



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501117-SD-26

Development

Alteration of hipped roof to pitched roof to rear of single-storey extension, with two pitched roof rear dormers and roof lights, the omission of the west side dormer, window modifications to all elevations and internal alterations, as amendment to previously authorised development (SD24B/0325W).

Location

242, Templeogue Road,
Templeogue, Dublin 6.

Planning Authority

South Dublin County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

SD26B/0014W

Applicant(s)

Sylvia Mo Wei Lu.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant permission

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

James Woo & Nikki Higgins.

Observer(s)

None.

Date of Site Inspection

20/05/2026.

Inspector

Anthony Abbott King

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow with a front and rear garden located on the south side of Templeogue Road. The River Dodder is located to the rear of the property.
- 1.2. The building line on the southeast side of Templeogue Road is irregular. No. 242 Templeogue Road is setback from the street. The setback accommodates in-curtilage car parking.
- 1.3. The dwellinghouse on site has been extended to the rear with foundation slab and blockwork in situ to roof level.
- 1.4. The adjoining single-storey house to the southwest at no. 244 Templeogue Road is set significantly forward of no. 242 Templeogue Road and has a side garden providing a separation distance between the properties.
- 1.5. No. 244 Templeogue Road has been extended to the rear resulting in a significantly larger format dwellinghouse incorporating a single-storey volume addition to the rear of the street volume of the original main house.
- 1.6. The adjoining house to the northeast at no. 240 Templeogue Road is positioned marginally forward of the building line of no. 242 Templeogue Road.
- 1.7. No. 240 Templeogue Road has a deep footprint. The rear building line of no. 240 Templeogue Road is positioned forward of the established rear building line of the existing bungalow on the appeal site.
- 1.8. However, the partially constructed extension to the rear of no. 242 Templeogue Road projects beyond the rear building line of no. 240 Templeogue Road.
- 1.9. The site area is given as 0.079 hectares.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The alteration of hipped roof to pitched roof to the rear of single-storey extension, with two pitched roof rear dormers and roof lights, the omission of the west side dormer, window modifications to all elevations and internal alterations, as amendment to previously authorised development (SD24B/0325W).

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Grant permission subject to condition.

3.1.1. Condition 3 is relevant and states:

Amendments - Glazing.

The following amendments to the design shall be carried out: The attic level gable window on the southwestern elevation of the rear extension, and the 2 no. windows on the proposed dormer structure on the eastern roof plane above the rear extension, shall be fitted with obscure glazing, and such obscure glazing shall be maintained in perpetuity.

REASON: In the interest of residential amenity.

3.1.2. Condition 4 is relevant and *inter alia* states:

Development to be in accordance with previous permission. (a) All relevant conditions of reg. ref. SD24B/0325W shall apply, save as may be required by conditions attached hereto or where amended as per the description of this development, subject to part (c). (b) This permission shall expire upon the expiry of permission reg. ref. S24B/0325W, subject to any extension thereof. (c) For clarity, condition 5 of this permission supersedes the condition relating to financial contributions under permission reg. ref. SD24B/0345W.

REASON: To ensure that the development shall be in accordance with the permission, and that effective control be maintained.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

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

- The planning case officer concluded that the overall design and scale of the proposed development subject to condition would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- None

3.3. Third Party Observations

There are two third party submissions on file, which are summarised below:

- The owners of properties in the immediate vicinity object to the proposed development for a pitch roof over the single-storey rear extension and associated fenestration, which it is claimed would have an adverse impact on the residential and visual amenity of adjoining properties in terms of design resulting in adverse overbearing, overlooking and disturbance impacts inconsistent with development plan policy and the SDCC House Extension design Guide (2025).
- The elevated windows located in the rear extension, in particular 2 pitched roof rear dormers, would introduce direct overlooking / perception of overlooking of adjoining garden(s) resulting in a serious and unacceptable loss of privacy inconsistent with policies H11 & H14 (subordinate to existing dwelling) of the development plan.
- It is claimed that the proposed pitched roof and dormer additions would raise the height of the structure above the originally proposed rear extension and materially above the height and scale of adjoining properties resulting in increased bulk and visual intrusion inconsistent with the established character of the streetscape (row of matching bungalows).
- The significant increase in the height and bulk of the existing extension would result in additional overshadowing and loss of light to the rear garden and rear rooms of the adjoining properties and would represent overdevelopment.
- The proposed development represents an intensification of use on site and would result in a material increase in noise, disturbance and general activity levels inconsistent with existing residential amenity.
- One third party notes drainage concerns in relation to a new soakway and requests the submission of a satisfactory geotechnical and drainage assessment to safeguard adjoining properties.

