



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323176-25

Development	Attic conversion for storage, including rear dormer. Conversion of existing garage for extended living with new window to front elevation
Location	29 Belmont Gardens, Donnybrook, Dublin 4, D04 A2A2
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB2041/25
Applicants	Alastair MacDonald and Vanessa Bainbridge
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Split decision: To grant permission for garage conversion and refuse permission for attic conversion
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellants	Alastair MacDonald and Vanessa Bainbridge
Observer	Philip O'Reilly
Date of Site Inspection	3 rd November 2025
Inspector	Trevor Rue

Table of Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
6.0 EIA Screening.....	10
7.0 The Appeal	10
8.0 Assessment	12
9.0 AA Screening.....	15
10.0 Water Framework Directive	15
11.0 Recommendation	16
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	16
13.0 Conditions	16
 Appendix A: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening	 19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is about 3.3 kilometres to the south of Dublin City Centre. It has a stated area of 0.034 hectares and comprises a 2½-storey semi-detached, four-bedroom dwelling on the south-eastern side of a residential cul-de-sac. There is a garage to the side of the dwelling with a utility room behind and *en-suite* facilities above, leaving just a small gap between the site and the neighbouring property, 27 Belmont Gardens. There are two separate storage rooms in the attic, situated on either side of stairs and a landing.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for a rear extension at attic level, to include a dormer window. The extension would be used to create additional storage spaces. The dormer would contain two windows. Measured externally, it would be 4.985 metres in width. Measured internally, it would create about 9.15 square metres of floor space.
- 2.2. Permission is also sought to convert the garage into a playroom with no increase in floor space, and to insert a window in the front elevation in place of the garage door.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. On 3rd July 2025, Dublin City Council decided to grant permission for the proposed garage conversion, subject to 10 conditions, and to refuse permission for the proposed attic conversion.

In regard to the garage conversion, Condition 1 required adherence to the plans, particulars and specifications lodged with the application. Condition 2 required a development contribution of €8,646.30 to be paid to the planning authority. Condition 3 required the house and extension to be used as a single dwelling unit. Condition 4 required the proposed attic conversion to be omitted from the scheme. Condition 5 required external finishes to harmonise with those of the house. Condition 6 was to do with drainage. Condition 7 to 9 regulated the construction process, while Condition 10 required compliance with various codes of practice.

3.1.2. The following reason was given for refusing permission for the attic conversion:

Having regard to the size, design and location of the proposed dormer on the rear roof, it is considered that the development would appear overbearing and would seriously injuring the residential amenity of the adjoining properties. The proposal would be contrary to the policies set out in Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 regarding residential extensions, specifically Appendix 18, Section 4.0 (Alterations at Roof Level/ Attics/ Dormers/ Additional Floors) and Section 5.0 (Attic Conversions / Dormer Windows) which seeks to protect residential amenity and ensure dormers are subordinate in scale. The development would therefore, create a precedent for similar type undesirable development and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

Planning Report

3.2.1. A planning officer's report dated 3rd July 2025 provided the reasoning for the authority's decision. The main points were as follows:

- The proposed garage conversion is acceptable and would be in keeping with previous approvals on the site.
- The proposed dormer is excessive in size and poorly sited on the existing roof plane, directly on the boundary with the neighbouring property, No. 27. The side elevations of the dormer are illustrated only by a coloured line. In the rear elevation the dormer appears to be significantly below the ridge of the existing roof, whereas the proposed side elevation seems to indicate the dormer would come off the ridge line. The proposed section indicates that the dormer would have a floor-to-ceiling height of 2.1 metres coming up from the eaves line of the original house. While these concerns may arise due to poor drawing clarity, the "dormer" reads as a second-floor extension.
- The proposed dormer is not acceptable. It is excessive in width and is not subordinate to the roof slope. It is not set back from the eaves to minimise its visual impact or reduce the potential for overlooking of adjoining properties.

- 3.2.2. According to a record sheet produced by the planning authority, the development contribution was based on a proposed and granted floor space of 113.90 square metres and a contribution area of 73.90 square metres. The residential rate of €117.00 per square metre was applied to the latter figure, resulting in a total of €8,646.30.

Other Technical Reports

- 3.2.3. According to the planning officer's report, the Council's Drainage Division had no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- 3.3.1. No comments were received from Uisce Éireann.

