



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501174-DN-26

Development	First-floor extension to side of house, constructed over the existing structure to the side
Location	143 Annamoe Drive, Cabra, Dublin 7 D07 T2X6
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council (North)
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1164/26
Applicant(s)	Orla Donohoe and Eamonn Kelly
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Valerie Kearney Ryan Mary McSherry
Observer(s)	None

Date of Site Inspection

29th May 2026

Inspector

Conor Hughes

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	4
2.0	Proposed Development	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History	8
5.0	Policy Context	8
6.0	EIA Screening	11
7.0	The Appeal	12
8.0	Assessment	14
9.0	AA Screening	19
10.0	Water Framework Directive	20
11.0	Recommendation	21
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	21
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	25

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is comprised of the buildings and curtilage of a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling on the northern side of Annamoe Drive approximately 100 metres east of the junction of Annamoe Terrace.
- 1.2. The main dwelling is of masonry construction with smooth render finish. It has a concrete tiled hipped roof with a brick chimney, aluminium windows, uPVC doors, fascia and gutters.
- 1.3. The plot is triangular in shape and given its location on a corner the rear garden is much larger than in neighbouring properties. Consequently, the building has been extended to the side and rear with two flat roofed blocks that are a sitting, dining and utility room.
- 1.4. In front of the dwelling is a hardstanding with in-curtilage parking for two cars and the boundaries with the neighbouring properties are defined by a low block wall. Masonry pillars with capstones are located either side of the entrance.
- 1.5. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and most of buildings are small rows of terraced housing.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises a first-floor extension for a bedroom over an existing ground floor kitchen/dining and utility room with internal alterations to a bathroom, ensuite bathroom and first floor landing.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- On 19th March 2026 the Planning Authority issued notification of their decision to approve planning permission for a first-floor extension for a bedroom over an existing ground floor kitchen/dining and utility room with internal alterations to a bathroom, ensuite bathroom and first floor landing subject to the following conditions:

1. the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans.
2. a contribution in the sum of €1, 872.00 to be paid towards expenditure that was and/ or is proposed to be incurred by the Planning Authority in respect of public infrastructure.
3. the new front facing first floor window in the landing area to be finished with obscure/opaque glazing and permanently maintained.
4. the external finishes to match the existing finishes of the house in respect of materials and colour.
5. the drainage to be in compliance with the requirements of the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works.
6. the building works required to be carried out between the hours of 7.00am to 6.00pm on Mondays to Friday, 8.00 a.m. to 2.00pm on Saturday and at no other time unless otherwise agreed.
7. the developer to comply with the requirements set out in the Codes of Practice from the Drainage Division, the Transportation Planning Division and the Noise and Air Pollution Section.
8. During the construction and demolition phases, the proposed development to comply with British Standard 5228 ' Noise Control on Construction and open sites Part 1.
9. the site development works and construction works to be carried out in a manner as to ensure that the adjoining street(s) are kept clear of debris, soil and other material.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The proposal to extend the dwelling was considered by the Planning Authority to be ancillary to the enjoyment of the residents of the host dwelling and acceptable in principle, subject to an assessment against the requirements of Appendix 18 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028 and the protection of neighbouring amenity.

- An observer living at 141 Annamoe Drive had concerns that a window proposed in the landing would lead to direct overlooking and loss of privacy.
- The Planning Authority concluded in respect of this observation that ordinarily a landing window would not be of concern given it is front facing. However, given the site-specific context and the potential for a low level of overlooking it was concluded on balance that the window should be fitted with obscured glazing.
- The observer was also concerned that the first-floor extension would also result in a loss of 'skylight (VSC)' in two ground floor windows in the side elevation of 141 Annamoe Drive.
- The Planning Authority concluded in respect of the second observation that the proposed first-floor extension did not impact on the amenity of the neighbouring residential property as the side facing windows were not the only windows serving the rooms.
- The Planning Authority considered the proposed alterations to the residential dwelling did not unduly impinge on the residential or visual amenities of the area.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Planning, Policy and Development Management Division (DPPDMD) had no objection to the proposed development, subject to the developer complying with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Version 6.0.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Transport Infrastructure Ireland offered advice to the planning authority but had no site-specific comment on the proposed development.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Submission on behalf of Mary McSherry

- The observer lives at 141 Annamoe Drive and objected to the proposed development due to the loss of 'skylight (VSC)' from the two windows on the side elevation. This is not in accordance with Appendix 16 of the Development Plan.

