



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323259-25

Development

Planning Permission to a). convert attic space for storage use and extend attic to rear b). install windows to north and east elevations of attic and all associated site works.

Location

17 Shelerin Road, Clonsilla, Dublin 15

Planning Authority

Fingal County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

FW25A/0227E

Applicant(s)

Liam Kinnucan and Fionnuala Keane.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

To grant permission

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Liam Kinnucan and Fionnuala Keane.

Observer(s)

N/A.

Date of Site Inspection

31st October 2025.

Inspector

R Taylor

Table of Contents

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1.0 | Site Location and Description | 3 |
| 2.0 | Proposed Development | 3 |
| 3.0 | Planning Authority Decision..... | 4 |
| 4.0 | Planning History | 6 |
| 5.0 | Policy Context | 7 |
| 6.0 | EIA Screening | 9 |
| 7.0 | The Appeal | 9 |
| 8.0 | Assessment..... | 12 |
| 9.0 | AA Screening | 18 |
| 10.0 | Water Frame Directive..... | 19 |
| 11.0 | Recommendation | 20 |
| 12.0 | Reasons and Considerations | 20 |
| 13.0 | Conditions | 20 |
| Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening | | 23 |

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1** The appeal site is located at 17 Shelerin Road, Clonsilla, Dublin 15. This comprises a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling finished in brick at ground floor and smooth render at first floor, with a hipped and pitched roof with concrete roof tiles. There is a driveway and garden area to the front with hedging to the northern and western/roadside boundaries. There is a single storey extension to the rear with garden area beyond comprising hard and soft landscaping. Rear boundary treatments comprise timber fencing approximately 1.8m in height with a row of mature trees approximately 4m in height adjacent. The gable of the dwelling of the appeal site is located approximately 1.8m from the northern site boundary with the adjacent dwelling, number 18 Shelerin Road. The site and neighbouring properties have broadly level topography.
- 1.2** The site is located within a row of semi-detached dwellings of similar design and layout. There is a dense vegetated/hedging boundary interspersed with mature trees opposite the site with open space beyond. To the rear there is a further residential street of 2 storey semi-detached dwellings of similar design to the appeal site, known as "Sorrel Heath".

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1** The proposal comprises an attic roofspace extension including a dormer to the rear, converting the existing hipped and pitched roof to a pitched, and includes a new window gable in the northern elevation at second floor with a further window within the dormer. The attic extension has a stated floorspace of 26.17sqm. Finishes include standing seam zinc cladding to the roof, rear and side elevations of the dormer window, and render to the gable at second floor to match the existing dwelling.
- 2.2** The plans indicate that the dormer is approximately c. 0.53m from the gable, c. 0.487m from the boundary with the adjacent dwelling and set back c. 0.76m from the eaves of the rear elevation. The dormer has a proposed external width of

5.114m, and internal width of 4.514m. The attic room has a stated internal height of 1.879m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision

The Planning Authority notification of granted permission is dated 10th July 2025 and includes 10 conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

1. Development shall be carried out in its entirety in accordance with the plans, particulars and specifications lodged with the application, save as may be required by the other conditions.
2. This permission relates solely to that detailed in the statutory public notices and does not refer to any other aspects of the development that may be shown in the lodged plans.
3. The developer shall amend the design of the proposed development to accord with the following: (a) The maximum width of the dormer shall be 3.1m externally and be centrally located on the roof plane (b) The dormer structure shall be set down a minimum 0.3m from the existing ridge of the principal dwelling (c) The maximum external width of any window opening in the dormer shall not exceed 1.7m wide.

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

4. Second floor window to stairwell on southern gable wall to be fitted and permanently maintained with obscure glass. The use of film is not acceptable.
REASON: In the interests of residential amenity.

5. The dwelling and extension shall be jointly used as a single dwelling unit and shall not be used for multiple occupancy living units / non-residential uses, except where otherwise permitted by way of a separate grant of planning permission.

6. Any attic floor space must comply with Building Regulations to be used for human habitation. Any room which does not comply, shall not be used for human habitation.
7. Finishes of the proposed dormer shall match the existing dwelling, as per drawings submitted, unless otherwise agreed in writing.
8. Requirements relating to surfacewater, in compliance with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works, Version 6.0, FCC, April 2006, and SuDS design and provision.
9. Prevent the spillage or deposit of any materials including clay rubble or other debris on adjoining roads...(and) applicant/developer shall be responsible for the full cost of repair in respect of any damage caused to the adjoining public road.
10. Restriction of hours of construction Monday – Saturday and at no times on Sundays or Bank holidays.

