracts from the ACA should be refused. As indicated earlier although the application site has an elevated position, the dwelling is set back off the Glenalua Road and Talbot Road and is shielded from views due to the number of intervening buildings. I am of the opinion that the proposed extension would not be visible from the surrounding road network and would only be visible from limited viewpoints along the private shared laneway which accesses the site and from nearby private dwellings/gardens.
- 8.4.4 A photograph from Killiney Hill of the existing dwelling on the site was provided by a third party, however, this is from a considerable distance and only shows the upper floor of the extension and does not demonstrate that the proposed extension would be visible as it would sit 3.76 metres below the ridge line. Given the limited visibility of the proposed extension and the context in which the development sits, along with the number of contemporary style dwellings, I do not consider that the proposed extension would detract from the ACA.

8.5 Parking

- 8.5.1 The application site is located within Zone 3 parking area as defined by supplementary Map T2 of the Development Plan with Table 12.5 indicating that a standard of two parking spaces are required for a house with three or more bedrooms. The third party indicates that only one parking space has been shown on the proposed site plan and the removal of the existing garage will remove a parking space.
- 8.5.2 I noted at the time of inspection that there was one car parked along the southern boundary of the site and that there was sufficient room to the front of the site to park one vehicle as shown on the site plan. In addition, the ground floor plan shows parking for one car to the side of the dwelling. I accept that two car parking spaces are not shown on the proposed site plan, however, I consider that there is sufficient areas of hardstanding within the site to accommodate two car parking spaces. In addition, the Transport Planning Section and the Planning Authority were satisfied with the access and parking arrangement.

8.6 Other Matters

- 8.6.1 The use of the property was raised as a concern by the third party's and it was stated that the property could be used as a separate dwelling as the layout was indicative of a separate dwelling and that the only link is through a closet on the main dwelling. It was also stated that in pre-application report that the development was referred to as a granny flat.
- 8.6.2 The current application is for a residential extension to the main dwelling and must be assessed as such. The link provided between the main dwelling and the extension is to be through an office (formerly a bedroom) which accesses into the front hallway of the extension. Given the layout of the existing main dwelling, the only opportunity to provide a link from the dwelling to the extension would be through the office, or the living room area. I am of the view that while it may have been advantageous to have a link from a hallway, in the absence of one, I consider that a link to the extension through the office is an acceptable arrangement.
- 8.6.3 I note that the third party raises a concern that there is no physical link between the main dwelling and the lower ground floor of the extension, however, given the topography of the site and the absence of any lower ground floor to the main

dwelling, I do not consider that this aspect of the proposal would contravene any policy in the Development Plan.

- 8.6.4 There were several matters raised by third parties, including; potential damage to the laneway and boundary vegetation, concerns with noise and dust during construction, the need for Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and the devaluation of property.
- 8.6.5 In respect to the above, I note that issues to do with ownership and property damage are not matters which can be adjudicated by the Coimisiún. I refer to Section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007) which states that the planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land; these are ultimately matters for resolution in the Courts. I also refer to Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) states that 'a person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under this section to carry out any development'.
- 8.6.6 I do not consider that a CEMP is necessary for the construction of the proposed extension given the lack of watercourses or other environmentally sensitive receptors. Construction impacts can impact on residential amenity, however, these effects are normally short term and can be mitigated through the use of appropriately worded conditions. A condition was attached by the Planning Authority to its decision notice and I am of the view that a similar condition should be attached in this case to that adverse impacts can be controlled.
- 8.6.7 While the devaluation of property in the area was raised as a concern this is not normally considered to be a material consideration and I have not been provided with any evidence that such an effect would occur or that it would be disproportionate.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1 I have considered the development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at Knockadoo, Glenalua Road, Killiney, Dublin, A96 KF66, no relevant designated sites are close by.
- 9.2 The proposed development comprises the demolition of a garage and the construction of a two-storey extension to the rear of the existing two-storey dwelling

together with all associated site works. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.

9.3 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and nature of the development; and
- Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.

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

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1 The subject site is located at Knockadoo, Glenalua Road, Killiney, Dublin, A96 KF66 which is 520 metres west of the nearest water body.

10.2 The proposed development comprises the demolition of garage and construction of a two-storey extension to the rear of the existing two-storey dwelling together with all associated site works.. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.3 I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development ; and
- Distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

10.4 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. That planning permission be granted for the reasons and considerations set out below and subject to the conditions set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the design, appearance of the proposed side extension and alterations to the existing dwelling, it is considered that, subject to compliance with conditions below, the development proposed would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or residential amenities of property in the vicinity and would not adversely impact on the visual amenity or character of the Architectural Conservation Area. The proposed development, therefore, would 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 and received by the Planning Authority on the 20 th day of January 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 glazing on all the first floor northeast facing windows of the Kitchen/Living Dining Area and the adjoining seating area 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. A solid obscure panel of no less than 1.8 m shall be permanently fitted along the entire east side of the balcony/terrace at ground floor level. The panel shall be of solid construction and shall not contain any gaps. Reason: In the interests of residential amenities
3.	The existing dwelling and extension shall be used as a single dwelling unit apart from such use as may be exempted development for the purposes of the Planning and Development Regulations Reason: In the interests of clarity and to ensure the proper and sustainable development of the area.
4.	The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority. Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.
5.	a) All necessary measures shall be taken by the applicant to prevent any spillage or deposition of clay, dust, rubble or other debris, whether arising from vehicle wheels or otherwise, on the adjoining and/or adjacent public road and footpath network during the course of the construction works. b) Any damage to roads, footpaths or other public property caused by the development shall be made good to the satisfaction of the District Engineer. Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and proper control of development.
6.	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, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Barry Diamond
Planning Inspector

22nd June 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501092-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of garage and construction of a two storey extension to the rear of the existing two storey dwelling together with all associated site works.
Development Address	Knockadoo, Glenalua Road, Killiney, Dublin, A96 KF66
	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? (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)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. ☐ 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.	
☒ 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	
☐ 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)	

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: _____

This page is intentionally blank.