- The resident was particularly concerned about a reduction in light and heat due to health reasons particularly as no daylight and sunlight assessment was submitted with the planning application.
- The observer was also concerned that the proposed development is planned to be constructed one metre from the common boundary which may cause considerable privacy and overlooking issues. They were concerned the proposed window in the rear elevation would overlook the observer's private garden and the front window the observer's garden and multiple windows in the house. The observer was also concerned that obscured glass will not be effective when the window is open.
- The observer commented that the applicant had not complied with the relevant section of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 as the site notice was erected six days after the submission of the application to the council.
- The observer objected that the previous extensions have created an out-of-character, mis-matched building that is inconsistent with the existing built form in Annamoe Drive.
- The observer considered the first-floor side extension to be a visible obstruction to passers-by and it would not conform with the current pattern of development creating a precedence for similar development in the area which would further impact the character of the area and the residential amenities of surrounding properties. This is not in accordance with Section 15.4.2 of the Development Plan.

Valerie Kearney Ryan

- The observer lives at 139 Annamoe Drive and objected to the proposed development due to the loss of skylight to her sunroom and view from a first-floor bathroom window. The observer commented that the proposed extension will be overbearing on the property at 141 Annamoe Drive, that the applicant has a large back garden and an alternative location should have been considered for the extension.

Yiannis Nicolov

- The observer is an extended family relation of the resident at 141 Annamoe Drive who lived at the property in the past. He objected to the proposed development as it would take away the resident's privacy and result in a loss of light from the kitchen

and other areas of the house. The observer also commented that the existing ground floor side extension is already too close to the house and patio area.

Tracy Moore

- The observer is a friend and former neighbour of the resident at 141 Annamoe Drive and objected to the proposed development due to the loss of skylight and the impact this would have on the health and wellbeing of the resident. The observer was also concerned that the proposed development would harm the character of the road as the extension would harm the skyline as a result of closing a gap.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

- 4.1. Planning Authority Reference 3452/13 – permission granted on 12 December 2013 for the demolition of the existing single-storey conservatory structures at the rear and the side of the house and construction of a new single-storey flat-roof extension to the rear and side of the house, with application of external insulation to the existing fabric.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (the Development Plan) is the relevant plan for the area and the site is located within a Land-Use Zoning Objective Z1 – Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods which has the objective to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.
- It states at Section 15.11 House Developments that the guidance and standards relating to ancillary residential accommodation is found at Appendix 18 of the Development Plan.

- It states at paragraph 1.1 General Design Principles of Appendix 18 that:

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)*
- It states at paragraph 1.3 Extension to Side of Appendix 18 that:

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.
- It states at paragraph 1.4 Privacy and Amenity of Appendix 18 that:

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. Where essential, the size of such windows should be kept as small as possible and consideration should be given to the use of high-level windows and/ or the use of obscure glazing where the window serves a bathroom or landing. Bedrooms in general should not be lit by obscure glazed windows as a means to prevent undue overlooking of adjacent properties.

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 states at paragraph 1.5 Separation Distances that:

In cases where the backs of dwellings face each other or where the side of one dwelling faces the rear of a neighbouring property, a certain degree of separation is required to avoid any overbearing effect of one dwelling upon the other. With the emphasis on increased residential densities and the consequent incorporation of a variety of unit types and sizes in schemes, the requirement for 22 metre separation in such cases may no longer be applicable in certain instances. The acceptable reduction of such distances, however, requires a high standard of building design and layout particularly having regard to the height and inter-relationship between buildings, the use and aspect of rooms and relative floor levels.

