



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501100-DS-26

Development

Demolition of existing single storey kitchen and construction of new single storey pitched roof extension with rooflights. Increase in height of fence to front to 1.6m.

Location

No. 2 Castlewood Lodge,
Castlewood Terrace, Rathmines,
Dublin 6.

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

5010/26

Applicant(s)

Aoife Brennan.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant permission with conditions.

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Aoife Brennan.

Observer(s)

Scott Somers.

Date of Site Inspection

23/05/2026.

Inspector

Anthony Abbott King

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. No. 2 Castlewood Lodge is a two-storey semi-detached house forming a pair with No. 1 Castlewood Lodge. Castlewood Lodge is located off Castlewood Terrace to the east of the Swan Centre and is accessed via Castlewood Avenue
- 1.2. The infill semi-detached houses constructed circa. 2001 share a front hard surfaced forecourt and have abutting rear gardens. The forecourt is divided by an open wooden fence.
- 1.3. The linear residential plots accommodating the pair of abutting semi-detached infill houses has a northwest / southeast axis.
- 1.4. The houses on street form an identical pair comprising two-storey single-bay elevations with a symmetrically placed projecting single-storey gable end porch incorporating side by side entrances.
- 1.5. The site area is given as 0.013 hectares.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The demolition of existing single storey kitchen and construction of new single storey pitched roof extension with rooflights. Increase in height of fence to front to 1.6m

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Grant permission subject to 7 condition.

3.1.1. Condition number 2 is relevant:

The development shall be revised as follows: a. The proposed single storey rear extension shall be reduced in depth by 1.6 metres to be in line with the neighbouring property. Development shall not commence until revised plans, drawings and particulars showing the above amendments have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority, and such works shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the buildings.

Reason: *In the interests of orderly development and visual amenity.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The decision of the CEO of Dublin City Council reflects the recommendation of the planning case officer.

- The planning case officer concluded that the proposed development was acceptable subject to the reduction in the depth of the new rear extension by 1.6m to align with the extension to the rear of the neighbouring property at no. 1 Castlewood Lodge.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- No objection subject to condition.

3.3. Third Party Observations

There is one third party submission on file who is the observer on this first party appeal. The concerns of the third party are summarised in the observation section of this report.

I summarise below for clarity the adjoining property owner's concerns, as originally presented to the planning authority:

- Overbearing and visually dominant;
- Material loss of daylight, sunlight and sky view;
- Insufficient open space non-compliant with development plan standard.
- Inaccurate and misleading boundary drawings;
- Failure to demonstrate building control / construction viability.

I note that a page of the submission is dedicated to a shadow analysis, which is reviewed in the assessment section of this report.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. The following planning history is relevant.

- Under Reg. Ref. 0306/01 planning permission was granted for two semi-detached two-storey houses.

Condition 4 is relevant and states:

Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 of the Second Schedule of the Local Government (Planning and Development) Regulations 1994 (or any Order revoking or re enacting this Order) no extensions (including porches or dormer windows) to the dwelling houses or buildings shall be erected within the curtilage without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: *To safeguard the privacy and amenity of adjoining occupiers and maintain the cohesiveness of the development.*

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The following policy objectives *inter alia* of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 are relevant:

The relevant land-use zoning objective of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (Map H) is Z2 (Residential Conservation): *To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.*

The proposed development is a permissible use.

- **Residential conservation area designation**

The rationale for residential conservation area designation is that the overall quality of an area in design and layout terms is such that it requires special care in dealing with development proposals, which would affect structures both protected and non-protected in such areas. The objective is to protect conservation areas from unsuitable new developments or works that would have a negative impact on the amenity or architectural quality of the area.

BHA9 Chapter 11, (Built Heritage & Archaeology) is relevant including Policy BHA9, which *inter alia* states:

To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas – identified under Z8 and Z2 zoning objectives and denoted by red line conservation hatching on the zoning maps. Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.

- **Urban Consolidation**

Chapter 5 (Quality Housing and Sustainable Neighbourhoods), is relevant including:

Policy QHSN6 (Urban Consolidation) is relevant. The policy promotes and supports residential consolidation and sustainable intensification through the consideration of applications *inter alia* for infill development, backland development, mews development, re-use / adaption of existing building stock, and use of upper floors subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.

Policy QHSN10 (Urban Density) is relevant. The policy promotes residential development at sustainable densities throughout the city in accordance with the Core Strategy, particularly on vacant and/or underutilised sites, having regard to the need for high standards of urban design and architecture and to successfully integrate with the character of the surrounding area.

