



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322288-25

Development	Dormer window extension to the rear, and a flat roof window to the front roof surface, both at attic floor level.
Location	23 Burnell Park Green, Castleknock, Dublin 15
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	FW25A/0028
Applicant(s)	Lisa Foran and David Bernie
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant, with conditions
Type of Appeal	First Party v Condition
Appellant(s)	Lisa Foran and David Bernie
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	5 th June 2025

Inspector

Paul Christy

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1 Decision:	6
3.2 Planning Authority Reports	6
3.3 Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4 Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	8
4.1 Subject site:.....	8
4.2 No. 63 Burnell Park Ave.....	8
4.3 No. 43 Burnell Park Ave.....	9
4.4 No. 105 Burnell Park Lawn:.....	9
5.0 Policy Context.....	9
5.1 Development Plan: Fingal Development Plan, 2023-2029.....	9
5.2 Natural Heritage Designations	10
5.3 EIA Screening	11
6.0 The Appeal	11
6.1 Grounds of Appeal	11
6.2 Planning Authority Response	13
7.0 Assessment	13
7.1 Overview	13
7.2 Scale of the Proposed Dormer Window Relative to the Existing Dwelling ..	14

7.3. Potential Impacts on Adjacent Residential Properties.....	16
7.4. Development Contributions.....	18
8.0 AA Screening.....	18
9.0 Recommendation.....	19
10.0 Reasons and Considerations	20

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in the residential suburb of Castleknock on the north side of Dublin. The area is generally characterised by two-storey, semi-detached, pitched roof dwellings in a typical suburban layout. The subject dwelling is located in the middle of a crescent-shaped row of ten pairs of such semi-detached houses.
- 1.2. The front elevation presents as a dwelling typical of the area. A significant contemporary style extension, part two-storey and part single-storey, has been added to the side and rear of the property.
- 1.3. The adjoining dwelling has been extended to the rear in a manner similar to the subject dwelling. A 'summer house'-style structure is also contained in the rear garden of the adjoining property towards the rear fence.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. On the planning application form and public notices submitted to the Local Authority, the proposed development is described as being '*permission for a dormer window extension to the rear and a flat window to the front roof surface, both at attic level*', An additional item, namely '*velux x 2 to provide for headroom over stairwell*' is also included on the rear elevations on the submitted plans.
- 2.2. The proposed dormer window is a box dormer design. It is to be positioned off-centre towards the adjoining third party boundary with a setback distance of 0.770m proposed. The proposed dimensions of the dormer are 4m long, 1.9m in depth and 2m in height, all measured externally. A flat roof is proposed with the top of the roof being in line with the ridge of the main dwelling. The dormer is set back 0.4m from the eaves. In terms of fenestration, two windows are proposed on the main rear elevation. The larger window is 1.6m, and the smaller window 0.7m, in width. No windows are proposed on either side elevation. The submitted plans identify the roof and side elevations being finished in zinc cladding to match the materials used for the roof of the existing rear extension.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision:

- 3.1.1. Grant, subject to standard conditions, plus a condition (Condition 2) requiring amendments to the design of the rear dormer window. The Condition required that:

‘The developer shall amend the design of the proposed development to accord with the following:

- a. the maximum width shall be 3m externally, and centrally located on the roof plane;*
- b. the position to be set down a minimum of 300mm from the ridge of the roof of the dwelling; and*
- c. the total window fenestration to be no greater than 1.5m in width.*

Reason: In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.’

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. [Planning Report]: One report on file dated 19 March 2025 signed by a Senior Executive Planner (SEP), endorsed by an Administrative Officer, and signed off by a Senior Planner. The key issues addressed in the report are the design of the rear dormer, and the impact on the visual and residential amenities of the area. The following key points are noted:

- The proposal has been assessed against a specific section of the Development Management Guidelines contained in the County Development Plan that deals with roof alterations – Section 14.10.2.5: ‘Roof Alterations Including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions’;
- The height of the dormer, being equal in height to the principal roof, *‘relates poorly to the main dwelling’*. The writer goes on to observe that were the permission to be granted, the dormer should be *‘set to a minimum of 0.3m*

below the ridge line of the main dwelling to appear as a subordinate addition.'

