



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL501521-DR-26

Development	Two Storey extension to front rear and side, and single storey extension to the rear, plus internal alterations
Location	10 Mayfield Terrace, Ballinteer, Dublin 16, D16PK79
Planning Authority	Dun Laoighre Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25B/0721
Applicant(s)	Penny Walker
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Aly Alvy
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	13 th August 2026
Inspector	Andrew Hersey

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1 The appeal site is located at No. 10 Mayfield Terrace, Ballinteer, Dublin 16, within an established residential area. The site has a stated area of approximately 0.021 ha and accommodates a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling with a hipped roof profile.
- 1.2 The dwelling is set back from Mayfield Terrace and is served by an existing vehicular entrance and off-street parking area to the front, together with pedestrian access along the front/side of the property. The principal area of private amenity space is located to the rear.
- 1.3 The site is bounded by No. 9 Mayfield Terrace to the east, No. 11 Mayfield Terrace to the west, and residential properties at Ballinteer Gardens to the rear. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and Mayfield Terrace comprises established rows of two-storey terraced dwellings of generally similar scale, form and appearance.
- 1.4 The subject property occupies an end-of-terrace position, with the side portion of the site providing a degree of separation between the existing dwelling and the adjoining property to the east.
- 1.5 The boundary between the appeal property and No. 11 Mayfield Terrace comprises a combination of block walling and timber fencing.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The proposed development, as described in the application and indicated on the submitted plans, comprises the following works:
 - Construction of a two-storey extension to the front and side of the existing dwelling;
 - Construction of a single-storey extension to the rear of the dwelling; and
 - Internal alterations to the existing dwelling

- 2.2 The proposed works would provide additional accommodation at both ground and first-floor levels and would involve associated alterations to the external elevations of the dwelling

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

- 3.1 Decision – Grant Permission subject to the following conditions. The following conditions are relevant to the appeal;
- 3.2 Condition 2 states that the windows serving the front/side extension on the side elevation are to be manufactured and maintained opaque in the interest of privacy and future residential amenity to the rear (north).
- 3.3 Condition 3 refers to drainage
- 3.4 There are no conditions with respect to S48 Development Contributions

3.2 Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1 The Planning Authority considered the principle of the proposed development to be acceptable having regard to the residential zoning of the site. It was considered that the proposed extensions were modest in scale and would not give rise to undue overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impacts on adjoining residential properties. Concern regarding windows on the side elevation was considered capable of being addressed by condition.
- 3.2.2 Further Information was requested on 13th February 2026 in relation to surface water drainage and the treatment of hardstanding areas. A response was submitted on 17th April 2026, comprising revised drawings and SuDS proposals, including permeable paving and associated surface water measures. Following consideration of the response, the Drainage Planning Section raised no objection subject to conditions.
- 3.2.3 The Planning Authority considered that the matters raised by way of Further Information had been satisfactorily addressed and recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions.

3.3 Other Technical Reports

- 3.3.1 Drainage Planning Report dated 3rd February 2026 requested Further Information in relation to the disposal of surface water generated by the development and the treatment of proposed hardstanding areas. The applicant was requested to demonstrate compliance with the Council's SuDS requirements and to provide permeable hardstanding surfaces.
- 3.3.2 Following receipt of the Further Information response, a further Drainage Planning Report dated 11th May 2026 raised no objection to the development, subject to conditions requiring surface water to be managed locally through the proposed rainwater planters, permeable paving and associated SuDS measures, with no discharge to the public sewer.

3.4 Prescribed Bodies

No reports on file

3.5 Third Party Submissions

- 3.5.1 A third-party submission was received from Aly Alvy of 11 Mayfield Terrace on 3rd February 2026. The principal issues raised may be summarised as follows:
- That the submitted drawings do not adequately illustrate the relationship of the proposed development with adjoining properties, thereby making assessment of its impact difficult.
 - That the proposed two-storey front and side extension would alter the character of Mayfield Terrace and establish an undesirable precedent for similar development.
 - That the proposed extension would have an overbearing impact on the adjoining property at No. 11 Mayfield Terrace, having regard to its two-storey scale and proximity to the shared boundary.