The majority of conditions applied are of a standard nature, save for condition 3 which is the subject of this appeal and will be considered in the assessment below.

3.1.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.1.2.1 In recommending a grant of permission, a single planning report notes the following:

No pre-planning consultation undertaken.

Consultation with Departmental water services, conditions recommended.

No third-party submissions received.

3.1.2.2 No site planning history. Relevant planning history for similar proposals noted at 12, 19, and 23 Shelerin Road.

3.1.2.3 The proposed finishes, design of the revision from hipped to pitched, and associated impact on character and amenity are acceptable. Neighbouring amenity will not be adversely affected. Separation distances to properties to the rear exceeds 16m.

- 3.1.2.4 The proposed hipped to gable extension is acceptable given precedent for this development evidenced by the listed planning history. Gable windows require obscure glazing to minimise overlooking amenity impacts/safeguard privacy.
- 3.1.2.5 The proposed dormer would be overbearing and dominant in relation to the existing dwelling. A reduction by planning condition will allow the proposed dormer to be subordinate in relation to the existing dwelling and minimise impact on character. The dormer should be reduced in width to 3.1m with minimum step-down from the ridge of 0.3m. The proposed window opening should match those below on the rear elevation and not exceed 1.7m in width.

3.1.2.6 Other Technical Reports

Water Services: no objections (surface water and flooding) subject to condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

None

4.0 Planning History

4.1 The Authority report notes no recent history on the appeal site.

4.2 Locality:

19 Shelerin Road: FW24A/0091: attic conversion including change of roof profile from hip to gable and a new window to side elevation at attic level. Grant Permission 07 June 2024.

12 Shelerin Road: FW25A/0091E: attic conversion to include a reconfiguration of the side roof profile from hipped to gable end and to include a dormer window structure to the rear roof slope. Grant Permission 05 June 2025.

23 Shelerin Road: FW22B/0096: attic conversion, raising of gable end to change roof profile with dormer projecting window to rear, 2 no velux lights to front and all associated site works. Grant Permission 12 Dec 2022.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

5.1.1 The Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 was made on 22nd February 2023 and came into effect on 5th April 2023. It has regard to national and regional policies in respect of residential development. The following policy considerations are relevant based on the nature of the proposal:

5.1.2 Map Sheet No. 13 Blanchardstown South. Zoning Objective: RS – Residential: Objective: Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity. Objective Vision: Ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity.

5.1.3 Chapter 3: Sustainable Placemaking and Quality Homes.

5.1.4 3.5.13.1 Residential Extensions: The need for people to extend and renovate their dwellings is recognised and acknowledged. Extensions will be considered favourably where they do not have a negative impact on adjoining properties or on the nature of the surrounding area.

5.1.5 Policy SPQHP41 – Residential Extensions: Support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

5.1.6 Objective SPQHO45 – Domestic Extensions: Encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area.

5.1.7 Chapter 14 Development Standards:

5.1.8 14.10.2 Residential Extensions:

The need for housing to be adaptable to changing family circumstances is recognised and acknowledged and the Council will support applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend as the needs of the household

change, subject to specific safeguards. In particular, the design and layout of residential extensions must have regard to and protect the amenities of adjoining properties, particularly in relation to sunlight, daylight and privacy. The design of extensions must also have regard to the character and form of the existing building, its architectural expression, remaining usable rear private open space, external finishes and pattern of fenestration. Additionally, careful consideration should be paid to boundary treatments, tree planting and landscaping.

5.1.9 14.10.2.5 Roof Alterations including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions: Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles, for example, changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/'A' frame end or 'half-hip', will be assessed against a number of criteria including:

- Consideration and regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
- Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
- Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
- Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures and prominence.

Dormer extensions to roofs will be evaluated against the impact of the structure on the form, and character of the existing dwelling house and the privacy of adjacent properties. The design, dimensions, and bulk of the dormer relative to the overall extent of roof as well as the size of the dwelling and rear garden will be the overriding considerations, together with the visual impact of the structure when viewed from adjoining streets and public areas.

