



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

**PL-501147-DN-26**

---

<b>Development</b>	Demolish existing single storey garage at side and single storey extensions at side and rear and construct a two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear and all associated works
<b>Location</b>	25 Shanowen Drive, Santry, Dublin 9 D09 C592
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	WEB1265/26
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Raja Mukherji and Rachel McBride
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Leslie Shaw
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None

**Date of Site Inspection**

16 May 2026

**Inspector**

Killian Harrington

## Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description .....	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision.....	4
4.0	Planning History .....	6
5.0	Policy Context .....	8
6.0	EIA Screening .....	12
7.0	The Appeal .....	12
8.0	Assessment.....	14
9.0	AA Screening .....	20
10.0	Water Framework Directive .....	20
11.0	Recommendation .....	21
12.0	Reasons and Considerations .....	21
13.0	Conditions .....	22
<b>Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening .....</b>		<b>25</b>

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

The subject site is an end of terrace, two bay, two storey house set in a block of four dwellings located on the south-east side of Shanowen Drive, Santry, Dublin 9. The subject site faces northwest and resembles a sub-triangular form with the splayed garden providing an area for another flat roofed side shed which runs along the boundary with no. 27 Shanowen Drive. Similar to adjacent dwellings, the house formerly had a fully hipped roof which was then modified to provide a half hipped type roof profile. Each succeeding terraced block of houses are separated from the next block by a side garage attached to the gable end of these houses. The subject property is set back from the adjacent side boundary of no. 27 Shanowen Drive by a flat roofed side garage which lies adjacent to the gable end of the house. The terrace containing the subject site is set at an angle to the terrace containing no. 27 Shanowen Drive. In terms of the front façade, the subject property has a 'bay' window and is finished in half brick/ half render.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

2.1 The proposed development comprises the following:

- Demolition of the existing single storey garage at side abutting no. 27 and the demolition of the single storey extension at side that projects to the rear.
- Construction of a two storey extension to side abutting no. 27 and a new single storey extension to rear and all associated site works.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1 Decision**

Dublin City Council granted planning permission subject to 8 standard conditions

#### **3.1.1. Planning Authority Reports**

There was no objection in principle to the demolition of the existing single storey, side garage and the side garden shed. It was noted that the proposed development involves the demolition of the side garage yet the proposed

development seeks to retain its front building line. The Planning Authority also noted the recent planning history of the site and observed how the subject proposal differed to that previously refused namely removing the two-storey element of the rear extension and changing the high 'A' gable roof to a hipped roof form. Having assessed the potential for overbearance, overlooking and shadowing, the Planning Authority was satisfied that the subject application has addressed the reasons for refusal set out under Reg. Ref. WEB2702/24 (ACP 323122-25) and the proposed development would provide for an acceptable form of development at this location. The planner's report concludes that the overall bulk was reduced, preserving residential amenity and the design was more sympathetic to its surroundings, thus it was considered that the proposed works were designed in accordance with Appendix 18 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and was therefore acceptable to the planning authority. Overall, the proposed development was considered to be in keeping with the residential character of the area and would not detract from the existing residential amenities of the area.

#### 3.1.2 Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division – Recommended grant of permission subject to conditions

#### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

#### 3.4. Third Party Observations

An observation from a neighbouring property made the following points:

- The proposed development has been already refused planning permission under ACP 323122-25 and the current proposal is effectively the same.
- Applicant has submitted applications on other properties as part of a property portfolio

- Not in accordance with planning policy by reason of proximity to the boundary, proximity of windows to the boundary and excessive size of additional bedroom
- The proposed development would have negative impact in terms of light and access to views.
- Proposal is out of scale and character with neighbouring property and breaks the symmetry of terraced blocks separated by gaps and would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring property

## 4.0 Planning History

### 4.1 Subject site

- Reg. Ref. no. WEB2702/24 (ACP 323122-25) – planning permission refused by ACP following third party appeal for the demolition of existing single storey garage at side and single storey extensions at side and rear and construct, two storey extension to side, single and two storey extensions to rear. Continuation of existing attic conversion, with new window to rear at attic level and new velux roof window to front, and all associated site works at no. 25, Shanowen Drive, Santry, Dublin.

