



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501580-DR-26

Development	Retention of reduction of ground works, relocation of existing front wall and new roof to existing cottage. Permission for extension to side and rear, with wastewater treatment system, and associated works.
Location	Bayview, Barnacullia, Dublin 18, D18 A5F9
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D26A/0250/WEB
Applicant	Sinead Fahy
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Retention with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant	Darren Byrne
Observers	None

Date of Site Inspection

21/08/2026

Inspector

Siobhan Carroll

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Planning History	6
5.0 Policy Context	6
5.1. Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	7
6.0 EIA Screening	7
7.0 The Appeal	8
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
7.2. Applicant Response	9
7.3. Planning Authority Response	12
8.0 Assessment	12
9.0 AA Screening	18
10.0 Water Framework Directive	19
11.0 Recommendation	19
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	20
13.0 Conditions	20
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	23

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site with a stated area of 0.7 hectares is located at Bayview, Barnacullia, Dublin 18. It situated on the eastern side of Barnacullia Road and located circa 1.3km to the south of Stepside.
- 1.2. The Barnacullia car park which has panoramic views across the city and over Dublin Bay is situated circa 220m to the north-west of the appeal site. The Blue Light Public House is opposite the car park on the western side of Barnacullia Road.
- 1.3. The appeal site is setback from the public road circa 15m and is accessed via an existing laneway immediately to the south. The property on site is a detached single storey dwelling. The site extends for back for circa 210m. The gradient of the appeal site slopes significantly downwards from the rear (west) of the site towards the east. The majority of the site contains mature planting comprising trees, hedges and scrub.
- 1.4. The site is bounded to the south-west by a single storey detached dwelling Furry Hill. The property Woodhaven a detached dwelling adjoins the site to the north. The cottage Anna Liffy is situated to the south of the appeal site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the retention of reduction of ground works, relocation of existing front wall and new roof to existing cottage. Permission for extension to side and rear, with wastewater treatment system, and associated works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. On the 25th of May 2026 the Planning Authority issued a decision to grant permission and grant retention in respect of the proposal subject to 11 no. conditions.
- 3.1.2. Condition no. 4 refers to drainage and specifies that the disposal of surface water shall be in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Authority.

- 3.1.3. Condition no. 6. refers to the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan.
- 3.1.4. Condition no. 8 and no. 9 refer to specifications in relation to the Biocycle package treatment plant.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports
- 3.2.2. Planner's Report dated 25/05/2026 – It was concluded that having regard to the Objective B zoning of the site, massing, scale and form of the proposed extension elements for retention and completion that the development proposed and existing would not adversely impact on the residential amenity of adjacent properties by reason of overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing appearance. It was further considered that the proposed development and existing would not detract from the character of the surrounding area and would be in accordance with the relevant provisions of the development plan. A grant of retention permission and permission was recommended.
- 3.2.3. Other Technical Reports
- 3.2.4. Drainage Planning Report dated 05/05/2026 – No objection subject to conditions.
- 3.2.5. Environmental Enforcement/Waste Management Report dated 15/04/2026 – No objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. The Planning Authority received one submission/observation in relation to the application the main issues raised are similar to those set out in the appeal.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1.1. There is an extensive planning history referring to the site and surrounding area which detailed in the report of the Planning Officer.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.1.1. The appeal site at Bayview, Barnacullia, Dublin 18 is located on lands zoned objective B, which seeks 'To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture.'
- 5.1.2. There are protected views from Barnacullia Road facing north-east over the site.
- 5.1.3. The site is located within the Barnacullia Historic Landscape Character Area.
- 5.1.4. Chapter 4 refers to Neighbourhood – People, Home and Place
- 5.1.5. Section 4.3.1.2 – Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation
- 5.1.6. Section 4.3.1.3 – Policy Objective PHP20: Protection of Existing Residential Amenity
- 5.1.7. Chapter 11 refers to Heritage and Conservation
- 5.1.8. Policy Objective HER20: Buildings of Vernacular and Heritage Interest

It is a Policy Objective to:

- i. Retain, where appropriate, and encourage the rehabilitation and suitable reuse of existing older buildings/structures/features which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and streetscape in preference to their demolition and redevelopment and to preserve surviving shop and pub fronts of special historical or architectural interest including signage and associated features.
- ii. Encourage the retention and/or reinstatement of original fabric of our historic building stock such as windows, doors, roof coverings, shopfronts, pub fronts and other significant features.
- iii. Ensure that appropriate materials be used to carry out any repairs to the historic fabric.