3.4. Third Party Submission

- 3.4.1. The Council received a submission from Philip O'Reilly, the substance of which was repeated in his observations at appeal stage.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Application Site

- 4.1.1. **3684/11:** On 23rd March 2012, the Council granted permission to the present appellants for a part two-storey, part single-storey extension to the side and rear of the dwelling, along with associated elevational changes and widening of the front entrance gate to facilitate additional off-street parking. A development contribution of €4,432.35 was required.
- 4.1.2. **2888/12:** On 3rd September 2012, the Council decided grant permission to the present appellants for modifications to the planning permission 3684/11, including changes to front and rear façade and a new dormer window to the rear. On 15th January 2013, following a third-party appeal (**241145**), An Bord Pleanála granted permission for elements of the proposed development subject to the terms and conditions of the previous planning permission. It refused permission for the proposed dormer window to the rear on the grounds that it would be overbearing and likely to lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy to the adjacent dwelling house to the north.

- 4.1.3. **3367/18:** On 26th September 2018, the Council granted permission to the present appellants for conversion of the garage to a playroom to incorporate a new bay window on the front façade in lieu of the garage door.

4.2. Other Sites in Donnybrook

- 4.2.1. **4214/07:** On 1st October 2007, the Council granted permission for a new dormer window at the rear of the existing two-storey dwelling at 21 Belmont Gardens. (Drawings illustrating the dormer are available by searching the Council's website using the reference number 2664/16 relating to a later application for the same site.)
- 4.2.2. **2390/17:** On 27th April 2017, the Council decided to grant permission for alterations and extensions to the existing house at 33 Belmont Gardens including a dormer window to the rear. On 8th September 2017, following a third-party appeal (**248548**), An Bord Pleanála granted permission for the development, including the rear dormer.
- 4.2.3. **WEB1700/21:** On 21st August 2021, the Council decided to grant permission for reconstruction of the existing rear top-floor dormer structure at 2 Arranmore Road with a wider dormer, subject to a condition requiring the width of the dormer to be reduced from 4.2 metres to 3.2 metres. On 20th January 2022, following a first-party appeal (**311300**), An Bord Pleanála directed the Council to remove that condition.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. Map H of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 shows Belmont Gardens, including the application site, within Primary Land Use Zoning Category Z1, Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods. The Z1 zoning objective, set out in Section 14.7.1 of the Plan, is to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. Section 14.7.1 goes on to say that the vision for residential development in the city is one where a wide range of high quality accommodation is available within sustainable communities. Permissible uses in Z1 areas include residential.
- 5.1.2. Policy QHSN6 in Chapter 5 of the Plan is to promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification through the consideration of applications for infill development, backland development, mews development, re-use/adaption of

existing housing stock, and use of upper floors, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.

- 5.1.3. Appendix 18 to the Plan deals with ancillary residential accommodation. Section 1.1 acknowledges that residential extensions play an important role in promoting a compact city in line with the core strategy [of the Plan] as well as providing for sustainable neighbourhoods and areas where a wide range of families can live. It says the design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and, in particular, the need for light and privacy. The form of the existing building should be respected, and the development should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar or contrasting materials and finishes.
- 5.1.4. Section 1.1 of Appendix 18 goes on to say that innovative, contemporary design will be encouraged. A contemporary or modern approach, providing unique designs, can offer a more imaginative solution. However, such proposals are still required to take account of the design issues outlined in [the Plan]. Applications for extensions to existing residential units should:
- not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling;
 - not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight; and
 - achieve a high quality of design.
- 5.1.5. Section 4.0 of Appendix 18 to the Plan states that the roofline of a building is one of its most dominant features and it is important that any proposal to change the shape, pitch or cladding of a roof is carefully considered. Alterations at roof level can include the conversion of an attic space and inclusion of dormer windows or the provision of an additional storey modifying the roof profile entirely.
- 5.1.6. Section 5.0 of Appendix 18 to the Plan states that dormer windows, where proposed should complement the existing roof profile and be sympathetic to the overall design of the dwelling. Dormer windows may be provided to the front, side or rear of a dwelling. Table 18.1 provides the following guidelines for attic conversions and the provision of dormer windows:
- Use materials to complement the existing wall or roof materials of the main house.
 - Do not obscure the main ridge and eaves features of the roof.

