



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL501253-DS-26

Development	Planning permission for a new two-storey dwelling on site to side of existing house, together with widening of existing driveway entrance to 3.5 metres, along with miscellaneous alterations to existing house, to include demolition of existing single storey scullery to rear and widening of existing pedestrian entrance to form new vehicular entrance and associated site works
Location	232 Sundrive Road, Crumlin, Dublin 12
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1264/26
Applicant(s)	Brian Sheridan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Catherine Ginnell
Observer(s)	Niamh Holland
Date of Site Inspection	22nd July 2026
Inspector	Andrew Hersey

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1 The application site is located at 232 Sundrive Road, Crumlin, Dublin 12 and comprises a corner site extending to approximately 0.038 ha, situated at the junction of Sundrive Road and Downpatrick Road within an established residential area characterised predominantly by two-storey semi-detached dwellings.
- 1.2 The site is occupied by an existing two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a detached garage, timber shed and a large side garden fronting Downpatrick Road. Vehicular access is currently provided from Downpatrick Road.
- 1.3 The site has dual road frontage and is bounded by residential properties to the east and west, with boundary walls, hedging and mature planting enclosing the site.
- 1.4 The surrounding area comprises established suburban housing with a number of side extensions and more contemporary alterations evident in the vicinity.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The principal elements of the proposal include:
 - Construction of a new two-storey, two-bedroom detached dwelling in the side garden of No. 232 Sundrive Road.
 - Demolition of the existing rear scullery to the existing house.
 - Widening of the existing vehicular entrance and creation of a second vehicular entrance.
 - Subdivision of the site into two residential plots

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

- 3.1 **Decision** – Grant Permission subject to conditions. The following conditions are relevant to the appeal;
 - 3.1.1 Condition 3 refers to materials, finishes and any requirement amendments to the proposal to be agreed prior to the commencement of development. In particular the condition stipulates that (b) the first-floor side window to the ensuite bathroom shall be fitted with obscure glazing and permanently maintained as such and (c) that the

flat roof area over the ground floor shall be accessible for maintenance purposes only and shall not be used as a balcony or external seating area. Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity

3.1.2 Condition 4 requires that each vehicular entrance shall be a maximum of 3 metres in width. No gates shall open outwards across the public footpath.

3.1.3 Condition 5 requires the use of SUDS specifically on the proposed driveways

3.2 Planning Authority Reports

The case planners report identifies, in summary, the following issues;

- That the principle of infill residential development is accepted, having regard to Development Plan policy promoting compact growth.
- That the proposal was assessed against the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028 and relevant national guidance on residential design and amenity.
- That the proposed dwelling found to comply with the relevant standards for internal accommodation, private open space, plot ratio and, substantially, site coverage.
- That residential amenity impacts, including overlooking and overshadowing, assessed and considered acceptable subject to mitigation of the first-floor side en-suite bathroom window by means of obscure glazing.
- That planning history was reviewed and previous refusals distinguished from the current proposal.
- That permission was recommended subject to conditions

3.3 Other Technical Reports

- Drainage (19th February 2026)– no objection subject to conditions
- Transportation Planning (19th February 2026) has no objection subject to the width of each vehicular entrance being no more than 3.0 metres in width and that outward opening gates not be allowed

3.4 Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann (1st March 2026) – no objection subject to conditions

3.5 Third Party Submissions

3.5.1 Two submissions were received by the Planning Authority which raise the following issues:

- That the proposed dwelling is considered to be overly dominant and would result in an overbearing impact on adjoining properties due to its scale, proximity to neighbouring dwellings and the constrained nature of the site.
- Concerns are raised regarding loss of privacy and overlooking arising from first-floor windows, including potential overlooking of neighbouring habitable rooms. It is requested that obscure glazing and restricted opening be provided where appropriate.
- It is contended that the proposal constitutes overdevelopment of the site, with inadequate private open space and insufficient separation distances, contrary to the residential amenity objectives of the Dublin City Development Plan.
- Concerns are also expressed regarding the proposed parking layout and vehicular access arrangements, including vehicle manoeuvring, reversing movements onto the public road and potential road safety impacts.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 Planning Reg. Ref. 1343/05 - Permission refused for demolition of existing shed and portions of garden walls, to construct 1 no. two-bedroom two storey dwelling, a new vehicular access to be created to serve the existing house, the existing vehicular access to serve proposed house fronting Downpatrick Road and associated site works. The reason for refusal was the following.

