



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501444-DR-26

Development	Single storey front extension with associated works.
Location	86, O'Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, Dublin, A96W2D8
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D26B/0166
Applicant(s)	Danielle Dolliou
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Katarzyna Jones
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	11 th August 2026
Inspector	Barry Diamond

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision.....	3
4.0	Planning History	4
5.0	Policy Context.....	5
6.0	EIA Screening.....	6
7.0	The Appeal	7
8.0	Assessment.....	8
9.0	AA Screening.....	11
10.0	Water Framework Directive	12
11.0	Recommendation	12
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	13
13.0	Conditions	13

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is circa 0.297ha and comprises a two and a half storey semi detached dwelling finished in smooth render. The roof has two dormer windows projecting from the roofscape and has a contoured tile finish. The dwelling has a front garden area which separates it from the O'Rourke Park estate road. There is also a single vehicular access running along one side of the property which accesses onto O'Rourke Park.
- 1.2. The adjoining semi-detached property (No. 88) is a two storey dwelling finished in a roughcast render. The site is located within a residential area which comprises mainly of two storey dwellings, including town houses and semi-detached properties.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises a proposed front single storey extension with associated site development works to a dwelling house.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 7th May 2026 the Planning Authority issued a decision to grant planning permission subject to standard conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The decision of the planner reflects the decision to grant planning permission. It includes the following points:

- Given the precedent for other front extensions in the area and the dimensions proposed the proposal is considered acceptable;
- The front elevation of the extension will replicate the existing tripe window configuration of the dwelling;
- There are no window opes proposed on either gable of the extension ensuring no overlooking will occur;

- Having regard to the southeastern orientation of the proposed extension, no overshadowing should occur at the neighbouring property;
- No external finishes to the extension has been provided;
- The proposal does not lead to any significant concerns in relation to Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1 The third party appellant (No. 88 O'Rourke Park) owns a dwelling adjoining the appeal site and they raised an observation during the processing of the planning application which is attached to the file. I consider that the issues raised in their submissions to the Coimisiún correlate with the issues raised to the Planning Authority.

4.0 Planning History

Site

D01B/0510 – Permission was granted in September 2001 for the alterations to existing attic conversion and extension to porch at 86 O'Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, Co. Dublin.

Setting

D14A/0344 - Permission was granted in 2014 for the construction of a single storey extension to the front (South East) elevation and the widening of the main entrance gateway to 3.5m at 70 O'Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, Dún Laoghaire, Co Dublin.

D12B/0024 - Permission was granted in April 2012 for a single storey extension to the front, plus modifications to existing first floor windows (also to the front) at 89, O'Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin.

D07B/0197 - Permission was granted in June 2007 for development consisting of: a) proposed construction of single storey extension at ground floor level to front of existing terraced dwelling house with windows and door facing front boundary, b) proposed construction of extension to rear of existing terraced dwelling house at first floor level over existing single storey extension with windows facing rear boundary and all ancillary site works at 93, O'Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, Co Dublin.

D07B/0988 – Permission was granted in March 2008 for development and retention (a) Retention of existing storage shed to rear garden (b) Retention of window at attic level to dwelling (c) Minor alteration to windows at first floor level to rear (d) Minor alteration to front porch door and roof at ground floor level all of the above in their present form. (e) proposed construction of bay window to front within porch and all ancillary site works at 93, O'Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, Co. Dublin.

D07B/0005 - Retention permission was granted in November 2007 for alterations to approved plans for extension D05B/0781; principally minor increases in floor areas and a change to rear ground floor window at 91, O'Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, Co. Dublin

D06B/0988 - Permission was granted in February 2007 for an extension to a porch at 91, O'Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, Co. Dublin.

D05B/0781 - Permission was granted in February 2006 for a single storey extension to the front and a 2 storey extension to the rear of 91, O'Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, Co. Dublin.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The relevant Development Plan is the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. The site is zoned 'A' with the objective to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities. Residential development, including alterations to existing dwellings, is permitted in principle under this zoning.

Chapter 3 Climate Action

Section 3.4 Achieving Sustainable Planning Outcomes

Section 3.4.1.3 Policy Objective CA7: Construction Materials.

Chapter 4 Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place

Section 4.3.1.2 Policy Objective PHP19 – Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation

Section 4.3.1.3 Policy Objective PHP20 – Protection of Existing Residential Amenity

Chapter 12 (Development Management)

Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings

- (i) Front extensions, at both ground and first level will be considered acceptable in principle subject to scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. A break in the front building line will be acceptable, over two floors to the front elevation, subject to scale and design however a significant break in the building line should be resisted unless the design can demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the proposal will not impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings. Excessive scale should be avoided and external finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.