- The total fenestration '*should be reduced to a maximum of 1.5m in width to prevent actual and perceived overlooking.*'
- Notes that the dormer is set back from the eaves, party boundary and gable. Goes on to state that: '*The main roof slope has a width of c6.4m and the dormer width should be reduced to a maximum of 3m wide, in order to appear less dominant/overbearing on the roof plane.*'

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. One submission received from occupants of a dwelling in a 'back-to'back' row to the rear of the subject property. In the submission, the Author '*objects to the proposed development*' for the following reasons:

- '*would seriously overlook our house and garden as the distance between the 2 houses is only the length of the 2 rear gardens.*' *The maximum height of the dormer on the roof top ... would give an unnecessary invasive view into ours and a large number of other houses opposite.*'
- '*Would form a dominant part of the roof of the existing house and negatively impact on the character of the existing dwelling.*'
- In the application it is stated that a reason for the extension is to facilitate a working from requirement but the dwelling has already been significantly extended and currently has 3 velux windows in the rear roof.

The Author goes on to expand on the theme of overlooking and invasion of privacy including: questioning what safeguards would there be in place as (they) would not feel comfortable if someone is constantly visible in the dormer space while working there?; the size of the windows – would any size constraints or shading conditions

be applied?; any conditions on 'lighting pollution'?

- 3.4.2. The submission concludes with references to specific provisions in the Development Plan, namely Objective DMS41 and Development Management Guidelines Section 14.10.2.5, and asks will these be applied *'without reference to previous similar applications re dormers in the area which have different distances between houses but which nevertheless overlook their neighbours'*?

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject site:

- 4.1.1. FW15B/0062. Two-storey extension to side and part two-storey, part single-storey extension at rear. 2015 Grant

4.2. No. 63 Burnell Park Ave.

- 4.2.1. P.A. Ref. FW20A/0090, ABP Ref. PL06F.308014 2020: The application included various elements, including a part single/part two-storey extension to the side, and a dormer window extension at attic floor level to the rear.
- 4.2.2. Condition 2a. of the Local Authority's decision required: *'The proposed dormer feature on the rear roof plane omitted and replaced with a roof light (if desired).'* The reason given was: *'In the interests of visual and residential amenity and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.'*
- 4.2.3. A First Party appeal against the above-noted condition was submitted to the Board. The Board upheld the appeal and decided that the Condition would not be warranted. The Reason given by the Board noted the nature and scale of the proposed development and thus it was considered that the dormer window would be subordinate to the main roof plane and would not result in a negative impact on the existing character and form or on the privacy of adjacent properties.

4.3. No. 43 Burnell Park Ave.

- 4.3.1. P.A. Ref. FW20B/0070, ABP Ref. PL06F.308013 2020: The application was for an attic conversion to include a dormer window structure at attic level to the rear.
- 4.3.2. The Local Authority decision was to refuse on the basis that, by virtue of its scale and dimensions, it would form a dominant part of the roof of the existing house and (would) negatively impact on the character of the dwelling.
- 4.3.3. A First Party appeal against the above-noted refusal was submitted to the Board. The Board upheld the appeal and decided to grant permission. The Reasons included noting, inter alia, 'the nature, form, scale and design of the proposed development'.

4.4. No. 105 Burnell Park Lawn:

- 4.4.1. P.A. Ref. FW12B/0015 2012; This application was for, inter alia, an attic conversion with dormer to rear of the dwelling. The Local Authority granted Permission, subject to a condition requiring that the two attic windows on the rear elevation be fitted and permanently maintained thereafter with obscure glass. The Reason given was: '*Residential amenity and to prevent overlooking*'.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan: Fingal Development Plan, 2023-2029

