



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501383-DF-26

Development	First floor extension to side on an existing single storey, and associated works.
Location	17, Warren Close, Castleknock, Dublin, D15T95T.
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	FW26A/0107E.
Applicant(s)	Niamh and John McMenamin.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission.
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Niamh and John McManamin.
Observer(s)	No valid observation.
Date of Site Inspection	27 th June 2026.
Inspector	Des Johnson

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in Diswellstown, Dublin 15, a short distance north of Castleknock Community College and to the west side of Carpenterstown Road.
- 1.2. No.17, Warren Close is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located at the south-eastern end of a cul-de-sac (Warren Close). It faces north-west on to the cul-de-sac. It has a large single-storey extension to the north-eastern side and rear and a single-storey porch to the front.
- 1.3. I was unable to gain access to the rear of the site at the time of inspection (lunchtime).

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal is for or a first-floor extension to the side over an existing single storey structure to create 2 no. additional bedrooms, and associated works.
- 2.2. The gross floor area of existing development is stated to be 186sqm, gross floor area proposed is 25.80sqm and the site area is 0.111ha. It is proposed to connect to public services.
- 2.3. The proposed extension is 2.9m wide at the front, 4.8m wide to the rear, and is c.8.4m deep.
- 2.4. Proposed external finishes of brickwork and render would match the existing dwelling.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority refused permission for a single reason. The reason states, in summary, that the proposal by reason of its incongruous design, including cantilevered front element, represents a visually discordant feature that fails to integrate with the existing dwelling or established streetscape. It would be overbearing resulting in negative impact on the visual and residential amenities of the area. It would be contrary to the zoning objective, be contrary to Section 14.10.2.4 and would contravene Policy SPQHP41 and Objective SPQHO45 of the Development Plan and would set an inappropriate precedent.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

This is summarised as follows:

- The site is zoned 'RS' with the objective *to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity*. The proposed development is generally acceptable under the zoning subject to compatibility with the overall policies and objectives of the Development Plan. Section 14.10.2 is applicable. There is sufficient precedent in the area for first-floor side extensions over single-storey structures. There is concern that the proposed design creates a 'tunnelling' effect and is visually incongruous with the existing dwelling and would result in loss of residential amenity. There appear to be inconsistencies between existing development as shown on submitted drawings and development permitted under Reg Ref: FW188/0016. There is one Third-Party objection relating to overlooking, overshadowing and overbearance of private amenity space, and absence of consultations. The proposal fails to respect the character of the site and would result in a significant negative impact on both the visual and residential amenities of the area.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Water Services Department – no objection. Condition recommended.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

None relating to this appeal. One objection submitted at planning application stage.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. Reg Ref: FW188/0016 – permission for single-storey extension to rear and side of subject site.

- 4.2. Reg Ref: 09B/0105 – permission for first-floor extension of 5sqm and associated roof modifications at 6, Warren Close.
- 4.3. Reg Ref: F01B/0390 - permission for double-storey extension to side, single-storey extension to side and rear and extension to canopy at front at 13, Warren Close. It was a condition that a set-back of 400mm be provided from the front façade, and the ridgeline be reduced by 200mm. The reason for the condition was in the interest of visual amenity and the proper planning and development of the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029 is the statutory plan for the area.

The site is zoned 'RS' with the objective *to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity*.

Section 14.10.2.2 refers to Side Extensions. Side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on residential amenity. First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. In certain cases, a set-back of the extension's front facade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall generally match the existing.

Section 14.10.2.4 refers to First Floor Extensions. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:

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

Policy SPQHP41 – refers to Residential Extensions. It is policy to support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

Objective SPQHO45 – refers to Domestic Extensions. It is an objective to encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

Rye Water Valley/Cartron SAC & pNHA – c.7.5km to the west

South Dublin Bay & River Tolka Estuary SPA & pNHA – c.11.4km to east southeast

South Dublin Bay SAC & pNHA – c. 12.8km to the southeast

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The proposal is for a domestic extension and is not of a Class for the purposes of Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. As such, the development is excluded at pre-screening stage.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

These may be summarised as follows:

- This is a family of six and there is an acute housing need. Purchasing a larger home is not financially viable. The development would provide additional bedrooms of standard size. The family have deep roots in this community. The proposed works forms part of a general energy upgrade.
- It is proposed to build over an existing single-storey extension that was permitted in 2018 under Ref: FW18B/0016. This would minimise disturbance to the neighbours. This approach complies with Section 14.10.2.2 of the Development Plan. It avoids disruption in relocating services. There would be no terracing effect as No.17 is an end-of-terrace/semi-detached property, and the streetscape impact is minimal. This is a side extension
- There is no need for a ground floor extension as the existing layout meets needs.
- The cantilevered design element minimises ground floor disturbance and avoids utility relocation. It is the lowest embodied carbon solution and would present a

cohesive façade. The public notices correctly describe the proposal. The structural engineering for the cantilevered section would be fully described at building control stage

- External finishes would match the existing dwelling, and the design would create visual harmony. There would be no negative impact on the streetscape. Numerous first-floor extensions have been granted in the area.
- The design minimises overbearance and any overshadowing: there would be setbacks of 2.1m at the mid-point on the proposed extension and 2m to the rear.
- The side elevation window facing 15 Warren Close would have opaque glazing to prevent overlooking. There are no opposing windows with other property with separation of less than 16m. The loss of light to neighbouring properties would be minimal given current orientation and ridgelines
- There is no statutory requirement to consult with neighbours. Meetings were held with the neighbours immediately adjacent, and all were supportive and welcomed early engagement. The appellant's contention in that there was no consultation with his tenants is factually incorrect
- There would be no reduction in the rear garden area
- The proposal is in line with Policy SPQHP41 which supports extensions of appropriate scale, and Objective SPQHO45 relating to domestic extensions
- There are precedents (listed) of similar type development within a 350m radius of the proposed development. A grant of permission for 13, Warren Close (F01B/0390) conditioned a setback of 400mm from the front façade and a 200mm reduction in height, and the appellant would be willing to accept similar conditions if deemed necessary to address concerns raised.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- The planning authority considers that the proposed development would not sufficiently respect the existing dwelling on site, residential amenity and is visually incongruous. The proposed development contravenes Policy SPQHP41 and Objective

SPQHO45 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. In the event of permission being granted provision should be made for a financial contribution condition.

