



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-5001182-SD-26

Development

Demolition of chimney, garage conversion, extension to rear including 2 no. rooflights, roof alterations including half hip roof, dormer and rooflights and elevation alterations.

Location

No. 137, Fortfield Road, Terenure, Dublin 6W.

Planning Authority

South Dublin County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

SD25B/0663W

Applicant(s)

Georgina & Robbie Dillon.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant permission.

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Patrick & Irene Fitzgerald.

Observer(s)

none.

Date of Site Inspection

24/05/2026.

Inspector

Anthony Abbott King

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. Fortfield Road is located to the southwest of Terenure Village. The houses on Fortfield Road are setback from the carriageway enjoying in-curtilage parking. The rear gardens are substantial.
- 1.2. No. 137 Fortfield Road is a three-bay two-storey semi-detached pre-war house circa.1939 located on the western side of Fortfield Road opposite the Terenure College grounds.
- 1.3. The abutting house to the north at no.135 Fortfield Road is a mirror pair with no. 137 Fortfield Road. The houses are similar in form and appearance.
- 1.4. The semi-detached houses on this section of Fortfield Road have hipped roofs, paired gables above projecting two-storey bay windows with redbrick and pebble dash finishes.
- 1.5. The adjoining house to the south at no.139 Fortfield Road forms part of another mirrored pair of semi-detached houses with no.141 Fortfield Road.
- 1.6. A number of the houses in the streetscape have front, side and rear extension / alteration.
- 1.7. The site area is given as 0.069 hectares.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the following:
 - a) Demolition of existing chimney to rear;
 - b) Conversion of existing garage to habitable space;
 - c) Single storey flat roof extension to the rear with 2no. rooflights;
 - d) New half hip roof to the side over existing first floor;
 - e) 1no. rooflight to the front and 2no. rooflights to the rear of dwelling;
 - f) dormer extension to the rear of dwelling;
 - (g) Alterations to front, side and rear elevations and all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Grant permission subject to 4 conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

Amendments - Glazing.

The following amendment to the design shall be carried out: The first floor window on the southern elevation shall be fitted with obscure glazing, and such obscure glazing shall be maintained in perpetuity.

REASON: *In the interest of residential amenity.*

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 following a further information request and acceptable response.

- The planning authority requested additional information (03/02/2026) *inter alia* in the matters of potential impacts on the adjoining properties at nos. 135 (south) and 139 (north) Fortfield Road.
- The planning authority invited amendments to the development proposal *inter alia* to demonstrate that the scale, height and massing of the of the proposed rear extension along the shared property boundary with no. 135 Fortfield Road would not adversely impact the neighbouring property.
- Further information was received (23/02/2026) including the amendment of the design of the rear extension and the submission of a shadow analysis, which was acceptable to the planning authority.
- The planning authority concluded that the proposed development would result in minor overshadowing impacts on the property at no.135 Fortfield Road (north). However, the proposal was in compliance with established BRE daylight and sunlight guidelines and existing residential amenity would be maintained.

- Finally, the planning authority was satisfied that revised site layout submitted by further information response accurately reflects the relevant adjoining built form.
- The planning authority concluded the development as amended would be consistent with the relevant planning policy framework, would not result in unacceptable significant overshadowing or overbearing impacts on adjoining properties (nos. 135 & 139 Fortfield Road) and would be consistent with the pattern of rear extension in the area and is would be acceptable in principle subject to condition.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- None requested.

3.3. Third Party Observations

There are two number of third party submissions on file. One of the submissions is from the appellant who has reiterated their objections in the grounds of appeal. The submissions are summarised below

- The proposed development is excessive in scale in particular the height and depth of the proposed rear extension, which is out of character with the existing built form and established pattern of rear extension.
- The bulky design of the rear extension will be overbearing on no. 139 Fortfield Road, because of insufficient setback from the property boundary, and will cause overbearing / overshadowing of no. 135 Fortfield Road, because of its location on the property boundary.
- The submitted drawings and notices are unclear in particular in relation to demolition elements and the elevation of rooflights.
- The overall development is out of place with the architecture of the adjoining properties in the streetscape in particular the introduction of a half hipped roof / “Dutch gable” and cantilever, which would be visually obtrusive.