'The site of the proposed development is zoned Z1 in the County Development Plan 2005- 2011 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. It is considered that the proposed development by reason of its scale, would constitute

overdevelopment of this restricted site resulting in the inadequate provision of private open space which would seriously injure the residential amenities of the proposed and existing house. The proposed development would thereby be contrary to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan, paragraph 15.9.12 in relation to houses in corner/side garden sites and would thereby be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area'

- 4.2 Planning Reg. Ref. 3256/00 - Permission refused for a two-bedroom house to the side, fronting Downpatrick Road, and replacement carparking crossover for existing house. The decision was upheld on appeal to An Coimisiún Pleanála with the reason for refusal relating to overdevelopment of the site due to inadequate provision of private open space.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

- 5.1.1 The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is the statutory development plan in force in the area at present.
- 5.1.2 Within the plan the site is subject to zoning objective Z1 Residential Neighbourhoods which seeks to *protect and/or improve the amenities of residential areas*.
- 5.1.3 Policy SC10 refers to Urban Density and seeks to ensure appropriate densities and the creation of sustainable communities.
- 5.1.4 Policy SC11 refers to Compact Growth and seeks to promote compact growth and sustainable densities through the consolidation and intensification of infill and brownfield lands, particularly on public transport corridors.
- 5.1.5 Section 15.13.3 refers to Infill /Side Garden Housing Developments and seeks that *The development of a dwelling or dwellings in the side garden of an existing house is a means of making the most efficient use of serviced residential lands. Such developments, when undertaken on suitable sites and to a high standard of design, can constitute valuable additions to the residential building stock of an area and will generally be allowed for by the planning authority on suitable large sites.*

The planning authority will favourably consider the development of infill housing on appropriate sites, having regard to development plan policy on infill sites and to facilitate the most sustainable use of land and existing urban infrastructure. In general, infill housing should comply with all relevant development plan standards for residential development including unit sizes, dual aspect requirements, internal amenity standards and open space requirements. In certain limited circumstances, the planning authority may relax the normal planning standards in the interest of ensuring that vacant, derelict and under-utilised land is developed.

The planning authority will have regard to the following criteria in assessing proposals for the development of corner/side garden sites:

- The character of the street.*
- Compatibility of design and scale with adjoining dwellings, paying attention to the established building line, proportion, heights, parapet levels and materials of adjoining buildings.*
- Accommodation standards for occupiers.*
- Development plan standards for existing and proposed dwellings.*
- Impact on the residential amenities of adjoining sites.*
- Open space standards and refuse standards for both existing and proposed dwellings.*
- The provision of a safe means of access to and egress from the site.*
- The provision of landscaping and boundary treatments which are in keeping with other properties in the area.*
- The maintenance of the front and side building lines, where appropriate.*
- Level of visual harmony, including external finishes and colours.*
- Larger corner sites may allow more variation in design, but more compact detached proposals should more closely relate to adjacent dwellings. A modern design response may, however, be deemed more appropriate in certain areas and the Council will support innovation in design.*

- *Side gable walls as side boundaries facing corners in estate roads are not considered acceptable and should be avoided.*
- *Appropriate boundary treatments should be provided both around the site and between the existing and proposed dwellings. Existing boundary treatments should be retained/reinstated where possible.*
- *Use of first floor/apex windows on gables close to boundaries overlooking footpaths, roads and open spaces for visual amenity and passive surveillance.*

5.2 Section 28 Guidance

5.2.1 *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)*, promotes compact growth through the appropriate consolidation and intensification of serviced urban lands while ensuring that a high standard of residential amenity is maintained. In my view, the proposed development is consistent with these objectives, having regard to the quality of the residential accommodation proposed, the provision of private open space and the absence of any unacceptable impacts on adjoining residential amenity.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024) which is located 6.2km metres to the east of the site and
- South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) which is located 6.2km to the east of the site