- **Climate Action**

Chapter 3, Policy CA 6 is relevant and states:

Retrofitting and Reuse of Existing Buildings

To promote and support the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction, where possible. See Section 15.7.1 Re-use of Existing Buildings in Chapter 15 Development Standards.

- **Residential Extensions**

Chapter 15 (Development Standards), Section 15.11 is relevant and provides development management guidance and standards *inter alia* for residential extensions

as detailed in Appendix 18, (Ancillary Residential Accommodation). Section 1 (Residential Extensions) is relevant.

- Section 1.1 (General Design Principles) *inter alia* states:

The design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular, the need for light and privacy. In addition, the form of the existing building should be respected, and the development should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar or contrasting materials and finishes.

Innovative, contemporary design will be encouraged. A contemporary or modern approach, providing unique designs, can offer a more imaginative solution. However, such proposals are still required to take account of the design issues outlined in this document.

Applications for extensions to existing residential units should:

- *Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling*
 - *Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight*
 - *Achieve a high quality of design*
 - *Make a positive contribution to the streetscape (front extensions)*
- Section 1.2 (Extensions to Rear) *inter alia* states:
 - Section 1.4 (Privacy & Amenity) is relevant and *inter alia* states:

It is important to make sure that any extension does not unacceptably affect the amenities of neighbouring properties. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight. It is advisable to discuss proposals with neighbours prior to submitting a planning application.

- Section 1.6 (Daylight and Sunlight) is relevant and *inter alia* states:

Large single or two-storey rear extensions to semi-detached or terraced dwellings can, if they project too far from the main rear elevation, result in a loss of daylight to neighbouring houses. Furthermore, depending on orientation, such extensions can have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight received by adjoining properties. On the other hand, it is also recognised that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable.....

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage 'The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Growth Guidelines for Planning Authorities', (15 January, 2024).

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.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the first party appeal are summarised below:

- This appeal is solely against Condition number 2 of the notification of decision to grant planning permission. The first party otherwise welcomes the grant of permission. The Commission is requested to omit Condition number 2, which it is claimed is unwarranted, unjustified and negatively impacts the design of the proposed extension.
- The proposed development represents an appropriately scaled architect designed rear mono-pitch roof extension consistent with the pattern of development in the Rathmines area and is consistent with development plan policy supporting compact growth and climate action, including retrofitting existing buildings as provided for by Policy CA6.
- The development is consistent with urban consolidation national, regional and development plan policy. It is consistent with the Z2 residential zoning objective, including Policy BHA9, which provides for the protection of the special interest and character of conservation areas.
- The appeal site is not part of a symmetrical terrace rather a semi-detached pair. The pattern of development in the area which lacks uniformity. The neighbouring

property (no.1 Castlewood Lodge) has an extension that breaks the current rear building line.

- The development is to rear of no. 2 Castlewood Lodge and will not break the front building line of the semi-detached pair of houses.
- The appeal statement includes examples of recently permitted rear extensions in Rathmines where the rear building line of adjoining property was not considered pivotal in the planning assessment, including no. 20 Fortfield Terrace (Reg. Ref. WEB5753/25), No. 14 Fortescue Lane,(Reg. Ref. WEB1747/25) & 31 Mountpleasant Terrace (WEB2422/25), which have projections that exceed existing adjoining extensions.
- The design rationale for the build form is to introduce a lightwell into the internal plan aligned with best natural light and ventilation practice in order to avoid a long dark tunnel effect resulting from aggregating the floor area of the rear reception room of the original house with the new kitchen / dining extension.
- The reduction in the depth of the extension by 1.6m compromises the internal function of the new kitchen / dining area, which would measure a reductive 2.7m x 3.3m beyond the lightwell.
- The development proposal is located in an exceptionally accessible area within walking distance of available services and public transport connection in Rathmines Village.
- The residual rear garden (19.8 sqm) would satisfy open space standards for a 3-bedroom house in an urban area (5 sqm per bed space).
- The proposed development is consistent with development plan standards for residential development and extensions including daylight and sunlight standards. The rear gardens are south facing and the extension is single storey in height.
- It is claimed that Condition number 2 was attached to the grant of planning permission solely to address the concerns of the third party who is the adjoining property owner at no. 1 Castlewood Lodge rather than by reason of a specific planning policy. The attachment of Condition number 2 is unjustified.