The exact distances applicable in such cases will be determined on a case-by-case basis having regard to the above criteria and other relevant development plan standards. The planning system does not give neighbours 'a right to a view' and does not always prevent people's view from being blocked. However, extensions should be designed so as not to dominate or appear unduly overbearing when viewed from adjoining properties.

- It states at paragraph 1.6 Daylight and Sunlight of Appendix 18 that:

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. Consideration

should be given to the proportion of extensions, height and design of roofs as well as taking account of the position of windows including rooms they serve to adjacent or adjoining dwellings.

- It states at paragraph 1.7 Appearance and Materials of Appendix 18 that:

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.

Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

- The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities set out Section 5.3 the standards for housing. In respect of this proposal:
 - Policy SPPR2 set a minimum private open space standard for three-bedroom houses of 40 square metres.
 - The guidelines for considering the impact of daylight performance are set out at paragraph 5.3.7.

Natural Heritage Designations

- The site is approximately 6.5 kilometres northwest of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA:004024) and South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC:000210).
- The site is approximately 7.5 kilometres west of the North Bull Island Special Protection Area (SPA:004006) and the North Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC:000208).

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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). 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 the report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

Mary McSherry

- The appellant lives at 141 Annamoe Drive and previously objected to the proposed development.
- The appellant sets out in the grounds of appeal that the proposed development will result in a loss of light to the kitchen, sitting room and patio area.
- The appellant is concerned that the first-floor extension is overbearing given it is proposed to be located between three and four feet from the boundary. The fascia, soffits and gutters will also bring the extension closer.
- A proposed window will result in a loss of privacy.
- The appellant is concerned that the loss of light and proximity to the boundary will have a detrimental impact on her health and well-being as the patio is the appellants outdoor amenity space and the place where she socialises in the summer.
- The appellant explains that the gardens at 141 and 143 Annamoe Drive are north-north-east facing and the patio and kitchen get lots of light in the morning. The first-floor extension will reduce this and cause shadowing. The appellant believes the application should have been supported by a daylight assessment.
- The appellant highlights the previous history of a ground floor extension which overlooked her property and which required the boundary wall between the two properties to be raised to address this impact.
- The appellant describes the site notice not being displayed on the site.
- The appellant suggests that an existing landing window was brought closer when external insulation was added to the neighbouring property. This window looks

directly onto her back door, kitchen and living room windows. An umbrella is needed to protect the privacy of the patio area and the kitchen blinds are kept half closed.

- The new window in the front elevation would be a further invasion of privacy and it needs to be fully enclosed and opaque particularly as it is not specified on the plans what the room is used for.
- The appellant describes Annamoe Drive as a peaceful road with some houses backing onto the Victorian houses on Charleville Road. In the intermittent spaces between the rows of terraced houses the sky, trees and chimneys from Charleville Road can be seen from Annamoe Drive. This gap is important to the character of the road the proposed first-floor side extension will seriously detract from this.
- The appellant is not able to extend her house closer to the boundary with 143 Annamoe Drive because of two large manholes which service the road. The proposed extension further limits the ability of the appellant to do work at her home due to the excessive build-up.
- The submission by a consultant on behalf of the appellant is appended to the grounds of appeal.

Valerie Kearney Ryan

- The appellant lives at 139 Annamoe Drive and previously objected to the proposed development.
- She highlights in the grounds of appeal that a proposed development will result in the loss of skylight to her sunroom as the gable wall of the double height extension will block her view of the blue skies.
- The appellant states that the proposed extension will be up against the boundary of the dwelling at 141 Annamoe Drive and that it is not right to block the resident's natural daylight.
- The appellant is also concerned that the view from the roadside will look different as there will be no light coming through between the two buildings.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- In a response dated 28 April 2026 the Council confirm that no new matters arise in the grounds of appeal that would alter the opinion of the planning authority that planning permission is approved subject to a condition requiring the payment of a Section 48 development contribution.

