



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323470-25

Development

Conversion of existing attic space comprising of modification of existing roof structure, raising the existing gable, c/w window, new access stairs, 2 no roof windows to the front and flat dormer to the rear.

Location

24, Ferncarrig Avenue, Sandyford,
Dublin 18, D18R2W6

Planning Authority

Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County
Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D25B/0347/WEB

Applicant(s)

Tristam Riordan

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Tristam Riordan

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

22nd of October 2025

Inspector

Karen Hamilton

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Planning History	5
5.0 Policy Context	6
5.1. Dún Laoghaire- Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028	6
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	7
6.0 EIA Screening	7
7.0 The Appeal	7
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
7.2. Planning Authority Response	8
7.3. Observations	8
8.0 Assessment	8
8.4. Condition No.2	9
9.0 AA Screening	11
10.0 Recommendation	11
11.0 Reasons and Considerations	12
12.0 Appendix 1 - EIA Pre-Screening – Form 1	13

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site consists of a two storey semi detached dwelling, located within the Ferncarrig estate, Sandyford, Dublin 18. The house fronts onto a cul-de-sac road and backs onto the side of a similar style dwelling to the rear. The design of the dwelling is like those in the vicinity and includes a hipped roof profile.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises of:
- Conversion of attic space, modification of existing roof structure, raising existing gable c/w, new access stairs, 2 no roof windows to front and flat roof dormer to rear.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Decision to grant permission subject to 5 conditions of which the following condition is of note:

Condition No 2: The dormer to the rear of the dwelling shall be reduced in size to a maximum of 3m when measured externally, with the glazing reduced accordingly to reflect the revised dimensions.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the planner reflects the above decision to grant permission and refers to the following:

- The principle of development is acceptable.
- The proposed alteration from a hipped roof to a Dutch Gable Roof is acceptable and in keeping with Section 12.3.7 of the development plan.

- The proposed dormer at the rear is well positioned although there is some concern regarding the overall width of the dormer and a condition should be attached to reduce the overall width to a maximum external width of 3m.
- The one new window in the gable end of the dwelling is fitted with obscure glazing and there should be no overlooking.
- The proposal is in accordance with Section 12.3.7 (iv) of the development plan

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Planning Section: No objection to proposal.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None received.

4.0 Planning History

None of relevance on the site.

In the vicinity

D22B/0472

Permission granted for an attic conversion for storage and dormer to the rear, at 4 Ferncarrig Court.

The grounds of appeal quote several planning permissions which are further dealt with below in the report.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dún Laoghaire- Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028

The site is located on lands zoned as residential (A) where it is an objective 'To provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities'

5.2. Chapter 12: Development Management

Section 12.3.7.1: Extensions to Dwellings

(iv) Alterations at Roof/ Attic Level:

Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles - changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/ 'A' frame end or 'half-hip' for example – will be assessed against a number of criteria including:

- Careful consideration and special 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, i.e. to the front, side, and rear, will be considered with regard to impacts on existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. The design, dimensions, and bulk of any roof proposal relative to the overall size of the dwelling and gardens will be the overriding considerations. Dormer extensions shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries.

Dormer extensions should be set down from the existing ridge level so as to not read as a third storey extension at roof level to the rear.

The proposed quality of materials/finishes for dormer extensions will be considered carefully as this can greatly improve their appearance. The level and type of glazing within a dormer extension should have regard to existing window treatments and fenestration of the dwelling. However, regard should also be had to size of fenestration proposed at attic level relative to adjoining residential amenities.

Particular care will be taken in evaluating large, visually dominant dormer window structures, with a balance sought between quality residential amenity and the privacy of adjacent properties. Excessive overlooking of adjacent properties should be avoided.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

None of relevance.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1.1. 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.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal are submitted from the applicant in relation to the requirements of Condition No.2. The issues raised are summarised below:

- The appeal is against condition No.2.
- There are many examples of attic conversions with rear dormer windows in the County Council and the Ferncarrig Estate. These vary in size and style.
- The council guidelines were followed and the design is based on planning applications previously granted within the Ferncarrig Estate.
- Examples of 5 permissions granted have been included for similar proposals in the same estate (addresses supplied in the appeal statement):
 - D24A/0741/WEB
 - D24B/0019
 - D23B/0520

- D22B/0472

- No observations have been received.
- Maps and drawings received with the appeal statement reflect those submitted to the Planning Authority as part of the proposed development.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

Submission to refer the Commission to the planner's report. The grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which would justify a change of attitude of the proposed development.

7.3. Observations

None received.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. This is a first party appeal against a condition of a grant of permission.

8.2. Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) allows the Commission (so long as it is satisfied that the application does not require an assessment as if it had been made to it in the first instance) to give the relevant planning authority direction regarding the attachment, amendment or removal of the condition. I am satisfied that the development (attic conversion and associated external alterations including change of roof profile and dormer window) is otherwise in accordance with the Development Plan and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, and I am satisfied that the appeal only relates to Condition 2 and does not raise any further issues. I am satisfied that the appeal may be dealt with under Section 139 of the Act, and I am going to limit my consideration to the appropriateness of the condition in question. I consider the issues to be:

- Condition No. 2

8.3. Condition No.2

8.4. The proposed development comprises an attic conversion, internal stairs and external works to include an extension and change in the roof profile. The proposal also includes two Velux windows along the front of the roof, window of the side gable and a dormer window to the rear. The report of the area planner notes the design to be generally in keeping with the surrounding area and Section 12.3.7 of the development plan, although has some concern with the overall width of the dormer window. The report notes that the width of the dormer should be reduced to 3m (external dimensions) and fitted with glazing to reflect the size of the dormer. The grant of permission included Condition No 2 states the following

‘The dormer to the rear of the dwelling shall be reduced in size to a maximum of 3m when measured externally, with the glazing reduced accordingly to reflect the revised dimensions,

Reason in the interest of the visual amenity.