- It is claimed that the third-party submission is based on the argument that the proposed extension should match the design of the extension to the adjoining property, which is itself an exempted development extension (not the subject of a planning permission as required by the parent permission and unauthorised).
- The first party is willing to alter the design of the development to address the concerns of the third party in lieu of Condition number 2.
- The first party proposes that the fence located on the shared property boundary would be retained (reinstated) after the completion of the construction of the southwest elevation blockwork wall. A ground floor plan drawing is appended to the appeal statement at an indicative scale of 1:100 illustrates same (Appendix B).

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority have not responded to date

7.3. Observations

There is one observation on file, which is summarised below:

- The observer is the adjoining property owner at no. 1 Castlewood Lodge located to the west of the appeal site who is the third party who submitted an observation to the planning authority (11/02/2026).
- The third party shares a property boundary with the appeal site. The third party requests the Commission to uphold the decision of the planning authority to attach Condition number 2.
- Condition number 2 directly address the site specific issue of a 1.6m projection and a 4.18m flank wall on a constrained shared boundary.
- The subject condition is modest, proportionate and grounded in the amenity standards of Appendix 18 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.
- The appeal does not address the shadow study, the outlook impact or offer an alternative design that would reduce the overbearing and daylight / sunlight impact of the development on no. 1 Castlewood Lodge.

- The adverse impacts of the development can only be addressed by following the rear building line established by the extension to the rear of no. 1 Castlewood Lodge.
- The Rathmines precedents cited by the first party appeal do not represent a correct comparator as none introduce overbearing massing on a shared property boundary with an immediate principal habitable room and patio. The planning assessment should be site specific.
- The flank wall of the extension positioned on the shared property boundary projecting 1.6m beyond the established rear building line would introduce a new and abrupt form of enclosure / overbearing impact immediate to the patio and the principal habitable room (photographs inserted in submission of existing boundary as viewed from inside the habitable room).
- The shadow study submitted with the original third party submission to the planning authority based on BRE principles (prepared using a 3-dimensional model) show more than 2 hours' loss of solar gain to the principal habitable room during the Spring Equinox.
- It is claimed that a significant and measurable reduction in morning solar gain is inconsistent with Appendix 18 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. The third party's shadow analysis in the absence of a first party response in the appeal statement stands as the only substantive evidence of sunlight / daylight impact before the Commission.
- The 1.6m projection beyond the established building line would create a new form of enclosure on the shared boundary altering the spatial relationship between the semi-detached houses inconsistent with Appendix 18 of the development plan, which requires that rear extensions maintain a reasonable level of outlook for adjoining properties.
- It is claimed that the existing built context is established. The planning status of the existing extension (2017) to the rear of No. 1 Castlewood Lodge is not relevant given that the 7-year period under Section 157(4) of the Planning and Development Act has elapsed.

- The finished room dimension cited by the appellant resulting from compliance with Condition number 2 is a design choice reflecting the extension design in its current form. Internal design is a legitimate consideration but it does not override the development plan external amenity protections.
- It is claimed that the footprint permitted by Condition number 2 can accommodate alternative configurations within the development envelope.
- Finally, the alternative design option submitted on appeal (the reinstatement of a fence in front of a new boundary wall) by the first party is a cosmetic modification that does not mitigate the impact of the 1.6m projection of the proposed extension beyond the established rear building line.

8.0 **Assessment**

- 8.1. This is a first-party appeal against Condition number 2 attached to the notification of decision of Dublin City Council to grant permission for the proposed development subject condition. The appeal relates to Condition number 2 attached to the permission.
- 8.2. I note that no other appeal and one observation has been received, which relates solely to Condition number 2, and consider that the de novo assessment of the proposed development is not warranted in this instance.
- 8.3. I am satisfied that that the proposal is otherwise in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. As such and in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, the assessment of the proposed development will be confined to the conditions subject to appeal.
- 8.4. I have 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, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant planning policies and guidance.
- 8.5. I consider that the only planning matter at issue in this case is Condition number 2 of the notification of decision to grant planning permission and that no other planning matters need to be considered by the Commission.

8.6. *Condition no. 2*

Condition number 2 provides for the reduction in the depth by 1.6m of the proposed rear single-storey extension to no. 2 Castlewood Lodge in order that the extension should align with the extension to the rear of the adjoining dwelling at no. 1 Castlewood Lodge.

8.7. The rationale for the reduction in the depth of the extension as provided for in the condition reason is in the interests of orderly development and visual amenity.

8.8. The first party *inter alia* claims that Condition number 2 is applied solely in response to a third-party observation to the planning authority and that the rear extension as originally submitted to the planning authority is appropriately scaled consistent with the pattern of development in the area (Rathmines). I interrogate this matter below.

