

2, 3, 4, & 9 Marine Court
Lower Albert Road
Sandycove
Co. Dublin

An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street
Dublin 1
D01 V902

Date: 1st September 2026

Re: Third-Party Appeal against the Grant of Planning Permission

Planning Register Reference: D26A/0462/WEB

Applicant: Lisa O'Neill

Location: 11 Marine Court, Glenageary, Co. Dublin, A96 E1C5

Development: Construction of a new two-storey, one-bedroom dwelling utilising the footprint and form of the previously permitted extension, together with a new entrance, shared vehicular access and driveway arrangement with No. 11, boundary treatments, services and associated works.

Dear Sir/Madam,

We, the third-party appellants named below, wish to appeal the decision of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council dated 11th August 2026 to grant permission for the above development. We previously made observations on the application and therefore have standing to make this appeal.

We have no objection to residential development in principle. Our concern is whether this particular established residential plot can accommodate a second dwelling without unacceptable consequences for the existing dwelling, the proposed dwelling and the established character of Marine Court.

The appeal considers the subdivision of No. 11 Marine Court and its consequences for the existing dwelling, the adjoining communal green space and the proposed dwelling, together with the relevant planning history, parking and access arrangements, private open space, residential accommodation and the cumulative impact of the development on the other residents of Marine Court. These matters are summarised below and addressed in detail in subsequent sections 1-5.

Summary of Grounds

We respectfully ask An Coimisiún Pleanála to consider the following principal grounds:

- **Subdivision and boundary** — loss of side access/garden, consequences for the existing dwelling, and the relationship of the proposed dwelling to the boundary wall and adjoining communal Council-owned green space.
- **Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan compliance** — particularly Section 12.3.7.5 and the requirements applicable to subdivision of an established house curtilage.

- **Planning history** — the precedents in the Planner’s Report are **not** directly comparable, while the relevant refusal at No. 12 Marine Court (D00A/1196) does not appear to have been considered.
- **Parking and access** — the drawings do not specifically identify any parking spaces for either the existing or proposed new dwelling, yet the Planner concludes that the “proposed car parking arrangements” are acceptable.
- **Private open space** — the Report applies a 20m² requirement despite the Development Plan specifying 48m² for a 1–2 bedroom house, without explaining the discrepancy.
- **Residential accommodation** — one-bedroom classification and “Office” capable of functioning as a second bedroom, with apparent discrepancies in bedroom, storage and living-room provision, particularly relevant if the development were to be viewed as a two-bedroom house.
- **Bins, landscaping and SUDS** — no bin-storage provision is identified for either house and the proposed frontage requires assessment against Development Plan requirements.
- **Residential amenity, character and overdevelopment** — the cumulative effect of the subdivision, loss of access and daylight to the existing dwelling, constrained site and private open space, parking and access arrangements, and introduction of a second **semi-detached** dwelling into an established estate of **detached** houses.

These matters are addressed below.

1. Subdivision and consequences for the existing dwelling

Section 12.3.7.5 of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan (DLR CDP) specifically addresses subdivision of existing house curtilages to provide additional dwellings and requires consideration of matters including the relationship between the dwellings, car parking for existing and proposed dwellings, side/gable and rear access and maintenance space, and adequate usable private open space for both dwellings.

The submitted drawings **do not provide a number of dimensions** necessary to establish the precise extent and configuration of the proposed development. This is material because, without those dimensions, the relationship between the proposed dwelling, the original dwelling, the boundary wall and the adjoining communal green space, as well as the extent of the private open space and access arrangements, cannot be fully assessed.

The proposal involves substantially reducing the established curtilage of No. 11 to create a separate constrained residential plot of approximately 100m². As the proposed new dwelling appears to extend to the boundary wall with the communal Council-owned green space in Marine Court, the original dwelling would lose its established side garden and the entire side access between the front and rear of the property. This is not simply a loss of garden area. The existing side gate provides practical access to the rear of the original four-bedroom house for bins, bicycles, gardening equipment, maintenance and other normal residential purposes. The subdivision also changes the established parking and access arrangement serving the original dwelling.