- Finally, one third party notes the removal of boundary vegetation and the widening of the driveway entrance.
- The third parties recommend refusal of planning permission or substantial amendment including redesign to reduce height and omit overlooking windows.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. The following planning history is relevant.

- Under reg ref: SD24B/0325W planning permission was granted subject to 4 conditions for the following:
 - (1) demolition of existing single-storey rear access porch (3.7 sqm);
 - (2) Construction of single-storey pitched roof extension to rear garden, along with converted attic dormer bedrooms to west and South;
 - (3) Widen front vehicular access entrance gate to Templeogue Road;
 - (4) Installation of 2 no. of roof lights on the extension;
 - (5) Ancillary site works in association.

I note the proposed works are given as 99.3 sqm and the footprint of the ground floor extension is approximately 65 sqm.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The local policy framework is provided by the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028. The relevant policies and objectives are set-out below:

- Zoning

The relevant land-use zoning objective is “RES”(Map 6): *'To protect and/or improve residential amenity.'*

- Urban Consolidation

Chapter 6, (Housing is relevant) including the following policies:

Policy H11 *inter alia* states: *to promote a high standard of privacy and security for existing and proposed dwellings through the design and layout of housing.*

Policy H14 (Residential Extensions) Objective 1 is relevant and states:

To favourably consider proposals to extend existing dwellings subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities and compliance with the standards set out in Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring and the guidance set out in the South Dublin County Council House Extension Design Guide, 2010 (or any superseding guidelines).

- Residential Extensions

Section 12.6 (Housing / Residential Development) is relevant. Paragraph “Extensions” states:

The design of residential extensions should have regard to the permitted pattern of development in the immediate area alongside the South Dublin County Council House Extension Guide (2010) or any superseding standards.

Section 4 (Elements of Good Extension Design), Rear Extension is relevant and provides for the following positive criteria in the assessment of rear extensions:

- *Match or complement the style, materials and details of the main house unless there are good architectural reasons for doing otherwise.*
- *Match the shape and slope of the roof of the existing house, although flat roofed single storey extensions may be acceptable if not prominent from a nearby public road or area.*
- *Make sure enough rear garden is retained.*

- Other relevant policy documents

The South Dublin County Council (SDCC) House Extension Design Guide (2025).

Section 3.1.7 Built Form Principle (BFP) 1 (All Extensions & Alterations to Houses) is relevant and states:

- *Respects the appearance and character of the house and character of the house and subject streetscape / local area.*
- *Does not read as overly dominate relative to existing structure by reason of scale or position.*
- *Provide comfortable internal space and useful outside space.*
- *Incorporate energy efficient measures where possible.*
- *Do not adversely impact on adjoining properties by way of significant overbearing visual appearance.*
- *Does not result in significantly increased levels of overshadowing of adjacent properties.*
- *Does not directly overlook / result in significantly increased levels of overlooking of adjacent properties. Where a new window could result in overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties, consider alternative design solutions such as repositioning the window or use of a high level window (cill level 1.7m), angled window or obscure glazing.*
- *Consideration of external finishes, such as use of light-coloured materials on elevations adjacent to neighbouring properties.*
- *Consideration of remaining private open space.*
- Section 3.4 (Rear Extensions) is relevant. Section 3.4.1 (general considerations relating to all rear extensions) *inter alia* states:

In most instances, the scale of a rear extension should be proportionate to the scale of the existing house or its plot. The roof form and height of the rear extensions adjoining party boundaries should be considered and parapet height should always be minimised. The quantum of garden space remaining following an extension should be of a useable scale.....Most typical dwellings with rear gardens can accommodate a ground floor rear extension that extends across the entire width of the rear wall of the house.....

First floor or two-storey rear extensions require careful consideration, as depending on the design, this type of extension can have serious adverse effects on the residential amenities of neighbours. A set-back from any adjoining dwellings (terraced / semi-detached) is generally required, unless modest depth and favourable orientation negate same.....