Reason for refusal:

*It is considered that, by reason of its design, scale and massing, and overbearing nature, the proposed development would be visually obtrusive, would be out of character with the existing residential properties in the vicinity, and would set a precedent for further inappropriate development in the vicinity of the site. The proposed development would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Commission considered that the proposed roof profile, which incorporates the attic accommodation over the first-floor extension, interrupts the distinctive*

*pattern of housing blocks in the area which consist of two terraced houses bookended by semi-detached houses with hipped roof profiles. The proposed first floor extension with attic conversion does not have a set-back or a break in the roof profile, is not subordinate to the existing house, breaks the visual harmony of the housing block, does not make a positive contribution to the streetscape, and, therefore, is not in accordance with Section 1.1 (General Design Principles) and Section 5.1 (Additional Floors) of Appendix 18 (Ancillary Residential Accommodation) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. Furthermore, the Commission considered that the massing and design of the proposed two-storey extension, with an additional attic floor, would have an overbearing and adverse impact on the residential amenities of the adjacent property at number 27 Shanowen Drive.*

- Reg. Ref. 1243/06 – planning permission granted for a.) the construction of new single storey extension to rear. b.) the construction of new single storey extension to side c.) the conversion of existing attic to habitable room to include removal of existing hipped roof, and rising of gable wall to ridge line and 3 no. velux windows to rear, all to existing dwelling at 25 Shanowen Drive, Santry, Dublin 9
- Reg. Ref. 3507/01 – planning permission granted for the demolition of existing garage and single storey extension to the side, attic conversion to habitable room, erection of two storey domestic extension to the side and a single storey extension to the rear at no. 25 Shanowen Drive, Santry, Dublin 5.

#### 4.2 Adjacent sites

##### *32 Shanowen Drive*

Reg. Ref. 4482/09 - Planning permission granted for a first floor extension at side over existing converted garage, a single storey extension to front with two storey and single storey extensions to rear. Solar panels to front and velux roof windows to front, side and rear and all associated site works.

## **5.0 Policy Context**

### **5.1 Development Plan**

Under the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 the site is zoned objective Z1; Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods with an objective 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.' The following Dublin City Development Plan policy objectives have specific relevance to this appeal:

#### Policy QHSN6 Urban Consolidation

To promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification through the consideration of applications for infill development, backland development, mews development, reuse/ adaption of existing housing stock and use of upper floors, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.

#### Policy QHSN10 Urban Density

To promote 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.

#### Policy QHSNO4 Densification of Suburbs

To support the ongoing densification of the suburbs and prepare a design guide regarding innovative housing models, designs and solutions for infill development, backland development, mews development, re-use of existing housing stock and best practice for attic conversions.

#### Appendix 16 – Sunlight and Daylight

The appendix provides specific metrics for assessing daylight and sunlight in new developments. Key requirements include targets for daylight factor and vertical sky component (VSC) to ensure adequate light for new and existing properties. For example, a minimum average daylight factor of 5% is recommended for predominantly daylit appearances, and minimum values of 2% for kitchens, 1.5% for living rooms, and 1% for bedrooms are also specified. Proposals will continue

to be assessed on a case-by-case basis depending on site specific circumstances and location.

## Appendix 18 – Ancillary Residential Accommodation

### *Section 1.1 (General Design Principles)*

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)*

'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. The extension should match or complement the main house. First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the planning authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:

- Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries
- Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability
- Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries
- External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing'

### *Section 1.3 (Extensions to the Side)*

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. 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.

