



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501464-DR-26

Development	Retention of single-storey ground floor side extension. Permission for side and rear extensions with associated works.
Location	Ballytrain, Stillorgan Road, Galloping Green South, Dublin 18
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D26B/0145/WEB
Applicant(s)	Richard and Tara O'Halloran
Type of Application	Permission & Retention Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Split Decision
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellants	Richard and Tara O'Halloran
Observer	Foxrock Golf Club
Date of Site Inspection	11 th August 2026

Inspector

Barry Diamond

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	4
2.0	Proposed Development	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History	6
5.0	Policy Context.....	7
6.0	EIA Screening.....	9
7.0	The Appeal	10
8.0	Assessment.....	12
9.0	AA Screening.....	17
10.0	Water Framework Directive	18
11.0	Recommendation	19
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	19
13.0	Conditions.....	19

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site comprises a site of 0.097 ha and contains a large two storey semi-detached house finished in smooth render and a hipped roof finished in a flat concrete roof tile. The site is accessed off the Stillorgan Road (N11) by a private shared laneway which serves three other dwellings. The dwelling has both side and rear single storey annexes.
- 1.2. The dwelling is enclosed by a high stone wall to the front of the site and some intermittent trees. A concrete block wall approximately 2 metres in height separates the site from the adjoining semi-detached property to the southeast. A laneway runs along the sites northwestern boundary which separates the site from the adjoining two storey townhouse development 'The Fairways'.
- 1.3. A dwelling known as 'The Hermiston' is located to the rear of the site and is a protected structure (RPS No. 2041). The surrounding area has a mixed typology with single storey and two storey dwellings along with apartment blocks, including a five storey apartment block which is currently under construction approximately 50 metres to the northwest. Foxrock Golf Club is located to the west of the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises a number of different elements including:
 - Retention of a single storey extension at ground floor level to the side of the existing dwelling;
 - The proposed development of a two storey extension above ground floor to the side of the existing dwelling;
 - The proposed development of a single storey extension at ground floor level to the rear of the existing dwelling;
 - Proposed amendments to the existing front and rear elevations and to the existing roof; and
 - All associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 7th May 2026 the Planning Authority decided to issue a split decision to refuse permission for the first and second storey extensions to the side of the dwelling and the associated roof alteration to the property for the following reason:

3.1.1 Refusal Reason

The proposed first and second floor extensions to the side of the dwelling and associated roof alterations would read as a third storey, appearing overbearing, visually dominant, and result in an adverse impact on the streetscape and would not be in accordance with 12.3.7.1 (iv) Extensions to Dwelling of the Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed two storey extension and roof alteration are therefore considered to be not in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.1.2 Grant of Permission and Retention Permission

The decision granted permission for the proposed rear extension at ground floor level and granted retention permission for the side extension at ground floor level. Standard conditions were applied.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the planner reflects the decision of the Planning Authority to issue a split decision. It includes the following points:

- The single storey side annex to be retained is well proportioned and would not give rise to overlooking and is acceptable;
- The location scale and overall form of the rear extension is considered acceptable;
- The quantum of rear garden space remaining is considered to be acceptable;
- There are no objections to the drainage arrangements;
- The height of the first and second floor extension is unacceptable and would read as a three storey dwelling and would have an overbearing impact, be visually dominant and out of scale with the adjoining properties;
- The first floor extension would be acceptable, however, the roof form and upper floor design are integral to the proposal and therefore the first and second floor are unacceptable and contrary to Section 12.3.7.1;

- The proposal would not give rise to any adverse impacts on the protected structure (Hermiston) which is located 40 metres away;
- There are no changes to the existing access arrangements;
- Issues of ownership raised by the third party are not material planning considerations; and
- The proposal does not lead to any significant concerns in relation to Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Water Services Section: no objection subject to a condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No consultation of prescribed bodies was carried out by the Planning Authority, however, as part of the appeal, consultation with the following relevant bodies was carried out to ascertain whether the proposed development would have an effect on any designated site:

- An Taisce – No response received.
- The Heritage Council - No response received.
- Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage – No response received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

An observation was raised during the processing of the planning application by Foxrock Golf Club which is attached to the file. I consider that the issues raised in their submission to the Coimisiún correlates with the issues raised to the Planning Authority.

4.0 Planning History

Site

D14A/0730 – Permission was granted in February 2015 to sub-divide the existing two storey dwelling to provide pair of semi-detached dwellings with new vehicular

access off private access road and associated site works at Ballytrain, Stillorgan Road, Foxrock, Dublin 18

Setting

D20A/0536 - Permission was granted in November 2020 for a variety of extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling to include widening of the entrance gates at Fahanmura, No. 2 Knocksinna, Foxrock, Dublin 18 a protected structure.