- Meet building regulation requirements.
- Avoid extending the full width of the roof or right up to the gable ends.
- Be visually subordinate to the roof slope, enabling a large proportion of the original roof to remain visible.
- Avoid dormer windows that are over dominant in appearance or give the impression of a flat roof.
- Relate to the shape, size, position and design of the existing doors and windows on the lower floors.
- Avoid extending above the main ridge line of the house.
- Be set back from the eaves level to minimise their visual impact and reduce the potential for overlooking of adjoining properties.

5.2. Development Contribution Scheme

- 5.2.1. Section 9 of Dublin City Council's Development Contribution Scheme 2023-2026 set the level of contribution for residential development at €113.82 per square metre. The Council subsequently applied a tender price indexation increase, which raised that sum to €117.00 per square metre with effect from 1st April 2025. Note 2(a) to Section 9 states that the floor area of proposed development in a single dwelling unit shall be calculated as the gross floor area. This means the area ascertained by the internal measurement of the floor space on each floor of a building (including internal walls and partitions). Note 3 confirms that new extensions to existing developments, including domestic extensions, will be charged at the specified rates, other than in circumstances where no contribution or a reduced contribution applies
- 5.2.2. Section 10 of the Scheme states that the first 40 square metres of extensions to a residential development will not be required to pay development contributions under the Scheme (subsequent extensions or extensions over and above 40 square metres will be charged at the residential rate per square metre). Section 11 states that where an applicant is granted permission to demolish in part or in full an existing building and replace with another, then the development contribution payable is to be charged on the net additional floor space created.

5.3. National Policy and Ministerial Guidelines

- 5.3.1. The First Revision to **Project Ireland 2040: The National Planning Framework** was published in April 2025. National Policy Objective 44 is to support the provision of lifetime adaptable homes that can accommodate the changing needs of a household over time.
- 5.3.2. Publication of **Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities** took place in January 2024. Section 3.3.1(i) sets out key priorities for city and metropolitan growth. These include realising opportunities for adaptation, reuse and intensification of existing buildings.

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.4.1. The application site is not in any Natura 2000 site of European nature conservation importance. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are:
- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA), about 2.2 kilometres to the east, designated for various bird species;
 - North Bull Island SPA, about 6 kilometres to the north east, also designated for various bird species;
 - South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC), about 2.2 kilometres to the east, designated for mudflats and sandflats, annual vegetation of drift lines, annuals colonising sand and mud and embryonic shifting dunes; and
 - North Dublin Bay SAC, about 6 kilometres to the north east, designated for tidal mudflats and sandflats, annual vegetation of drift lines, annuals colonising sand and mud, salt meadows, shifting and fixed dunes, dune slacks and petalwort.
- 5.4.2. Table 10-2 of the Development Plan lists two other sites of international nature conservation importance in Dublin Bay, namely North Bull Island Ramsar Wetland Site; and Sandymount Strand / Tolka Estuary Ramsar Wetland Site. It also lists North Bull Island National Special Amenity Area and North Bull Island National Nature Reserve.
- 5.4.3. The application site is not in or near any Natural Heritage Area (NHA). There are five proposed NHAs in the area served by Dublin City Council – North Dublin Bay; South

Dublin Bay; Dolphins, Dublin Docks near Pigeon House Harbour; Grand Canal and Royal Canal.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment 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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). 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.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 7.1.1. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- This house is home to a family of six, including three teenagers and one child, and the attic conversion is a necessary and sustainable adaptation to meet those needs. The planner's report focuses exclusively on perceived visual impact without weighing the clear residential benefits. This narrow approach does not reflect the broader aims of sustainable and family-supporting planning policy. The refusal of permission for the dormer is unsupported by the physical context, relevant precedent or proper planning analysis.
- The planning officer appears to have defaulted to refusing the dormer purely on the basis of An Bord Pleanála's previous refusal, without assessing the very different context of the present proposal. The dormer proposed in 2012 would have been located on the opposite [north-western] side of the roof, where it would have been visible from adjoining gardens. The current proposal places the dormer above an existing two-storey rear extension with a substantial volume. It would conceal the dormer in garden-level and first-floor views from both neighbouring properties and eliminate any meaningful risk of visual dominance or overlooking – the two key concerns in the previous refusal.