Bin storage

No bin-storage location or design is identified on the submitted plans for either the proposed dwelling or the original dwelling. This is particularly relevant where the existing side access to No. 11 is being removed. Section 12.3.4.7 of the DLR CDP states that, for individual houses, the proposed location and design of bin storage should be clearly shown, having regard to the number of bins required (standard is currently 3 bins per dwelling – general waste, recycling and

compost, i.e. **6 bins in total** for the original and proposed new dwelling) and possible future requirements.

Proximity to boundary wall

Section 12.3.7.5 of the DLR CDP specifically requires consideration of the relationship between the original and proposed dwelling, adequate usable private open space and side/gable and rear access/maintenance space. As mentioned above, the absence of boundary details and relevant measurements on the submitted drawings also makes it difficult to assess the precise extent and usability of the private open space attributed to each dwelling.

This lack of sufficient detail and dimensions also makes it difficult to determine whether the proposed dwelling extends to and/or abuts, or indeed incorporates, the boundary wall adjoining the Council-owned communal green space. In particular, the drawing of the gable end of the new dwelling facing the communal green makes no reference to the existence of the boundary wall or its relationship to the proposed dwelling. There also appears to be no external access within the proposed residential curtilage to its side elevation for routine external maintenance, including rendering, painting and gutter repairs. The relationship of the new gable, windows and boundary treatment with the communal green, including the established mature trees and vegetation, should therefore be assessed on the basis of a defined proposal including in-curtilage access.

If the proposed new dwelling does indeed extend to and/or abut, or incorporate the boundary wall, clarification is required as to whether the boundary wall is in the joint ownership of the applicant and Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council or is wholly under the ownership of the Council. It should also be established as to whether the eaves of the proposed dwelling are contained wholly within its curtilage or whether they project over the boundary wall and/or encroach upon or overhang the adjoining communal green space.

Chapter 12 of the DLR CDP states that: “The proposed construction of new building structures directly onto the boundary with the public realm (including footpaths/open space/roads etc), is **not acceptable** and it will be required that the development is set within the existing boundary on site and shall not form the boundary wall.” A sufficient separation should therefore be maintained between the proposed dwelling and the existing boundary wall to ensure that the wall, together with the eaves and external elevations of the proposed dwelling, can be accessed and adequately maintained entirely from within the curtilage of the proposed dwelling, without the need for access to or encroachment upon the adjoining communal green space. Any construction work over the duration of such a project would also have the potential to cause disruption to other Marine Court residents’ use and enjoyment of this space through the erection of scaffolding or the presence of machinery or equipment over an extended period of time.

The Planner’s Report also expressly states: “Details of the proposed boundary treatments to separate the original and the proposed dwelling do not appear to have been provided. This matter can be addressed via condition.”

We respectfully submit that, in the circumstances of this proposal, this is a matter requiring assessment rather than simply deferral. The development involves subdivision of an established residential plot into two separate dwellings. The nature, position and treatment of the boundary between them are directly relevant to the relationship between the properties, usable private open space, access and maintenance arrangements, and the overall character of the subdivision.

Summary

Although the Planner's Report refers to Section 12.3.7.5 of the DLR CDP, its assessment does not satisfactorily demonstrate how the original dwelling will continue to function following removal of its entire side access and alteration of its established parking and access arrangements. Nor does the Report address the uncertainty arising from the insufficient detail and dimensions provided in the submitted drawings regarding the extent of the proposed dwelling and its relationship with the adjoining communal green space.

We therefore request that the subdivision be assessed as a whole, including its consequences for the original dwelling and the precise extent and relationship of the proposed new dwelling to both the original dwelling and the adjoining communal green space, rather than principally as an assessment of whether the new dwelling can be accommodated on the land being separated from No. 11.

2. Planning history and precedent

The Planner's Report refers to D24A/0273 and D24A/0461 at No. 20 Marine Court and D12A/0010 at "The Bungalow", Spencer Villas. However, **none of these** provide directly comparable precedents.