ACP 321151-24 & D24A/0614/WEB – Permission was granted in February 2025 for the modifications to previously approved permission (Reg. Ref. D18A/1112 and ABP-303816-19) to include the addition of 8 apartments via an additional floor increasing the number of floors from 4 to 5 and the number of apartments from 28 to 36 and all associated site works at Funchal and Garryknock, Stillorgan Road, Foxrock, Dublin 18.

ACP-321311-24 & D24A/0480 - Permission was granted in March 2025 for the construction of 4 No. three-storey dwellings and all associated site works at Avila (formerly Windrush), Knocksinna, Foxrock, Dublin 18.

D15A/0622 – Permission was granted in June 2016 for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of 24 dwelling units at Springfield House, Springfield Park, Foxrock, Dublin 18.

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 11 Heritage and Conservation

Section 11.4.1.2 Policy Objective HER8: Work to Protected Structures - Ensure that any development proposals to Protected Structures, their curtilage and setting shall have regard to the 'Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities.

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.

(ii) Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining.

(iii) Ground floor side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity.

(iii) First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. However, in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front façade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.

(iv) Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles - changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/ 'A' frame end or 'half-hip' for example – will be assessed against a number of criteria including:

- Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
- Existing roof variations on the streetscape.

- Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
- Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence

Section 12.8.7 – Private Amenity Standards – Quality Standards.

Section 12.8.7.1 – Separation Distances.

Section 12.8.7.2 – Boundaries.

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities

Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007)

5.3. 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.6km to the west of the Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code SAC 003000), c.5.78km west of the Dalkey Islands SPA (site code SPA 004172), c.2.85km to the southwest of the South Dublin Bay SAC (site code SAC 000210) and the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (site code SPA 004024), c.7.69km to the north of Ballyman Glen SAC (site code SAC 000713), c.7.23KM to the northnortheast of Knocksink Wood SAC (site code SAC 000725) and c.8.18km to the northeast of the Wicklow Mountains SAC/SPA (site code SPA 004040 & SAC 002122). The site is also situated c.2.85km to the southwest of the South Dublin Bay pNHA (site code pNHA 000210) and is situated c.4.04km to the northwest 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 grounds of appeal are submitted by JSA Planning on behalf of the applicant.

Their comments can be summarised as follows:

- The refusal greatly overstates the scale and design of the proposal and the evolving character of the Stillorgan Road (N11);
- The site occupies a prominent position along one of the principal radial routes into Dublin City in an area experiencing ongoing changes in density, scale and form;
- The proposal is designed to integrate with the existing building and established building line and is subordinate to the host dwelling;
- There is no overlooking and would not adversely effect residential amenity;
- The proposed ridge is only 750mm above the height of the adjoining dwelling (No. 1 The Fairways)
- The shadow study demonstrates that there is no material overshadowing of neighbouring properties;
- The ridge height of the extension is 1.4 metres above the ridge height of the dwelling and is considered to be appropriate given the set back and would not be overbearing;
- The additional accommodation at second floor level is largely contained within the roof structure rather than forming a distinct full additional level;
- The proposal involves a reconfiguration of the existing roof, including a reduction in parts of the current ridge meaning the change is not a simple vertical addition but a rebalancing of the roof form across the building;
- The proposal complies with Section 12.3.7.1 (iv) of the Development Plan which allows for roof extensions;

- The scheme has been designed so that the dwelling continues to be the dominant element and retains visual prominence;
- The set back ensures that the bulk and massing of the extension are appropriately moderated;
- There are a number of precedents for taller forms of development in the area, a five storey apartment building to the west of the site at Funchal and Garryknock (ACP 321151-24 & D24A/0614/WEB) and 3 storey dwellings adjacent to the N11 corridor at Knocksinna, Foxrock (ACP-321311-24 & D24A/0480) and also at Westminster, Foxrock (D15A/0622); and
- Conclusions regarding visual impact and overbearing impact must be grounded in clear, reasoned and evidence based assessment as per Leech & Anor v An Commision Pleanala [2024] IEHC 599.

7.2. 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.

7.3. Observations

There was one observation made during the appeal by Foxrock Golf Club which can be summarised as follows:

- Unacceptable scale, bulk and massing;
- The extension is not subordinate to the host dwelling contrary to Policy Objective PHP19;
- The proposal relies on unauthorised development for further upward and outward expansion;
- There is no set back for the three storey side extension along the side boundary;
- The north side of the Stillorgan Road exhibits a recognisable rhythm of low density residential development, notwithstanding the presence of larger developments elsewhere;
- The development would disrupt the established rhythm of the streetscape contrary to Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan;

- It is not clear how development could be feasible without access to the private laneway which it is stated is under the ownership of the Golf Club; and
- There is an absence of drainage and sewerage plans which may affect the private laneway with no permitted access to the laneway.