- Section 3.4.2 (Built Form Principle (BFP) 4 –Rear Extensions) is relevant and states:
 - *Should be designed with consideration to relationship with any adjoining properties, in particular the depth and height of ground floor level extensions.*
 - *Should provide for setback from shared site boundaries at first floor level unless depth and orientation of site negate adverse impacts on adjacent properties.*
 - *Should provide for adequate separation distance between opposing first floor level windows serving habitable rooms.*
 - *Ridge height of first floor / two storey rear extensions should respect the ridge height of the main house.*
 - *Extensions to bungalow / dormer bungalow should be modest in depth at first floor level and be set back from shared boundaries and adjoining properties.*
 - *Should ensured adequate rear amenity space is retained.*

- Section 3.5.2 (Built Form Principle (BFP) 5- Roof Alterations & Extensions – Rear Dormer Elements) is relevant and states:
 - *Should be located below the ridge line of the main dwelling.*
 - *Should be set back at least 3 no. tile courses from the eaves line of the dwelling.*
 - *Should be inset from party boundaries and side wall / roof hip of dwelling.*
 - *Should be appropriately scaled so as not to read as an additional storey to the dwelling, or obscure the main features of the roof.*
 - *Should consider quality external finishes / materials and window proportions relative to the main house.*

Roof Alterations

- Should tie in with the original ridge height and ridge position of the dwelling.
- Should be finished with materials that match the main roof of the dwelling.
- Any window provided in an extended gable elevation that faces an adjacent house should be fitted with obscure glazing.

Roof lights

- Should be appropriately sited on the roof plane of the dwelling.
- Should not provide for an excessive degree of glazing on the roof of the dwelling.

5.2. **Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines**

- The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (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 this third-party appeal are summarised below:

- The appellant is the owner / occupier of no. 244 Templeogue Road who formally appeal the decision of the planning authority to grant planning permission for the proposed extension and attic conversion at 242 Templeogue Road, as the development fails to protect the residential amenities of adjoining property inconsistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- The proposed development results in a significant increase in scale and massing. The overall building depth of 15.78m substantially increases the footprint of the building on site. It is claimed that the additional dept and height of the attic conversion will result in a material loss of light (overshadowing) to both the rear garden and rear-facing rooms of the appellant's property.
- The proposed pitched roof dormer and altered roof profile intensify the adverse impact of the adjoining development creating an overbearing and dominant form when viewed from the appellant's property. It is claimed that the cumulative effect

is one of excessive bulk that is not in keeping with the established pattern of development.

- The introduction of habitable attic accommodation including rear dormer windows gives rise to direct overlooking (an elevated clear line of sight) to the appellant's garden resulting in a loss of privacy. The attic level southwestern gable window is of particular concern. It is claimed that obscure glazing as required by condition is neither adequate or appropriate and that the matter cannot be permanently resolved by condition.
- Furthermore, It is claimed that it is a well-established principle of good design that issues of overlooking should be addressed through design and layout of a development rather than through reliance on mitigation measures. The southwestern gable attic window represents an avoidable and unnecessary infringement on privacy and sets an undesirable precedent.
- The presence of the attic level southwestern gable window gives rise to a continued perception of elevated overlooking including adverse impacts of light spill, movement and general awareness of overlooking. It is claimed a more appropriate design approach would omit or reposition the opening to entirely eliminate overlooking.
- The proposed north contiguous elevation clearly demonstrates the increased height and bulk of the development in relation to adjoining properties reinforcing the conclusion that the development is visually intrusive, overbearing and fails to respect the established residential context.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority confirms its decision. This issues raised in the appeal have been covered in the Chief Executive Report.

7.3. Observations

There are no observations on the appeal file.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. 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, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Zoning / principle of development
- Impact on the dwellinghouse on site & adjoining properties
- Impact on the receiving streetscape
- Other matters

8.2. Zoning / principal of development

The appeal site is zoned Objective “RES” of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028, which seeks to protect and/or improve residential amenity. Residential is a permitted land use.

8.3. I note that Policy H14 (Residential Extensions) Objective 1 seeks to favourably consider proposals to extend existing dwellings subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities and in compliance with the standards set out in the South Dublin County Council House Extension Design Guide

8.4. I also note that Policy H11, which promotes a high standard of privacy and security for existing and proposed dwellings through the design and layout of housing.

8.5. I consider that the provision of additional residential accommodation on site is acceptable in principle subject to satisfying the requirements of the residential zoning objective to protect existing residential amenities and the relevant development management standards of the development plan, including the South Dublin County Council (SDCC) House Extension Design Guide (2025).