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1 See completed Form 1 & 2 on file. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1 Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1 A third party appeal against the decision of Dublin City Council to grant planning permission was lodged by Ms. Catherine Ginnell, 1 Downpatrick Road, Crumlin, Dublin 12, on 29 April 2026. The grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- The condition requiring the proposed first-floor en-suite bathroom window to be obscure glazed is inadequate to protect the residential amenity of No. 1 Downpatrick Road, as it does not prevent the window from opening and allowing overlooking.
- The proposed first-floor bathroom window would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the appellant's principal living accommodation due to the close proximity and direct line of sight between the properties.
- The proposed dwelling would have an overbearing impact and would constitute overdevelopment of the constrained corner site, to the detriment of the residential amenities of adjoining properties.
- The appellant requests that the condition relating to the bathroom window be strengthened to require the window to be fixed shut or restricted to high-level opening only or, alternatively, that planning permission be refused.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

7.3.1 A response was received from Dublin City Council on the 6th may 2026 and raises the following issues;

- requests that the commission uphold the decision
- that condition 3(b) be retained
- that a S48 development contribution be imposed
- that a name and numbering condition be imposed

7.4. Observations

7.41 One observation on the appeal was received on the 24th April 2026 from a Niamh Holland of 234A Sundrive Road. The observation raises the following issues;

- Concern that the proposed first-floor windows would directly overlook the bedroom of No. 234A Sundrive Road, resulting in an unacceptable loss of privacy.
- It is submitted that the proposal does not incorporate adequate measures to mitigate overlooking and would adversely affect residential amenity.
- The observer requests that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse planning permission

8.0 Assessment

8.1. I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file and I have inspected the site and have had regard to relevant local development plan policies and guidance.

8.1.2 The Planning Authority accepted the principle of the proposed development, comprising the demolition of the existing single-storey rear extension to No. 232 Sundrive Road, the demolition of a single storey garage to the side and the construction of a new infill dwelling within the side garden. In doing so, it was satisfied that the proposal accords with the strategic objective of the Dublin City Development Plan to promote compact growth through the consolidation and intensification of appropriately located infill and brownfield lands. In this regard, Policy SC11 (Compact Growth) seeks to promote compact growth and sustainable densities through the consolidation and intensification of infill and brownfield lands, particularly those located on public transport corridors. The Planning Authority also raised no concerns in relation to the proposed works to the existing dwelling

8.1.3 Equally, the appellant does not dispute the principle of the proposed infill dwelling or the associated works to the existing house. Rather, the appeal is principally concerned with the impact of the proposed first-floor en-suite bathroom window on the residential amenities of the adjoining property, particularly in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy. A secondary concern relates to the contention that the proposed dwelling would give rise to an overbearing impact and represent an overdevelopment of the site. The appellant also contends that the condition requiring the first-floor en-suite bathroom window to be fitted with obscured glazing is

insufficient to safeguard residential amenity. Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028, I am satisfied that the principle of the proposed infill dwelling on this serviced urban site is acceptable. I further note that the principle of the development is not disputed by the appellant. Accordingly, my assessment is confined to the detailed issues relating to residential amenity raised in the appeal.

8.1.4 I am satisfied that the substantive issues arising from the grounds of this third-party appeal relate to:

- Privacy/overlooking
- Overbearing impact/overdevelopment

8.2 Privacy/overlooking

8.2.1 Section 15.13.3 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028 addresses infill and side garden housing developments. The Plan recognises that the development of dwellings within the side garden of existing houses represents an efficient use of serviced residential land and states that such developments will generally be supported on suitable sites where they are of a high standard of design. In assessing such proposals, the Planning Authority is required to have regard, inter alia, to the character of the street, the compatibility of the proposal with adjoining development, development plan standards for both the existing and proposed dwellings, and, of particular relevance to this appeal, the impact of the development on the residential amenities of adjoining properties, including privacy, overlooking, boundary treatment and the relationship between existing and proposed buildings.