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
- Protected Structure
- 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 residential extensions 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 storey semi-detached dwelling which includes a single storey side annex with a sloping monopitch roof which the application seeks permission to retain. The side annex (28sqm) is located to the northwest boundary of the site, is subordinate to the main dwelling and is finished in

materials which harmonise with the existing dwelling. I consider that this element of the proposal is in accordance with Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan. In addition, the Planning Authority also considered this element of the subject application to be acceptable.

- 8.3.2 A small rear annex is proposed (6sqm) to extend the existing kitchen. The design and glazed openings harmonise with those of the existing kitchen annex and I consider that this element of the proposed works is a minor form of development with little impact on the design of the existing dwelling. The Planning Authority also had no objection to this element of the scheme.
- 8.3.3 The extension also includes amendments to the existing front and rear elevations which would include a lowering of the existing hipped roof by 0.675 metres and the creation of a double pitched front and rear gabled roof profile. This form of roof profile is evident in the area, however, in the majority of cases the apex of the gable does not protrude beyond the ridge line of the respective dwellings, however, in the application case the apex of the gables do extend beyond the ridge line.
- 8.3.4 The proposal also includes a first and second floor extension to the northwestern aspect of the dwelling which is proposed to be constructed above the existing ground floor side annex which is the subject of the retention application and referred to earlier in the report. The annex would be 9.51 metres above finished floor level with a depth of 11.23 metres, it has a pitched front and rear gabled roof profile. There are door openings at ground floor level with window openings at first and second floor level.
- 8.3.5 As a result of the reprofiling of the existing roof, the main ridge line will be reduced by 0.671 metres meaning that the proposed annex will sit 2.071 metres above the finished ridge line of the dwelling. The Planning Authority consider that this element of the application creates a third storey to an existing two storey dwelling that would appear visually dominant and would result in an adverse impact on the streetscape and would not be in accordance with Section 12.3.7.1 (iv) of the Development Plan. It is noted in the Planning Officers report that there was a general acceptance towards a first floor extension with the primary concern being the second floor annex.
- 8.3.6 Section 12.3.7.1 (iv) of the Development Plan states that there are a number of criteria in which an extension at attic/roof level will be considered. Key concerns in relation to the subject proposal will be how it harmonises with the rest of the

structure, its visibility, prominence and its position on the streetscape. I am of the opinion that the proposed second floor annex is not subordinate to the existing dwelling, exceeding the ridge height by 2.071 metres. The applicants consultant refers to the ridge height of the annex as only exceeding the existing ridge height of the dwelling by 1.4 metres, however, I do not consider this relevant as the proposed annex would have to be read in conjunction with the roof profile of the completed development which is 0.671 metres lower than the existing roof profile.

8.3.7 The key criteria in the policy (Section 12.3.7.1 iv) in my view relate to how the annex would be read in the context of the existing dwelling, whether the development would be prominent and its impact on the streetscape. In my view the proposed second floor annex is not subordinate to the main dwelling, however, the views of the existing dwelling and any subsequent alterations are largely masked by the existing 2 metre high stone wall along the Stillorgan Road (N11) and the existing trees within the application site and within the adjoining properties.

8.3.8 In my view the site does not occupy any prominent position along the Stillorgan Road which has a mixture of dwelling types and an evolving character which includes the construction of an apartment complex 50 metres to the northwest which has a ridge height of 15.169 metres and a further six storey apartment block (Roselawn) which is located 150 metres to the northnorthwest of the site. I am of the opinion that a view of the application building is possible from a fixed position to the east of the site, however, viewpoints are limited and lost in transit and would not in my view be so detrimental as to detract from the overall streetscape.

8.3.9 Overall I do not consider that the proposed second floor annex or amendments to the roof profile would be visually dominant and would not adversely affect the streetscape. In my opinion the proposal complies with Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan.

8.4 Residential Amenity

8.4.1 The existing single storey side annex contains no windows other than 4 No. skylights and therefore I do not consider that there is any concerns with overlooking. In addition, the proposed rear annex is a minor extension to the existing and although it contains a large glazed rear elevation, this already exists on the existing rear annex and the site is well enclosed. I do not consider that the proposed rear annex would cause any overlooking.

