



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-000080
PL-500101-DR

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 06 February 2026.

The Commission decided by a majority of two to one to remove condition number two and attach condition number three generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, subject to the amendments shown on the attached copy of the draft order.

Planning Commissioner:

Eamonn James Kelly

Eamonn James Kelly

Date:

6th day of February 2026

Having regard to the nature of the condition numbers 2 and 3, the subject of the appeal, the Commission is satisfied that the determination by the Commission of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and, based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and

Development Act, 2000 to REMOVE condition number 2 the reason therefor, and to ATTACH condition number 3 and the reason therefor.

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential zoning of the site, the established pattern and character of development in the area, and the nature and scale of the proposed extensions, it is considered that the proposed first#floor rear/side extension, as originally submitted, by reason of its form and the very limited projection above the existing eaves line, would not detract from the character of the existing dwelling or the visual amenities of the area. The modest technical build#up required for the flat#roof element is a construction necessity and does not materially alter the appearance of the dwelling or give rise to adverse impacts on neighbouring properties. In this regard, condition number 2 of the planning authority's decision, requiring the set#down of the first#floor rear/side extension below eaves level, is not warranted.

In respect of condition number 3, while the dormer window was referenced in the development description, it was not meaningfully illustrated in the drawings submitted with the application. As a result, adjoining residents were not afforded a reasonable opportunity to assess its scale, design or potential impacts during the statutory consultation period. To accept revised drawings at appeal stage would undermine procedural transparency and public participation. Furthermore, the appeal documentation does not demonstrate a functional planning need for the dormer, which appears to serve a non#habitable attic/storage/office space. In the absence of clear justification and in the absence of proper public consultation, it is considered appropriate that condition number 3 be retained to ensure that any

uture proposal for a dormer can be fully assessed by the planning authority in the first instance.