7.3. Observations

- None

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the application details and all the other documentation on file, including the submission received to appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regards to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered as follows:

- The principle of development
- The impact on the visual amenity and character of the area
- The impact on residential amenity of the property at 139 Annamoe Drive
- The impact on residential amenity of the adjacent property at 141 Annamoe Drive
- Other Matters

The principle of development

- 8.2. The site is subject to an objective Z1 zoning in the Development Plan which has the purpose of improving residential amenity while protecting existing residential amenities.
- 8.3. I agree with the Planning Authority that a first-floor extension is acceptable in principle at his location subject to being in accordance with the requirements of the policies and objectives of the zoning and consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The impact on the visual amenity and character of the area

- 8.4. It is stated in paragraph 1.3 of Appendix 18 that first floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable.
- 8.5. The proposed development is a first-floor extension that has been designed to be constructed on top of an existing single-storey extension. The proposed hipped roof and finishes match the existing dwelling and are consistent with the requirements of paragraph 1.3 of Appendix 18.
- 8.6. It is further stated that in certain cases the proposed extension will need to be set-back from a front façade and the roof profile and ridge adjusted to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a ‘terracing’ effect.
- 8.7. I observed at the site visit that 141 and 143 Annamoe Drive are end of terrace dwellings located in triangular plots presenting a narrow frontage to the street in front. In the backdrop the gap between the two buildings widens and the space is framed by mature trees on the rear boundaries of both properties.
- 8.8. I also observed that the dwelling at 141 sits forward of the dwelling at 143 Annamoe Drive and that as a consequence there is only an oblique view of the gap when standing immediately in front of the two buildings.
- 8.9. Both appellants argue that infilling this gap harms the character of the two dwellings and the street in the wider context. Having regard to my observation from the site visit and the detail of the submitted plans I note however that the existing single storey side extension is already set back by approximately five-metres and is not obvious from the street even when viewed from in front of the two buildings.
- 8.10. Whilst building over the ground floor side extension will narrow the gap the distance of set-back from the front façade means the first-floor extension will integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a ‘terracing’ effect consistent with the guidance in paragraph 1.3 of Appendix 18.
- 8.11. Consequently, I agree with the Planning Authority that the proposed extension will not unduly impinge on the visual amenity of the street or be out of keeping with the host building or other buildings in the local context.

The impact on residential amenity of the property at 139 Annamoe Drive

- 8.12. In respect of the impact of the proposed development on the residential amenity of 139 Annamoe Drive the appellant living at this address argues the proposed first floor extension will result in the loss of skylight to a ground floor sunroom and loss of view from a first-floor bathroom window which is on the gable of a two-storey extension.
- 8.13. I observed at the site visit that the dwelling at 139 is sited at an oblique angle to and one plot away from 143 Annamoe Drive. In between the dwelling at 141 has been extended on the ground floor and there is mature vegetation on the boundary with 139 which obscures any view of the sunroom from 143 Annamoe Drive.
- 8.14. At its closest point the proposed extension will be approximately 10 metres from the boundary with 139 Annamoe Drive and when the mature hedgerow and trees on the two boundaries in between are taken into account the proposed first floor extension will have little or no impact on the residential amenity of the resident of this property as a result of loss of skylight or view.
- 8.15. It is stated at paragraph 1.6 of Appendix 18 that it is recognised that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable from extended dwellings. However, I could not find any evidence of harm to the residential amenity of the property at 139 Annamoe Drive that would sustain a refusal of planning permission.

The impact on residential amenity of the adjacent property at 141 Annamoe Drive

- 8.16. In respect of the impact the proposed development on the residential amenity of the residents of 141 Annamoe Drive the appellant argues the proposed first floor extension will result in the loss of skylight to two windows in the side elevation of the dwelling.
- 8.17. I note the Planning Authority had previously concluded that the rooms at the back of the appellant's property benefited from light penetration on two sides and that there was no significant loss of daylight or sunlight as a result of the proposed first-floor extension to 143 Annamoe Drive.
- 8.18. I do not agree with this analysis however as there is insufficient evidence that the windows in the side elevation are secondary and that the rooms in the back of the appellant's home benefit from light penetration from windows on two sides.