4.0 Planning History

- ### 4.1. There is no recent planning history on site.

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

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

Chapter 12 (Implementation & Monitoring) 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.

- 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 3.2.2 Built Form principle (BFP) 2 – Front Extensions is relevant and states:
 - *Should not dominate the front elevation of the house.*
 - *Should not exceed 1.5 metres in depth where there is a regular / uniform front building line along the street.*
 - *Should retain a driveway depth of 6 metres.*
 - *Should complement the design and materials used in the main house, unless design rationale for alternative materials is demonstrated.*
 - *Roof profile of two storey front extension should tie in with that of the main house, unless design rationale for alternative profile is demonstrated.*
 - *Roof profile of ground floor front extension to a bungalow / dormer bungalow should be carefully considered relative to the eaves level of the house.*

- 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 ensure 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. proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the third-party appeal are summarised below:

- The third party does not object in principle to the extension of the neighbouring property in an appropriate manner. However, the present proposal is unacceptable as the permitted development would have an adverse and detrimental impact on the amenities and value of the third party's property inconsistent with the character and pattern of development in the vicinity setting an undesirable precedent.
- The present 1930s house (applicant) in form and design has only been slightly altered since its construction and represents with the mirrored abutting semi-detached house (appellant) a residential unit of period scale and proportion and a streetscape element intrinsic to the character of the area.
- The semi-detached building typology imposes constraints on possible extensions in a way that an extension to a detached property would not be constrained. It is claimed that the proposed development does not acknowledge these constraints.
- The third party requested a meeting (February, 2026) with the first party following a further information request by the planning authority. The further information response does not address the third parties concerns. Furthermore it is claimed the response does not address the planning authority's concerns in a meaningful way.
- The amendments in the design submitted by further information response, providing for a 20cm reduction in height and a 50cm reduction in length, will not address the overshadowing and overbearing effect and loss of daylight / sunlight to the main living room, kitchen and dining room of the third party's house resulting from the proposed extension.
- It is claimed that Drawing no. 25031-PL-10 shows the rear elevation with the contiguous property of the third party misrepresented in terms of the rear extension, height, width of openings and height to first floor window cill, which is relevant to daylight / sunlight analysis.
- The shared boundary wall is 1350mm high and only steps up to 1800mm for a length of 3150mm. The shared boundary follows the slope of the ground and drops 150mm over the length of the proposed extension. It is claimed that the

proposed extension would have an overbearing impact and would be visually obtrusive.

- The existing lean-to conservatory located on the property boundary comprises translucent polycarbonate sheeting in an aluminium frame. The overshadowing from same does not affect the daylight and sunlight entering the third party's internal reception spaces and patio area beyond.
- The overshadowing assessment submitted by further information response contains multiple inaccuracies. The third party claims that the analysis is grossly inaccurate.
- The proposed extended roof exhibits a "Dutch Gable" and cantilever is inappropriate and inconsistent with the mirror image elevation design of the existing semi-detached houses on the Fortfield Road, which are characterised by hipped roofs and paired gables. It is claimed that the roof alteration would be visually obstructive and would break the integrity of the Fortfield Road streetscape Circa.1930.
- The design of the façade places external emphasis on the primary internal spaces, including the main section of the roof design covering each house pair. It is claimed that the proposed roof alteration would give the end bay of the house an unwanted prominence inconsistent with the intrinsic character of the streetscape.
- The third elevation bay of the house facade is recessed to acknowledge that ancillary service accommodation was subordinate and located to the side of the house and given a different roof (flat roof) treatment (garage / scullery at ground floor maids room / WC at first floor).
- The proposed works to the front, side and rear of the house would significantly erode the external appearance and character of the adjoining and adjacent properties. The alterations to the roof would significantly break the balance and articulation of the semi-detached pair making one house visually conspicuous disrupting the rhythm and character of the streetscape.
- The third party lists alterations to the appeal site conducted to date (1980s) by previous owners. The third party claims that the current application is not

complete without and application for retention planning permission for the increase in the vehicular access width together with the paving over of almost the entire front garden.