- 5.1.9. Chapter 12 refers to Development Management
- 5.1.10. Section 12.2.1 – Built Environment
- 5.1.11. Section 12.3.9 – Demolition and Replacement Dwellings
- 5.1.12. Section 12.3.10.5 – Extensions – Rural
- 5.1.13. Section 12.3.10.9 – Wastewater Treatment Systems

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. Wicklow Mountains SAC (Site Code 002122) is located circa 3.8km to the south-west of the appeal site.
- 5.2.2. Wicklow Mountains SPA (Site Code 004040) is located circa 4km to the south-west of the appeal site.
- 5.2.3. Knocksink Wood SAC (Site Code 00725) is circa 4.63km to the south of the appeal site.
- 5.2.4. South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) is located circa 6.36km to the north-east of the development site.
- 5.2.5. South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) is located circa 6.36km to the north-east of the development site.
- 5.2.6. Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 003000) is located circa 9.12km to the east of the appeal site.
- 5.2.7. Dalkey Island SPA (Site Code 004172) is located circa 9.14km to the east of the appeal 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 and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations).

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal has been submitted by Philip Comerford Architect on behalf of Darren Byrne. The issues raised are as follows:

- Firstly, it is stated that the proposed extension would be located close to the retaining wall which is the northern boundary of the site. Concern is expressed that distances between the proposed extension and adjoining properties have not been indicated on the plans.
- Concern is raised that the proposed extension would undermine the stability of the existing retaining wall to the appellant's property to the north.
- A wastewater drainage pipe is proposed to be relocated to the location of the retaining wall. It is stated that a trench would be required to accommodate this pipe.
- It is stated that key information is missing from the application required for a valid planning application. The site notice does not match the application form. The site notice indicates that permission was sought for permission and retention. The plans show a difference between the existing cottage and the proposed extension; however they do not indicate the works for which retention permission is applied.
- The contiguous elevations do not adequately describe the works and their impact on neighbouring properties. The elevations do not show any information on either existing or proposed external ground levels. The retaining boundary wall between the subject site and the houses on Barnacullia Road is not shown in elevation. No information was provided on the locations of car parking and other areas of paving or hardstanding or planting and landscaping.
- The application form indicates that surface water drainage will be provided by means of a soak pit, however this is not indicated on any of the drawings.

- It is submitted that the design of the proposed extension does not maintain the character of the area. It is stated that the largely glazed elevation to the north-east does not respect the local architectural character.
- It is stated that the existing cottage has not been lived in since at least 2006. It is considered that the use of the cottage has been abandoned and as such the application should be made for a new dwelling and extension to an abandoned dwelling.
- It is stated that the front wall and north-west gable of the existing cottage were demolished. The current application shows the entire floor of the cottage to be lowered by 1.5m. An engineer's report to show how it is possible to retain the existing fabric has not been provided. The appellant considers that insufficient information has been provided regarding the demolition required to construct the proposal.
- It is highlighted that the laneway used to access the appeal site off Barnacullia Road is a public right of way into the Barnacullia Historic Landscape Character Area.
- The matter of vehicular access is raised. It is stated that no information has been provided in relation to sightlines at the narrow junction between the laneway and Barnacullia Road.
- It is considered that the development could not be safely constructed as the laneway is too narrow to accommodate construction traffic. Concern is raised that construction vehicles would have to unload at the junction with Barnacullia Road which would block access for vehicles and pedestrians.
- It is requested that the Commission overturn the decision to grant permission for the reasons set out in the appeal.