- 8.19. In grounds of appeal the appellant exhibits a consultant report which highlights at page 7 with reference to the guidance at Appendix 16 of the Development Plan a concern that the proposed development will impact on the 'skylight (VSC)' enjoyed by the two ground floor windows facing.
- 8.20. However, it is not identified what assessment was used to determine why the vertical sky component (VSC) test could not be met. The consultant also concedes at page 7 that:
- 'We note that there is not likely to be any impact in relation to sunlight (on the ground or to windows) given that the development is north of our client's property.'*
- 8.21. It is also my observation that the existing ground floor extension at 143 is positioned at a 45 degree angle to the boundary with 141 Annamoe Drive which means the gap between the two buildings increases as you step back into the site.
- 8.22. When viewed from beyond the narrow gap towards the front of the two properties and looking back towards Annamoe Drive there is sufficient space between the buildings to allow light to penetrate into the rooms served by these two windows both of which are relatively large in size.
- 8.23. A photograph supplied at figure 6 on page 10 of the consultant's report is taken from inside the appellant's living room. This is one of the two impacted windows and I note there is good light penetration into the room and borrowed light reflected from the painted surface on the rendered walls.
- 8.24. Whilst a taller building will be closer to the two windows on the side elevation of the appellant's home, I conclude that the proposed first floor extension is in accordance with the guidance at paragraph 1.6 of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan and that it will not result in a significant loss of residential amenity for the following reasons.
- 8.25. The proposed extension is relatively small in size, located to the north and oriented away from the two windows in the side elevation of the neighbouring property. The hipped roof is only extended over the third bedroom and not the part of the extension closest to the two windows. Consequently, the bulk and mass of the proposed roof does not remove a significant block of 'skylight' and there remains sufficient distance between the properties to allow good light penetration into the rooms from above.

- 8.26. The appellant is also concerned that when constructed the first-floor extension would also be dominant and overbearing on the patio area and the rooms served by the windows in the side elevation.
- 8.27. The extension is to the side of the building and at its closest point will be approximately five metres distant from the closest window. For the same reason outlined in the preceding paragraphs I do not consider the first-floor extension to be dominant and overbearing.
- 8.28. This window as exhibited in the photograph in the consultant's report already has a two-storey gable elevation within seven metres and bringing this closer by two metres will not from my observations from the site visit demonstrably change the outlook from this room.
- 8.29. Some impact is inevitable in an urban setting and the appellant has a large rear garden which is not impacted by the proposed development.
- 8.30. The patio area extends back and away from the first-floor extension and there is no loss of residential amenity as a consequence of this.
- 8.31. The appellant is also concerned that the window proposed in the front elevation of the first-floor extension will result in a loss of privacy because of overlooking and this is to the detriment of the appellants residential amenity.
- 8.32. Having visited the site, read the submission by the consultant appended to the appellants grounds of appeal and looked in particular at the photograph exhibited at figure 5 on page 9 of the submission it is my observation that this is a landing window and not a window serving a habitable room.
- 8.33. The window proposed opposite is also a landing window replacing a bathroom window in the gable. It is small in size and faces the gap between the two buildings. The scope for someone to stand, dwell and look into any private habitable room or any private area of the neighbouring property is not practical and the potential for a loss of privacy or for harm to be caused to the residential amenity to the occupant of 141 Annamoe Drive extremely limited.
- 8.34. I do not consider the appellants concern that there will be a loss of privacy from the proposed the first-floor landing has been substantiated. A refusal of permission based

solely on the of loss of residential amenity from overlooking cannot be sustained in my opinion.