- Concerns are also raised regarding the proposed windows facing towards the adjoining property and their potential impact on residential amenity and privacy

4.0 Planning History

4.1 Adjacent

- 9 Mayfield Terrace – Reg. Ref. D18A/0663
Permission was granted for the construction of new ground-floor extensions to the front, side and rear of the dwelling, including a new porch to the front, internal modifications and widening of the existing vehicular access with associated site works.
- 13 Mayfield Terrace – Reg. Ref. D10B/0327
Permission was granted for a 16 sq.m. side extension over the existing garage and the replacement of the flat roof over the kitchen to the rear with a lean-to roof

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

5.1.1 The development plan in force in the area is the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022–2028. Within the plan, the appeal site is zoned Objective A, which seeks *‘to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities’*. Residential development, including extensions to existing dwellings, is permitted in principle under this zoning objective.

5.1.2 The following provisions of the Development Plan are of particular relevance:

- Section 12.3.7.1 – Extensions to Dwellings: provides guidance in relation to residential extensions, including extensions to the rear and side of existing dwellings. Proposals are required to have regard to the character and form of the existing dwelling and surrounding area and to the potential impact upon adjoining residential amenities.

- Policy Objective EI6 – Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS): requires development to incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage measures.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024) which is located 5.0 km to the north east of the site and
- South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) which is located 5.0km to the north east of the site

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1 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 & Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1 Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1 A third party appeal in the name of Aly Alvy of 11 Mayfield Terrace was lodged on the 10th June 2026. The appeal in summary raises the following issues;

- That the proposed two-storey front/side extension would materially alter the established character and architectural rhythm of Mayfield Terrace. The appellant disputes the Planning Authority's conclusion that comparable extensions are characteristic of the area and contends that there are no comparable examples of two-storey front extensions within the terrace.
- That the submitted drawings are stated to inaccurately depict the adjoining property at No. 11 Mayfield Terrace, including its existing rear extension, and do not adequately illustrate the wider streetscape context. It is argued that this undermines the Planning Authority's assessment of streetscape character, precedent and the relationship of the development with adjoining properties.

- That concerns are raised regarding differences in ground and garden levels between the appeal site and No. 11. It is submitted that these level differences have not been adequately represented and that the rear extension would consequently appear taller and more visually dominant when viewed from the adjoining property than suggested by the submitted drawings.
- Concerns are also raised regarding the proposed shallow-pitched roof to the rear extension. The appellant questions whether the roof can be constructed as illustrated and submits that any increase in roof pitch or height could increase its visual prominence and overbearing impact.
- That the appellant submits that the potential impacts on daylight, sunlight and overshadowing have not been adequately assessed. No daylight, sunlight or shadow analysis accompanied the application, and it is argued that the Planning Authority therefore did not have sufficient information to properly assess the effects on adjoining residential amenity and garden areas.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

7.3.1 A response to the appeal was received from Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council on 12th June 2026. The Planning Authority states that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new issues that would warrant a change in its assessment of the proposed development.

7.4. First Party Response to Appeal

None received

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1 I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file, inspected the site, and had regard to the relevant local development plan policies and guidance.
- 8.2 I am satisfied that the substantive issues arising from the grounds of this third-party appeal relate to the following matters:

- The accuracy and adequacy of the submitted contextual information;
- The impact of the two-storey front/side extension on the character of Mayfield Terrace;
- The relationship of the development with No. 11 Mayfield Terrace, including site levels and potential overbearing impacts;
- Overlooking and privacy;
- Daylight, sunlight and overshadowing; and
- Surface water drainage.

8.3 The appellant raises concerns regarding the accuracy of the submitted drawings, particularly the representation of No. 11 Mayfield Terrace and the relationship between the respective properties. While I acknowledge these concerns, I consider that the application and appeal documentation, including the photographs submitted with the appeal, together with my observations during my site inspection, provide sufficient information to allow the proposed development and its relationship with adjoining properties to be adequately assessed.

8.4 The appellant considers that the two-storey front/side extension would adversely affect the established character and architectural rhythm of Mayfield Terrace. Section 12.3.7.1(i) of the Development Plan provides that front extensions at both ground and first-floor level are acceptable in principle, subject to their scale, design and impact on visual and residential amenities. I note that the proposed extension incorporates a shallow-pitched roof form which would be distinct from the principal hipped roof of the dwelling. However, this element would remain substantially below the main ridge, thereby retaining the visual primacy of the original roof form. I concur with the Planning Authority that the extension is relatively modest in scale and would integrate satisfactorily with the existing dwelling. Having regard also to the end-of-terrace location of the property, I do not consider that the proposal would appear unduly dominant or materially detract from the established character or visual amenities of Mayfield Terrace.