7.2. Applicant Response

A response to the appeal has been submitted by Farry Town Planning Ltd. on behalf of the applicant Sinead Fahy. The issues raised are as follows:

- The appellant lodged an initial objection to the application to the Council on the 24th of April 2026. This objection raised the same issues as those contained in the grounds of appeal.
- Having previously refused permission on the site the Planning Authority concluded that the proposal for which permission is now sought is appropriate.
- It is set out in the appeal that the proposal is situated too close to the northern boundary of the appellant's house. In response to the matter the first party state that the appellant does not appear to object to the size of the extension or the principle of extending the cottage.
- The appellant's objection to the proposed extension appears to stem from the risk of structural damage to their property. The appeal does not specify in what ways the development might cause structural harm. It is highlighted that the boundary treatment between the appellant's property and the appeal site consists of a robust retaining wall. The erection of a single storey extension to the side of the existing house would be unlikely to impact the structural stability of the appellant's property. It is submitted that in the absence of any technical arguments the question of whether it would be appropriate to refuse permission would seem redundant.
- Regarding the claim in the appeal that "the applicant has not provided sufficient information to allow the application to be assessed." This statement is at variance with the approach of the Council who both validated the application and also decided the application without seeking further information.
- The response from the Planning Authority to the appeal submitted to the Commission states; "It is considered that 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."
- The appeal states that an engineer's report was not submitted with the application to show how it is possible to retain the existing fabric. In response the first party state that it would be open to the Commission to attach a

condition requiring such a report be provided to the Council prior to commencement of development.

- In relation to matter of information regarding the demolitions required to construct the proposal, it is submitted that this information has been provided on the plans provided with the application.
- The first party disagree with the point that the application drawings are confusing. The distinction between the existing built fabric of the house and the unapproved walls were provided.
- In relation to concerns regarding the contiguous elevations and levels indicated, the submitted site layout drawing indicates that the FFL of the existing house is at 220.06 and the new FFL would be at 218.56. The submitted plans propose no steps between the existing cottage and the new addition. The finished floor level would clearly be at 218.56.
- Regarding the issues of parking and access from the laneway there is an existing entrance to the site, which is protected by wire fencing, which provides access to an area which is to be used for car parking purposes.
- Regarding the matter of the soak pit the existing soak pit is shown on the site layout to the north of the existing cottage.
- Regarding the design of the extension, it is subordinate to the existing cottage. It is highlighted that the cottage is not a Protected Structure and is not recorded on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage.
- The extension is at a lower level to the house. The design is modern which contrasts with the architecture of the existing dwelling. It is submitted that the design of the extension wholly accords with Policy Objective HER20 of the Development Plan.
- It is highlighted that the extension would not be visible from the public road and that there are a variety of building styles in the surrounding area.
- It is noted that the proposed design is markedly different from the design of the extension previously proposed under Reg. Ref. D23B/0108.

- It is stated in the appeal that ‘the existing cottage has been uninhabited since at least 2006’ and that ‘its use as a dwelling has been abandoned.’
- It is highlighted that this dwelling has had a number of owners/occupiers in the last two decades and that the statements in the appeal are not supported by evidence.
- The first party refer to the extensive planning history on the site, and they highlighted that in all cases the property was identified as a dwelling and permission was sought either to extend and/or alter the house or use the existing use to facilitate an application to develop a new dwelling on the lands.
- The grounds of appeal refer to the vehicular access arrangements and state that permission should be denied on the basis of the access and associated road safety. It is noted that falling household size means that there is no direct correlation between the size of the development and the use of the entrance. It is noted that the existing access has served the property since the late nineteenth century and serves a combination of residential, agricultural and woodland developments to the north. It is highlighted that this access is outside the subject land and is not in the control of the application.
- The first party endorse the architectural assessment of this modest development which is set out in the report of the Planning Officer, and they disagree with the appellant's conclusion that the proposal would be contrary to policies in the County Development Plan that seek to maintain the character of the area.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- 7.3.1. The Coimisiún is referred to the previous Planner's Report. It is considered that 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