8.9. *Principle of development*

The appeal site is zoned Objective Z2 residential conservation of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, which seeks to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.

8.10. The extension of the existing dwellinghouse on site is acceptable in principle.

8.11. I note the urban consolidation policies and objective of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, including Policy QHSN6.

8.12. Policy QHSN6 (Urban Consolidation) promotes and supports residential consolidation and sustainable intensification through the consideration of applications *inter alia* for infill development, backland development, mews development, re-use / adaption of existing building stock.

8.13. I consider that the application represents an existing housing stock adaption for modern living including the construction of a new rear extension to replace a smaller existing extension on site.

The existing amenity of adjoining properties

8.14. The substantive rationale for the attachment of Condition number 2 is the protection of the existing residential and visual amenity of the abutting semi-detached house at no.1 Castlewood Lodge (observer) to the west of the appeal site.

- 8.15. The abutting house at no.1 Castlewood Lodge has an existing single-storey extension. The proposed extension, the subject of design revision Condition number 2, would have a depth of 6545mm and would project 1.6m beyond the rear building line of the abutting extended property.
- 8.16. The planning case officer having regard to the existing context considered that the proposed extension should be reduced to align with the adjoining property.
- 8.17. The planning authority attached Condition number 2 to ensure conformity of the rear building form in terms of building line in the interests of orderly development and visual amenity.
- 8.18. The first party claims that the planning assessment does not support the reduction in the depth of the extension by 1.6m, as the proposed extension in whole is designed to protect existing amenities and is consistent with the pattern of development in the area.
- 8.19. The first party cites a number of examples in Rathmines where planning has been granted for development proposals to extend dwelling houses incorporating rear extensions that break the rear established building line of adjoining properties.
- 8.20. The third party (observer) states that the precedents cited do not have equivalence and that none of the examples cited introduce overbearing massing on a shared property boundary with an immediate principal habitable room and patio.
- 8.21. I note these matters. However, I consider that the proposed development as it relates to Condition number 2 shall be assessed on its own merits within the site specific context.

Appendix 18 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

- 8.22. The observer claims that Condition number 2 is warranted by reason of the guidance on the protection of existing residential and visual amenity provided in Appendix 18 (Ancillary Residential Accommodation) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 in the matter of the residential extension of an existing dwellinghouse.
- 8.23. Appendix 18, Section 1.1 (General Design Principles) *inter alia* lists the following matters for consideration in the assessment of extensions to existing dwelling houses:
- Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling;

- Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight;
- Achieve a high quality of design;
- Make a positive contribution to the streetscape.

8.24. I interrogate these matters below.

Proposed rear extension submitted to the planning authority

- 8.25. The existing single-storey extension has a given floor area of 4.82 sqm. The internal floor area of proposed extension would be approximately 18 sqm.
- 8.26. The extension would accommodate a kitchen / dining room separated by a courtyard / lightwell (2 sqm) from the existing living room.
- 8.27. The extension would extend across the full width of the plot (4275mm). It would have a depth of 6545mm measured from the principal rear elevation of the house.
- 8.28. The mono-pitch roof would rise to a maximum height of 4.180mm on the shared property boundary with no. 1 Castlewood Lodge.
- 8.29. The footprint of the extension would be approximately 30 sqm (4275mm x 6545mm), including the internal lightwell.
- 8.30. The first party claims that the reduction in the projection (1.6m) of rear extension, as required by Condition number 2, would compromise the viability of the proposed internal layout of the ground floor of the extended dwellinghouse. I acknowledge the argument of the first party.
- 8.31. I note that the external envelope of the extension as designed and the internal functional layout are integrated.
- 8.32. I consider that the reduction in the floor area of the extension by reason of the redesign required by Condition number 2, to comply with the reduction in the depth of the extension by 1.6m, would provide a suboptimal internal floor area given the original design concept.
- 8.33. The first party specifically cites the function of the internal lightwell. I consider that the reduction in extension depth would result in a restricted floor area (approximately 10

sqm) beyond the lightwell, which would compromise the function of the proposed kitchen / dining room.

- 8.34. Finally, I note the third party observation that the footprint permitted by Condition number 2 can accommodate alternative configurations within the development envelope.
- 8.35. I acknowledge that an alternative design solution may optimise the permitted floor area. However, optimisation may require a materially different development proposal.
- 8.36. I conclude that the proposed new build rear extension would upgrade the existing accommodation on site and would enhance the residential amenity of the subject property. However, the reduction in the extension depth by 1.6m would result in a suboptimal ground floor plan based on the permitted design concept.