- 5.1.1. Chapter 3: 'Sustainable Placemaking and Quality Homes': Policy SPQH41 and Objective SPQH045 contain similar support for residential extensions, subject to appropriate scale, and the protection of residential amenities and the environment.
- 5.1.2. Chapter 14: 'Development Management Standards': In Section 14.1: Introduction' it is stated that: '*Proposals must comply with the standards and criteria that apply to particular development types, be consistent with the objectives set out in the preceding chapters and be compliant with relevant legislative guidance.*' In this

context, several provisions contained in Section 14.6, 'Design Criteria for Residential Development in Fingal' are relevant to the subject proposal:

- Section 14.6.6.4: 'Overlooking and Overbearance' contains general guidance on the assessment of levels of overbearance and potential to cause significant levels of overlooking to neighbouring properties.
- Section 14.10.2.5: 'Roof Alterations Including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions' provides specific guidance in relation to dormer windows. This includes:
 - ~ they will be evaluated against the impact on the form and character of the existing dwelling and the privacy of adjacent properties;
 - ~ the design, dimensions, and bulk relative to the overall extent of roof as well as the size of the dwelling and rear garden will be overriding considerations, together with the visual impact when viewed from adjoining streets and public areas;
 - ~ dormers shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries and shall be set down from the existing ridge level so as not to dominate the roof space;
 - ~ materials/finishes should match those of the existing roof;
 - ~ the level and type of glazing should have regard to existing window treatments and fenestration of the dwelling;
 - ~ regard should also be had to the extent of fenestration proposed at attic level relative to adjoining residential units and to ensure the preservation of amenities;
 - ~ excessive overlooking of adjacent properties should be avoided.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The Royal Canal Proposed Natural Heritage Area (Site Code 002103) is located 0.79km to the north of the subject site, and the Liffey Valley Proposed Natural

Heritage Area (Site Code 000128) 0.72km to the south-east. The nearest Natura 2000 site is the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Special Protection Area (Site Code 004024) located over 10km away to the east.

5.3. EIA Screening

- 5.3.1. 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). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. The additional space is required '*to ensure the ongoing viability of their home*' and '*for use a work from home office*'. The current attic zone is too small to cater for the required use and the proposed dormer would resolve the matter. There is also an issue with the viable headroom in the attic area. The existing apex of the roof internally measures only 1.94m and therefore it is only possible to stand upright for a small section in the central area.
- 6.1.2. Several detailed points are made in support of the structure as viewed externally:
- Taking into account the first floor extensions of the subject house and No. 25 to the south¹, the dwelling appears wider in the streetscape than other typical houses and the extent of the roof area is larger than normal. Thus the dormer would be proportional to the roof area in which it sits.
 - Question the reference in the Planner's report to the main roof slope having a width of 6.4m and state that this is factually incorrect. State the width of the

¹ No. 25 is in the separate pair of semi-detached dwellings to the south, as opposed to being the dwelling attached to the subject dwelling.

roof of the house is 9.54m and the overall width, including the other semi-detached house, is 15.83m. For this reason, absolutely no need to restrict the width of the dormer. Indeed a 3m dormer would appear too small in the overall context.

- The right-hand side of the dormer will be 4.77m from the side gable wall, yet a reduction in width and a further increase in this dimension was considered necessary?
- Why set the dormer down by 300mm (when) it was clearly pointed out to the Planning Authority that the existing ridge line is exceptionally low, and there is a requirement for the roof to be at the maximum height? The dormer won't be visible from the front of the house and it wouldn't upset the ridgeline of the neighbouring houses when viewed from the street outside. The dormer is proposed to the rear of the house where it is only visible from neighbouring gardens as is normally acceptable, with thousands of similar precedents. The reduction of 300mm is entirely pointless, as the 300mm wouldn't improved the dormer's appearance. In fact, the gap between the roof of the dormer and the ridge wouldn't be visible from the ground.

6.1.3. The Appellants refer to 'Precedent developments' in the area. In doing so, they reference the three cases addressed in Sections 4.2 to 4.4 above.