Having examined the application details and all other documents on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local

authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issue in this appeal to be considered is as follows:

- Compliance with Development Plan policy
- Design issues
- Vehicular access and parking
- Surface water drainage
- Other matters

8.1. Compliance with Development Plan policy

8.1.1. The proposal comprises two elements firstly, the retention of the reduction of ground works, relocation of existing front wall and new roof to existing cottage. Secondly, permission is sought for an extension to side and rear of the existing cottage, with wastewater treatment system, and associated works.

8.1.2. The site is located in a rural agricultural area which is subject to zoning objective 'B' 'To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture' under the provisions of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. Under this zoning objective residential development including residential extensions are open for consideration. The Planning Authority in their assessment of the application were satisfied that the proposal entailed an extension to an existing dwelling. The appeal referred to the subject cottage and stated that it had not been lived in since at least 2006 and as such the use was abandoned. In response to this matter the first party stated that the dwelling has had a number of owners/occupiers in the last two decades and that the property was in all previous planning applications described as a dwelling. In relation to this matter, I would note that while the cottage may be vacant it has consistently been deemed to constitute a dwelling in terms of the planning history on the site. Furthermore, I note that the Planning Authority did not raise the matter in their assessment of the proposal.

- 8.1.3. Section 12.3.10.5 of the Development Plan refers to extensions in rural locations it sets out that extensions of reasonable size may be acceptable subject to the extension respecting the character, scale and proportions of the existing dwelling. I am satisfied that the proposed extension to the existing dwelling is in accordance with this provision of the Development Plan. I shall examine design issues in the following section of the report.
- 8.1.4. The site is located within protected views from Barnacullia Road north-east over the site. Having regard to the setback of the extension from the public road and the single storey nature of the proposed extension. I note that it would not be visible from the public road and therefore would not impinge on protected views.
- 8.2. Design issues
- 8.2.1. The grounds of appeal raised concern in relation to the design of the proposed extension. It was contended in the appeal that the design of the proposed extension does not maintain the character of the area. It was stated in the appeal that the largely glazed elevation to the north-east does not respect the local architectural character. In response to the matter the first party highlighted that the extension has been designed to be subordinate to the existing cottage and that it will be constructed at a lower level to the cottage. In relation to the design character of the extension the first party submit that design is modern which contrasts with the architecture of the existing dwelling. They highlighted that the extension would not be visible from the public road and that there are a variety of building styles in the surrounding area. It is also submitted in the appeal response that the proposal accords fully with the provisions of Policy Objective HER20 of the Development Plan which refers to buildings of vernacular and heritage interest.
- 8.2.2. In relation to Policy Objective HER20 of the Development Plan it seeks to retain, where appropriate, and encourage the rehabilitation and suitable reuse of existing older buildings/structures/features which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and streetscape. The subject cottage represents a building of vernacular interest. I note that there are similar older cottages to the south and west of the site and a variety of building styles in the surrounding area. In relation to the works to the existing cottage, it is proposed to retain the roof which has been constructed. The property previously had a

corrugated metal roof, however the proposed tiled roof is considered acceptable in the context of current requirements to ensure properties are appropriately insulated.