- The third party claims that the site notice and the newspaper notice are inadequate to describe the nature and extent of the development, as required by Article 18 and 19 of the Planning & Development regulations 2001-2004. The application should be refused on the grounds of inadequate notices.
- The gross floor space of proposed works as given on the application form is incorrectly stated as a gross floor area of 48 sqm. The comprehensive works proposed would be significantly in excess of the stated floor area (137.40). Furthermore, the demolition works are not quantified.
- The proposed single-storey extension to the rear is grossly excessive in terms of its height and scale in relation to the original house and does not integrate with it in terms of layout.
- The third party claims that unauthorised change of use / intensification of use has occurred since the property was acquired by the present owners.
- The 5-bedroom family home has been advertised as a multi-unit 7 bedroom property with individual rooms to let (analogous with a hostel inconsistent with the “RES” zoning objective), which can accommodate up to 12 / 14 unrelated persons at a time resulting in a depreciation residential amenities.
- The precedents cited by the first party at no. 117 Fortfield Road (SD13B/0040) and 153 Fortfield Road (SD14B/0255) do not represent examples of equivalent development in terms of location and building height.
- The proposed rear extension is inconsistent with Section 3.0 of the SDDC House Extension Design Guide (2025) and all of the built form principles for all extensions and alterations to houses.

7.2. Applicant Response in the case of a 3rd Party Appeal

The applicant response is summarised below:

- The proposed development has been carefully designed by an experienced architectural and engineering team ensuring appropriate response to suburban

context and character and appropriate scale with reference to permitted residential extensions in the area and adjoining properties.

- The proposed development was the subject of a further information response to the planning authority including revised drawings and an “Overshadowing Assessment”.
- The planning authority issued a grant of permission following the amendment of the rear extension design to provide for an overall height reduction from 3.9m to 3.69m and a reduced depth from 7.75m to 7.45m.
- It is claimed that a significant proportion of the third party concerns do not relate directly to material planning considerations (for example Section 3 of the response addresses occupancy issues).
- It is claimed that the first party sought to engage with the third party on a number of occasions prior to the submission of the planning application.
- In the matter of the impact on the residential amenities of no.135 Fortfield Road, the relevant matters were addressed during the application process including overshadowing and overbearing impacts.
- The “Overshadowing Assessment” demonstrates that the development will not give rise to any significant or unacceptable adverse impacts on the residential amenity of nos. 135 and 139 Fortfield Road.
- In the matter of the established character of the area, the first party includes a “Character Area Assessment” provided in Appendix 1 of the submission.
- The built environment analysis highlights that the Fortfield Road area has experienced a significant degree of residential extension and alteration over time, including substantial rear extension, roof alteration (including half hip design), dormer extension and contemporary architectural interventions.
- It is claimed that the permitted developments in the vicinity cited in the application submission are part of the established and emerging suburban character of the area and demonstrate that residential adaptation and extension with modern additions is a common and accepted feature of the locality.

- In the matter of compliance with the SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025), the first party includes a planning policy compliance assessment in Appendix 2 *inter alia* with the relevant Built Form Principles (BFP) of the Guide, including BFP1, BFP4, BFP5 & BFP7.
- In the matter of property value, depreciation in property values must be supported by objective evidence and property value is in itself not a planning issue *per se*, reflected in the established approach of the Commission.
- In the matter of validation issues, these are matters for the planning authority. It is claimed that the cited inaccuracies in the public notices and floor area calculation in the application form would not result in invalidation.

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

The planning authority confirms its decision. The issues raised in the appeal have been covered in the CEO order.

7.4. **Observations**

None.

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
- Pattern of development in the area
- 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 (SDCC) House Extension Design Guide.

8.4. 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 (SDCC) House Extension Design Guide (2025).

8.5. Pattern of development in the area

The proposed development proposes to extend and upgrade the existing dwelling house on site, which on the day of my site visit presented as requiring refurbishment.

8.6. The third party does not object in principle to the extension of the neighbouring property.

8.7. It is claimed that the scale and design of the proposed development and as amended by further information response would have detrimental impact on the amenities and value of the third party’s property inconsistent with the character and pattern of development in the vicinity setting an undesirable precedent.

8.8. The first party highlights that the proposed works are compatible in scale and layout with the emerging pattern of domestic extension along Fortfield Road.