8.2.2 In the present case, neither the Planning Authority nor the appellant disputes the suitability of the site for infill residential development. Accordingly, the principle of the proposed development is not at issue. Rather, the question for the Commission is whether the detailed design of the proposed dwelling, and in particular the first-floor en-suite bathroom window, would result in an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers having regard to the above policy provisions

- 8.2.3 I note that the Planning Officer expressly considered the appellant's concerns regarding overlooking from the proposed first-floor side en-suite bathroom window. The Planning Officer acknowledged that, in the absence of mitigation, there was potential for overlooking of the adjoining property. However, it was concluded that this issue could be satisfactorily addressed by requiring the window to be fitted with obscure glazing as a condition of any grant of permission. This recommendation was subsequently incorporated into Condition 3(b) of the final decision, which requires that the first-floor side window serving the en-suite bathroom be fitted with obscure glazing and permanently maintained as such in the interests of visual and residential amenity.
- 8.2.4 I further note that, in its response to the appeal, the Planning Authority recommends that the Commission uphold its decision to grant permission, including the retention of Condition 3(b). Accordingly, the issue for the Commission is not whether the potential for overlooking has been identified, but whether the condition imposed adequately mitigates that potential having regard to the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the adjoining property.
- 8.2.5 I note that the proposed dwelling is set back approximately 2 metres from the common boundary with No. 1 Downpatrick Road, the appellants property. The first-floor side window serving the en-suite bathroom is therefore positioned in relatively close proximity to the adjoining property. I further note that the appellant's concern relates to the potential for overlooking of the kitchen/living area within the single-storey extension to No. 1 Downpatrick Road arising from this window.
- 8.2.6 I have carefully considered the relationship between the proposed window and the adjoining property. Having regard to the fact that the window serves a non-habitable en-suite bathroom, the approximate 2-metre setback from the common boundary, and the potential for overlooking identified by the Planning Authority, I consider that the requirement for permanently obscured glazing is capable of satisfactorily mitigating the potential for any loss of privacy. Notwithstanding this, given the close proximity of the window to the common boundary, I consider that the protection afforded by Condition 3(b) would be enhanced by requiring that the window also be fitted with a restrictor limiting any opening to a maximum of 100mm. Such a

modification would continue to provide natural ventilation to the en-suite while further safeguarding the residential amenities of the adjoining property.

8.2.9 Subject to this modification, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not give rise to an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining property in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy.

8.2.10 I note that an observer, Ms. Niamh Holland of No. 234A Sundrive Road, also raises concerns regarding overlooking arising from the proposed development. However, I note that No. 234A is located on the opposite side of Sundrive Road, with a separation distance of in excess of 20 metres between the proposed dwelling and the observer's property. Having regard to this separation distance, the intervening public road, and the established pattern of development along Sundrive Road, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not give rise to an unacceptable level of overlooking or loss of privacy to the occupiers of No. 234A. In my view, the observer's concerns in this regard do not warrant a refusal of permission or the imposition of any additional mitigation measures.

8.3 Overbearing impact

8.3.1 Section 15.13.3 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028 recognises that side garden housing can make an efficient use of serviced residential land and generally supports such development on suitable sites where it is of a high standard of design. In assessing such proposals, regard is to be had, inter alia, to the character of the street, compatibility of design and scale with adjoining dwellings, the impact on the residential amenities of adjoining properties, development plan standards for both existing and proposed dwellings and the maintenance of appropriate levels of open space.

8.3.2 The appellant contends that the proposed dwelling would appear overbearing and would constitute an overdevelopment of the site

8.3.3 I have examined the proposed development in the context of the surrounding pattern of development and the relationship with adjoining properties. The proposed dwelling is a two-storey detached dwelling positioned within the side garden of No. 232 Sundrive Road. While the dwelling is located approximately 2 metres from the common boundary with No. 1 Downpatrick Road, I note that the adjoining property

contains a substantial contemporary single-storey extension along this boundary. The proposed dwelling therefore relates principally to a single-storey built form rather than to the main two-storey element of the adjoining dwelling.

8.3.4 Although overshadowing does not form a specific ground of appeal, it is a related aspect of residential amenity which I have nevertheless considered. I note that the proposed dwelling would be located to the east of the appellant's property and would therefore principally give rise to morning shadow. As the sun tracks southwards and westwards during the day, the extent of any overshadowing of the appellant's single-storey extension and private open space would diminish. Having regard to the orientation of the site, together with the limited scale of the adjoining extension and the urban context in which the development is proposed, I am satisfied that any additional overshadowing would not be so significant as to materially diminish the residential amenities of the adjoining property.