- 8.2.3. Regarding the extension it proposed to be located to the north-west of the cottage and setback marginally from the front elevation of the cottage. The extension has a proposed area of 80sq m and it is proposed to accommodate the kitchen, living, dining room, the bathroom and separate toilet. The bedrooms are proposed within the existing cottage. I note that the ridge height of the proposed extension is circa 2.1m below that of the cottage and the proposed roof profile of the extension features a shallow roof pitch. These design features ensure that the proposed extension will appear subordinate to the existing cottage. The appeal refers to concerns regarding extensive glazing to the extension. I note that there is no glazing proposed to the west facing elevation with the proposed windows and doors located to the east facing elevation which is away from the appellant's property and over the large garden of the property. I consider the proposed extension which is of a contemporary design reflects the form and scale of the existing cottage that it respects the vernacular architecture of the property.
- 8.2.4. The grounds of appeal raised concerns in relation to the proposed finished floor level of the extension relative to the existing cottage. In response to the matter the first party highlighted that the submitted site layout drawing indicates that the finished floor level of the extension and the existing cottage. The finished floor level (FFL) of the existing house is at 220.06 and the new FFL would be at 218.56. The first party highlighted that the submitted plans propose no steps between the existing cottage and the new addition. I note that the existing and proposed finished floor levels of the extension and exiting cottage are indicated on the Site Layout Plan Drawing No: 22-1459-20.
- 8.2.5. Overall, having regard to the details set out above, I consider that the extension has been sensitively design having regard to the vernacular character of the existing cottage.
- 8.2.6. Accordingly, I would concur with the assessment of the Planning Authority that the proposed reinstatement of the property to a habitable condition including the proposed extension of the property would be a positive addition to the area and would be in accordance with Policy Objective HER20 which refers to Buildings of

Vernacular and Heritage Interest and Section 12.3.10.5 of the Development Plan which refers to residential extensions in rural areas.

8.2.7. Concern is raised that the proposed extension would undermine the stability of the existing retaining wall to the appellant's property to the north. In response to the matter the first party noted that the appeal does not specify in what ways the development might cause structural harm. The appeal response highlighted that the boundary treatment between the appellant's property and the appeal site consists of a robust retaining wall. The first party submit that the proposed construction of the extension would be unlikely to impact the structural stability of the appellant's property. As ascertained from the Site Layout Plan Drawing No: 22-1459-20 the proposed extension is setback c.2.5m from the existing retaining wall. Accordingly, I would concur with the first party that having regard to the robust nature of the existing retaining wall and the proposed separation distance to the extension that it would be unlikely to impact the structural stability of the appellant's property.

8.3. Vehicular access and parking

8.3.1. The grounds of appeal raised the issues of vehicular access arrangements and car parking. The site is setback circa 15m from the public road and is accessed via an existing laneway immediately to the south of Barnacullia Road. In response to the concerns of the appellant referring the vehicular access arrangements and car parking the first party highlighted that vehicular access to the site is from the laneway and that there is an existing entrance to the site. In relation to car parking provision the first party confirmed that this will be provided on site within the area to the east of the dwelling.

8.3.2. Having regard to the nature of the development which entails the refurbishment of an existing cottage and an extension to the cottage to provide a kitchen/living/dining room and a bathroom, I do not consider that the proposal would result in generating any significant level of additional traffic and I consider the existing vehicular access arrangements are acceptable on that basis. Furthermore, I am satisfied that car parking can be accommodated on the site.

8.3.3. The matter of construction traffic was also raised in the grounds of appeal. Specifically, concern was expressed that construction vehicles would cause congestion on the Barnacullia Road. I consider that the issue of construction traffic

can be satisfactorily addressed with the attachment of a condition specifying that the developer shall submit a Construction Management Plan prior to commencement of development to the planning authority for their agreement

8.3.4. Accordingly, I am satisfied with vehicular access arrangements and proposed car parking.

8.4. Surface water drainage

8.4.1. The matter of surface water drainage was raised in the grounds of appeal. Specifically, it is stated in the appeal that the application form indicated that surface water drainage will be provided by means of a soak pit. It was stated in the appeal that the location of the soak pit was not indicated on the drawings. In response to the matter the first party highlighted that the existing soak pit is shown on the site layout to the north of the existing cottage. I note that the location of the existing soak pit is clearly indicated on the Site Layout Plan Drawing No: 22-1459-20. It is located circa 24m to the north-east of the exiting cottage.