No. 20 Marine Court (D24A/0273 and D24A/0461)

The applications at No. 20 Marine Court (D24A/0273 and D24A/0461), a house which also partially borders a second communal green space in Marine Court, concerned a modest **single-storey extension** and alterations to an original dwelling on a **substantially wider plot**, with the plans showing approximately **6.136m at the front and 7.674m at the rear between the original house and the boundary wall**, compared with approximately **4.000m and 3.689m respectively at No. 11**. The subsequently built single-storey extension at No. 20 extends only **2.850m** from the side of the house, leaving the entire front garden with adequate parking and considerable side garden space remaining (see attached image of No. 20 with built extension). We also note that the Planner's Report for the current application (D26A/0462/WEB) incorrectly states that, in the case of D24A/0273 and D24A/0461 permission was granted for: "3) Construction of a new garage/store to the front/side of the existing dwelling." The decision letter in fact required the garage/store to be set within the existing boundary wall to the rear garden and it was currently withdrawn entirely from the application.

Given these factors and based on the fact that the plot at No. 20 was **not subdivided** for construction of a new and separate dwelling, these applications do not provide a directly comparable precedent for the subdivision of an established detached-house plot to create a second independent dwelling.

"The Bungalow", Spencer Villas (D12A/0010)

D12A/0010, as cited by the Planner's Report, is somewhat more relevant in the sense that it involved subdivision of an original house and site to create two dwellings, however the circumstances were materially different. The overall site was over four times larger at approximately **1,416m²**, compared with a total site of **331m² at No. 11 Marine Court**. Each resultant dwelling at Spencer Villas had two designated parking spaces and separate vehicular access, with railings and gates to the front and a substantial hedge dividing the front curtilage (see attached images). The residual rear gardens were approximately **320m² and 370m²** respectively. Rear access to both properties is also available via an adjacent lane approximately 3.75m wide. Spencer Villas is also an unusually wide road, shown on the plans as approximately **9.75m wide**, providing substantially more space for vehicles to enter and exit the respective

properties and reducing the potential for conflict between vehicles and access arrangements. Contrastingly, Marine Court is a particularly narrow road, allowing just sufficient space for two average vehicles to comfortably pass each other provided no other vehicles are parked on the footpaths/roadside which is an increasingly common occurrence.

This issue was also raised in the appellants' original submissions but not addressed in the Planner's Report: Marine Court has ongoing issues in relation to non-resident parking, often leading to difficulties for residents in accessing driveways and, on occasion, blocking residents from leaving their houses altogether by non-resident parking on opposite sides of the road or on the paths, thereby preventing not only access/egress by residents but also by emergency services, refuse collection vehicles etc.

The Planner's Report states that Spencer Villas is characterised by "a mix of house types including paired semi-detached house types". The proposal (D12A/0010) was, therefore, already consistent with an **existing mix of house types** on that road. Marine Court, by contrast, comprises a cul-de-sac of approximately 20 established detached houses on individual plots, with **no previous subdivision** to create an additional dwelling. The differences between the situation in Spencer Villas and the proposed new dwelling at 11 Marine Court in terms of site area, access, parking, road width, residual private amenity space and established character are therefore substantial. The aerial comparison enclosed with this appeal (see Page 12) clearly illustrates the differences.

No. 12 Marine Court (D00A/1196 and D13A/0319)

More significantly, our original observation expressly drew attention to a particularly relevant application within Marine Court itself, planning ref. D00A/1196 at No. 12 Marine Court, concerning a proposed additional **detached**, two-storey, two-bedroom dwelling on a larger site within the same estate. In the application letter for D00A/1196, the entire site is given as **385m²**, compared with an overall site area of **331m²** at 11 Marine Court. D00A/1196 was refused by the Council for the following reasons: "Having regard to the configuration and restricted nature of the site, it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its **scale and proximity to the site boundaries**, would result in **overdevelopment** of the site. It is considered that the proposed development would seriously injure the residential amenities of property in the vicinity, the visual amenities of the area and would be **contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.**"

A subsequent application, D13A/0319, for a modest part single-/part double-storey extension to the side of the main house at the same location, No. 12 Marine Court, was approved with modifications but was not built. From the dimensions provided with application ref. D13A/0319 it is apparent that the site to the side of the original house at 12 Marine Court is of a similar width to that of No. 20 (D24A/0273 and D24A/0461), namely approximately **6.100m** at the front and **7.100m** at the rear between the original house and the boundary wall with the communal green space, compared with approximately **4.000m** and **3.689m** respectively at No. 11.