- 105 Burnell Park Ave.: A dormer window 4.27m in width was proposed and permitted. There was no reduction in width, nor was a setdown of the roof required.
- 63 Burnell Park Ave.: Note that the Board granted permission for the dormer as proposed, without alteration, and that the width of the dormer was 4.175m and there was no set down proposed.
- 43 Burnell Park Ave.: Note that the dormer window was refused entirely by the Local Authority but that, on appeal, permission was granted for the dormer as proposed, without alteration. The width of the dormer in that case was also 4.175m and there was no set down proposed.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- 6.2.1. A response was received from the Planning Authority on 29th April 2025. The Authority '*concur(s) with the original decision and conditions attached*'.
- 6.2.2. The Authority also refers to the Appellants' challenge against the section of the Planner's report dealing with the width of the main roof slope (refer para. 6.1.2, second bullet above) and defends its position as follows. The Authority defines the main roof slope of a dwelling as being that of the principal dwelling before it has been extended (and that) in this instance, the existing side extension has been stepped back from the principal front elevation, and the roof profile is stepped down from the main roof slope's ridge height. Therefore, when assessing this application, the proposed dormer should be evaluated against the main roof slope. Furthermore, the proposed roof dormer should appear as a subordinate addition to the main roof slope, by not exceeding 3m in width.
- 6.2.3. The Authority concludes by stating that the dormer is: '*excessively dominant and will only service a non-habitable space. Reducing the dormer will not affect its use.*' and recommends that the Board uphold the Authority's decision, and apply Condition 2 as originally attached.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Overview

- 7.1.1. This is a first-party appeal only against Condition No. 2 attached to the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission. The requirements of Condition No. 2 are set out at Section 3.
- 7.1.2. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the nature of Condition No. 2, it is considered that the determination by the Board of the application, as if it had been made to it in the first instance, would not be warranted. Therefore, in my opinion, the Board may determine the matters raised in the appeal only, in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

7.1.3. Having examined the application details, and all other documentation on file including the submission received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues to be assessed in this appeal against Condition No. 2 of the Planning Authority's decision are as follows:

- the scale of the proposed dormer window relative to the existing dwelling; and
- the potential impacts of the proposed dormer on the amenities of adjacent residential properties.

7.2. Scale of the Proposed Dormer Window Relative to the Existing Dwelling

7.2.1. I note the concerns of the Planning Authority in relation to the height and width of the dormer as expressed in the Planner's Report wherein it is stated that:

- *'The proposed dormer is equal in height to the principal roof, and therefore relates poorly to the main dwelling, and were permission to be granted should be set to a minimum of 0.3m below the ridge line of the main dwelling to appear as a subordinate addition.'*; and
- *'The main roof slope has a width of c6.4m, and the dormer width should be reduced to a maximum of 3m wide, in order to appear less dominant/overbearing on the roof plane.'*

7.2.2. I also note the Appellants' contention that the reference in the Planner's report to the main roof slope having a width of 6.4m is factually incorrect, that the width of the roof of the house is 9.54m and the overall width, including the other semi-detached house, is 15.83m and that, for this reason, (there is) absolutely no need to restrict the width of the dormer and indeed a 3m dormer would appear too small in the overall context. The pleadings of the Agent for the Appellants in the appeal submission are noted where he refers to Condition 2 and states that: *'... it would mean people in the attic space couldn't stand upright in the dormer area and as such, the entire development would be pointless.'*

7.2.3. I have also considered the Planning Authority's defence of its position on the width of

the roof as contained in its response to the appeal ie. that the proposed dormer should be evaluated against the main roof slope, particularly as in this instance, the existing side extension has been stepped back from the principal front elevation, and the roof profile is stepped down from the main roof slope's ridge height.