- 8.4.2 Both the existing side annex and the proposed rear annex are modest single storey annexes with mono pitched roofs which would have no overbearing impact on any adjoining residential properties.
- 8.4.3 The proposed first and second floor side annex has a ridge height of 9.94 metres and 7.12 metres to the eaves. The proposed side annex contains only one high level opaque window which does not raise any concerns with overlooking towards the opposing side gable of No. 1 The Fairways which has only a single gable window which is also finished in opaque glazing. There is a separation distance of 6.92 metres between the side gable of the proposed annex and the first floor of No. 1 The Fairways with a private laneway in between. Although the height of the side annex to the eaves will increase to 7.12 metres above finished floor level, given the separation distance and the lack of any clear glazed windows in the side gable of No. 1 The Fairways, I do not consider that there would be any significant overbearing impacts.
- 8.4.4 A Shadow Assessment was provided as part of the submissions to support the planning application which was submitted to the Planning Authority. The submission to the Planning Authority provided an analysis of the seasonal and daily shadow paths for the proposed structures. As part of the appeal submissions an analysis of the shadow impacts of the existing development has also been provided.
- 8.4.5 Having taken into account the submitted existing and proposed Shadow Assessments there is additional overshadowing to the side gable and front of the adjoining dwelling (No. 1 The Fairways). The overshadowing is relatively short-lived and restricted to the morning period during the Spring. In addition, the window which is overshadowed in the side gable is finished in opaque glass which is indicative of a non-habitable room. I do not consider that the proposed annexes would create any additional adverse overshadowing impacts.

8.5 **Protected Structure**

- 8.5.1 To the rear of the application site (southwest) is a large detached dwellings known as 'The Hermiston' which is a protected structure and listed as House(s) (RPS Nos: 2041) on the record.
- 8.5.2 Policy Objective HER8: Work to Protected Structures states that '...any development proposals to Protected Structures, their curtilage and setting shall have regard to the 'Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities' and that '...any development, modification, alteration, or extension affecting a Protected Structure

and/or its setting is sensitively sited and designed, and is appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, layout, and materials.'

- 8.5.3 The proposed development does not include works to any protected structure nor are there works within the curtilage of the Hermiston or any other protected structure. The Development Plan does refer to the impact that the development can have on the setting of a protected structure and that can include both views towards and views out of the protected structure.
- 8.5.4 The protected structure is set back off the Stillorgan Road by 90 metres and is shielded from view by the roadside wall, the existing intervening dwellings and existing mature vegetation. I am of the view that the setting of the protected structure(s) would not be affected from the Stillorgan Road (N11) or any other public vantage point. I note that Section 13.8.1 of the Architectural Heritage Protection – Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2011 refers to the setting being affected by 'important views'.
- 8.5.6 The views out of the protected structure(s) towards the application site would be limited due to the separation distance of 40 metres to the proposed development, the existing trees within the grounds of the Hermiston and given that a two storey dwelling already exists on the application site. Any views of the proposed development from the protected structure would be read against this backdrop and would not detract from the setting of the protected structure.
- 8.5.7 I consider that the proposed development would not adversely affect the protected structures or their setting and is acceptable in this regard. In addition, the Planning Authority did not raise any concern with the impact of the proposed development upon the protected structure.

8.6 Other Matters

- 8.6.1 Concerns were raised by the observer to the appeal that the proposed side annex could not be constructed without access being gained to the private laneway which runs along the northwestern boundary of the site and is stated that the laneway is under private ownership. In respect to the above, I note that issues to do with ownership are not matters which can be adjudicated by the Coimisiún. I refer to Section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007) which states that the planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land; these are

ultimately matters for resolution in the Courts. I also refer to Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) states that 'a person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under this section to carry out any development'.

8.6.2 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.

8.6.3 Lastly no condition was applied seeking a developer contribution under Section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as the development which was granted by the Planning Authority did not exceed 40sqm and therefore fell within the exemptions and reductions under Section 7 of the Development Contribution Scheme of Dun Laoghaire County Council. As I consider all aspects of the proposed extension to be acceptable which amounts to a floorspace of 96sqm the exemption does not apply. I consider that a condition requiring a contribution to be made is now necessary.

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 Ballytrain, Stillorgan Road, Galloping Green South, Dublin 18 no relevant designated sites are close by.

9.2 The proposed development comprises the retention of single storey ground floor side extension and permission for side and rear extensions 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; and

- Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.

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 Ballytrain, Stillorgan Road, Galloping Green South, Dublin 18 which is 1.1km metres southeast of the nearest water body.

10.2 The proposed development comprises the retention of single storey ground floor side extension and permission for side and rear extensions 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 and setting of the development to be retained along with the proposed extensions and alterations and having regard to 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 streetscape or 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 13th 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 flat 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.
6	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.
7	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 Coimisiún 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, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Barry Diamond
Planning Inspector

24th August 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501464-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of single-storey ground floor side extension. Permission for side and rear extensions with associated works.
Development Address	Ballytrain, Stillorgan Road, Galloping Green South, Dublin 18
	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 <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.	
☒ 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.