8.9. Section 12.6 (Housing / Residential Development) Paragraph “Extensions” of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 *inter alia* states that the design of residential extensions should have regard to the permitted pattern of development in the immediate area.

8.10. The first party *inter alia* cites two-storey rear extensions at nos. 145 (SD06B/0027) & 153 Fortfield Road and a single-storey extension at no. 171 Fortfield Road (Ref:

SD18B/0371), which it is claimed demonstrates that rear / side extensions of a comparable or greater scale of the proposed development are a characteristic of the area.

- 8.11. I have reviewed the planning permissions at no. 171 Fortfield - Road Reg. Ref: SD18B/0371 (December 2018), 145 Fortfield Road - Reg. Ref: SD06B/0027 (September 2006 on appeal) and no. 153 Fortfield Road - Ref. SD14B/0255 (December 2014), which include permission for a large extension to the rear of no. 153 Fortfield Road.
- 8.12. I note that the cited planning permissions were granted under the provisions of a previous development plan.
- 8.13. Finally, I note Appendix 1 (Character Area Assessment) of the application response (15/05/2026), which provides a detailed analysis of the built form of the suburban environment in the vicinity of the appeal site including the recent pattern of extension and alteration of the adjacent housing stock.
- 8.14. I conclude that the proposed development shall be assessed on its own merits within the its site specific context.
- 8.15. Impact on residential and visual amenity of the dwellinghouse on site and adjoining properties
- 8.16. 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.
- 8.17. No. 137 Fortfield Road has a substantial rear garden. There is an existing rear extension(s), approximately 3m in depth, extending for the full width of the rear elevation. The proposed development includes replacing the existing extension(s) with a larger single-storey rear extension.
- 8.18. No. 137 Fortfield Road abuts no.135 Fortfield Road (the appellant) to the south and no. adjoins no. 139 Fortfield Road to north. The side and rear property boundaries are characterised by mature planting.

The rear extension(s) and proposed rear fenestration alterations

- 8.19. I note that the planning authority requested additional information and amendments to the development proposal *inter alia* to demonstrate that the scale, height and massing of the of the proposed rear extension along the shared property boundary with no.135 Fortfield Road would not adversely impact the neighbouring property.
- 8.20. The first party amended the design of the development proposal by reducing the depth and height of the proposed ground floor rear extension. The first party claims that the proposed replacement extension would not result in a significant loss of light or overbearing impacts on adjacent properties.

Ground floor rear Extension

Footprint & Scale

- 8.21. The third party claims that the rear extension is excessive in scale in comparison with the original house and does not integrate with it in terms of layout.
- 8.22. The rear extension would have a depth of 7450mm (as amended by further information response 23/02/26) and with the existing rear extension extend for the full width of the garden with the exception a setback (minimum 1185mm) with the shared property boundary to the south with the adjoining property at no. 139 Fortfield Road.
- 8.23. The gross floor space of the existing dwelling house on site is 205 sqm. The proposed rear extension would have a footprint of approximately 73 sqm (9810 x 7450).
- 8.24. I note that the application form states that the gross floor area of the proposed works is 48 sqm. The third party states that the gross floor internal area is misrepresented on the application form.
- 8.25. I consider that the floor area stated reflects the additional floor area proposed.
- 8.26. The internal floor area of the extension as amended by further information response would be approximately 59 sqm (6400mm x 9110mm).
- 8.27. The existing rear extension(s) on site measure approximately 30 sqm.
- 8.28. I note that the proposed floor area of the rear extension net the existing rear extension(s) would represent a net floor area gain of approximately 29 sqm.
- 8.29. I also note a floor area gain at attic level.

8.30. I consider that the proposed extension would be subordinate in floor area to the main house.

Layout

8.31. The development proposal would remove part of the rear elevation ground floor wall, which would create an opening between the rear reception room and hall of the main house and the open plan dining / living / kitchen area (with enclosed pantry) accommodated in the new extension.

8.32. The rear reception room would be internalised and is denoted as a playroom on the submitted drawings. The open plan dining / living / kitchen area would incorporate an enclosed pantry.

8.33. I consider that the proposed ground floor would represent a functional and integrated internal layout at ground floor level.

