



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501597-DR-26

Development	Two-storey extension to front and side with attic conversion and associated internal and external works.
Location	27, Sweetbriar Lane, Kilmacud, Dublin 14, D14ET80
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D26A/0280/WEB
Applicant(s)	Keith and Sarah Davies
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Keith and Sarah Davies
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	21 st September 2026
Inspector	Bernadette Quinn

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, with a stated area of 0.031ha, is located on the western side of Sweetbriar Lane in Kilmacud. The site contains a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey side extension on the southern side elevation and a single storey rear extension. There is a dormer window on the rear roof serving a bathroom. There is a garden and car parking area to the front which is accessed by vehicular access from Sweetbriar Lane. The rear boundary contains mature hedgerow separating the appeal site from properties to the rear.
- 1.2. The area is characterised by suburban development which includes semi-detached two storey dwellings of a similar design to the appeal site along part of the western side of Sweetbriar Lane, gable fronted dormer dwellings further south on Sweetbriar Lane and to the rear, two storey terraced dwellings on the opposite side of the road to the appeal site and single storey terraced dwellings to the north and south on Sweetbriar Lane.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the following:
 - a new front and side extension two-storey in height, constructed over the existing single-storey converted garage;
 - extension and alteration of the existing roof to form a gable end incorporating attic accommodation within the roof;
 - flat roof to the rear element of the new side extension;
 - replacement of the roof to the existing rear single-storey extension;
 - new porch;
 - new roof over the existing front bay window;
 - alterations to vehicular access gate; internal alterations and all associated site works.

The existing dwelling has a floor area of 156.12sq.m. and the proposed works have a floor area of 50.94sq.m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On 03rd June 2026 Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council issued notification of decision to refuse permission for one reason as follows:

The proposed development, by reason of its excessive height, scale, massing and the introduction of a full third storey with gable fronted and flat roofed elements, would read as incongruous and result in a visually dominant form that fails to integrate with the existing dwelling. The development would appear out of character with the established pattern of predominantly one and two storey dwellings in the area, would disrupt the coherent roofscape, and would set an undesirable precedent for similar large-scale extensions. The proposal would therefore seriously injure the residential and visual amenities of the area and would be contrary to Section 12.3.7.1 'Extensions to Dwellings' of the Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development would thus be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planning Officer's report dated 03rd June 2026 can be summarised as follows:

- Regard is given to the previous proposal on site which was refused. The current proposal is similar in size/dimensions as the previous proposal, the key difference is the omission of a third storey balcony element which has been replaced by a single large window.
- Significant concerns remain regarding the introduction of a full third storey element and its potential to disrupt the coherent roofscape pattern and set an undesirable precedent.
- The introduction of a third storey is considered out of scale with the property and the established character of the area and would appear overly prominent in the streetscape and disrupt the established roof profile pattern.

- The three storey nature of the rear extension would lead to an undue level of overbearing on the neighbouring dwelling and the addition of a large window at second floor close to the party boundary to the south would give rise to significant overlooking concerns.
- The addition of an additional storey within the existing roof plane would be inappropriate for the building typology of the appeal site and streetscape which are two-storey semi-detached dwellings.
- The proposal, when combined with the existing rear attic dormer, significantly increases the bulk and visual dominance of the dwelling resulting in overdevelopment of the roof profile with the additions failing to read as subordinate to the main roof profile.
- The proposal to alter the dwelling to an extent that is visually incongruous and out of character with both the original structure and the prevailing pattern of development in the area and the proposal is not in accordance with Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings of the Development Plan.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Planning: No objection subject to conditions.

Transportation Planning: No objection subject to conditions.