- 7.2.4. Finally in terms of comments made, I also note those contained in the third party submission to the Planning Authority on this issue where they state their belief that the dormer, by virtue of its scale and dimensions, would form a dominant part of the roof and negatively impact on the character of the existing dwelling.
- 7.2.5. In the Development Plan, the Local Authority has clearly identified the integration of dormer windows with the host dwelling as an important consideration. I refer in particular to that part of Section 14.10.2.5 wherein it is provided that in evaluating dormer windows against the impact on the form and character of the existing dwelling: *'the design, dimensions, and bulk relative to the overall extent of roof as well as the size of the dwelling and rear garden will be overriding considerations'*; and *'dormers shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries and shall be set down from the existing ridge level so as not to dominate the roof space.'*
- 7.2.6. This policy guidance clearly requires that consideration should be given not just to the bulk of the dormer relative to the roof space, but also to the size of the dwelling and rear garden. The size of the dwelling has been significantly enlarged to the side and rear in the form of a substantial part two-storey, and part single-storey, side and rear extension. Also, even with the addition of the rear extension, the rear garden is still relatively spacious, with the distance from the back elevation of the rear extension to the back fence measuring 13.2m and the width of the garden measuring c.16m at its widest. The dormer would occupy 62% or thereby of the principal roof of the rear elevation in two-dimensional terms². I also note the depth of the proposed dormer at c.4.3m. Whilst the dormer is set back from the eaves (0.4m) and party boundary (0.77m), it is not set down from the existing ridge. Whereas the Local Authority has broken down the relevant policy into the three individual elements (ie. setback from the eaves, party boundary and ridge height) and sought to ensure that

² Principal roof slope = 28.8m² (6.4m x 4.5m); and proposed dormer = 18m² (4m x 4.5m)

each individual element is independently complied with regardless of the others, a more reasonable way of interpreting this policy, in my opinion, is to consider the cumulative impact of these three elements 'in the round'. Having regard to the aforementioned context of the significantly extended dwelling and remaining spacious garden, it is my opinion that the bulk and scale of the proposed dormer can generally be absorbed by this dwelling, subject to the modest amendments addressed in Section 7.3.

- 7.2.7. I have examined the planning history of the area as referenced in the appeal submission and the Planning Authority report. Two of the three cases referenced in the Appeal were decided by the Board (ABP Refs. 308013-20 and 308014-20). The proposed dormer windows in these cases were similar in scale to the subject proposal and were supported by the Board in each case. One was partly for a similar use as that proposed in the subject case ie. office space (ABP ref. 308013-20), and a toilet was also proposed. The other was for an attic storage area. These decisions were made in the context of the previous Development Plan, the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023, whereas the subject proposal must be assessed against the provisions of the current Development Plan, 2023-2029. The broad intent of the relevant provisions of the two Plans (Objective DMS41 in the previous Plan and Guideline 14.10.2.5 in the current Plan) is similar. Whilst the Policy in the new Plan is more detailed, and this detail includes the aforementioned specific provision requiring the set down of the dormer roof from the ridge of the host dwelling, at paragraph 7.2.6 I have set out my reasons for not requiring compliance with this specific provision.

7.3. Potential Impacts on Adjacent Residential Properties

- 7.3.1. In the Planning Authority's report, the SEP advises that: '*...the total window fenestration in the dormer structure should be reduced to a maximum of 1.5m in width to prevent actual and perceived overlooking.*' This was reflected in Condition No. 2(c) although the reason given in the Authority's final decision was more generic ie. 'In the interest of the proper planning and development of the area.'