- 8.35. That said, I note in paragraph 1.4 of Appendix 18 states that windows overlooking adjoining properties should be avoided. In a circumstance where a window is essential and located in a landing area then it should be kept small size and fitted with obscure glazing.
- 8.36. Having a second window in the landing is essential to maximise light penetration into the centre of a floor which has two rooms without windows and I note proposed landing window has also been designed in accordance with the first of the two criteria in that it is small.
- 8.37. Making the installation of the landing window subject to a condition requiring the window to be fitted with obscured glass is consistent with and would bring the proposal into conformity with the requirements of Appendix 18.

Other Matters

- 8.38. The appellant suggests in their ground of appeal that the site notice was not correctly served during the application process. The planning report clearly states the site notice was inspected and in order on 10 February 2026. No evidence to the contrary is available.
- 8.39. I further note that there was no prejudice to the appellant during the application process and she was able to retain professional advice and make observations. No challenge was brought to the Planning Authority and the application was not returned.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located approximately 6.5 kilometres northwest of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA:004024) and South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC:000210) approximately 7.5 kilometres west of the North Bull Island Special Protection Area (SPA:004006) and the North Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC:000208).

The proposal development comprises a first-floor extension for a bedroom over an existing ground floor kitchen/dining and utility room with internal alterations to a bathroom, ensuite bathroom and first floor landing.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The site in an established residential area and the proposed development involving the development of a first-floor side extension is small in scale.
- The distance to the identified European sites and the lack of connection.
- Taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority.

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 (Stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The subject site is approximately seven hundred and fifty metres southwest of the Royal Canal.

The proposed development comprises a first-floor extension for a bedroom over an existing ground floor kitchen/dining and utility room with internal alterations to a bathroom, ensuite bathroom and first floor landing.

I have assessed the proposed 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 and 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 wither qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The site is located in an established residential area and the proposed development involving a first-floor extension to the side of an existing dwelling is small in scale. The applicant indicated SuDS drainage is proposed. If properly designed and installed SuDS can be an acceptable form of mitigation.

I conclude 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 should be approved for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 12.1. The commission is satisfied, based on the information provided, that permission is granted for first-floor extension for a bedroom over an existing ground floor kitchen/dining and utility room with internal alterations to a bathroom, ensuite bathroom and first floor landing for the reasons and considerations set out below.
- 12.2. The proposed first floor extension to the dwelling by reason of its size, form, scale and distance of setback will not harm visual amenity or character of the area nor will it harm the residential amenity of adjacent properties as a result of a loss of daylight/sunlight, privacy or dominance.
- 12.3. Consequently, the proposal complies with the Z1 zoning objective which seeks 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities' and is in accordance the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area subject to the following conditions.

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 26th day of January 2026, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. All external finishes, shall harmonise in material, colour and texture with the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity

3. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:

- (a) The proposed first floor window to landing area in the front elevation shall be finished with obscure/opaque glazing and permanently maintained.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

4. The existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity

5. 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 Bord 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.

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Friday inclusive, 8.00am to 2.00pm Saturdays and no works permitted on site on Sundays and Public holidays. Deviations from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been obtained from the Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

7. Drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the relevant Section of the Council for such works and services.

Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit to the Planning Authority for written agreement a Stage 2 - Detailed Design Stage Storm Water Audit.

Upon completion of the development a Stage 3 Completion Stormwater Audit to demonstrate Sustainable Urban Drainage System measures have been installed, and are working as designed and that there has been no misconnections or damage to storm water drainage infrastructure during construction, shall be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement.

Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

8. A Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The CEMP shall include but not be limited to construction phase controls for dust, noise and vibration, waste management, protection of soils,

groundwaters, and surface waters, site housekeeping, emergency response planning, site environmental policy, and project roles and responsibilities.

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

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.

Conor Hughes
Planning Inspector

19th June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501155-DN-26
Proposed Development Summary	The development comprises a first-floor extension for a bedroom over an existing ground floor kitchen/dining and utility room with internal alterations to a bathroom, ensuite bathroom and first floor landing.
Development Address	143 Annamoe Drive, Cabra, Dublin 7 D07 T2X6
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 ☐	
No ☐	

Inspector: _____

Date: 19th June 2026