Environmental Enforcement/Waste Management: No objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None on file.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site:

D25A/0935/WEB on 5th February 2025 the Planning Authority refused permission refused for front and side extension, partially two-storey and partially three-storey, over the existing single-storey converted garage; extension of the existing roof to form a gable end; a flat roof to the rear of the new side extension; replacement of the roof to the existing rear single-storey extension; a new porch; a new roof over the existing front bay window; alterations to vehicular access gate; internal alterations and all associated site works. Refusal reason: The proposed development, by reason of its excessive height, scale, massing and the introduction of a full third storey with gable fronted and flat roofed elements, would read as incongruous and result in a visually dominant form that fails to integrate with the existing dwelling. The development would appear out of character with the established pattern of predominantly one and two storey dwellings in the area, would disrupt the coherent roofscape, and would set an undesirable precedent for similar largescale extensions. The proposal would therefore seriously injure the residential and visual amenities of the area and would be contrary to Section 12.3.7.1 'Extensions to Dwellings' of the Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022–2028. The proposed development would thus be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

D07B/0979: Permission granted for amendments to porch, garage and extension to rear, attic conversion.

Surrounding Area:

D23B/0045: Permission granted at 16 Sweetbriar Lane for front dormer window.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, 2022-2028 (as varied) is the statutory development plan for the area. The site is zoned Objective 'A' residential with the objective to: 'provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities' under which residential development is listed within the 'Permitted in Principle' category of this zoning objective.

5.1.2. In Chapter 4 Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock - Adaptation It is a Policy Objective to: Conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF.

5.1.3. In Chapter 12 Development Management, Section 12.3.7.1 provides guidance with respect to front and rear extensions and alterations to roof. The relevant considerations include:

- 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. Front extensions, particularly at first floor level, should reflect the roof shape and slope of the main dwelling. A minimum driveway length of 6 metres should be maintained.
- Extensions to the Rear: 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. The extension should match or complement the main house. First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:
 - Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries.
 - Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability.
 - Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.
 - External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.

- 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. 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.
- Alterations at Roof/Attic Level: 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.
- Dormer extensions to roofs, i.e. to the front, side, and rear, will be considered with regard to impacts on existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. The design, dimensions, and bulk of any roof proposal relative to the overall size of the dwelling and gardens will be the overriding considerations. Dormer extensions shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries. Dormer extensions should be set down from the existing ridge level so as to not read as a third storey extension at roof level to the rear. The proposed quality of materials/finishes for dormer extensions will be considered carefully as this can greatly improve their appearance. The level and type of glazing within a dormer extension should have regard to existing window treatments and fenestration of the dwelling. However, regard should also be had to size of fenestration proposed at attic level relative to adjoining residential amenities. Particular care will be taken in evaluating large, visually dominant dormer window structures, with a balance sought between quality residential amenity and the privacy of adjacent properties. Excessive overlooking of adjacent properties should be avoided.

5.2. National Guidance

5.2.1. The following ministerial guidelines are considered relevant to the appeal site:

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) (the 'Compact Settlements Guidelines')

SPPR 1 requires a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms above ground floor level at the rear or side of houses. Separation distances below 16 metres may be considered acceptable in circumstances where there are no opposing windows serving habitable rooms and where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme to prevent undue overlooking of habitable rooms and private amenity spaces.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1. South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) and South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) are located approx. 3km northeast 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.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal in relation to the decision can be summarised as follows:

- A Planning Report submitted with the application is attached and it is requested that consideration is given to the report in assessing the appeal.
- The existing ridge height is retained, and attic accommodation is contained within the roof profile, the proposal does not constitute a full third storey as stated by the PA. The Development Plan does not prohibit attic accommodation or roof-level alterations. Roof alterations and attic-level

accommodation are an established feature of Sweetbriar Lane. The existing dwelling contains attic accommodation. The proposal should be assessed as a two-storey extension with attic accommodation, not as a new full three-storey dwelling or three-storey extension.