Residual garden

8.34. The appeal site has a rear garden depth of over 30m. The plot width is also substantial. The residual rear garden would have an amenity area in excess of 250 sqm.

Roof profile

8.35. The extension design incorporates a flat roof with large concealed rooflights, which would provide additional natural light into the deep internal floor area (7450mm).

8.36. I consider that a flat roof design is acceptable in principle in terms of function and build form distinguishing the new build extension from the existing pitch / hipped roof dwellinghouse on site while reducing overall massing consistent with the SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025).

Material finish

8.37. The extension would have a smooth white render finish and would exhibit aluminium sliding door fenestration giving access to the rear garden.

8.38. I consider the material finish acceptable in principle and in detail.

Height

- 8.39. The first party has reduced the height of the rear extension by further information response (28/02/26). The rear extension as originally submitted to the planning authority had a height of 3900mm.
- 8.40. The amended extension height is 3690mm, which is acceptable to the planning authority.
- 8.41. The first party states that the amended height of the extension represents the minimum practical height of the extension in order to ensure alignment with the existing ceiling height of the ground floor of the existing dwellinghouse.
- 8.42. I note that the external height of the extension is determined by the finished internal floor to ceiling height (3000mm) aligned with the floor to ceiling height of the principal reception rooms of the main house (2790mm).
- 8.43. I consider the proposed rear extension height as amended acceptable for a single-storey extension.

Depth

- 8.44. The proposed replacement extension would have significantly greater projection from the established rear building line of the subject pair of semi-detached houses.
- 8.45. The projection of the proposed rear extension has been reduced by further information response from 7950mm to 7450mm.
- 8.46. I acknowledge the marginal reduction in the depth of the proposed extension by 500mm relative to the overall projection of the extension from the established rear building line (7450mm as amended).

Massing / overbearing

- 8.47. The substantive matter under appeal is the massing of the rear extension along the shared property boundary with no. 135 Fortfield Road and the impact of the extension massing on the residential and visual amenity of the abutting property.
- 8.48. The proposed rear extension would be located on the shared property boundary with the abutting semi-detached house at no. 135 Fortfield Road located to the north.

- 8.49. Section 4.2 (Built Form Principle (BFP) 4 –Rear Extensions) states that rear extensions should be designed with consideration to relationship with any adjoining properties, in particular the depth and height of ground floor level extensions.
- 8.50. Section 3.4 (Rear Extensions) *inter alia* states that 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.
- 8.51. Notwithstanding the subject houses are a mirror semi-detached pair and the extension would be located on the shared property boundary exhibiting a height of 3690mm, I consider that the single storey build form and flat roof profile of the proposed rear extension would significantly mitigate overbearing impacts on the abutting dwelling house (see north elevation - 25031-PL-11).

Overshadowing

- 8.52. The Planning authority requested a shadow impact assessment of the development by way of further information expressing concern at the dept, height and proximity of the proposed northern elevation of the rear extension located on the shared property boundary with no.135 Fortfield Road abutting.
- 8.53. I acknowledge that the receiving environment to the rear of the pair of semi-detached houses is sensitive. The proposed replacement extension is to the south of no.135 Fortfield Road (appellant) in the direct path of the sun.
- 8.54. No. 135 Fortfield Road has an existing modest hipped roof rear extension that is significantly setback from the shared side property boundary with no. 137 Fortfield Road.
- 8.55. The patio amenity space to the rear of no.135 Fortfield Road is located in the setback between the south elevation of the single-storey hipped roof extension and the side shared property boundary with no. 137 Fortfield Road.
- 8.56. The north side elevation of the proposed rear extension to No. 137 Fortfield Road would be located directly south of the patio area and rear living room window of the main house.
- 8.57. I have reviewed the submitted “ overshadowing Assessment “, prepared by David Lee Planning (February 2026). I consider that the assessment provides a reasonable and

full assessment of the impact of the development on the adjoining properties in terms of daylight / sunlight impact analysis.