Section 12.4.8.1 – General Specifications

Section 12.4.8.3 – Driveways/Hardstanding Areas.

Section 12.8.7 – Private Amenity Standards – Quality Standards.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located on or within proximity to any designated Natura 2000 site. The subject site is situated c. 3.71km to the west of the Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code SAC 003000) c. 3.22 km to the west of the Dalkey Islands SPA (site code SPA 004172). It is also c. 2.08 km to the south of the South Dublin Bay SAC (site code SAC 000210) and the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (site code SPA 004024). The site is also situated c. 2.08 km to the south of the South Dublin Bay pNHA (site code pNHA 000210) and is situated c. 1.8km to the west of the Dalkey Coastal Zone and Killiney Hill pNHA (site code pNHA 001206).

6.0 EIA Screening

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

requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of my report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appellants (No. 88 O'Rourke Park) grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The precedents referenced in the Planners Report are all more restrained than the current proposal (Nos. 89, 91, & 93 O'Rourke Park) and they have no overshadowing/overbearing issues;
- No. 70 O'Rourke Park protrudes further than the current proposal but 50% of the extension is open plan, just a roof supported by a pillar;
- It seems there is a genuine limit on how far it is considered appropriate to extend outward;
- A picture of scaffolding which projects only one metre to the front of the appeal site indicates how a shadow will be cast by the proposed extension which will protrude 2.5 metres;
- At the very least the extension should be brought in line with the other single storey extension with a two metre protrusion being the absolute limit;
- The applicants property is expanding front, back and top, dwarfing a smaller address, leading to a loss of light/view;
- Details of neighbour disputes relating to overgrown ivy, guttering, smoke and building works;
- Two previous proposals on the appeal site were found to be invalid; and
- One of the residents of the third party property has a medical condition and works from home.

7.2 Applicant Response

The applicant for planning permission response can be summarised as follows:

- The existence of similar nearby extensions supports the principle of a single storey extension;

- The proposal is modest and domestic in scale;
- No evidence has been provided showing unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight;
- SunCalc shows that throughout all four seasons, no overshadowing is present after 10AM;
- Any change in outlook for the neighbouring property does not automatically mean an unacceptable planning impact;
- Any future applications would have to be assessed on their merits;
- The Council has considered that the proposal is acceptable;
- The appeal should focus on the current proposal and not the previous invalid submissions;
- A lack of private consultation does not make a development unacceptable; and
- The appeal should be decided on its planning merits and not the personal history between the parties.

7.3 Planning Authority Response

The grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the Planning Authority, would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

8.0 Assessment

8.1 Having 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, having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design & Layout
- Residential Amenity
- Other Matters

8.2 Principle of Development

- 8.2.1 The site is located on lands which are subject to 'Existing Residential (A)' under the Development Plan, the objective of which is "to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities." I also note that the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 is supportive of residential extensions. In this regard Section 12.3.7.1 'Extensions to Dwellings' supports applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend existing dwellings subject to specific safeguards. I consider that the principle of a residential extension is acceptable subject to issues of design, neighbour amenity and other relevant factors.

8.3 Design

- 8.3.1 The application site contains an existing two and a half storey semi-detached dwelling and the proposal is to create a single storey monopitch front annex which extends across the entire frontage of the dwelling (6.5 metres in width) and projects 2.5 metres from the existing building line of the dwelling. The annex will increase the size of the existing living room by an additional 14sqm.
- 8.3.2 The front elevation of the proposed extension has three windows on the front elevation which harmonise with the existing ground floor window arrangement and are symmetrically aligned to the existing windows on the first floor of the property. No other windows openings are proposed on either gable elevation of the proposed annex.
- 8.3.3 It is noted that a number of other similar extensions have been approved at Nos. 70, 89, 91 & 93 O'Rourke Park which are in close proximity to the site. I do agree with the third party that the proposed extension protrudes further than the established examples closeby, however, I consider that in the context of the surrounding developments that the proposed design is acceptable. In my view the projection is not excessive and would not dominate the front elevation of the dwelling. In addition, a driveway of at least 6 metres would remain and no changes are proposed to the existing vehicular access. I am of the opinion that the proposed design and layout complies with Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan.
- 8.3.4 It is noted that no material finishes to the external of the building are indicated on the proposed plans. This matter can be controlled by way of a condition requiring the external materials to harmonise with the existing dwelling.