Any planning application submitted in relation to extensions, basements or new first/ upper floor level within the envelope of the existing building, shall clearly indicate on all drawings the extent of demolition/ wall removal required to facilitate the proposed development and a structural report, prepared by a competent and suitably qualified engineer, may be required to determine the integrity of walls/ structures to be retained and outline potential impacts on adjoining properties. This requirement should be ascertained at pre-planning stage. Side gable, protruding parapet walls at eaves/ gutter level of hip-roofs are not encouraged.

The proposed construction of new building structures directly onto the boundary with the public realm (including footpaths/ open space/ roads etc.), is not acceptable and it will be required that the development is set within the existing boundary on site and shall not form the boundary wall. The provision of windows (particularly at first floor level) within the side elevation of extensions adjacent to public open space will be encouraged in order to promote passive surveillance, and to break up the bulk/ extent of the side gable as viewed from the public realm.

#### *Section 1.4 Privacy and Amenity*

Extensions should not result in any significant loss of privacy to the residents of adjoining properties. Generally, windows overlooking adjoining properties (such as in a side wall) should be avoided

#### *Section 1.7 Appearance and Materials*

The extension should not dominate the existing building and should normally be of an overall scale and size to harmonise with the existing house and adjoining buildings; the appearance of the existing structure should be the reference point for any consideration of change that may be proposed. The materials used should complement those used on the existing building; features such as windows and doors on the new extension should relate to those on the original building in terms of proportion and use of materials

#### *Section 4.0 - Alterations at Roof Level/ Attics/ Dormers/ Additional Floors*

The following criteria will be considered in assessing alterations at roof level:

- 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 5.0 – Attic Conversions / Dormer Windows*

Where it is proposed to extend the ridge height to accommodate an increased floor-to ceiling height, the design should avoid an overly dominant roof structure. The proposed scale of the roof should retain similar proportions to the building where possible.

### 5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is c. 1km south of Santry Demesne proposed NHA and c.3.3km north of North Dublin Bay proposed NHA, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and c. 6km northwest of North Dublin Bay proposed NHA, North Dublin Bay SAC and North Bull Island SPA.

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

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1 Grounds of Appeal

The third party appeal includes the following grounds:

- Design is contrary to planning - The proposed design is not in accordance with planning criteria for domestic extensions for the following reasons:
  1. Contrary to planning policy for not maintaining a 2 metre proximity to the boundary. The extension is to be built right up to the boundary wall of no. 27. In addition, windows above ground should be at least 11 metres from the boundary they face. The front and rear windows are c. 1 metre from the boundary between no. 25 and no. 27.
  2. The proposed master bedroom is c. 24 sqm and this is above the size limit for bedrooms.
- Residential Amenity - In terms of light and views, the proposed development would have negative amenity impact on no. 27 in terms of light, privacy and access to views. It will block the view of the east-facing window located

above the converted garage and will block sunlight on this window, the downstairs east-facing kitchen window and the south-facing window of the converted garage. In terms of overlooking, the first floor window at the rear of the side extension will overlook the rear garden of no. 27

- Scale and character - The proposal is out of scale and character with neighbouring property and breaks the symmetry of terraced blocks separated by gaps and would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring property. The proposal doubles the size of the property and does not conform to the typical single-storey extensions in the area.
- Planning history - The proposed development has been already refused planning permission under ACP 323122-25 and the current proposal is effectively the same with a two-storey extension to the side. The application constitutes an investment property and not a home for a family. The applicant has submitted applications on other properties in the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown administrative area, some of which were refused.

## **7.2. Planning Authority Response**

None

## **7.3. Observations**

None

## **7.4 Applicant Response**

In response to the appeal the applicant makes the following points:

- In relation to alleged breach of planning law regarding 2 metre proximity to boundaries, the appellant is referring to planning regulations for exempted development. These are not applicable to a development that is subject to planning permission.