Dormer extensions 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.

The quality of materials/finishes to dormer extensions shall be given careful consideration and should match those of the existing roof.

The level and type of glazing within a dormer extension should have regard to existing window treatments and fenestration of the dwelling. Regard should also be had to 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

Special Protection Areas:

South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA Sitecode 004024 c. 12.2km to southeast.

Special Area of Conservation:

Rye Water Valley/Carton SAC Sitecode 001398 c. 5.9km to southwest.

North Dublin Bay SAC Sitecode 000206 c. 15.3km to southeast.

South Dublin Bay SAC Sitecode 000210 c. 13.7km to southeast.

Natural Heritage Areas (NHA) – none in close proximity to the site.

Proposed Natural Heritage Areas:

Royal Canal pNHA Site Code 002103 c. 490m to south.

Liffey Valley pNHA Site Code 000128 c. 1.5km to southwest.

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development does not come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA, that is, it does not comprise construction works, demolition or intervention in the natural surroundings. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1.1 Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1 The applicant is the appellant, and the grounds of appeal are submitted by Cummings & Voortman Architects on their behalf. The appeal relates to condition 3 of the decision.

7.1.2 The requirement of the condition limits the use of the space and would make the proposal unviable, demonstrated by an attached section drawing. It would result in an internal height of 1600mm and restricted floorspace.

7.1.3 Policy objectives PM46 and DMS41 are quoted:

PM46: Encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area.

DMS41: Dormer extensions to roofs will only be considered where there is no negative impact on the existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. Dormer extensions shall not form a dominant part of a roof.

Consideration may be given to dormer extensions proposed up to the ridge level of a house and shall not be higher than the existing ridge height of the house.

7.1.4 The planning report states that the proposal would not have a significant impact on residential amenity.

7.1.5 Planning Authority concerns relate to the scale in relation to the existing dwelling. It is set well back from the eaves and would not be dominant as it cannot be seen from the front or sides and can only be seen from the rear of the property. First floor windows of the closest property are 23m away. The revisions stated in the condition would not make the dormer less dominant.

7.1.6 The top of the dormer is aligned with the existing ridge.

7.1.7 Photographs of 4 constructed dormers at 44 Aspen Avenue, 15 Limelawn Hill, 28 Lohunda Dale (all Clonsilla) are cited as examples of dormers where dormer roof height aligned with the ridge of the dwelling and are not set down. Elevations or sections are also shown.

7.1.8 4 Deerhaven Avenue, Clonee is also cited, and a section drawing and photograph are also shown. In that case a 300mm set down from ridge and width of 3m was successfully appealed to An Bord Pleanála. The inspector concluded that the 300mm reduction from the ridge was unnecessary as it would not be visible from the front of the house.

7.1.9 The examples demonstrate that the Council find similar developments to the proposal acceptable and it is uncertain why the stance has been taken in the appeal case.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- 7.2.1 A single response from the Authority was submitted to ACP and is dated 14th August 2025.
- 7.2.2 The Authority accept the use of the space will be limited. However, it has been illustrated as “attic storage” on the plans which do not require a minimum height for functionality. Viability is not a material planning consideration.
- 7.2.3 FW21B/0025: 44 Aspen Avenue, Clonsilla, Dublin 15 decision included the following condition:
- Prior to the commencement of development on site, the developer shall submit revised plans and elevations for the written agreement of the Planning Authority which show, a) The proposed dormer extension shall have a maximum external width of 3.0 metres. b) The proposed dormer extension shall be centred in the roof pitch. c) The proposed width of glass in the dormer extension shall be no more than 1.5 m wide. d) The proposed dormer extension shall be at least 300 mm below the existing roof ridgeline.
- REASON: In the interest of orderly development, residential and visual amenity.
- 7.2.4 FW21B/0022 did not include the above condition attached to 44 Aspen Avenue, however the dimensions of the dormer extension were c. 2.9m wide and c. 0.4m step down from the ridge.
- 7.2.5 FW18B/0046 28 Lohunda Dale included a c.0.26m step down from the ridge. This site is located in a separate residential estate, on the opposite side of the Ongar Road and does not set a precedent for the subject site. This was also granted over 7 years ago. No design changes were required by condition.
- 7.2.6 The above cases were assessed against Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023.
- 7.2.7 The Authority has been consistent in their approach to the design of dormer roof extensions in that proposals should not exceed half the width of the roof plane and stepped down a minimum of 0.3m from the ridge.
- 7.2.8 The scale of the proposed dormer as submitted would not be subordinate and therefore is unacceptable in terms of visual and residential amenity.