Daylight / Sunlight

- 8.37. Section 1.6 (Daylight and Sunlight) of Appendix 18 *inter alia* provides that large single rear extensions to semi-detached buildings can, if they project too far from the main rear elevation, result in a loss of daylight to neighbouring houses.
- 8.38. Furthermore, depending on orientation, such extensions can have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight received by adjoining properties.
- 8.39. The subject properties at nos.1 & 2 Castlewood Lodge have south rear elevations facing the path of the sun. I note the south orientation is optimal in terms of sunlight exposure.
- 8.40. The observer submitted a shadow analysis finding as part of the third party submission process to the planning authority. The third party states that shadow analysis submitted confirms more than 2 hours' loss of solar gain to the principal habitable room during the Spring Equinox.
- 8.41. The observer states that the first party on appeal has not addressed the sunlight / daylight concerns of the adjoining property owner.
- 8.42. I note that the appeal statement under the heading "Daylight, Sunlight & Overshadowing", which states that the layout of the development, including its single-storey height, has been guided by the requirement to minimise impacts on neighbouring

properties and that the subject properties receive ample sunlight at peak hours due to the south orientation.

- 8.43. I acknowledge that no shadow study has been submitted. However, I do not consider that a detailed professionally commissioned daylight / sunlight analysis is required given the orientation of the rear curtilage of the subject properties.
- 8.44. I have reviewed the page of the original submission under the heading “Daylight & Sunlight Impacts (BRE Analysis)” containing the observers key findings in the matter of the loss of sunlight / daylight to the adjoining property to the west of the appeal site.
- 8.45. I acknowledge that the east light currently received may be reduced by the projection (1.6m) on the shared property boundary of the proposed extension beyond the rear building line.
- 8.46. I accept the impact identified by the observer in the submitted analysis in regard to morning light.
- 8.47. However, the rear garden and principal rear habitable space within the house would receive adequate sunlight over the course of the day given the southern orientation of the rear curtilage of no. 1 Castlewood Lodge and the location of the rear fenestration directly in the path of the sun.
- 8.48. I note that Section 1.6 (Daylight and Sunlight) recognises that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable.
- 8.49. I conclude that there would be no significant adverse impact in terms of loss of sunlight / daylight on the rear elevation and garden of the adjoining property given the single storey height of the proposed extension and the south orientation of no. 1 Castlewood Lodge.

Overbearing / Outlook

- 8.50. The third party claims that there would be significant overbearing impacts from the height and projection of the extension on the shared property boundary beyond the rear building line that would result in a tunnel effect reducing outlook from the internal spaces of the adjoining house.

- 8.51. I do not agree with the third party. I consider that the modest 1.6m projection of the proposed extension on the property boundary at a height of 4.180 would have minor overbearing impacts and would be acceptable given the urban context.
- 8.52. I acknowledge that the outlook from the ground floor rear kitchen dining room of no. 1 Castlewood Lodge would be obliquely impacted. However, the open nature of the shared property boundary would be maintained for 4630mm of its existing length (6230mm).
- 8.53. I conclude that no significant adverse impacts in terms of overbearing or loss of outlook would result from the projection of the extension by 1.6m beyond the rear building line of no. 1 Castlewood Lodge.
- 8.54. I note that the physical relationship would change between the adjoining properties. The first party has submitted an alternative design that would reinstate the existing boundary fence subsequent to the construction of the masonry wall of the extension to mitigate the change in context.
- 8.55. The third party opinion is that the alternative design option is cosmetic and would not address the substantive issues of overshadowing and overbearing on the adjoining property.
- 8.56. I do not consider that overshadowing and overbearing impacts are substantiated. I do not consider that an alternative design solution that reinstates the existing fence is necessary or reasonable in context.

Finishes

- 8.57. The projection of the extension beyond the rear building line of no. 1 Castlewood Lodge would manifest as a rendered masonry wall on the shared property boundary. I consider that the material finish is acceptable.
- 8.58. I conclude on balance that the existing residential and visually amenities of the adjoining property at no.1 Castlewood Lodge would be maintained without the attachment of Condition number 2.