- The applicant has taken on board the neighbours' concerns and an Coimisiun Pleanala's concerns following the refused application WEB2027/24. This application is substantially reduced in size and scale.
- The side window at No 27 does not require views. The main purpose for landing windows is to provide light for the stairwell and the landing area.
- The applicant disagrees that this proposal is out of character with the established pattern and streetscape within the Shanowen Drive area. The proposed materials are consistent with the existing dwellings and the applicant will ensure that finishes blend with the existing design pattern.
- There is a written clarification from the applicant confirming that the subject property is the permanent home of the applicants. The proposed extension is required for a growing family, multigenerational care and work from home requirements. The assertion of commercial investment is therefore incorrect.
- The applicant response includes a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment carried out in accordance with BRE guidelines from a suitably qualified professional dated June 2025 originally submitted as part of the previously refused scheme (ACP-323122-25 and DCC ref WEB2027/24) with the additional first floor rear extension. The summary of this report indicated negligible reduction of daylight on adjacent properties and imperceptible reduction in sunlight on the amenity spaces of neighbouring dwellings.

## **8.0 Assessment**

8.1. The subject house has an existing single storey, side garage and a side garden shed constructed between the flank wall of the modified house and the side garden boundary of no. 27 Shanowen Drive. The current proposal would involve the demolition of these structures and the provision of a two storey side extension and a new flat roofed single storey rear extension.

- 8.2 Under the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 the site is zoned Z1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods with an objective 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.' The proposed development as ancillary accommodation is permissible in this zoning as it relates to the alterations and extension of an existing residential use.
- 8.3 Following a review of the file, assessment of the relevant planning policies and inspection of the site, I conclude that the primary concerns in this appeal are (1) Design Issues and (2) Neighbouring Residential Amenity.

*Design Issues*

- 8.4 It should be stated at the outset that the current proposal is different to the previously refused proposal as the current proposal would have a fully hipped roof adjacent to the boundary with no. 27 Shanowen Drive instead of a standard open 'A' gable elevation against the boundary as previously proposed. Also, the two storey extension at the angle between the side extension and the flat roofed rear extension has been reduced at first floor level. There has been much reference in both the third party appeal and the applicant response to the previous application that was ultimately refused by the Commission. Although this has relevance, this appeal involves a different proposal and each case will be assessed on its merits.
- 8.5 Firstly, the single-storey element to the rear is a flat roofed, rear extension with 2 no. rooflights and would extend c. 10.7 metres across the width of the house and project between c. 5.5 metres and c. 2.5 metres from the rear elevation of the house and its two storey side extension. The parapet height at the boundary of no. 23 would be c. 2.9m. It is considered that the proposed single storey rear extension would be unobtrusive and should have no adverse impact on the visual amenity of neighbouring houses. Although full width, it is similar to the other rear extensions of Shanowen Drive that are built to the boundary and so is in keeping with the prevailing pattern of development.
- 8.6 The two storey side extension would extend the house out on its western side by 4.2 metres. The proposal would also involve modifying the roof in order to extend the roof out to the side boundary in a hipped gable roof profile, in keeping with the

traditional roof types in the area and mitigating the appearance of bulk at the front and side profile.

- 8.7 The appeal references the scale and massing of this side extension being out of character for the area and also refers to a loss of symmetry and a gap arising between properties. However, the revised proposal includes for a hipped roof which is considered to be a more sympathetic roof treatment and provides for a subordinate form of roof extension than previously proposed. This would have a far more harmonising effect on the visual appearance of the subject proposal from the front and would in my opinion be acceptable. Due to its conformity with the building line, the design incorporating the splayed shape of the site and the continuation of the form and materials of the existing dwelling, the proposal would be in keeping with the appearance of the host dwelling and all other dwellings on the street.
- 8.8 The proposed extension is also to the side and is considered similar to a typical 'above the garage' first floor extension visible from street level. Such an arrangement has been carried out in proximity at the site at No.32 Shanowen Drive (Reg. Ref. 4482/09) where the hipped roof profile has been extended over the two storey side extension to the boundary without detriment to the visual amenities or visual harmony of the area. As the footprint is similar and the extension is to the side, this level of visibility would be acceptable. This is a common form of extension in these type of residential properties where the space exists within the footprint of the house. The hipped roof form and proposed materials of the side extension correspond to those of the main dwelling. I am satisfied that there would not be substantial harm caused to the visual amenity of the area.
- 8.9 In relation to the concerns in the appeal around the massing at the boundary of no. 27, it is recognised that this is a full width side extension. Appendix 18 does not require specific set backs but rear and side extensions are to be mindful of neighbouring amenity and visual appearance. In this case the existing side garage is built to the boundary wall and, given the size of these dwellings and length of the curtilage and the splayed layout of the site, it is not considered necessary to provide a setback in this instance. The two storey side extension is at an angle, is set back at roof level and already remains subordinate to the main dwelling and