7.4. Observations

None.

7.5. Further Responses

None.

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. This is a first-party Section 139 (Planning and Development Act, 2000 [as amended]) appeal against a Condition. The Condition under appeal is Condition No. 3 attached to the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission. The precise wording of Condition No. 3 is set out at Section 3.1 of this Report.
- 8.2 Having regard to the nature of the Condition the subject of the Appeal, 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), and I intend to limit my consideration to the matters raised in relation to the terms of that condition.
- 8.3 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 in this appeal to be assessed are as follows:
- The scale of the proposed dormer relative to the existing dwelling;
 - Impact on character;
 - Residential Amenity;
 - Planning history in the area; and
 - Other issues

8.4 As referenced in Section 5.2.1 of this Report, the key policy consideration in the assessment of dormer window proposals is set out in Section 14.10.2.5, 'Roof Alterations Including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions' in Chapter 14: 'Development Management Standards' of the Development Plan. This policy provides that dormer windows will be evaluated against the impact on the form and character of the existing dwelling and (my emphasis) the privacy of adjacent properties, and (my emphasis) the visual impact of the structure when viewed from adjoining streets and public areas.

8.5 14.10.2.5 must also be read in context with the overall policy for extensions at paragraph 14.10.2, the third sentence of which states:

The design of extensions must also have regard to the character and form of the existing building, its architectural expression, remaining usable rear private open space, external finishes and pattern of fenestration.

Scale of the Proposed Dormer Relative to the Existing Dwelling

8.6 The site comprises a 2-storey dwelling, with a hipped and pitched roof form. The roof pitch is reasonably shallow. The proposal is a typical "box" design set within the rear roof elevation. Based on the submitted proposed roof plan, the roof of the site has a stated length of 6.136m, depth from ridge to rear eaves of 4.571m, and area of c. 28.05sqm. The length of the dormer, as proposed, is 5.114m and width of 3.875m with proposed area of c. 20 sqm. The rear/east elevation indicates the dormer is 2.244m in height. The highest part of the dormer meets the ridge of the dwelling with a flat/monopitch roof falling towards the rear elevation and eaves.

8.7 The length of the proposed dormer equates to 83% of the length of the revised roof design, with a depth of approximately 85%. In area terms the proposal equates to 70% of the rear roof plane.

8.8 The third paragraph of 14.10.2.5 broadly stipulates spatial/design requirements for dormer windows:

Dormer extensions 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.

- 8.9 Whilst dimensions are not stipulated, this paragraph clearly requires a set back from gables and boundaries and a set down from the ridge. Therefore, this directs proposal design to achieve an appropriate solution in relation to “the form, and character of the existing dwelling house” as discussed in the second paragraph of 14.10.2.5 and at 14.10.2.
- 8.10 In terms of glazing, the policy requires that the level and type of glazing ‘should have regard’ to existing window treatments and fenestration. The existing windows in the rear elevation are typical of windows found in suburban dwellings, and are largely of horizontal-emphasis design, with a single vertical-emphasis window at ground floor.
- 8.11 The proposed dormer window has dimensions of approximately 2.19m in width and 1.06m in height based on the rear elevation. This window exceeds the dimensions of the second-floor windows, with the dimensions of the rear first floor bedroom window measuring approximately 1.7m in width and 1.1m in height.
- 8.12 Based on the area and length calculations set out at paragraph 8.6 and 8.7 above and site visit assessment, I conclude that the design of the dormer would not be sufficiently subordinate to the dwelling roof and rear elevation. The design as proposed would have an unbalancing and dominant impact on the architectural composition of the rear elevation and dwelling.
- 8.13 Condition 3 of the decision stipulated in by the Local Authority, requires design revisions comprising a reduction in width to 3.1m, with minimum step-down from the ridge of 0.3m, and the proposed window opening should match those below on the rear elevation and not exceed 1.7m in width.
- 8.14 These dimensions would result in a dormer design of 3.1m in width, 3.58m in depth and approximate height of 2.33m, with an internal height of 1.60m based on the section details submitted in the appellant’s grounds for appeal. This equates to an approximate area within the roof of 11.1sqm, or 39.6% of the area. The length of the dormer equates to 50.5% of the length of the revised roof. The width of the dormer window of 1.7m (condition requirement (c)), would equal the width of the first-floor rear bedroom window, the largest of the 2 windows at first floor in the rear elevation.