Despite our original observations expressly referencing a relevant comparison with the current application, D00A/1196 does not appear in the Planner's Report. There is consequently no assessment of whether that decision to refuse permission is comparable to, or distinguishable from, the present proposal. We respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála consider **D00A/1196** directly and determine whether the circumstances of the present proposal genuinely justify a different conclusion.

3. Parking, shared access and front-garden landscaping

The Transportation assessment in the Planner's Report concludes: "The maximum parking provision for the proposed house is therefore **one space per dwelling**. The proposed car parking arrangements are therefore considered acceptable."

Absence of car parking designation and impact on public amenity

However, the submitted drawings do not specifically identify or designate **any car parking spaces for either the proposed dwelling or the existing dwelling at No. 11**. It is therefore unclear what physical "proposed car parking arrangements" were assessed in reaching this conclusion. Furthermore, the reference in the Planner's Report to "**per dwelling**" is significant. The statement that the maximum parking provision is "one space per dwelling" does not, in itself, demonstrate that a functional parking arrangement has been provided for either dwelling. This is particularly important in the context of a subdivision, where Section 12.3.7.5 of the CDP specifically requires consideration of car parking for **both the existing and proposed dwellings**. The proposed development will result in **two dwellings**, not one. Accordingly, the assessment should have considered the parking requirements of the resultant **two-dwelling** site rather than treating one parking space as sufficient for both the original and proposed dwellings. The area indicated as a shared access route on the drawings is, by its nature and situation, unsuitable for use as a clearly designated parking space. It is therefore unclear where the "one space per dwelling", i.e. two spaces in total for the original and the new dwelling, referred to in the Transportation assessment are intended to be located, particularly in light of the minimum one-third grass/landscaping requirement mentioned in the section below.

The proposal has the potential to give rise to inadequate parking provision for the resultant residential two-dwelling development, overspill parking on the public road and an associated impact on residential amenity. This is particularly relevant having regard to the fact that the original dwelling is a four-bedroom house and that Marine Court, an especially narrow road, is already subject to significant and regular non-resident parking and access obstruction.

It is, therefore, requested that consideration be given as to whether the proposed parking provision is consistent with Table 12.5 (page 262) of the DLR CDP, and whether the conclusion drawn in the Planner's Report, namely that one space is sufficient for the proposed development, properly applies the CDP's dwelling/unit-based parking standards. We respectfully request that it be established where the parking space for the proposed new dwelling is to be located, where parking for the existing dwelling is to be provided following subdivision, and whether vehicles can enter, leave and manoeuvre satisfactorily without obstructing the area designated on the drawing as "shared access".

Front garden, landscaping and SUDS

Section 12.4.8.3 provides that **a minimum of one third of front garden areas should be maintained in grass or landscaped in the interests of urban greening and SUDS**. The Development Plan also states (12.4.8.2) that "vehicular entrances and on-curtilage parking should not normally dominate a property's frontage".

The proposal creates a shared front curtilage serving two dwellings, with shared vehicular access and, according to the aforementioned sections of the CDP, a requirement for two parking spaces occupying a significant part of the frontage. It should, therefore, be established, taking into account the points raised above what part of the front garden is to be designated as the "minimum one third grass/landscaped area", where it is intended to locate the "one [parking] space **per dwelling**" and, consequently, whether the proposed arrangements subsequently comply with the one-third grass/landscaping requirements.

4. Private open space and residential accommodation

The Planner's Report specifically assesses the proposed accommodation against the *Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities* (2007) guidelines (see table on page 5/6 of Planner's Report) and records various room-size and storage figures. We respectfully request that these figures be verified against the submitted drawings.