owing to this and its position at the boundary, it does not adversely impact on the living spaces or the rear garden of no. 27 and a greater setback is therefore not warranted. The side extension at 32 Shanowen Drive provide a suitable precedent and is reflective of a general pattern in the locality of building extensions close to the boundary walls without severely impacting on the surrounding amenity.

- 8.10 The appeal has concerns about the size of the bedroom in the proposal. In terms of the internal layout, the side extension is to accommodate a replacement garage and study and bathroom at ground floor and an additional bedroom at first floor. The ground floor rear extension is proposed as living space off the existing kitchen. The proposed bedroom will be the master bedroom of the house and is larger than usual at about 23 sqm in area. However, it is noted that half of this area consists of the en-suite and storage. The remaining bedrooms of the size are relatively small. The Development Plan guidance (Section 15.11.1) states that the main bedroom of a house should be at least 13 sqm for a dwelling designed for 3 or more people. The room sizes meet the minimum requirements and the internal layout is therefore appropriate.
- 8.11 The appeal states that the proposal is too similar to the refused application (ACP 323122-25. However, as I have stated earlier, the bulk and massing at first floor level to the rear has been omitted and the roof profile set back, thereby removing the most sensitive elements to no. 27 in terms of residential amenity.
- 8.12 Overall, the proposal has been broadly designed in accordance with the guidance for rear and side extensions set out in Appendix 18 (Ancillary Residential Accommodation) of the Dublin City Development Plan. The design has been notably revised to address previous design concerns. Whilst there is divergence from the Appendix 18 guidance for boundary setback, the design has responded to the site layout, existing building form and the pattern of development in the area and so the design and appearance of the proposal are therefore acceptable in planning terms.

### *Neighbouring Residential Amenity*

- 8.13 The appeal raises concerns about the potential impact on the amenity of the adjacent dwelling to the west, no. 27 Shanowen Drive.
- 8.14 Firstly, I am satisfied that the single storey rear extension would be unobtrusive and, although it would be built against the boundary wall of no. 23 Shanowen Drive to the east, this would have no adverse impact on the amenity of that property and would be in keeping with the pattern of residential extensions in the area.
- 8.15 The two-storey side extension at the western boundary would not give rise to any unacceptable harm to the enjoyment of the no. 27. It replaces an existing garage structure so the first floor element is the only additional massing. There would be no overlooking as a result of the proposal as it is a side extension and there are no directly facing windows. Any overlooking into the rear garden is marginal and consistent with the suburban terrace housing design in the area.
- 8.16 In terms of light intake, although there is a landing window at this side of no. 27, this side elevation is not the main source of light for the house. There is also an east-facing ground floor window but this is a secondary kitchen window and is already impacted by the existing garage and boundary wall of no. 25. The rear elevation of this property including the main kitchen window at ground floor faces south and this elevation is not obscured in any way by the proposal, thus ensuring an adequate level of daylight and sunlight all year round. The proposal would not have an overbearing impact on no. 27 at this elevation.
- 8.17 It is noted that DCC and ACP determined in their assessment of planning application Reg. Ref. 2702/24, that based on the daylight/sunlight assessment carried out, the previous application would not have a significant negative impact on the neighbouring property in terms of access to daylight for habitable rooms. Furthermore, the previous proposal met the recommendations of the BRE guidelines (2022) for the impact on adjacent amenity spaces. In terms of shadow analysis, the previously proposed development would have cast some shadowing on the gable of no. 27 Shanowen Drive during the morning of the March Solstice

but this first floor rear extension has now been removed and I am satisfied that the impact would be negligible.