- 8.15 The dimensions as stipulated in condition 3 by the Local Authority, would provide a subordinate design and therefore meet the requirements of the policy in my opinion.

Impact on the Character

- 8.16 At my visit, I viewed the site from a number of public viewpoints in close proximity to the appeal site.
- 8.17 The dormer / rear roof plane would not be readily visible from any short or medium distance views from the site frontage and Shelerin Road, including from both northerly and southerly approaches. This is due to the narrow separation distances between gables of dwellings fronting onto the street.
- 8.18 Limited public views of the site are possible from a short stretch of the Sorrel Park road, corresponding with/via the gap between properties fronting Shelerin Road and Sorrel Heath. I do not consider that the site is readily visible from this viewpoint to the extent that the proposal, as submitted, would adversely impact on character.
- 8.19 The rear of the site and associated roof are not readily visible from Sorrel Heath and associated open space directly northeast of the site, again due to the narrow gaps/separation distances between properties within this street.
- 8.20 The turning head/terminus of the public road on Sorrel Heath is the only location in close proximity from which the roofscape of the site and immediate environs is visible, and primarily from a short stretch of the road/footpath between number 36, and frontages of, numbers 37-40 Sorrel Heath. A degree of screening is provided by the alignment of the row of existing dwellings to the rear and relative to the appeal site and intervening vegetation.
- 8.21 The rear of the site and associated roof are not readily visible from Aspen Avenue to the south of the site. Views are obscured by existing dwellings, boundary treatments and vegetation.
- 8.22 Based on a visual assessment of the site from the surrounding context, I conclude that the proposal/appeal site is not readily visible and accordingly there would be a negligible impact on local character.

Residential Amenity

- 8.23 Having regard to the existing first floor windows of the subject property and adjacent properties, and existing tree vegetation adjacent to the rear site boundary, I am satisfied that the proposed shall not result in excessive overlooking or loss of privacy of adjacent properties. A condition is included by the Local Authority for obscure glazing to the gable windows which will further protect privacy.
- 8.24 The proposal would also not result in unacceptable overshadowing of adjacent properties given the nature, design, and location of the development within the roofscape and taking account of the aspect of the site.

Planning History in the Area

- 8.25 The appellant refers to four other cases in the area which are considered to support the proposal, 44 Aspen Avenue, 15 Limelawn Hill, 28 Lohunda Dale, and 4 Deerhaven Avenue, Clonee.
- 8.26 The Local Authority advise that all of the above cases are not comparable to the appeal proposal.
- 8.27 The appellant's evidence includes section and elevation drawings, and photographs of the dormers at each site. Decisions, planning reports, floorplans and rear/detail elevations are not included.
- 8.28 I note that for the examples quoted for 44 Aspen Avenue and 28 Lohunda Dale, the indicated section drawings do not appear to relate/match the "as built" photographs provided. The Local Authority have confirmed that a similar condition to that subject of this current appeal was attached to the decision at 44 Aspen Avenue. They also advise that the dormer at 28 Lohunda Dale included a step down of c. 0.26m from the ridge. I would also note that this dormer includes a greater set back from the eaves on the rear and gable elevations and thus does not present a similar scale and massing to the appeal proposal.

- 8.29 The photograph of 15 Limelawn Hill illustrates is not comparable to the appeal proposal. The Local Authority advise that the design of the dormer comprised dimensions of c. 2.9m wide and a c.0.4m step down from the ridge.
- 8.30 4 Deerhaven Avenue is also cited by the appellant. They state that this was subject to a similar design restriction condition and successfully challenged/approved on appeal. The further response from the Local Authority does not include comments on this case.
- 8.31 Whilst the successful appeal of this case is noted, the policy context and considerations for this, and the other cited cases above, related to the previous development plan for the area, the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023. The policy considerations for the appeal are set out in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 as summarised at section 5 above.
- 8.32 I therefore conclude that the cited examples by the appellant are not comparable and do not support the design of the proposal.