- Local roof variations exist and the streetscape is not uniform. The PA assessment places weight on the area as predominantly one and two storeys. Consideration should be given to whether the proposal is acceptable in terms of design, scale, amenity and visual integration.
- The side extension will be constructed over an existing side structure, comparable two storey side extensions have been permitted in the area and the proposal is a logical extension consistent with established precedent.
- Roof level windows exist in the area including at the adjoining property and No. 31 which contains large dormer rooms and roof level windows and the overlooking concern is unsupported and inconsistently applied and not included in the reason for refusal.
- No third-party observations have been submitted, neighbours have confirmed their support, and no demonstrable residential amenity harm has been identified, and no traffic or drainage issues arise.
- The proposal is based on a site-specific context and would not create a precedent.
- The proposal was prepared in response to the PA's previous refusal including omission of a balcony, confirmation that a third storey is not introduced and that attic accommodation is contained within the roof space. The PA failed to assess whether the amendments addressed the previously identified concerns.
- Comparable forms of development have been granted in the area by the PA and ACP, including at 31 Sweetbriar Lane ref D17B/0445 which supports the proposal. Permission D23B/0064 granted permission for a front dormer and D16A/0122 related to substantial redevelopment works and was permitted following appeal. D15A/0070 relates to a two-storey side extension and front extension.

- No unacceptable overshadowing impact was identified. An existing extension to the rear of the neighbouring dwelling reduces the impact in terms of overlooking and this is relevant in assessing the residential amenity impact.
- No overbearing impact has been demonstrated, and the proposal does not extend beyond the established building line and remains proportionate to the host dwelling.
- The proposal is consistent with Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan.
- A photographic streetscape analysis submitted illustrates the varied architectural expression on the street and demonstrates the roofscape cannot reasonably be described as uniform or coherent.
- No side facing windows are proposed and the rear extension is stepped and articulated and aligns with the established pattern of development in the area.
- Negative impacts on surrounding residential and visual amenities do not arise.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

Response received states no new issues raised.

7.3. Observations

None received.

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, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Visual Impacts
- Residential Amenity Impacts

8.2. Visual Impacts

- 8.2.1. In assessing the proposal, the PA Planning Officer raised concerns in relation to the proposal to introduce a full third storey element and resulting visual impacts including impact on the streetscape, that the proposal increases the bulk and visual dominance resulting in overdevelopment of the roof profile with the additions failing to read as subordinate to the roof profile and as a result the proposal fails to comply with Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan. The refusal reason reflects these concerns and refers to the excessive height, scale, massing and resulting visual impacts.
- 8.2.2. In response the appellant outlines that the existing ridge height is retained, attic accommodation is contained within the roof profile, and that the proposal does not constitute a full third storey. The appeal outlines that the Development Plan does not prohibit attic accommodation or roof-level alterations, that roof alterations and attic-level accommodation are an established feature of Sweetbriar Lane, that the existing dwelling contains attic accommodation and the proposal should be assessed as a two-storey extension with attic accommodation, not as a new full three-storey dwelling or three-storey extension.
- 8.2.3. In relation to the PA concerns relating to the visual impact on the streetscape I note that the existing dwelling on site is a two-storey dwelling with attic accommodation including dormer to the rear. The proposed extension is a two-storey extension with attic accommodation proposed in the roof space and with the front elevation incorporating a front facing gable with window serving the attic. The proposed ridge level of the extension will match the existing ridge height and the proposed eaves height will be approx. 1.8m above the existing front eaves height and will project approx. 1m from the existing main front façade and in line with an existing ground floor bay window projection.
- 8.2.4. I note that the Development Plan in Section 12.3.7.1 outlines guidance in relation to front extensions and alterations at roof/attic level. Guidance relating to front extensions states that 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, excessive scale should be avoided, and front extensions, particularly at first floor level, should reflect the roof shape and slope of the main dwelling. In relation to alterations at roof/attic level the guidance states that alterations at roof level 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.