Open space

- 8.59. The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, Section 5.11.3 (Private Open Space) is a minimum open space standard of 10 sqm. per bed space. However, a less restrictive standard is applied to inner city housing of 5-8 sqm per bedspace.
- 8.60. I note that the appeal site is within 400m of Rathmines Village and has equivalence with an inner city location in terms of access to services and building typology.
- 8.61. The subject dwellinghouse has 3 bedrooms, which would indicate a minimum open space standard of 25 sqm.
- 8.62. The residual garden area would form a patio garden comprising an indicative private amenity space of 20 sqm (4272mm x 4630)
- 8.63. I acknowledge that the subject development relates to house extension rather than a new infill house where open space standards per bedspace principally apply. I note that open space standards may be relaxed on a case by case basis subject to qualitative analysis.
- 8.64. The patio garden would have an optimal south orientation. I consider that the residual amenity area to the rear of the extension in combination with the internalised courtyard would satisfy qualitative development plan private open space standards.

Impact on the visual amenity of the residential conservation area

- 8.65. The proposed development is located in a residential conservation area. The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 requires development within or affecting a residential conservation area to contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting.
- 8.66. The sawtooth configuration of Castlewood Terrace results in a line of vision from the western section of Castlewood Terrace toward the side blank elevation of the subject pair of semi-detached houses and part of their rear curtilage located forward of the front building line of Castlewood terrace (Nos. 5,6,7 & 8).
- 8.67. The gable elevation of no. 1 Castlewood Lodge closes the vista from an observation point immediately west of the Swan Centre on Castlewood Terrace.

- 8.68. The high boundary wall enclosing the front courtyards of the houses on Castlewood Terrace (to the west of the appeal site) screen the rear curtilage of the subject pair of semi-detached houses at ground floor level.
- 8.69. However, the existing pitch of the roof (ridge height 4180mm) of the single-storey extension to the rear of nos. 1 & 2 Castlewood Lodge is in part visible from the public domain given the prominence of the semi-detached plot, which closes the Castlewood Terrace vista.
- 8.70. I note that the proposed extension to the rear of no. 2 Castlewood Lodge would elevate above the flat roof section (height approximately 3500mm) of the existing extension to the rear of no. 1 Castlewood Lodge.
- 8.71. I consider that the southwest elevation of the proposed extension (4165mm) to the rear of no. 2 Castlewood Lodge would be obliquely visible from the public domain on Castlewood Terrace. However, there would be no discernible impact on the receiving environment.
- 8.72. The additional projection of the southwest elevation of the extension by 1.6m would be screened from public view by the front two-storey building line of nos. Nos. 5,6,7 & 8 Castlewood Terrace.
- 8.73. I conclude that the southwest elevation of the extension would not have an adverse visual impact on the streetscape consistent with Policy BHA9, which provides for the protection of the special interest and character of conservation areas.

Conclusion

- 8.74. Finally, I do not concur with the planning case officer that the proposed extension should be reduced to align with the adjoining property, as the single storey height and modest projection of the extension (1.6m) beyond the rear building line of the adjoining property would not result in a serious adverse impact on the residential and visual amenities of no.1 Castlewood Lodge. Furthermore, the additional project of the southwest wall of the extension would not be visible from the public street.

Other Matters

- 8.75. The planning status of the extension to the rear of no. 1 Castlewood is an operational matter for the planning authority.

9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed development in-light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

The subject site is located within an established suburban area and is connected to piped services and is not immediate to a European Site. The proposed development comprises the extension an existing dwellinghouse.

No significant 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 it could not have any effect on a European Site given the small-scale nature of the development.

I conclude 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

The site is located in a suburban location. It is not proximate to a visible watercourse.

The development comprises a rear extension to an existing dwellinghouse.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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 the small scale and nature of the development.

I conclude based on objective information, the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration of 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

Having regard to the nature of the condition the subject of the appeal, the Commission is satisfied that the determination by the Commission of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and, based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to remove Condition number 2 and the reason therefor.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential conservation zoning objective, the pattern of development in the area and the policy framework for urban consolidation and residential extension provided by the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, it is considered that the proposed rear extension by reason of its single-storey height and modest projection (1.6m) beyond the rear building line of the adjoining property at no. 1 Castlewood Lodge, would not seriously injure the residential and visual amenities of the area, including the amenities of the adjoining property at no.1 Castlewood Lodge to the west of the appeal site, which would be maintained, would provide a satisfactory standard of residential accommodation on site and, as such, would be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The planning authority's Condition 2 requiring the reduction in the projection of the rear extension is, therefore, not warranted.

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.

Anthony Abbott King
Planning Inspector

27 May 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501100-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	Domestic extension
Development Address	No.2 Castlewood Lodge, Castlewood Terrace, Rathmines, Dublin 6.
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. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____