8.6. Impact on residential and visual amenity of the dwellinghouse on site and adjoining properties

The proposed development is an amendment of an existing authorised permission to extend the subject dwelling house to the rear. The foundation and blockwork to roof level of the rear extension is constructed.

I note there was no construction activity on site on the day of my site visit.

- 8.7. Section 3.1.7 Built Form Principle (BFP) 1 (All Extensions & Alterations to Houses) SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025) provides a list of criteria guiding extension and alteration of dwellinghouses. I interrogate these matters below with reference to the receiving environment.
- 8.8. No. 242 Templeogue Road has a substantial rear garden. The rear boundary is defined by mature planting, which visually links the rear garden with the extensive parkland (Dodder corridor) to the south of the subject streetscape on Templeogue Road.
- 8.9. The rear garden of no. 242 Templeogue Road abuts the rear garden of no. 240 Templeogue Road (the appellant) to the northeast and no.244 Templeogue Road to the southwest. The shared property boundary in the immediate vicinity of the rear extension are defined by mature planting.
- 8.10. *Footprint*
- 8.11. The footprint of the rear extension measures 9662mm (width) and 7445mm (dept). The indicative footprint of the previously authorised extension measures 9660mm (width) and 7445mm (dept).
- 8.12. The planning case officer notes that the amended extension incorporates a previous external area between the rear elevation of the main dwellinghouse and the extension providing an indent in the built form of the permitted extension.
- 8.13. The permitted indent acted as a lightwell to a proposed bathroom window in the main dwelling house. The amended floor plans provide for the reconfiguration of the existing ground floor plan to replace the bathroom with a store room. I note there is an alternative ground floor shower room.
- 8.14. The amended proposal incorporates the indent of the previously authorised extension providing an overall extended ground floor footprint of 72 sqm. (9662 x 7445). The internal floor area of the existing bungalow on site is given as 105 sqm.

8.15. I conclude that the footprint of the rear extension would be subordinate to the footprint of the main house on site.

Residual garden

8.16. The rear garden of the appeal site has a dept greater than 20m. There would be a separation distance between the rear elevation of the extension and the rear garden boundary of approximately 14m.

8.17. I consider that the residual rear garden space would remain substantial given the dept and width of the plot notwithstanding the extension footprint.

Roof profile

8.18. The first party has materially altered the roof profile of the permitted rear extension replacing the hipped roof with a pitch roof. The proposed pitch roof would exhibit side gable elevations facing the appeal site boundaries with adjoining properties (maximum height 5509mm).

8.19. Within the pitch of the roof a habitable first floor (attic level) would be accommodated comprising a bedroom, home office and storeroom as indicated on the submitted drawings.

8.20. The attic level accommodation in the amended rear extension replaces a double bedroom, single bedroom and bathroom previously permitted within the hipped roof structure.

8.21. I consider the attic level accommodation acceptable in principle.

8.22. The previously authorised hip roof structure had a flat roof apex (5m) concealed behind the elevation profile of the hipped roof. The proposed pitch roof would have a ridge apex (5509mm) higher than the apex of the hybrid hipped / flat roof (5035mm).

Height

8.23. The proposed ridge height of the rear extension pitch roof would match the highest point of the ridge height of the main dwellinghouse (4909mm).

8.24. I note that the overall height of the rear extension would be higher (5509mm) than the height of the main house (4909mm). However, the height differential is accounted for by the positioning of the ground floor of the extension at a lower grade than the ground

floor level of the main house. The change in ground floor level (600mm) is illustrated on the submitted floor plans and sections.

- 8.25. I consider that the rear extension in terms of floor area would be subordinate to the main dwellinghouse on site and would match the maximum ridge height of the existing bungalow.
- 8.26. I acknowledge the proposed pitch roof profile would nuance the massing of the extension at roof level including the introduction of side gable elevations.
- 8.27. However, I do not consider that the amended extension would represent a significant increase in scale and massing from the authorised extension in terms of building footprint and volume.
- 8.28. I consider no significant overshadowing and overbearing impacts would result from the rear extension given the maximum extension height (approximately 5.5m) and the adequate separation distances of the side gable elevations from the site boundaries providing adequate setbacks with adjoining properties (minimum 1675mm).
- 8.29. I conclude that the proposed rear extension as amended would not have an adverse impact on the main dwellinghouse itself or adjoining properties in terms of height, scale and massing given that the extension would be subordinate in floor area and volume to the main house on site and given the separation distance to the boundaries with the adjoining properties to the southwest (approximately 2m) and northeast (approximately 7m).