8.3.5 While the proposed dwelling will introduce a two-storey built form adjacent to the appellant's property, it would be viewed within the context of an established suburban area characterised predominantly by two-storey dwellings. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling principally addresses the appellant's contemporary single-storey extension rather than the original two-storey dwelling. Although the outlook from this extension will inevitably change, I do not consider that the scale, height or proximity of the proposed dwelling is such as to create an oppressive sense of enclosure or visual dominance. In my view, the proposal maintains an acceptable relationship with the adjoining property having regard to the established pattern of development in the locality.

8.3.6 Accordingly, I am satisfied that, while the proposed development will inevitably alter the outlook from the adjoining property and result in a limited degree of overshadowing, these effects would not amount to an unacceptable overbearing impact or otherwise materially diminish the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers.

8.4 Overdevelopment

8.4.1 I have considered the appellant's contention that the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site. In this regard it is noted that the Planning Authority assessed the proposal against the relevant provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028, including the standards relating to internal accommodation, private open space, site coverage and plot ratio. In undertaking that assessment, regard was had to the minimum floor area standards contained in the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government publication Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (2007), as reiterated in the Design Manual for Quality Housing (2022), together with the private open space standards contained in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024). The Planning Authority concluded that the proposed dwelling complies with the relevant minimum internal floor area standards, while both the existing and proposed dwellings would retain private open space in excess of the minimum requirements for two-bedroom dwellings. I further note that the resulting site coverage and plot ratio were found to accord with, or substantially accord with, the indicative standards contained in the Development Plan. Having regard to these matters, I am satisfied that the proposal would provide a satisfactory standard of residential accommodation and does not constitute an overdevelopment of the site

8.4.2 I note that the Planning Authority assessed the proposal against the indicative plot ratio and site coverage standards contained in Appendix 3 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028. The proposed site for the new dwelling has an area of approximately 193 sq.m and the dwelling has a gross floor area of approximately 117.5 sq.m, resulting in a site coverage of approximately 60.9%. The Planning Authority also calculated that the retained site containing the existing dwelling would have a site area of approximately 186 sq.m and a site coverage of approximately 48.4%. While the proposed site coverage for the new dwelling marginally exceeds the indicative 60% site coverage standard by approximately 0.9%, I note that the corresponding plot ratio of approximately 1.64 falls comfortably within the indicative range of 1.5 to 2.5 for outer residential areas. Furthermore, both the proposed and existing dwellings provide private open space significantly in excess of the minimum requirements for two-bedroom dwellings, while the proposed dwelling also complies with the relevant standards relating to internal floor area, storage and residential

amenity. In these circumstances, I do not consider that the marginal exceedance in site coverage, when viewed in the context of the overall proposal, is sufficient to conclude that the development would constitute an overdevelopment of the site.

8.4.3 I have also had regard to the planning history of the site. I note that previous proposals for residential development on the site, under Register References 3256/00 and 1343/05, were refused permission on the grounds that they constituted an overdevelopment of the site, principally due to the inadequate provision of private open space. The decision under Register Reference 3256/00 was subsequently upheld on appeal. However, I am satisfied that the current proposal differs materially from the previously refused schemes. The proposed development provides a satisfactory standard of residential accommodation, including private open space in excess of the minimum standards applicable to both the existing and proposed dwellings, and has been assessed by the Planning Authority as complying with the relevant Development Plan standards relating to density, plot ratio and site coverage. Accordingly, I do not consider that the previous planning history provides a basis for concluding that the current proposal constitutes an overdevelopment of the site

8.4.4 Having regard to the foregoing, I consider that the proposal represents an appropriate form of residential intensification on a serviced urban site. Although the proposed site coverage for the new dwelling marginally exceeds the indicative standard contained in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028, I do not consider that this, either individually or cumulatively with the other characteristics of the proposal, is sufficient to conclude that the site would be overdeveloped. Rather, I am satisfied that the proposal achieves an appropriate balance between the efficient use of serviced residential land and the provision of a high standard of residential accommodation and amenity. The proposal is therefore consistent with the compact growth objectives of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028 and the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), while continuing to protect the residential amenities of both the existing and proposed dwellings.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2 The subject site is located
- 6.2km to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024)
 - 6.2km to the west of the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210)
- 9.3 The proposed development comprises of in part demolition and in part the construction of a separate dwelling in the side garden of an existing house. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.4 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, and its location in a suburban area, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site
- 9.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The relatively small scale nature of the works proposed
 - The lack thereof of any hydrological connection from the proposed development to the Natura 2000 site.
 - Having regard to the screening report/determination carried out by the Planning Authority
- 9.6 I conclude that 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.
- 9.7 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 proposed development is located 6.2km to the west of Dublin Bay.