Other Issues

- 8.33 The appellant refers to policy considerations Objectives PM46 and DMS41. These appear to relate to the previous development plan for the area, the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023. These considerations have been amended by policies within the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, summarised at section 5 above. For clarity, the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 and associated policies are therefore no longer a material consideration.
- 8.34 The grounds of appeal state that if the dormer is amended in line with the condition, the step down from the ridge would result in an internal height of 1.6m limiting the use of the space and would render the development unviable. The Local Authority response states that the space is indicated as storage which does not require a minimum height for functionality and that viability is not a material consideration.
- 8.35 Condition 3 includes a requirement to set down the roof of the dormer a minimum of 0.3m from the existing ridge. If applied, this would appear to reduce available internal floor-to-ceiling height to c. 1.6m based on the section drawing provided in the appellants' grounds of appeal. I consider that this reduced height would not

significantly impact the proposed storage use of the attic, which is the indicated use of the internal floorspace on the supporting floorplans. Minimum internal height is not a stipulated requirement of the policy, rather the focus relates to ensuring that the external appearance of the dormer is appropriate relative to the character of the dwelling, surrounding area, and amenity considerations. The appellant's stated requirement of increased internal height afforded by the design as shown on the supporting plans is a private/personal matter and I therefore conclude that this issue does not outweigh the policy requirements set out in the plan which are in the public interest.

- 8.36 Whilst I have concluded in the above assessment that the proposal would not adversely impact on the character of the area or neighbouring amenity, I consider that the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on the form and character of the existing dwelling and would not therefore be in accordance with the requirements of Sections 14.10.2 and 14.10.2.5, 'Roof Alterations Including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions' in Chapter 14: 'Development Management Standards' of the Development Plan. The condition as drafted by the Local Authority is therefore necessary and appropriate.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed access and associated works in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2 The subject site is located within an urban area of Fingal and 5.9km and 12.2km to the nearest European Sites.
- 9.3 The proposed development comprises alterations and works within the curtilage of an existing dwelling as described at section 2.0 above.
- 9.4 No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.5 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 reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- small scale alterations to an existing dwelling within a large suburban residential estate;

- distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.

- 9.6 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 9.7 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The subject site is located within an urban area of Fingal. There are no water bodies adjacent or in close proximity to the appeal site. The nearest water body to the site is the Royal Canal, approximately 489m to the south. The River Tolka is located approximately 2km to the Northeast/east of the appeal site.
- 10.2 The proposed development comprises alterations and works to the roof of an existing dwelling as discussed at section 2.0 above.
- 10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.4 I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & 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.
- 10.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- small scale alterations to an existing dwelling within a large suburban residential estate;
 - The location of the site and distance from nearest Water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.

10.6 Conclusion

I conclude that 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. 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 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
- (a) ATTACH condition number 3 and the reason therefor.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, residential land use zoning for the site, to the pattern of development in the area, and the scale, massing and design of the site, it is considered that the proposed dormer extension, by reason of its scale and design, would detract from the character of the dwelling. The Planning Authority's Condition 3 requiring the amendment of the proposed rear dormer window is, therefore, warranted in the interests of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

3. The developer shall amend the design of the proposed development to accord with the following: (a) The maximum width of the dormer shall be 3.1m externally and be centrally located on the roof plane (b) The dormer structure shall be set down a minimum 0.3m from the existing ridge of the principal

dwelling (c) The maximum external width of any window opening in the dormer shall not exceed 1.7m wide.

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

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.

R Taylor
Planning Inspector

11 November 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

| | |
|---|--|
| Case Reference | ACP-323259-25 |
| Proposed Development Summary | Planning Permission to a). convert attic space for storage use and extend attic to rear b). install windows to north and east elevations of attic and all associated site works. |
| Development Address | 17 Shelerin Road, Clonsilla, Dublin 15 |
| 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? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required. | |
| <p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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) | |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. | State the Class here |
| EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP. | |
| <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 <u>Part 2</u>, 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. | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 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)? | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3) |
| No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3) |

Inspector: R Taylor Date: 11/11/2025