Fenestration

- 8.30. The amended proposal would *inter alia* include gable windows in both the southwest gable elevation and the northeast gable elevation.

Dormer extension / fenestration

- 8.31. I note the western dormer located proximate to the shared boundary with no. 244 Templeogue Road (1675mm) previously permitted (obscure glazing) to light an attic level bathroom would be omitted from the development.

South dormer

- 8.32. The amended development proposes to re-position the south facing dormer fenestration. The south dormer window openings have a direct line of sight over the rear

garden of no. 242 Templeogue Road and the backland beyond the rear property boundary.

- 8.33. I consider that the proposed re-positioned south facing dormers lighting a bedroom and home office, respectfully, are acceptable in principle and in detail consistent with Section 3.5.2 (Built Form Principle (BFP) 5- Roof Alterations & Extensions – Rear Dormer Elements).

East dormer

- 8.34. The amended development proposes an east dormer to replace authorised rooflights. The dormer would be located between the rear roof plane of the existing dwelling house and the proposed northeast facing gable.
- 8.35. The east dormer would have two window openings lighting the stair hall and a unidentified space off the bedroom possibly a bathroom or dressing room, respectfully.
- 8.36. I note that the separation distance between the northeast side elevation of the extension and the property boundary with no. 244 Templeogue Road is approximately 7m. The dormer fenestration is set back approximately 1.5m from the eaves of the extension.
- 8.37. Furthermore, the property boundary is planted in the immediate line of sight of the proposed east dormer.
- 8.38. There is an extension to the rear of no. 240 Templeogue Road with south facing fenestration looking toward the rear garden of the property.
- 8.39. The extension to the rear of no. 240 Templeogue Road is single-storey with a flat roof. It projects significantly forward of the original rear building line of the main dwellinghouse on the appeal site.
- 8.40. The dormer window openings would have a line of sight northeast. The direct line of sight from the east dormer window openings would be toward the planted property boundary and the flat roof of the single-storey extension to the rear of no. 240.
- 8.41. The planning case officer recommended that the window openings would be furnished with obscure glazing.
- 8.42. I concur with the planning case officer given that openings light secondary spaces within the internal floor plan of the extension.

- 8.43. I conclude that the east dormer would not result in direct overlooking of the rear garden of the adjoining property to the northeast by reason of the projection of the existing extension to the rear of no. 240 Templeogue Road.
- 8.44. Furthermore, a line of sight beyond the adjoining property boundary (approximately 8.5m) would be mitigated by the use of obscure glazing.
- 8.45. I conclude that the east dormer is acceptable in principle and in detail subject to condition.

Southwest gable

- 8.46. The gable elevation that replaces the hipped roof is fenestrated. The proposed elevated first floor (attic level) window opening is less than 2m from the shared property boundary (1675mm) with no. 244 Templeogue Road (appellant).
- 8.47. The third party specifically cites the gable opening as a viewing opportunity and notwithstanding the incorporation of obscure glazing would result in a perception of overlooking.
- 8.48. The third party states that the presence of the attic level elevated gable window gives rise to a continued perception of elevated overlooking including adverse impacts of light spill, movement and general awareness of overlooking.
- 8.49. I consider that there is a direct line of vision into the rear garden amenity space of no. 244 Templeogue Road, which would result in direct overlooking of the adjoining property to the southwest.
- 8.50. I note that the first floor room within the pitched of the roof is designated a home office on the submitted first floor (attic level) internal layout plans. I also note that the room has an additional window opening facing south over the rear garden of no. 242 Templeogue Road.
- 8.51. I consider that the southwest gable window opening at attic level should be omitted from the development in the interests of residential amenity and in accordance with Built Form Principle (BFP) 1 (All Extensions & Alterations to Houses) SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025). This can be dealt with by way of condition if a positive recommendation is recorded.