Private open space

The Planner's Report (page 4 – “Development Plan Considerations”) identifies Section 12.8.3.3 of the Development Plan as being relevant policy, however, the accommodation standards table on page 5/6 of the Planner's Report under the heading “Residential Amenity” indicates a private open space “Requirement” of **20m²** and contrasts it with a purported “Provision” of **31.2m²** in this application. However, Table 12.10 “Private Open Space” on page 285 of the Development Plan (specifies a **minimum of 48m² for a one/two-bedroom house**, subject to the qualification that a lesser provision may be acceptable where it can be demonstrated that “good-quality usable open space can be provided on site”.

Given the fact that there are incomplete dimensions for the rear garden of both the original and proposed new dwellings provided on the applicant's drawings, the Planner's Report does not explain how the **20m² requirement** has been derived, how the “provided” **31.2m²** has been calculated, nor how these figures have been reconciled with the **minimum of 48m²** standard in the Development Plan. Nor does it demonstrate why the reduced “Provision” of 31.2m² is acceptable when compared with the aforementioned requirement of **48m²** in Table 12.10. This is particularly relevant given the constrained, approximately 100m² site and the requirements of Section 12.3.7.5 concerning adequate usable private open space **for both dwellings**. Any designated parking spaces and the shared access area within the front curtilage should not be included in meeting this requirement.

An Coimisiún Pleanála is therefore requested to clarify the applicable standard, verify the calculation of the **31.2m²** “Provision” asserted in the Planner's Report and, if this is the case, assess whether it constitutes **good-quality usable open space**. If provision below the 48m² stipulation in the Development Plan is considered acceptable, then the basis for that conclusion should be identified.

Bedroom and storage

The Planner's Report records **13m²** for the main bedroom and **2.07m²** of storage. However, according to the drawings, the principal bedroom measures approximately 3.397m × 3.103m = **10.54m²**. The plan also depicts a double bed within the room. The adjoining area is separately labelled “WIR”, is approximately 1.8m deep, and its width is not shown. Section 5.3.2 on page 48 of the *Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities* guidance identifies “**at least 11.4m²” as the minimum area for a double bedroom**. The bedroom as depicted on the drawings is therefore approximately **0.86m²** below that standard. It is unclear whether the additional area required to reach the 13m² figure has been obtained by including the separately labelled WIR. Storage is also not clearly designated anywhere for either of the two floors of the house on the submitted plans, despite the Planner's Report recording this as **2.07m²** in the Residential amenity table on page 6.

We therefore request that the Board verify the **13m²** bedroom figure, establish whether the WIR has been included in the bedroom or storage calculation or both, and confirm compliance with the applicable accommodation standards.

Living room and circulation

The Planner's Report records the principal living room as **9.4m²**, against an identified minimum of **11m²** and describes this as a “minor deviation”. Although the aggregate living area is recorded as 26.7m², this does not necessarily establish that the principal living room itself is adequately proportioned and functional. No dimensions are provided for the entrance hall or the downstairs WC. The actual proportions and circulation arrangements, including for the non-dimensioned entrance hall, should therefore be verified and considered rather than relying solely on aggregate floor-area figures.

“Office”

The first-floor plan contains a separate enclosed room with its own standard-sized window and door labelled “Office”, in addition to the principal bedroom. The only dimension shown for the room on the proposed plan is **2.024m**, which appears to represent its depth; its full internal width is not indicated.

However, the application is expressly presented as “utilising the footprint and form of the two-storey extension previously permitted under Planning Register Reference **D26B/0132/WEB**.” The drawings relating to that extension permission show the front of the corresponding extension as measuring 4.000m externally and **3.691m** internally. The proposed new dwelling retains the same approximately 4.000m external width at first-floor level and does not indicate any reduction in width at the location of the “Office”. On that basis, the available drawings indicate that the “Office” may be approaching **3.691m** wide, giving an indicative floor area of approximately 2.024m × 3.691m = **7.47m²**.

This is significant because the Planner's Report expressly assesses the proposed dwelling under the Residential Amenity heading by reference to the *Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities* (2007) guidelines. Those guidelines state under section 5.3.2, page 48, that “The area of a single bedroom should be at least **7.1m²**”. The apparent dimensions of the “Office” therefore indicate that its floor area is above the single-bedroom minimum identified in the guidance applied by the Planner's Report.