- 8.18 In terms of the amenity of the main dwelling, the property has a large shed type structure in the rear garden. The residual rear garden, following the construction of the combined extensions would provide more than 210 sqm of private open space. Therefore proposed development would retain an adequate private open space area for a four bedroom house.
- 8.19 It is considered that given the scale and design of the proposed side and rear extension where the first floor has been removed at the rear, the southerly orientation of the rear of these properties and the pattern of the development within this residential suburb in which some properties have extended over the single-storey garage, no overbearance, overshadowing or overlooking issues will arise as a result. I am satisfied that with respect to protecting residential amenity, the proposal complies with the provisions of the Development Plan, in particular the criteria set out in Appendices 16 and 18..
- 8.20 In relation to any other matters raised in the appeal, I am satisfied that the proposal involves ancillary accommodation for the purpose of general family living and not short term letting or commercial use. The appeal also references the views from the landing window of no. 27. Impacts on neighbour amenity can include overbearance/outlook and daylight/sunlight but views from windows are not protected under planning policy unless stated in the Development Plan. This was already established in the previous refusal that confirmed there were no protected views across the subject site.
- 8.21 Overall, the proposal as a combined one and two storey side/rear extension, is sufficiently scaled and designed to protect the residential amenity of the host dwelling and neighbouring dwellings and would not cause harm to the residential character or visual amenity of the area. The proposal would comply with the residential zoning and Development Plan policies and objectives and would be acceptable in planning terms.

## **9.0 AA Screening**

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at 25 Shanowen Drive in Santry in an established residential area c. 3.3 km north of South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and c. 6km northwest of North Dublin Bay SAC and North Bull Island SPA
- 9.2. The proposed development comprises the demolition of the existing single storey garage at side and single storey extensions at side and rear and construction of a two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear and all associated works.. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of works
  - Location in an established residential area
  - Lack of connections to nearest European sites
- 9.4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## **10.0 Water Framework Directive**

- 10.1. The subject site is located at 25 Shanowen Drive, Santry, Dublin 9 approximately 1 km south of the Santry River and c. 2 km north of the River Tolka.
- 10.2 The proposed development comprises the demolition of the existing single storey garage at side and single storey extensions at side and rear and construction of a

two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear and all associated 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
- Location-distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections

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. I recommend that planning permission be granted subject to conditions

## **12.0 Reasons and Considerations**

12.1 Having regard to residential zoning of the site, the residential character of the area, the design, scale and massing of the proposed development and the policies

contained in the Dublin City Development Plan, it is considered that the proposed development would not be injurious to the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, would not cause any harm to the visual amenity of the area and would be in keeping with the residential character of the area, thereby according with the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and 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 external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles/slates) shall harmonise with those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

- 3.** 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

4. All necessary measures should be taken by the applicant and contractor to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network, repair any damage to the public road arising from carrying out works and avoid conflict with between construction activities and pedestrian and vehicular movements on the surrounding public roads.

Reason: In the interest of amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection.

5. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00pm Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 8:00am to 2:00pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

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.

---

Killian Harrington  
Planning Inspector

28 May 2026

## Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-501147-DN-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Demolition of existing single storey garage at side and single storey extensions at side and rear and construction of a two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear and all associated works
<b>Development Address</b>	25 Shanowen Drive, Santry, Dublin 9
<b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX /OR LEAVE BLANK</b>	
<p><b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b></p> <p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,</li> <li>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)</li> </ul>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.</p>
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in <b>Part 1</b>.</p> <p><b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>
<b>1. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, 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?</b>	

<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.  <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.  <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.  <b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b>  <b>OR</b>  <b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b>	
<b>2. 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)?</b>	
<b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b>
<b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b>

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 28 May 2026