Northeast gable

- 8.52. The northeast gable would be located approximately 7m from the shared property boundary.
- 8.53. The northeast gable window located in the side elevation facing the property boundary would have a direct line of sight of the rear garden of the adjoining property to the northeast given the projection of the new extension to the rear of no. 242 Templeogue Road forward of the existing rear extension to no. 240 Templeogue Road (approximately 3m).
- 8.54. I note that the gable window lights a bedroom, which has an alternative dormer window opening facing south.
- 8.55. I consider that the northeast gable window opening should be omitted from the development in the interests of residential amenity in accordance with Built Form Principle (BFP) 1 (All Extensions & Alterations to Houses) SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025). This can be dealt with by way of condition if a positive recommendation is recorded.

Rooflights

- 8.56. Finally, the amended development proposal incorporates additional rooflights to the extension roof plane, including the western elevation. The rooflights would light / ventilate attic storage areas (non-habitable spaces).
- 8.57. I consider that the proposed rooflight would be appropriately sited and would not result in excessive roof glazing consistent with Section 3.5.2 (Built Form Principle (BFP) 5- Roof Alterations & Extensions) of the SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025).
- 8.58. I conclude the rooflights are acceptable in principle and in detail.
- 8.59. Impact on the streetscape

The amended development propose minor alterations to the front facade of the existing bungalow on site.

- 8.60. I note that the amended proposal introduces an elongated window opening into the gable elevation, under the eaves, that bookends the west section of the front façade (north elevation). The opening would light an internal attic space identified as storage on the submitted drawings.

- 8.61. The streetscape is characterised by single-storey dwellings with horizontal emphasis window openings in the instance of the subject bungalow.
- 8.62. I do not consider that the insertion of a window opening above the existing horizontal window opening(s) symmetrically placed in the subject gable would have an adverse impact on the building facade or on the receiving streetscape in terms of visual amenity.
- 8.63. Finally, the proposed amended rear extension would not be visible from the street, as it would be located behind the streetscape volume of the existing bungalow on site.

8.64. Other Matters

Development contribution

I note that the amended rear extension would have a greater internal floor area to the extension previously permitted.

I consider that a financial contribution condition should be attached to the amended planning permission to reflect the incorporation within the internal floor area of the previous indent of the extension that provided for an external lightwell between the dwelling and the extension, which is omitted in the application under appeal resulting in a material change in floor area.

Drainage

- 8.65. The matter of surface drainage is addressed in the suite of conditions attached to the previous grant of permission (SD24B/0325W). The conditions of SD24B/0325W can be linked to this amendment permission.

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 the urban core and is connected to piped services and is not immediate to a European Site. The proposed development comprises a domestic extension.

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**

10.1. The site is located in an inner city location. It is not proximate to a water course.

The development comprises the domestic extension of 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

11.1. I recommend a grant of planning permission subject to condition for the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential zoning objective, the pattern of development in the area, which is characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellinghouses that have been extended to the rear, and the policy framework provided by the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028, including the South Dublin County Council (SDCC) House Extension Design Guide (2025). It is considered that the proposed development subject to condition would be consistent with Built Form Principle (BFP) 1 (All Extensions & Alterations to Houses) and Built Form Principle (BFP) 5 (Roof Alterations & Extensions – Rear Dormer Elements) of the SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025), would not have an adverse impact on the existing residential amenities of adjoining properties and, as such, would be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application 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 developer shall submit for the written agreement of the planning authority revised elevation drawings that shall provide for the following:
 - (a) The gable attic level window openings in the proposed southwest side elevation and northeast side elevation of the rear extension shall be omitted and a solid masonry wall substituted;

(b) The proposed dormer structure on the eastern roof plane of the rear extension shall be fitted with obscure glazing and such obscure glazing shall be maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and in accordance Built Form Principle (BFP) 1 (All Extensions & Alterations to Houses) SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025).

3. Development to be in accordance with previous permission. (a) All relevant conditions of reg. ref. SD24B/0325W shall apply, save as may be required by conditions attached hereto or where amended as per the description of this development, subject to part (c). (b) This permission shall expire upon the expiry of permission reg. ref. S24B/0325W, subject to any extension thereof. (c) For clarity, condition 5 of this permission supersedes the condition relating to financial contributions under permission reg. ref. SD24B/0345W.

Reason: To ensure that the development shall be in accordance with the previous permission (SD24B/0325W) and that effective control be maintained.

4. 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. The contribution shall be paid prior to the 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 the Board to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000 that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme.

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-501117-26
Proposed Development Summary	Domestic extension amendments
Development Address	No. 242 Templeogue Road
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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> 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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	
<input type="checkbox"/> 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 N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> 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 N/A
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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____