8.5. The grounds of appeal consider the condition to reduce the size of the dormer is unreasonable and it is stated that it had been designed to reflect other similar permissions granted by the planning authority (four planning references included). I have provided the Commission with an overview of these permissions from the Local Authorities planning portal¹.

- D24A/0741/WEB: Conversion of existing attic space comprising of modification of existing roof structure, raising of existing gable c/w window, new access stairs, 2no. roof windows to the front and flat roof dormer to the rear, 9 Ferncarrig Avenue.
- D24B/0019: Conversion of existing attic space comprising of modification of existing roof structure, raising of existing gable c/w window, new access stairs, 2no roof windows to front and flat roof dormer to rear, 31 Ferncarrig Rise.

¹ [Online Planning Service - search applications](#) (accessed on the 25th of October 2025)

- D23B/0520: Conversion of existing attic space comprising of modification of existing roof structure, new gable window, new access stairs and flat roof dormer to the rear, 17 Ferncarrig Court.
- D22B/0472: Attic conversion for storage with dormer window to the rear. Raised gable to the side and new gable window to the side. Velux window to the front roof area, 4 Ferncarrig Court.

- 8.6. I have reviewed all those permissions quoted in the grounds of appeal and I note the attic works and dormer window design are similar in design and scale in all instances. They are also of a similar design and scale as that proposal before the Commission now. I have also reviewed the conditions attached to these permissions and note that the PA did not consider it necessary to amend the design and size of these dormer windows generally measuring 3.5m. That aside, I consider that all proposals should be based on their own merits. Therefore, I have undertaken an assessment of the dormer window in the proposed development.
- 8.7. In the first instance, I draw attention to the development management criteria in Section 12.3.7.1: Extensions to Dwellings. This is detailed above in Section 5.2, in general, alterations and extensions to the roof should have regard to the character and size of the dwelling, the existing roof profiles on the streetscape and visibility from the surrounding area. In terms of dormer windows, the criteria require the proposal to respect the character and form of the dwelling and privacy of adjacent properties. I note no size restrictions for dormer windows are included in these development plan criteria.
- 8.8. In assessing the design of the proposed dormer, I note the location to the rear of the dwelling and below the ridge line of the house. I do not consider the dormer will not be visible from the front streetscape and therefore will have no impact on the visual amenity or character to the front of the house.
- 8.9. The rear of the dwelling is visible from an internal access road at the rear of the site. The proposed dormer is centrally located on the roof, above two first floor windows and has a width of 3.5m and height of 1.5m. The window is 2.4m in width and 1m high. As stated above Condition No. 2 requires a reduction in the size of the dormer to 3m with the glazing reduced to reflect the revised dimensions.

- 8.10. Due to the location of the site, the dormer dwelling will be visible from the rear of the site. Having regard to the change in roof profile and its central location on the roof, I do not consider it will be visually overbearing or detract from the surrounding area. The dormer window is not directed into any properties where it would cause any unnecessary overlooking. The report of the area planner notes concern regarding the overall width of the dormer, recommended Condition no 2 to address this, although I find no analysis in the report which provides any rationale as to why the proposal has a negative impact on the character or why a 0.5m reduction in width would alter the design of the dormer so as to improve the current design proposed. To this end, I consider the existing proposal is in keeping with the design criteria in the development plan.
- 8.11. Having regard to the criteria in Section 12.3.7.1 of the development plan, which requires the design of the dormer window to respect the character and form of the dwelling, the design of the dormer on the rear roof profile, I do not consider a width of 3.5m is excessively dominant and I have no reason to believe a reduction in width is necessary to meet the development plan criteria or would it have any significant impact on the character of the dormer. In this instance, I do not consider the inclusion of condition no.2 necessary, and I recommend the Commission remove the condition.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development within a serviced urban area, the nature of the receiving environment and the proximity to the nearest European sites, I am satisfied that no appropriate assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

10.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the nature of the condition the subject of the appeal, the Commission is satisfied that the determination by the Board of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted

and, based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to REMOVE condition number 2 as follows:

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential land use zoning of the site in the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the development management criteria for alterations to roof profiles and dormers in Section 12.3.7.1, the location of the development and the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the design of the proposal is in keeping with the character of the dwelling and will not detract from the surrounding area or have a negative impact on the visual amenity. The proposal is in keeping with 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.

Karen Hamilton
Planning Inspector

28th of October 2025

12.0 Appendix 1 - EIA Pre-Screening – Form 1

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ACP-323470-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Conversion of attic space, modification of existing roof structure, raising existing gable c/w, new access stairs, 2 no roof windows to front and flat roof dormer to rear.		
Development Address	25 Ferncarrig Avenue, Sandyford, D18		
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	X
		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			Proceed to Q3.
No	X		
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X		Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			

Yes			Preliminary examination required (Form 2)
------------	--	--	---

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	X	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____