- 7.3.2. The SEP also considers the relationship of the proposed dormer with ‘back-to-back’ dwellings in the vicinity and observes that with: *‘in excess of 16m from neighbouring first and second floor windows, this is deemed acceptable as set out in SPPR 1: ‘Separation Distances’ of the ‘Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements – Guidelines for Planning Authorities’.* In this context, the SEP goes on to state that: *‘The proposal is deemed to be of a low impact traditional design in that no overbearing or overshadowing impacts are anticipated.’*
- 7.3.3. In the third party submission made to the Planning Authority, concerns are raised in relation to overlooking (please refer to para. 3.4.1).
- 7.3.4. In Section 14.10.2.5 of the Development Plan, several references are made to the need to protect the amenities of third parties including that (such developments): *‘will be evaluated against the impact on ... the privacy of adjacent properties’; ‘regard should also be had to the extent of fenestration proposed at attic level relative to adjoining residential units and to ensure the preservation of amenities’; and ‘excessive overlooking of adjacent properties should be avoided’.*
- 7.3.5. In terms of the concerns of the third party submission to the Planning Authority, I agree with the conclusions in the Planning Authority’s report that the distances between the proposed development and ‘back-to-back’ dwellings, being well in excess of 16m, is acceptable in the context of the contents of SPPR1.
- 7.3.6. With regards to potential impacts on the privacy and amenities of the adjacent property, I note that the proposed use of the space is to facilitate working from home and would simply observe that the societal and cultural shift towards working from home has undoubtedly resulted, in many cases, in the use of upper floor bedrooms for such working spaces. For this reason, and having regard also to the large ‘mirror image’ first floor bedroom windows close to the party boundary of the subject and adjacent properties that would already enable mutual overlooking, I am satisfied that the proposed development shall not result in ‘excessive overlooking’ of the adjacent property (this being the critical ‘test’ as set out in the Development Plan Section 14.10.2.5), subject to the following.

7.3.7. The dormer is positioned 'off-centre' towards the party boundary, and of the two windows proposed, the larger of the two is proposed adjacent to the party boundary. Notwithstanding my conclusions above in relation to 'excessive overlooking', in my opinion it would still be reasonable to require the following modest adjustments to the submitted design in the interests of orderly development. It is assumed that the 'off-centre' proposal has been made to accommodate the two velux windows that would serve the stairwell. In my opinion, it would be reasonable to laterally move the dormer to the centre of the main roof space. Whilst I acknowledge that this would result in the loss of one of the velux windows proposed over the stairwell, it would appear possible to retain the other one. Similarly, given that the proposed accommodation is for a single space for working from home, in my opinion it would be reasonable to swap the two windows around so that the narrower of the two would be closest to the party boundary.

7.4. Development Contributions

7.4.1. In its Observations on the appeal, the Local Authority refers to the need for financial contributions and a bond in the event the appeal is successful. However, given that the appeal is made only in respect of a specific condition not referring to such matters, this is not a consideration for the Board.

8.0 AA Screening

8.1 I have considered the proposed extensions to 23 Burnell Park Green, Castleknock, Dublin in light of the requirements of S.177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located over 10km away from the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Special Protection Area (Site Code 004024) located to the east. The proposed development comprises a dormer window extension to the rear, and a flat roof window to the front roof surface, both at attic floor level. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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 reasons for this conclusion are as follows:

- the nature of the works: small scale extension to an existing dwelling with existing connections to public services;
- the distance of the site from the nearest European site and the absence of any connections between the two.

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, 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.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. 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 (As Amended) to AMEND Condition No.2 and the reason therefore to read as follows:

Condition 2

The developer shall amend the design of the proposed development to accord with the following:

- (a) The dormer window shall be re-positioned to the south-west so that the side elevations are set back an equal distance from each gable edge of the principal roof plane;
- (b) The position of the proposed windows shall be reversed so that the narrower window is located on the party boundary side of the dormer rear elevation.

Reason: To preserve the amenities of adjacent residential properties and to cater for orderly development.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential land use zoning for the site, to the pattern of development in the area, to the significant rear and side extensions already added to the subject dwelling and the remaining generous garden area, it is considered that the proposed dormer extension, by reason of its limited scale, nature and design, and its location with respect to adjoining properties, would not detract from the character of the dwelling and would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity by reason of overlooking or loss of privacy, subject to the amendments required under the specified Condition.

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, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.



Paul Christy

Planning Inspector

17th June 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-322288-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Dormer window extension to the rear, and a flat roof window to the front roof surface, both at attic floor level		
Development Address	23 Burnell Park Green, Castleknock, Dublin		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)	Yes	✓	
	No		
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes			
No	✓		
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			
No	✓		
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	n/a		
5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No	n/a		
Yes	n/a		

Inspector: Paul Christy

Date: 17th June 2025

Paul Christy