8.4 Residential Amenity

- 8.4.1 The proposed front annex has three windows on the front elevation which face onto the O'Rourke Park estate road with no windows on either of the gable elevations. I consider that there are no concerns with overlooking with the proposal.
- 8.4.2 The main concern with the development which was raised by the third party appellant was that the development would lead to overshadowing of the front elevation of their property (No. 88). The observation they submitted to the Planning Authority made reference to a 60 degree angle test which it was stated was referenced in the Dublin City Plan. Their submission also included a photograph of scaffolding on the application site which caused some overshadowing of the neighbouring property.
- 8.4.3 The Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 does not make reference to a 60 degree angle test, rather it references the impacts on residential amenity of overshadowing and loss of light. No daylight or sunlight analysis was submitted by either party in either the application or the submissions to the Coimisiún. The applicant submitted a SunCalc link which it is stated demonstrates that there is no shadow cast on the third party's property after 10am across all four seasons.
- 8.4.4 The submitted ground floor plan for the applicants dwelling indicates that the existing three ground floor windows all serve a front living room, however, I am not aware of whether the third party's dwelling has a similar layout. In any case the appeal dwelling has a southeasterly orientation which limits the overshadowing impacts to the third party's window to the early morning period. I accept that some overshadowing will occur to the closest window on the neighbouring property, however, I consider that given the single storey nature of the proposal with a sloping monopitch roof which slopes downward from the front building line to an eaves height of 3.15 metres that the impacts would not be significant or long lasting.
- 8.4.5 The third party also raised a concern that the proposed development would have an overbearing impact. I am of the opinion that there would be a limited overbearing impact given the single storey nature of the extension and the mono pitch roof.
- 8.4.6 It was indicated that a resident of the third party's dwelling has a medical condition, however, no details have been provided as to why their condition would be more adversely affected by the proposed development. I have already determined that the

proposal will not have a significant adverse effect by way of overshadowing or overbearing and consider the proposal to be acceptable.

8.5 Other Matters

- 8.5.1 There was reference made to a number of neighbour disputes which I do not consider are material planning considerations and I have given no weight to these matters in this decision. The issue of a previous invalid submission was also raised by the third party, however, these previous submissions are not relevant to the merits of the current application.
- 8.5.2 The Planning Authority did not apply conditions requiring the developer to prevent spillages onto the public highway and to make good any damage, nor was there conditions restricting when building works could take place. I consider that conditions to this effect should be applied in the public interest and in the interests of good neighbourliness.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1 I have considered the development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at 86, O'Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, Dublin, A96W2D8 no relevant designated sites are close by.
- 9.2 The proposed development comprises the single storey front extension with 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.
- 9.3 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Small scale and nature of the development;
 - Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections; and
 - The screening opinion of the Planning Authority.
- 9.4 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 at 86, O'Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, Dublin, A96W2D8 which is 0.5km metres west of the nearest water body.

10.2 The proposed development comprises the single storey front extension with associated works. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.3 I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development; and
- Distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

10.4 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

That planning permission be granted for the reasons and considerations set out below and subject to the conditions set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the design, appearance of the proposed extension and the surrounding pattern of development, it is considered that subject to compliance with conditions below, the development proposed would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or residential amenities of any property in the vicinity and would not adversely impact on the character of the area. The proposed development, therefore, would be in accordance 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 and received by the Planning Authority on the 23rd day of March 2026, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the Planning Authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2	The existing dwelling and extension shall be used as a single dwelling unit apart from such use as may be exempted development for the purposes of the Planning and Development Regulations Reason: In the interests of clarity and to ensure the proper and sustainable development of the area.
3	The external finishes of the extension shall harmonise with the render finish and the contoured concrete roof tile of the existing dwelling. Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.
4	a) All necessary measures shall be taken by the applicant to prevent any spillage or deposition of clay, dust, rubble or other debris, whether arising from vehicle wheels or otherwise, on the adjoining and/or adjacent public road and footpath network during the course of the construction works.

	b) Any damage to roads, footpaths or other public property caused by the development shall be made good to the satisfaction of the District Engineer. Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and proper control of development.
5	Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 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.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Barry Diamond
Planning Inspector

18th August 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501444-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Single storey front extension with associated works
Development Address	86, O'Rourke Park, Sallynoggin, Dublin, A96W2D8
	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? (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)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. ☐ 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 Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
☒ 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	
☐ 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)	

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: _____

This page is intentionally blank.