8.0 **Assessment**

- 8.1. The proposal is for a first-floor domestic extension to the side over an existing single-storey extension to an existing two-storey semi-detached dwelling to create 2 additional bedrooms. The proposed extension is irregular in shape measuring 2.9m wide at the front and 4.8m wide to the rear, is c.8.4m deep and has a gross floor area of 25.8sqm. The front portion of the extension would be cantilevered. Proposed finishes would match the main dwelling.
- 8.2. The Planning Authority refused permission for reason of incongruous design, including the front cantilevered element, which would represent a visually discordant feature failing to integrate with the main dwelling or established streetscape. It would have a negative impact on the visual and residential amenities of the area, would contravene provisions of the Development Plan and would set an undesirable precedent.
- 8.3. The grounds of appeal outline the need for the proposed development, contend that the design avoids disruption in relocating services, minimises disturbance of neighbours, has no terracing effect and minimal streetscape impact, the cantilevered element would provide a cohesive façade with no negative impact on the streetscape and would minimise overshadowing and no overlooking.
- 8.4. I submit that the proposed development should be considered under the following headings:
- Policy
 - Visual impact
 - Residential amenities
 - Appropriate Assessment

Policy

- 8.5. The site is in an established residential development zoned 'RS' with the objective *to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity*. The

proposed development is permissible within this zoning subject to compatibility with other Policies and Objectives of the Development Plan.

Visual Impact

- 8.6. Warren Close has a north-south alignment with the cul-de-sac at its southern end. It has 11 pairs of semi-detached dwellings of which four pairs face east, four pairs face west and the remaining three pairs face northeast, north and northwest respectively.
- 8.7. The subject dwelling faces northwest on to the head of the cul-de-sac. It is sited at an angle to No.15 sited to the north. The relationship of the siting of the two dwellings relative to each other is most apparent when viewed from close to the cul-de-sac head. The proposed development would extend the dwelling frontage (at first-floor level) and existing pitched roof profile by 2.9m over the front element of the proposed extension. I consider that this would give rise to a terracing effect when viewed from close to the head of the cul-de-sac, having a negative visual impact.
- 8.8. The 1st Party contends that the proposal complies with Section 14.10.2.2 of the Development Plan. This Section refers to side extensions and states that they will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on residential amenity. The Planning Authority contends that that the proposal by reason of its incongruous design, including cantilevered front element, represents a visually discordant feature that fails to integrate with the existing dwelling or established streetscape. On balance, I consider that the proposal, with the cantilevered element and extension of the existing roof profile, would break the visual harmony of the existing housing blocks and would detract from the streetscape, and set an undesirable precedent for similar type development. As such, the proposal would contravene Policy SPQHP41 and Objective SPQHO45 of the Development Plan.
- 8.9. The grounds of appeal refer to a permission granted by the Planning Authority for a similar type of development at No.13, Warren Close, and to a condition requiring a setback of 400mm from the front façade and a 200mm reduction in height. The 1st Party states acceptance of similar condition if deemed necessary to address concerns raised. I consider that such a condition would partly address the concern that the proposal would have a terracing effect as the proposed extension would be visually subordinate

from the main dwelling. However, concerns relating to the cantilevered element and its impact on visual harmony would remain.

Residential amenities

- 8.10. The proposed extension shows a small side window in the side elevation facing No.15, Warren Close. This window lights a small landing area. Subject to a requirement that this window be fitted with opaque glazing, I contend that the proposed development would not give rise to any significant overlooking of neighbouring property. The submitted documents include a 'solar study' showing in 3D the degree of overshadowing at sunset on the summer solstice. Having regard to its design, scale and to its orientation of relative to surrounding property, I contend that the proposed development would not give rise to significant overshadowing of property in the vicinity.
- 8.11. The proposal does not have any impact on the existing rear private open space.
- 8.12. Other than the impact resulting from visual disharmony, I conclude that the proposed development would not be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of the area.

9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed domestic extension in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located in an established residential estate in Castleknock and c.7.5km east of Rye Valley/Cartron SAC.

The proposed development comprises first floor extension to side on an existing single-storey and associated works. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and small scale of the development
- The location in an established residential estate, the separation distance and absence of any connectivity to any European sites

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.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The subject site is located in an established residential area. The proposed development relates to the construction of a domestic extension with associated works. No water deterioration concerns are raised in the appeal. I have assessed the development in the context of the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment as there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that planning permission be refused.

12.0 Reason

1. It is considered that the proposed development, including a cantilevered front element, would be visually discordant feature which would fail to integrate with the existing dwelling or the streetscape. As such, the development would be seriously injurious to the visual and residential amenities of the area, contrary to Policy SPQHP41 and Objective SPQHO45 of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, would set an undesirable precedent and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

Des Johnson
Planning Inspector

16th July 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501383-DF-26
Proposed Development Summary	First-floor extension to side on an existing single-storey, and associated works.
Development Address	17, Warren Close, Castleknock, Dublin, D15T95T.
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.
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	
☒ 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.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	
No ☒	

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

This page is deliberately left blank.