We do not suggest that the room is necessarily intended by the applicant to be used as a bedroom. Rather, its physical configuration and functional capacity are relevant to determining whether the proposed accommodation has been correctly assessed as a one-bedroom dwelling. The room is separately enclosed, has its own window and door, and its unverified dimensions suggest that it appears capable of functioning as a bedroom without significant structural alteration.

This issue was **expressly raised** in the third-party submissions. The Planner's Report records amongst the issues raised by those making observations that the “Application should be assessed as a two-bed house” and states that “All planning issues raised in the submissions will be taken into account in the assessment of the application.” The appellants’ original submissions **specifically asked** the Council to consider whether the practical layout should be assessed as a one-bedroom or two-bedroom unit for the purposes of applying the relevant residential standards.

The Report subsequently states only that “While third party objections to the size, scale and potential use of the house are noted, it is considered that the internal layout and standard of accommodation is suitable for use as a one-bedroom house.” The appellants respectfully consider that this conclusion does not adequately explain how the specific issue concerning the “Office” was resolved, or why a separately enclosed room with the apparent characteristics and

dimensions described above should not be taken into account when determining the functional nature and intensity of the proposed accommodation.

The Report does not identify any reason why this room, despite being separately enclosed, naturally lit and independently accessed, should be excluded from consideration when assessing the functional capacity of the dwelling.

This is material because the classification of the dwelling affects the standards against which the accommodation is assessed. Table 5.1 on page 49 of the *Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities* (2007) distinguishes between a **1-bed/2-person house** and a **2-bed/3-person house** and specifies materially different requirements for floor area, living-room area, aggregate living area, aggregate bedroom area and storage. The Planner's own table assesses the dwelling as a one-bedroom house and records **9.4m²** for the main living room against an identified requirement of **11m²**. If the "Office" is reasonably considered to constitute additional bedroom accommodation, the applicable standards for a **2-bed/3-person** dwelling would therefore be more demanding. The important question of whether the "Office" should be taken into account consequently has implications for the assessment of the dwelling as a whole, rather than merely the nomenclature applied to that room.

We respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála consider the functional capacity of the "Office" and whether the proposed dwelling has been correctly characterised and assessed as a one-bedroom rather than a two-bedroom dwelling, having regard to the actual accommodation shown on the submitted drawings.

The appellants also note that a letter of support for the application from a non-resident of Marine Court repeatedly refers to the proposed development as a "granny flat", although the application itself is for a separate dwelling. Section 12.3.7.3 of the DLR CDP distinguishes a family/granny flat from a fully independent dwelling, describing it as a subsidiary element of the primary dwelling which is interlinked with and capable of being readily subsumed back into it. The development should therefore be assessed on the basis of the separate dwelling actually proposed and the accommodation shown on the submitted drawings, rather than the terminology used in the supporting letter.

5. Character, density and cumulative overdevelopment

Marine Court is an established development of 20 four-bedroom detached houses on individual plots in addition to three newer detached houses on the entrance road. No plot has previously been subdivided to create an additional dwelling. The only directly relevant application for an additional dwelling within Marine Court, **D00A/1196 at No. 12**, was refused.

The current proposal would introduce a materially different development pattern: two **semi-detached** dwellings occupying land that historically formed part of a single detached-house plot, with the new dwelling on a constrained, approximately **100m² site** and dependent on shared access. The proposal would also result in the loss of a substantial proportion of the established private rear garden serving No. 11.

The Planner's Report refers under "Development Plan Considerations" on page 4, to PHP18, PHP19, PHP20 and PHP42. We recognise the Development Plan objective of making efficient use of established residential land and supporting appropriate infill development. However, these objectives must be balanced against the protection of existing residential amenity and established character.

In the present case, the impact on the original dwelling is not limited to overlooking or overshadowing. The subdivision removes its entire side access, alters its established parking

and access arrangements and changes the practical functioning of the retained four-bedroom dwelling. At present, a side gate and fence provide direct access between the front and rear of No.11. The appellants respectfully submit that the resultant loss of access should not be addressed by creating or relying upon a new gate or other access through the boundary onto the adjoining Council-owned communal green space, particularly where no such access is identified on the submitted drawings.