8.4.2. In relation to the matter of surface water drainage serving the proposed extension, I note that the Drainage Planning Section in their report dated 05/05/2026 had no objections to the proposal subject to the attachment of a condition specifying that surface water from the proposed extension shall discharge into the existing soakaway on the site as indicated in the application. Accordingly, I am satisfied with the proposals concerning surface water drainage and I would recommend that should the Commission decide to grant permission then a condition referring to surface water drainage should be attached.

8.5. Other matters

8.5.1. It is set out in the appeal that the plans provided with the planning application were inadequate on the basis that the contiguous elevations do not adequately describe the works and their impact on neighbouring properties, that the elevations do not show any information on either existing or proposed external ground levels and that the retaining boundary wall between the subject site and the houses on Barnacle Road is not shown in elevation. In response to this matter the first party highlighted that the Planning Authority accepted the application as valid and proceeded to determine the application on its planning merits.

- 8.5.2. Having reviewed the plans and documentation submitted with the application, I would consider that they satisfy the provisions of Article 22 and Article 23 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 (as amended).

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. Wicklow Mountains SPA (Site Code 004040) is located circa 4km to the south-west of the appeal site. Knock sink Wood SAC (Site Code 00725) is circa 4.63km to the south of the appeal site. South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) is located circa 6.36km to the north-east of the development site. South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) is located circa 6.36km to the north-east of the development site. Rockabilly to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 003000) is located circa 9.12km to the east of the appeal site. Dalkey Island SPA (Site Code 004172) is located circa 9.14km to the east of the appeal site.
- 9.3. The proposal comprises the retention of reduction of ground works, relocation of existing front wall and new roof to existing cottage and permission for extension to side and rear, with wastewater treatment system, and associated works.
- 9.4. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.5. No streams/watercourses are identified on site.
- 9.6. 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 small scale and nature of the development.
 - The distance to the nearest European sites, and the absence of any hydrological or other pathways.
 - Taking into account the screening report of Dun Laoghaire Rath down County Council.

- 9.7. I conclude based on 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.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive, together with relevant guidance published by the Environmental Protection Agency (Ireland), including applicable codes of practice for the protection of water quality.
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.
- 10.3. The proposed development has been designed in accordance with EPA codes of practice and best practice guidance, ensuring that appropriate measures are incorporated to prevent pollution, control runoff, and protect both surface water and groundwater receptors.
- 10.4. Furthermore, the development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the maintenance or attainment of Good Ecological Status/Potential and Good Chemical Status, as required under the Directive.
- 10.5. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that retention permission and permission is granted.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Dun Laoghaire Rath down County Development Plan 2022-2028, specifically, Section 12.3.10.5 which refers to residential extensions in rural areas and Policy Objective HER20 which refers to Buildings of Vernacular and Heritage Interest, it is considered that, subject to conditions, the development, would provide reasonable protection of residential amenities, would generally respect the character and visual amenities of the area, would not be prejudicial to public health, water quality or the heritage of the area and would, therefore, be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be retained and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity.

3. The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles/slates) shall harmonise with those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

4. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

5. Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08:00 to 14:00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

7.

- (a) The wastewater treatment system hereby permitted shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations included within the site characterisation report submitted with this application on 31st day of March 2026 and shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled "Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)" – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.
- (b) Treated effluent from the wastewater treatment system shall be discharged to a percolation area/ polishing filter which shall be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled "Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)" – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.
- (c) Within three months of the first occupation of the dwelling, the developer shall submit a report to the planning authority from a suitably qualified person (with professional indemnity insurance) certifying that the wastewater treatment system and associated works is constructed and operating in accordance with the standards set out in the Environmental Protection Agency document referred to above.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to prevent water pollution.

8. 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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.”

Siobhan Carroll
Planning Inspector

27th of August 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL 501580-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of reduction of ground works, relocation of existing front wall and new roof to existing cottage. Permission for extension to side and rear, with wastewater treatment system, and associated works.
Development Address	Bayview, Barnacullia, Dublin 18, D18 A5F9
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.
(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 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:** _____