- 10.2 The proposed development consists of, in part demolition, and in part the construction of a separate dwelling in the side garden of an existing house.
- 10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.4 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.
- 10.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The minor scope of the works and nature of the development
 - The distance to the nearest water body, Dublin Bay and the lack of hydrological connections to the same.
- 10.6 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1 I recommend that permission for the development be granted

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 12.1 Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, and subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, I am satisfied that the proposal complies with the relevant provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028 and relevant national planning guidance. The proposal represents an

appropriate form of residential intensification on a serviced urban site, is consistent with the objectives of promoting compact growth and the efficient use of serviced land, would not give rise to any unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers and would accord 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.	(i) The external materials and finishes of the development shall be as specified in the plans and particulars lodged with the application and shall not be altered without the prior written agreement of the Planning Authority (ii) The proposed development shall be amended as follows: The first-floor side window serving the en-suite bathroom shall be fitted with permanently obscured glazing and shall be restricted so that any opening is limited to a maximum of 100mm. The window shall thereafter be permanently retained in that form. 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 [visual] [and residential] amenity.
3.	The car parking areas shall be constructed using permeable materials to allow for rainwater to soak into the ground within the property and the remainder of the garden shall be retained as a grassed area or soft landscaping.

	Reason: In the interests of amenity, ecology and sustainable development.
4	(a) Each vehicular entrance shall be a maximum of 3 metres in width. No gates shall open outwards across the public footpath. (b) Any works to the existing public lighting column/utility pole located adjacent to the site shall be agreed in advance with Public Lighting and Electrical Services at Dublin City Council. All works shall be at the applicant/developer's expense. (c) Footpath and kerb to be dished and new entrance shall be provided to the requirements of the Area Engineer, Roads Maintenance Division. (d) All costs incurred by Dublin City Council, including any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development, shall be at the expense of the developer. Reason: In the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety.
5	The developer shall enter into water and wastewater connection agreements with Irish Water. Reason: In the interest of public health
6	Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 07.00 to 18.00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08.00 to 14.00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority. Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity
7	The site development works and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the adjoining street(s) are kept clear of debris, soil and other material and, if the need arises for cleaning works to be carried

	out on the adjoining public roads, the said cleaning works shall be carried out at the developer's expense. Reason: To ensure that the adjoining roadways are kept in a clean and safe condition during construction works in the interests of orderly development.
8.	Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works. Reason: In the interest of public health.
9	In relation to individual houses the naming and numbering of dwelling units shall be in accordance with a naming and numbering scheme submitted to, and agreed in writing, by the Planning Authority, prior to the occupation of the dwelling(s). Reason: In the interest of orderly street numbering
10	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.

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.

Andrew Hersey

Planning Inspector

27th July 2026

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL501253-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	Infill House
Development Address	232 Sundrive Road, Crumlin, Dublin 12
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 Q2.
	☐ 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 <u>Part 1</u>, 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.	Class 10 (b) (i) Part 2 Housing Projects
☐ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	

☐ 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	
☒ 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)	Class 10 (b) (i) Part 2 Housing Projects – 500 houses

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference Number	PL501253-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	Infill House
Development Address	232 Sundrive Road, Crumlin, Dublin 12
The Board carried out a preliminary examination [ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended] of at least the nature, size or location of the proposed development, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations. This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development	<i>The proposed development comprises of permission for an infill dwelling and associated site works,</i>
Location of Proposed Development	<i>The development is situated in an suburban area in Dublin 12 where services are present. There are no sensitive environmental receptors on site or in the vicinity of the same.</i>
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	<i>Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitat, the likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.</i>
Conclusion	

Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA	Yes or No
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.	Yes
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.	No
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.	No

Inspector: Andrew Hersey

Date:

DP/ADP: _____

Date:

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)