- 8.2.5. Having considered the content of Section 12.3.7.1 relating to front extensions and alterations at roof/attic level I consider the main considerations relate to scale, design, compatibility with existing roof on the host dwelling and impact on the streetscape.
- 8.2.6. The appeal outlines a number of precedents in the area which are considered relevant which include two storey front projections/extensions, a first-floor gable projection to a two-storey dwelling, and a dormer window on the roof of a single storey dwelling. Having reviewed the precedents referred to I consider they are not directly comparable with the proposed front gable projection above first floor level.
- 8.2.7. In relation to the character of the area, Sweet Briar Lane fronting the site slopes from south down to north such that the dwellings to the south are positioned at a higher level than the dwelling on the appeal site and those to the north. The west side of the street is characterised by two storey semi-detached dwellings similar to the existing dwelling on the appeal site. The east side of the street is characterised by a terrace of two storey dwellings. To the south of the appeal site on the west side of the street are dormer dwellings with front facing gable elevations and on the east side to the north and south are terraces of single storey dwellings. Having regard to the above, whilst I note the appeal site contains a dwelling similar to other dwellings on this section of the street, I note the overall street is characterised by a mix of dwelling styles including single storey, dormer and two storey dwellings some of which have been altered and extended by way of two storey front extensions and dormers. I also note that the site is not within an ACA or other protected area designation.
- 8.2.8. I do not consider the front projection results in a significant break in the building line, noting it corresponds with the building line of the existing bay window projection approx. 1m deep, albeit incorporating a projection at first floor and roof level.
- 8.2.9. Having considered the scale and design of the proposed front extension and the character of the surrounding area, I note that the proposal will introduce a gable roof projection on the front elevation and an increase in eaves height above existing

which I consider differs from the established pattern of development in the area. However, I consider the proposed gable projection respects the existing roof shape and height. I do not consider the height, scale and massing is excessive, noting the proposed ridge height is in line with the existing ridge height, and I consider the scale of the proposal is in line with the scale of existing development on the site. I note development in the vicinity is varied in design and scale as outlined above and having regard to the established pattern of development in the area I do not consider the proposed front extension is of such a scale or design that it is likely to result in negative impacts on the streetscape. I therefore do not agree with the PA finding that the proposed front extension would be visually dominant or that it fails to integrate with the existing dwelling.

- 8.2.10. Having considered the criteria contained in Section 12.3.7.1 I consider the proposal complies with the Development Plan criteria relating to front extensions and roof alterations. I consider the proposed extension will integrate successfully with the surrounding streetscape and is unlikely to result in negative visual impacts on the streetscape and I am satisfied that the design proposed is acceptable.

8.3. Residential Amenity Impacts

- 8.3.1. The PA concerns relate to the proposed three storey element of the rear extension which is considered to lead to an undue level of overbearing on the neighbouring dwelling and overlooking as a result of the addition of a large window at second floor close to the party boundary to the south. I note that no concerns were raised in relation to the ground floor and first floor elements to the rear. Concerns are also raised that the proposed rear extension when combined with the existing rear dormer would result in overdevelopment of the roof profile. The refusal reason states that the proposal would seriously injure the residential amenities of the area.
- 8.3.2. The appeal outlines that rear roof level dormers exist on neighbouring properties and that the overlooking concerns are unsupported, no overshadowing or overbearing issues arise, the proposal does not extend beyond the established building line, and that neighbouring properties contain rear extensions.
- 8.3.3. I have considered the guidance contained in Section 12.3.7.1 relating to extensions to the rear and having regard to the concerns raised by the PA I consider the relevant consideration relate to potential impacts on surrounding residential or visual

amenities as a result of overbearing and overlooking as a result of the proposed rear second floor / roof level extension.