- 8.58. The analysis identifies additional overshadowing of the rear facade of no.135 Fortfield Road in Spring and Autumn (duration 1pm-4pm) including the southern elevation of the rear extension, the rear living room window adjacent to the property boundary and the patio area immediate to the rear elevation.
- 8.59. Notwithstanding the transparent nature of the existing extension to the rear of no. 137 Fortfield Road immediately south of the boundary wall (1800mm), I note that the rear living room window of no. 135 Fortfield Road already experiences partial overshadowing from the existing extension / boundary wall to the south.
- 8.60. I note there would be no overshadowing in summer months. Furthermore, I note there would be no overshadowing of first floor windows, as the proposed rear extension is single storey in height (3690mm).
- 8.61. I acknowledge that the physical context would change on the shared property boundary given the dept and height of the new extension, which would present as a high masonry wall (3690mm) along the boundary to the south of no. 135 Fortfield Road projecting at a depth of approximately 7.5m.
- 8.62. I acknowledge that a degree of overshadowing of the rear patio and rear living room of no.137 Fortfield Road would result.
- 8.63. However, I do not consider that the overshadowing impacts identified would warrant a refusal of planning permission or the requirement for a setback of the proposed extension on the southern side of the boundary.
- 8.64. I note the first party in the further information response clarifies that any minor setback off the shared property boundary would not materially alter the shadow pattern caused by the proposed development.
- 8.65. I concur with the planning authority that the rear extension as redesigned by further information response would comply with BRE daylight and sunlight guidelines and would on balance maintain the existing residential amenity of the adjoining property.
- 8.66. Finally, I note that Section 3.4.1 (general considerations relating to all rear extensions) of the SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025) *inter alia* states that 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.

- 8.67. In conclusion, I do not consider that the proposed extension would result in significant adverse overshadowing or overbearing impacts on the abutting residential property at no. 135 Fortfield Road to the north given the single-storey height of the extension and the limited shadow it would cast as evidenced by the submitted overshadowing study.

Fenestration

- 8.68. The rear extension does not have side elevation fenestration exhibiting blank walls to the north and south. The west elevation would have an expansive glazed sliding patio door that would have a direct line of vision into the extensive rear garden heavily planted to the rear.
- 8.69. I consider that no overlooking issues would arise from the proposed single-storey rear extension.

No. 139 Fortfield Road

- 8.70. Finally, I consider that the proposed extension would not have an adverse impact on the adjoining property to the south at no.139 Fortfield Road given the single-storey nature of the extension and the setback from the shared property boundary (minimum 1185mm).
- 8.71. The overshadowing analysis confirms that the rear extension would not give rise to overshadowing impacts to the habitable rooms of the adjoining property, at no.139 Fortfield Road, which is located to the south of the proposed development.

Conclusion rear ground floor extension

- 8.72. I conclude that the proposed rear extension would be subordinate in volume and floor area to the main dwellinghouse on site, would rationalise the internal floor area of the property while providing a contemporary design addition and, would not on balance result in significant adverse overbearing and overshadowing impacts on the adjoining properties at no.135 Fortfield Road (north) and no.139 Fortifeld Road (south) given the single-storey height and flat roof design of the proposed structure.
- 8.73. Furthermore, I do not consider that the extension would be visually obtrusive when viewed from the adjoining properties given the building form, the flat roof profile and the

white smooth render finish. Finally, I note the extension is not visible from the public domain.

Rear Dormer extension / attic conversion

- 8.74. Section 3.5.2 (Built Form Principle (BFP) 5- Roof Alterations & Extensions – Rear Dormer Elements) provides guidance in the matter of roof dormers. The development proposal includes the conversion of the attic into two accessible rooms denoted as attic and the other as a store.
- 8.75. I consider that the conversion of the attic is acceptable in principle.
- 8.76. The access stair to the converted attic would in part be accommodated within the front roof alteration. I assess the visual impact the proposed roof alteration on the receiving streetscape below.
- 8.77. The proposed development includes a rear dormer extension at attic level. The dormer would have a flat roof and a width of 4m and would be incorporated into an attic room accessed from the first floor. The purpose of the room is not identified on the submitted drawings denoted as attic.
- 8.78. The timber frame metal clad dormer extension would be setback from the eaves of the main dwellinghouse and would extend from just below the ridge of the roof of the main house.
- 8.79. The dormer would be asymmetrically placed in the rear roof plane with a separation distance of 1950mm from the party wall with no. 135 Fortfield Road.
- 8.80. I consider that the rear dormer would be acceptable in terms of scale, distance from ridge and eaves and material finish.
- 8.81. The single horizontal emphasises dormer window opening has a west orientation and the direct line of sight would be over the extensive rear garden of the appeal site.
- 8.82. The distance to the rear property boundary with houses on Fortfield Square is significant. There is no arising opposing window concern given the length of the rear garden (approximately 31m) and the mature planting of the rear garden.
- 8.83. I consider that on balance the rear dormer extension would satisfy the requirements of Section 3.5.2 (Built Form Principle (BFP) 5- Roof Alterations & Extensions – Rear Dormer Elements).