At the same time, due to the fact that it is intended that the proposed new dwelling be attached to the original house, the proposal would **remove natural daylight entirely** from the northern side of the original house due to the necessary removal of the original side-facing windows serving the stairs/landing, study, and downstairs WC of No. 11, resulting in a significantly darker and more enclosed internal environment in the original four-bedroom house. These impacts are relevant to the protection of existing residential amenity under PHP18, PHP19 and, in particular, PHP20.

The cumulative effect of the following matters should therefore be considered:

- subdivision of an established detached-house plot and introduction of a second semi-detached dwelling into an estate of established detached houses;
- the approximately 100m² site for the new dwelling;
- constrained private open space;
- loss of the entire existing side access and removal of natural daylight in the original house;
- unresolved parking and shared-access arrangements;
- the 9.4m² principal living room and apparent bedroom/storage discrepancies;
- absence of identified bin-storage provision;
- the boundary relationship with the communal green, including the absence of demonstrated maintenance access.

Taken together, these matters raise a substantial question as to whether the proposed intensification is consistent with the Development Plan's requirements to **protect existing residential amenity and established character**, and whether this particular site can accommodate the proposed development without overdevelopment.

Conclusion

We respectfully submit that, although the Planner's Report addresses a number of relevant planning policies, it does not adequately resolve several significant material issues arising from this particular subdivision.

In particular:

1. the consequences of removing the entire side access and substantially reducing the curtilage of the original dwelling;
2. the absence of clearly identified parking and bin-storage arrangements for both dwellings;
3. the assessment of the dwelling as a one-bedroom house notwithstanding the separately enclosed "Office" and the material question of its functional use, together with the apparent discrepancies between the submitted drawings and the accommodation figures relied upon in the Report;
4. the unexplained difference between the 20m² private-open-space requirement used in the Report and the 48m² minimum specified in Section 12.8.3.3/Table 12.10 of the DLR CDP;
5. the absence of boundary-treatment details separating the original and proposed dwellings and the insufficient detail regarding the relationship of the site at 11 Marine Court to the communal Council-owned green space, including the implications for maintenance access;
6. the failure to address or distinguish the directly relevant D00A/1196 decision at No. 12 Marine Court despite the appellants' request for this to be considered; and
7. the cumulative effect of these matters on overdevelopment, residential amenity and the established character of Marine Court.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála **overturn the decision of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council and refuse permission.**

We also respectfully request that the Inspector undertake a site inspection, as the existing parking and access arrangements, the relationship between the proposed and retained dwellings, the communal green, mature vegetation and established character of Marine Court are particularly important to understanding the issues raised.

Yours faithfully,

Caroline and Harald Handschuh
2 Marine Court
Lower Albert Road
Sandycove
Co. Dublin
A96 C3H4

Kieran Kavanagh
4 Marine Court
Lower Albert Road
Sandycove
Co. Dublin
A96 T9Y5

Catherine Kenny
3 Marine Court
Lower Albert Road
Sandycove
Co. Dublin
A96 P9V3

Ann and David Clarke
9 Marine Court
Lower Albert Road
Sandycove
Co. Dublin
A96 E5X0



Top image: Aerial comparison illustrating the substantially different site circumstances. The Spencer Villas site associated with **D12A/0010** had an overall area of approximately 1,416m², with substantial residual rear garden areas, separate front access/parking arrangements and a wider road frontage. The Marine Court site is substantially smaller, with the proposed new dwelling occupying approximately 100m² and relying on a shared access arrangement.

Bottom image: Street-level view of Spencer Villas illustrating the established semi-detached form, separate entrances, individual front curtilages and parking arrangements. This is materially different from the established pattern of detached houses on individual plots at Marine Court.



Image above shows current front view of **20 Marine Court (D24A/0273 and D24A/0461)**, with unobtrusive **single-storey extension** and small shed to the side/rear of the site. Note also the width of the side garden (**6.136m** at the front and **7.674m** at the rear between the existing house and the southern boundary wall, compared with approximately **4.000m** and **3.689m** respectively at No. 11.)