8.5 The appellant raises concern regarding the difference in levels between the properties, noting that the ground level at No. 11 is approximately 600mm below the finished floor level of the dwellings. I note that the proposed rear extension

incorporates a plinth of approximately 600mm, with a height of approximately 2.2 metres above this level. Section 12.3.7.1(ii) of the Development Plan requires rear extensions to be considered having regard, inter alia, to their length, height and proximity to mutual boundaries. While the extension would have a greater apparent height when viewed from No. 11, its overall height and single-storey scale remain relatively modest. In terms of overshadowing, having regard to the orientation of the properties, any potential impact would principally relate to morning/easterly sunlight and would be limited in duration. In the context of an established urban residential area, where a degree of impact arising from domestic extensions is to be expected, I do not consider that the proposal would result in an unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impact or seriously injure the residential amenities of No. 11.

8.6 The appellant also questions whether the shallow roof pitch proposed to the rear extension can accommodate the natural slate roof covering indicated on the submitted drawings. I consider that the development should be assessed on the basis of the plans and particulars submitted. The technical construction and performance of the proposed roof is primarily a matter for compliance with the Building Regulations and is not, in itself, a planning matter. Should permission be granted, the extension would be required to be constructed substantially in accordance with the approved plans, including the proposed height and roof profile. I therefore do not consider that this issue would warrant a refusal of permission.

8.7 With regard to overlooking and privacy, I note that six windows are proposed within the side elevation of the front/side extension. The Planning Authority imposed a condition requiring all six windows to be manufactured and permanently maintained in opaque glazing. However, I note that the intervening area between the proposed extension and No. 9 Mayfield Terrace is entirely within the appeal site and that the proposed windows would principally face towards the gable elevation of No. 9 rather than towards private amenity space or habitable room windows. Having regard to this relationship, I do not consider that the proposed windows would give rise to any significant overlooking or loss of privacy. I therefore consider the requirement for all six windows to be opaque to be unnecessarily restrictive. I consider that only the bathroom window should be fitted and permanently maintained with opaque glazing, in the interests of privacy, and recommend that the condition be amended accordingly.

8.8 Surface water drainage was addressed by way of Further Information, following which revised SuDS proposals were submitted incorporating permeable paving, rainwater planters and associated surface water measures. I note that the Drainage Planning Report dated 11th May 2026 raised no objection to the proposed development, subject to conditions requiring the proposed SuDS measures to be implemented and surface water to be managed within the site without discharge to the public surface water sewer. I am satisfied, therefore, that surface water drainage has been adequately addressed.

8.9 Overall, while I acknowledge the concerns raised by the appellant, I consider that the proposed development accords with the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022–2028, and in particular the guidance relating to domestic extensions contained in Section 12.3.7.1. Having regard to the scale, form and design of the proposed extensions, the end-of-terrace location of the dwelling and the established urban residential context, I consider that the proposed development would constitute an appropriate extension to the existing dwelling and would not seriously injure the residential amenities of adjoining properties or the character and visual amenities of Mayfield Terrace.

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

- 5km to the east of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024)
- 5km to the east of the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210)

9.3 The proposed development comprises of the construction of extensions with some drainage proposals using SuDS methodology. 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 5km to the west of Dublin Bay.
- 10.2 The proposed development consists of extensions and ancillary site works
- 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 provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022–2028, including the Objective A zoning of the site and the provisions of Section 12.3.7.1 relating to extensions to dwellings, to the established residential character of the area, and to the scale, form and design of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential amenities of adjoining properties or the character or visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	he development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 17th day of April 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 glazing to the ground floor bathroom window shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable. Reason: In the interests of residential amenity
3.	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
4	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
5.	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.

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

7th September 2026

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL501521-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Extensions to residential dwelling
Development Address	10 Mayfield Terrace, Ballinteer, Dublin 16, D16PK79
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.	State the Class here
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <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	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold

Inspector: _____

Date: _____