Rear rooflights

- 8.84. The proposed development proposes two rooflights in the rear plane of the existing dwellinghouse roof. I consider that proposed rooflights would satisfy the criteria listed in (Built Form Principle (BFP) 5 for rooflights.

Demolition of Chimney

- 8.85. The applicant proposes to demolish a chimney located in the rear roof plane in the location of the proposed dormer roof extension. I consider that removal of the chimney is acceptable.

Impact on the receiving streetscape

- 8.86. The development proposal includes the alteration of the roof profile of the main dwellinghouse. The side hipped roof (south gable) and flat roof of the existing two-storey garage extension would be replaced by a pitched roof and half hipped gable end elevation.

Front Rooflight

- 8.87. The new roof structure would extend the converted attic space to include a store room above a bedroom and bathroom at first floor level. Access to the attic level would be provided by an internal stairwell within the altered roof structure, which would incorporate a rooflight in the front roof plane lighting the attic stairwell.
- 8.88. The front rooflight is modest in scale and would satisfy the criteria listed in (Built Form Principle (BFP) 5 for rooflights.
- 8.89. The first floor bedroom and bathroom would be accommodated within the envelope of the existing garage recessed bay. The internal floor level would be raised to match the first floor level of the main house.

Gable elevation / roof alteration

- 8.90. A new window would be inserted in an existing opening in the side elevation (south) at first floor level. A door opening at ground floor level would be repurposed as a window opening.
- 8.91. I concur with the planning authority that the first floor opening should be furnished with obscure glazing in accordance with Section 3.5.2 (Built Form Principle (BFP) 5), which requires any window provided in an extended gable elevation that faces an adjacent

house should be fitted with obscure glazing. This matter can be dealt with by way of condition.

- 8.92. The third party claims that the proposal to extend the roof with a “Dutch Gable” and cantilever would be visually obtrusive and would break the integrity of the streetscape inconsistent with the mirror image elevation design of the existing semi-detached houses on Fortfield Road.
- 8.93. I acknowledge that the receiving streetscape is characterised by elevation continuity. The house facades on Fortfield Road exhibit paired front elevations with hipped roofs and paired projecting two-storey bays below expressed gables.
- 8.94. The third party claims the existing main roof gives external emphasises to the primary internal spaces in each of the pair of semi-detached houses, which is an intrinsic part of the character of the streetscape. The end recessed elevation bay has a flat roof and is subservient to the principal roof structure.
- 8.95. I note the new roof would have a uniform eaves line and would project over the end bay elevation of the front façade, which is recessed. The cantilever effect would create a deep eave above the end recessed bay replacing the flat roof with a slated pitch roof.
- 8.96. I note that the proposed roof design would not break the front building line.
- 8.97. Section 3.5.2 (Built Form Principle (BFP) 5- Roof Alterations & Extensions) of the SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025) requires that roof alterations should tie in with the original ridge height and ridge position of the dwelling and should have a similar material finish.
- 8.98. I consider that the proposed pitch roof with half hip gable would satisfy the criteria provided for roof alteration in (BFP) 5.
- 8.99. I acknowledge that the proposed alteration of the roof would disrupt the rhythm of the receiving streetscape. However, I note that the rhythm of the original streetscape on Fortfield Road has been altered to date including the introduction of half-hip gable roofs.
- 8.100. I note the “Area Character Assessment” submitted by the first party as part of the appeal response, which illustrates half hipped gable alterations at no. 171 Fortfield Road and no. 115 Fortfield Road.