- 8.3.4. The proposed side extension will extend to the rear over three floors with the ground floor projecting 3.6m from the existing main rear elevation and the first floor projecting 3.3m from the existing main rear elevation. A proposed roof level extension measures 2.4m wide and 2.5m high, will be in line with the main rear elevation and will be positioned above the proposed two storey extension at a distance of approx. 0.2m from the southern (side) site boundary and 0.8m from the side elevation of the neighbouring property to the south, and will have a flat roof. A new window is proposed on the attic level extension which measures approx. 1.96m high and 1.91m wide. It is proposed to retain an existing dormer window and roof lights on the rear elevation.
- 8.3.5. I note that neighbouring properties to the north and south contain single storey rear extensions similar in scale to the existing extension on the appeal property. The property to the north at No. 25 includes a hipped roof on the single storey rear extension whilst the property to the south at No. 29 contains a flat roofed single storey rear extension and a rear roof level dormer. The proposed new window at attic level will be located a distance of approx. 15m from the rear site boundary, beyond which is the side elevation of an extension serving No. 73 Woodley Park which is separated from the appeal site by mature trees such that no directly opposing rear windows are visible from the appeal site.
- 8.3.6. In relation to concerns relating to overbearing, I do not consider the scale of the rear extension at roof level is excessive in the context of existing development on the site and the scale of adjoining properties. I do not consider this element of the proposal will result in unacceptable overbearing impacts on neighbouring properties. I also do not agree with the PA that taken with the existing rear dormer this element will result in overdevelopment of the site.
- 8.3.7. Having reviewed the drawings and inspected the site I do not consider the proposed rear roof level window would give rise to excessive or unacceptable overlooking above what already exists from existing windows. Whilst I note the proposed rear roof window is closer to the boundary with the property to the south at No. 29 than the existing dormer at the appeal site, I note that the No. 29 contains a rear ground

floor extension and I consider the extent of overlooking arising would not give rise to overlooking impacts substantially beyond those which currently exist from existing rear dormer windows or that such impacts would result in unacceptable impacts on adjoining residential amenity.

- 8.3.8. A window with a height of 4.1m and width of 0.95m is proposed above ground floor on the south side elevation serving the stairs. This window will face the side elevation of No. 27 and as it serves stairs I am satisfied that it will not give rise to unacceptable overlooking.
- 8.3.9. Having regard to the scale and design proposed I am satisfied that the proposal will not give rise to unacceptable overbearing or overlooking impacts and will be acceptable with regard to residential and visual amenities of neighbouring properties.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive.

I have considered case PL-501597-DR-26 in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The proposed development is located within a residential area and comprises modifications to an existing dwelling and all associated site works. The closest European Sites are South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024), both located approx. 3km northeast of the proposed development.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and domestic nature of the development
- The location of the development in a serviced urban area, distance from European Sites and urban nature of intervening habitats, absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.
- Having regard to the screening determination of the PA.

I conclude, 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. 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. 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. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 as varied, including the Residential land use zoning of the site, Policy Objective PHP19 and the provisions of Section 12.3.7.1 relating to extensions and alterations at roof/attic level, to the established residential use on the site and the pattern of development in the area, and to the and the scale, form and design of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be in keeping with the established pattern of development at this location and would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity. The proposed

development would, therefore, 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 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. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwelling shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

3. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water which shall also provide for appropriate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS), shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

4. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between 0800 to 1900 hours Mondays to Fridays inclusive and 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.

5. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction and Environmental Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement

of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures, waste management and recycling of materials, environmental protection measures, welfare facilities, site deliveries, complaints procedure, pest control and traffic management arrangements.

Reason: In the interest of public safety, environmental protection, and residential amenity.

6. Prior to commencement of development, a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) shall be prepared and submitted to the planning authority for written agreement. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times.

Reason: In the interest of reducing waste and encouraging recycling.

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 the An Bord 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.”

Bernadette Quinn
Senior Planning Inspector

23rd September 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501597-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Two-storey extension to front and side with attic conversion and associated internal and external works.
Development Address	27, Sweetbriar Lane, Kilmacud, Dublin 14, D14ET80
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	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
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	

No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)
--	--

Inspector: _____ Date: _____