- The proposal is fully in keeping with the pattern of development in the area. Several similar rear dormers have been approved nearby, including at 21 and 33 Belmont Gardens. The dormer approved on appeal at 2 Arranmore Road [about 1 kilometre from the application site] occupies a larger portion of the rear roof than the appellant's proposal.
- While Table 18.1 in Appendix 18 to the Development Plan suggests dormers should be subordinate and set back from the eaves, it does not require total invisibility. The proposal balances visual discretion and usability.
- The planning officer's conclusions regarding scale, visibility and overlooking are not borne out by the site conditions. Photographs taken from both adjoining gardens were included in the appeal statement to show that the dormer would not be visible from either property. A photograph taken from the window of the existing two-storey extension to the appellants' dwelling at No. 29 was submitted to demonstrate that no houses back directly on to the site.
- Both adjoining neighbours at Nos. 27 and 31 have confirmed support for the development. The one third-party submission received [at application stage] came from a non-local resident based in Harold's Cross [about 2.5 kilometres away] who is known to submit frequent objections to applications across the city. This cannot be equated to local opposition, of which there is none.
- While not the primary focus of this appeal, it is noted that the same garage space was granted permission under reference number 3367/18 without any development contribution but that as part of the current grant, a contribution of €8,646.30 is required. If the Commission considers this matter in scope, it is requested to review the reasonableness and consistency of this contribution.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- 7.2.1. The planning authority requested the Commission to uphold its decision and if permission is granted to apply a condition requiring payment of a development contribution under Section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000.

7.3. Observations

7.3.1. The observations of Philip O'Reilly, writing from an address in Harold's Cross, may be summarised as follows:

- A dormer window is an architectural element which is wholly contained within the existing roof profile. It should be subordinate to the hosting roof and the hosting structure. It should be set back from the main roof ridge and set well back from the eaves. It should also be set at a distance from the property boundaries. Anything else is not a dormer. A dormer should not eliminate the traditional roof profile or convert a pitched roof to a flat-roofed box.
- The proposal is for an extra storey to be constructed on top of the existing two-storey extension to the main part of the house, to provide a rear three-storey structure in an area where the predominant building height is two-storey. There is no precedent for three-storey structures in this area. None of the approved dormers cited by the appellants reads as a third floor. The development would be visually dominant when seen from a wide area including Donnybrook Manor [to the south east] and would upset the character of the area.
- The original 1930s structure is already overextended to the rear. The existing two-storey extension is of significant size and if the dwelling is enlarged as proposed, it would be a mere formality to extend the "dormer" out over the existing extension. It would give rise to an undesirable precedent.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Issues

8.1.1. Having inspected the site and considered in detail the documentation on file for this first-party appeal, it seems to me that the main planning issues are:

- the acceptability in principle of the proposed development;
- the effect of the proposed attic conversion on the visual and residential amenity of the area; and
- whether the planning authority has correctly applied its development contribution scheme.

8.2. Acceptability in Principle

- 8.2.1. The Dublin City Development Plan states that residential development is permissible in the Z1 zoned area where the application site is located. In line with national policy and Ministerial guidelines, the Plan favours adaption of existing housing stock, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.
- 8.2.2. No one has objected to the Council's decision to grant permission for the conversion of the garage into a playroom and I find that element of the application acceptable. While the proposed attic conversion would have insufficient head height to accommodate an extra bedroom, it would provide increased storage space for a family of six. This weighs in favour of the proposal. However, the effects of the attic conversion on the visual and residential amenity of the area must be carefully assessed and balanced against the benefits to the appellant's family

8.3. Visual and Residential Amenity

- 8.3.1. The Development Plan requires dormer windows to complement the existing roof profile and to be sympathetic to the overall design of the dwelling. They should avoid extending right up to the gable ends. They should be visually subordinate to the roof slope, enabling a large proportion of the original roof to remain visible. They should not be over dominant in appearance. They should be set back from the eaves level to minimise their visual impact.
- 8.3.2. The proposed rear dormer window would have a width of almost 5 metres. Its south-western edge would be flush with the existing roof next to No. 27. The proposed main section drawing shows it descending vertically from roughly 650 millimetres below the apex of the roof to the top of the flat-roofed first-floor extension. It would not be visually subordinate to the roof slope and would obscure a substantial area of the roof. It would not be set back from the eaves, which is already masked by the existing rear extension. Due to its size and position, the dormer would add an unsympathetic feature to the rear elevation of the dwelling. In these respects it would not comply with Development Plan policy.
- 8.3.3. The appellant argues that the dormer would not be seen from the adjoining properties at Nos. 27 and 31. I confirmed during my site inspection that in short views the proposed dormer window would be largely concealed by the bulky two-storey

extension that projects from the rear of the dwelling. When seen in the context of the extension, the dormer would not be overbearing. It would not add significantly to the existing potential for overlooking from the rear windows of the extension.