- 8.101. I have observed on the day of my site visit that that the streetscape on Fortfield Road is evolving and that roof alteration similar to the proposal is part of that streetscape evolution.
- 8.102. I do not consider that the introduction of roof alterations in the vicinity, including half-hip gables, have depreciated visual amenity or have depreciated the character of the receiving streetscape.
- 8.103. I note that the end bay of the front elevation (east) would remain recessed. Thus maintaining the hierarchy of the central bays in the overall façade composition.
- 8.104. I conclude on balance that the proposed front roof alterations are acceptable in principle and in detail.
- 8.105. Finally, I note alterations to the front façade including the replacement of the garage door with a window opening, making good render finishes and window replacement.
- 8.106. I consider that the proposed elevation changes are art of the overall upgrade of accommodation on site and are acceptable in principle consistent with Built Form Principle (BFP 7 – Other Alterations) of the SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025).

Garage conversion

- 8.107. The development proposal would convert the garage to form part of the ground floor functional layout. I consider that the conversion of the garage is acceptable in principle.
- 8.108. In conclusion on balance the proposed front elevation changes and significant roof alteration are acceptable in principle and in detail as part of the upgrade of accommodation on site.
- 8.109. Other Matters
- 8.110. The planning authority by way of further information requested the first party to clarify the relationship between the proposed extension and the adjoining properties at nos. 135 (north) and 139 (south) Fortfield Road at ground floor level.
- 8.111. I consider that the further information response (23/02/26), including Drawing No. 25031-PL-06, clearly demonstrates the relationship between the proposed extension and the built form of the adjoining properties.

8.112. I can confirm that the existing spatial relationship between the abutting property at no. 135 Fortfield Road and the appeal site is as submitted, as observed on the day of my site visit.

8.113. I do not consider that the drawings submitted by way of further information include inaccuracies that would be material to this planning assessment.

Change of use / intensification of use

8.114. The third party claims that unauthorised change of use / intensification of use has occurred since the sale of the property to the current owners. The dwellinghouse on site has been advertised as multioccupancy development and is in use as same with individual rooms available to rent.

8.115. I consider that Section 3 of the first party response clarifies matters in regard to occupancy.

8.116. The temporary rental of the property during the planning and design process is in accordance with the existing use status of the property and the property is registered with the Residential Tenancies Board.

8.117. The first part rejects the suggestion that the proposed development is designed to facilitate commercial or hostel-type accommodation. The subject property was purchased as a family home for the applicant and their 3 children and principal private residence.

8.118. I accept the bona fides of the first party given the clarification provided in the applicant response.

Public notices

8.119. The third party claims that the site notice and the newspaper notice are inadequate. I do not agree with the third party.

8.120. I consider that the public notices are sufficient in their description to adequately inform the public. I also note that the appellant has a comprehensive understanding of the proposed development as evidenced in the third party objection on file and the appeal statement.

Works carried out in the 1980s

8.121. Finally, the third party claims that the current application is not complete without and application for retention planning permission for the increase in the vehicular access width together with the paving over of almost the entire front garden.

8.122. I advise the Commission that the development the subject of this assessment is the application submitted to the planning authority, as validated by the planning authority. The submission of a hypothetical application to compressively regulate all accretions and alterations to the existing dwellinghouse on site and its curtilage is not within the scope of this assessment.

Development contribution

8.123. I consider that a financial contribution condition should be attached to the permission as required under the relevant development contribution scheme.

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 and roof alterations.

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, the policy framework provided by the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028, including the SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025), It is considered that the proposed development would represent a reasonable upgrade of residential accommodation on site, would not on balance have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining properties, including no. 135 Fortfield Road abutting to the north, would be consistent with the relevant provisions of SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025),

including (BFP) 1 (All Extensions & Alterations to Houses) and (Built Form Principle (BFP) 5- Roof Alterations & Extensions), 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 first floor window on the southern gable elevation 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 with Built Form Principle (BFP) 5 (Roof Alterations & Extensions) SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025).

3. The site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

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

4. The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.

5. 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-501182-SD-26
Proposed Development Summary	Domestic extension and roof alterations
Development Address	No. 137, Fortfield Road, Terenure, Dublin 6W.
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	

3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____