



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

**Board Order**  
**PL 06D.248820**

---

## **Planning and Development Acts 2000 to 2017**

**Planning Authority: Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council**

**Planning Register Reference Number: D17A/0356**

**Appeal** by Alan Curran and Judith Archbold of 89 Whitebarn Road, Churchtown, Dublin against the decision made on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2017 by Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council to grant subject to conditions a permission in accordance with plans and particulars lodged with the said Council.

**Proposed Development:** 1. Increase width of existing vehicular access exiting onto Whitebarn Road, Churchtown. 2. The removal of the existing single storey rear extension and the construction of a new single storey side and rear extension consisting of a kitchen/dining area, w.c. and utility room, covered with a tiled pitched roof incorporating skylights. 3. Conversion of the attic space for use as a study/playroom to incorporate a dormer window to the rear and a gable wall build up to the existing side hip roof of dwelling. General internal remodel and upgrade to existing dwelling to suit the proposed layouts. All structural, drainage and associated site works to be implemented. All at 89 Whitebarn Road, Churchtown, Dublin.

## **Decision**

**Having regard to the nature of the condition the subject of the appeal, the Board is satisfied that the determination by the Board 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 ATTACH condition number 2 and the reason therefor.**

## **Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022 for dormer extensions, the scale and design of the proposed dormer extension and the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that condition number 2 should be attached, in the interests of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to remove condition number 2, the Board considered that, given the dimensions, scale and bulk of the proposed dormer at 4.5 metres wide, the dormer would not be consistent with residential and visual amenities and that condition number 2, by reducing the scale of the dormer extension and replacing the proposed window with a roof light, would address this.