- 8.3.4. The third-party observer made mention of views from Donnybrook Manor to the south east. When viewed from the end of the cul-de-sac adjacent to 79 Donnybrook Manor at a distance of about 35 metres, the dormer would read as a large flat-roofed second-floor extension. The modified roof profile would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the dwelling. However, the Donnybrook Manor viewpoint is confined to a small area and the impact of the dormer could be mitigated by reducing its size.
- 8.3.5. The proposed dormer would accommodate extensions to two existing attic rooms. The smaller extension, with a width of roughly 1.9 metres, would be at the south-western end of the roof abutting the gable. A condition could be attached to any grant of permission requiring the omission of that part of the dormer and restricting its overall width to no more than 3.1 metres. In my judgment, if such a condition were imposed, the attic conversion would on balance be acceptable.

8.4. Development Contribution Scheme

- 8.4.1. Section 48(10) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 provides that no appeal may be made against a condition requiring a contribution to be paid in accordance with a development contribution scheme, but an appeal may be brought where an applicant for permission considers that the terms of the scheme have not been properly applied in respect of any condition laid down by the planning authority. It seems to me that, in referring to consistency, the appellants are not challenging the development contribution scheme itself but querying whether it has been correctly applied by the planning authority.
- 8.4.2. The proposed conversion of the garage into a playroom would not involve any increase in floor space and would not attract a development contribution. The proposed attic conversion, if approved in accordance with the application, would create about 9.15 square metres of floor space. If a condition were imposed requiring the width of the dormer to be reduced, less floor area would be created. The Council's Development Contribution Scheme contains an exemption for the first 40 square metres of floor

space but it seems to me that that exemption was used up when the existing side and rear extensions were approved (3684/11 and 2888/12).

- 8.4.3. I therefore conclude that in the event of an attic conversion being approved, the development contribution should be calculated by multiplying the area in square metres of new floor space by €117.00. If the Commission were to decide not to approve any attic conversion, then no development contribution would be payable.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 9.1. Having considered the nature, location and small scale of the proposed development, the nature of the receiving environment as a built-up urban area, the absence of emissions from the development, the distance from the nearest European site and the absence of any known hydrological link between the application site and any European site, I am content on the basis of objective information that the development is not likely to have a significant effect on any European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. I therefore conclude that the carrying out of an appropriate assessment under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The application site is located about 400 metres from the River Dodder and about 1.6 kilometres from the Grand Canal. The proposed development comprises an extension and alterations to an existing dwelling. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.2. I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. 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 surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

- 10.3. The reasons for this conclusion are the nature and small scale of the proposed works, the distance from nearest water bodies and the absence of any known hydrological connections.
- 10.4. I conclude on the basis of objective information that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend to the Commission that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 12.1. Having regard to the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and in particular to the Z1 zoning pertaining to the site and the provisions of Appendix 18 concerning ancillary residential accommodation, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenity of the area and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
----	--

2.	<p>The proposed development shall be amended as follows. The proposed rear dormer shall be separated by at least 1.9 metres from the south-western edge of the existing roof, and its width, measured externally, shall be reduced to no more than 3.1 metres. Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.</p>
3.	<p>Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit proposals for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interest of sustainable drainage.</p>
4.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes of the proposed new window in the front elevation and the proposed dormer window shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
5.	<p>Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to and agree in writing with the planning authority a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction and demolition waste.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.</p>
6.	<p>The existing house, the extended living area and the extended attic shall be used as a single dwelling unit only.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the development will not be out of character with existing residential development in the area.</p>

7.	<p>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. The contribution shall be paid prior to the 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 An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000 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.</p>
----	---

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.



TREVOR A RUE

Planning Inspector

13th November 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323176-25
Proposed Development Summary	Attic conversion for storage, including rear dormer. Conversion of garage for extended living with new window to front
Development Address	29 Belmont Gardens, Donnybrook, Dublin 4, D04 A2A2
	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? (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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.
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)?	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector:



TREVOR A RUE

Date: 13th November 2025