



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500024-DR

Development

Widening of front vehicular access including partial removal of front boundary wall; conversion of existing front carport/store to home office with new front window and side French doors; alterations to ground floor front-facing windows; attic conversion for storage with three dormers to north roof slope and three rooflights to south roof slope.

Location

9 Richview Villas, Clonskeagh Road, Dublin 14

Planning Authority

Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D25A/0572/WEB

Applicant(s)

Alan Petherbridge & Nadine Farren.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant and Refuse Permission (split decision)

Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Alan Petherbridge & Nadine Farren.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	19 th of January 2026.
Inspector	Deirdre Scully.

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	4
2.0	Proposed Development	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History	7
5.0	Policy Context.....	7
6.0	EIA Screening.....	10
7.0	The Appeal	10
8.0	Assessment	11
9.0	AA Screening.....	15
10.0	Water Framework Directive	16
11.0	Recommendation	17
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	17
13.0	Conditions	17

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located at no. 9 Richview Villas and faces directly onto the Clonskeagh Road. The property is a detached two storey house with a steep pitched roof located within a large plot with off street parking and garden. The site is bound to the south by a commercial car sales unit with housing on the west and northern boundaries. A dense tree canopy within the adjoining sunken garden is located along the boundary.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of three elements (i) widening the existing vehicular driveway to 3.5m; (ii) conversion of the existing car port to the front of the house into a home office and (iii) addition of three dormer windows to the north roof and rooflights flush with the roof on the southern roof.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Council issued a notification to REFUSE permission for the three dormer windows and to GRANT permission for remaining elements (driveway widening, rooflights and home office) of the proposed development on the 11th of September 2025. The reason for refusal stated:

“It is considered that the proposed three side dormers at attic level would be unduly large, bulky, and result in overbearing and visually dominant within the existing roofscape of the house. Therefore, the proposed three side dormers would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area and would not in accordance with Section 12.3.7.1 (iv) Alterations at Roof/Attic Level of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In relation to the other elements of the application the decision stated:

Having regard to the Objective ‘A’ zoning of the site, and policies and objectives as set out in the 2022-2028 Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, it is

considered that the development will not detract from the amenity of the area and is consistent with the provisions of the current County Development Plan. The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Standard conditions are attached to this grant of permission; with no conditioned changes.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

One planning report is filed for this application, dated the 11th of September 2025 contained within the Chief Executives Order of the same date. The following is a summary of the key points made in the Planners Report:

- The application is assessed against the Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 focussing on four particular areas; each of which are listed below.
- Principle of Development: The planner considers the form of development within the context of the Objective 'A' residential development zoning and states that the form of development proposed is permitted in principle; subject to the Planning Authority being satisfied the development would not have "undesirable effects".
- Climate Action: The Policy Objective CA7 is noted regarding choice of construction materials in carrying out the works; taking into account that the house is an existing structure.
- Residential Amenity and Visual Impact: The works are considered in two elements (i) car port conversion and window alteration; and (ii) attic conversion and three attic side dormer. The planner, having examined the positions of the window at ground floor level and the small extent of the office area conversion from the open style car port (18 sq. m.), comes to the conclusion that the works would not adversely affect residential amenity. In relation to the three dormers, the use of the attic space as "storage" is noted,

and the fact this space is wholly created within the existing built envelope of the roof, the conclusion is reached that this conversion is also acceptable as regards residential amenity impact. In relation to the three roof lights on the southern elevation of the roof, these are also concluded as to have no significant impact. The three dormers on the northern elevation are considered due to their overall bulk, scale, design and size relative to the overall size of the roof to be unduly large and bulky and would result in an “overbearing visually dominant” roofscape and have a negative impact on the character of the house, and would also set an undesirable precedent. A potential risk to the trees at the northern boundary during construction is also referenced. The planning report suggests a more modest approach to the design of the dormers would be more appropriate, taking into account the location and nature of the site.

- Access, Parking, Transport: No concerns are raised on the widening of the driveway to the maximum 3.5m development management standard in the Development Plan (Sc. 12.4.8.1)
- The report concludes with a recommendation to grant all works with the exception of the dormer windows which are recommended for refusal for the reasons of visual amenity and undesirable precedent.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

No planning history is recorded for this site. Some recent planning applications in the area include:

D25A/0115- Permission GRANTED at 22 Laburnum Road, (road to the rear of the site) for extension works including dormer windows at 1st floor; with the second dormer on the roof elevation removed by condition on grounds of visual and residential amenity.

D13A/0409- Permission GRANTED for retention of change of use of family flat (granted under D06A/0592) to separate dwelling at 16 Laburnum Road (immediately to the rear of the subject site).

D17A/1142- Permission GRANTED for extension of dwelling at ground and first floor levels at 18 Laburnum Road.

D19B/0465- Permission GRANTED for two storey and single storey extension to rear and front at 7 Richview Villas.

D08B/0568- Permission GRANTED for retention to alterations to previously approved dormer window (D07B/0695), including ridge height increase and a second new dormer window at 4 Richview Villas.

D10A/0587- Permission GRANTED for change of use of two storey over basement office building to medical use and ancillary works at Ballintaggart House, Clonskeagh

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Dún Laoghaire- Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028

Zoning

5.1.1 The site is zoned Objective A which seeks ‘to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.’

Residential development is listed as a use that is “permitted in principle” under this zoning objective.

Policy Objectives

5.1.2 The following provisions of the Dún Laoghaire- Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028 are of relevance:

Policy Objective CA6: Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings- (Chapter 3: Climate Action)

'Require the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction where possible recognising the embodied energy in existing buildings and thereby reducing the overall embodied energy in construction as set out in the Urban Design Manual (Department of Environment Heritage and Local Government, 2009). (Consistent with RPO 7.40 and 7.41 of the RSES).'

Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock - Adaptation (Chapter 4: Neighbourhood- People, Homes and Place)

'Conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption of homes consistent with NPO 34of the NPF....'

This is elaborated on within the supporting text stating *"Implementation of this policy will necessitate the use of the Council's powers under planning - and other associated legislation - to ... actively promote and facilitate adaptation of existing housing stock to accommodate changing household size and needs.."*

Development Management Standards (Chapter 12):

5.1.3 Relevant aspects of this chapter to the application are:

Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwelling; particularly (i) extensions to the front and (iv) alterations at Roof/Attic Level.

- (i) *'Front extensions, at both ground and first level will be considered acceptable in principle subject to scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. A break in the front building line will be acceptable, over two floors to the front elevation, subject to scale and design however a significant break in the building line should be resisted unless the design can demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the proposal will not impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings.*
- (ii) *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.'

Section 12.3.7.4: Detached Habitable Rooms:

'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.'

Section 12.4.8 Vehicular Entrances and Hardstanding Areas:

'In general, for a single residential dwelling, the maximum width of an entrance is 3.5 metres.'

Policy Objectives PHP42: 'Building Design & Height' and CA7: 'Construction Materials' are both referenced in the Planners Report; however it is considered they have no significant bearing on assessing the application.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located in or adjacent to any site designated for natural heritage. The nearest designated sites to the appeal site are approximately 2.4km to east- the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (includes Booterstown Marsh) (004024), Booterstown Marsh NHA (001205) and the South Dublin Bay SAC (00210) and South Dublin Bay pNHA (000210).

6.0 EIA Screening

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

A first party appeal has been submitted by the owners of the subject property. The following provides a summary of the grounds of appeal

- The Commission is requested to grant permission for the three dormer windows in recognition that the design of the extension is compliant with the policy objectives of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan and that the concerns raised and reasons given for the refusal are unfounded.
- The appeal statement points out that the visual impact of the dormer windows has been minimised by (i) use of least visible elevation; (ii) the set down from the ridge line; (iii) use of three smaller windows than one expanse.
- The planners report errs in describing the positioning of the dormers as “not set back from the existing eaves line”.
- They highlight that the roof scale on this dwelling is very large and the dormers are in proportion to this scale, and are therefore proportionate.
- The area contains a mix of uses and housing typologies and styles, there is no uniformity in house design on this road so therefore it is not out of character.
- Other recent developments are named (with one photographed) showing a precedent established for large dormers additions to roof profiles within the area.
- The location of the dwelling within a large site gives generous separation distances to the adjoining property.

- The trees that are raised as a concern in the planners report as being possibly impacted by construction are in fact located in the adjoining garden and will not be removed or negatively impacted as the paved area adjoining the house can be used for works.

Photographs are included with the appeal of the lands and views from the Clonskeagh Road.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

None.

7.3. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

8.1 Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file in relation to the appeal, the report of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the policies and objectives of the Dún Laoghaire- Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows

- Visual Impact due to Design
- Design, Bulk and Precedent set.

Also raised in the planners report but not referenced in the refusal reason are

- Potential residential amenity impact
- Impact on trees on northern boundary.

These will also be examined below in this report.

With regard to the other elements of the planning application, I consider that the works proposed to the house- the car port conversion and roof lights - are minor in

scale, have a low impact on the house, and are in keeping with the zoning objectives and therefore will not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity. With regard the drive widening, the expansion to meet existing standards has no substantial impact on road safety or amenity and is also considered in keeping with the residential amenity zoning and is acceptable.

This report will now therefore focus on examining the impact of the proposed three dormer windows.

8.2 Visual Impact due to Design

The planners report raises this as the main concern and reason for refusing permission the dormer windows. The report states that the windows would result in in an “overbearing visually dominant” roofscape and have “a negative impact on the character of the house.”

The planners assessment contains two elements with regard to the visual impact; (i) overbearing and visually dominant and (ii) the negative impact on the house.

In relation to the overbearing dominant design, the appellants make the case in their statement that the design approach sought to minimise the impact of the addition of dormers by providing three individual windows rather than one large structure along most of the elevation (the solid form being similar to examples sited with granted permission).

As regards visual dominance, the northern elevation is not facing the road and is the lesser visible side elevation of the two. The southern elevation is more exposed as it abuts a commercial entrance and car showroom, with a set back and surface car park leaving the southern elevation visible from the southern approach. The house itself is well set back from the road and in line with the properties to the north. Having considered the points made by the appellants, I consider that the location of the dormers on the northern elevation is the least intrusive location and considering that it does not face the public road; either directly or indirectly, I do not agree that the works would be visually intrusive; but are similar as regards impact to many other dormer windows added to rear roof elevations.

The approach of using three windows across what is an extensive roof elevation is an appropriate design response in reducing the volume and bulk of the dormer insertion. The proportion of roof remaining is enough to preserve the form and shape of the roof profile, the dormers are wholly contained within the slope and from the front elevation are read as one protrusion. The roof to window ratio is not dissimilar to many traditional style terraced/semi-detached houses with dormers added (such as recently granted D25B/0619/WEB). I consider therefore that there is no justification to refuse or reduce the windows on design or bulk as the extent and length of the elevation can absorb the three windows.

As regards a negative impact on the house, the house design is of no architectural, artistic or heritage merit; and can, due to its scale, absorb the change created by the dormer windows. The form and pattern of development on Clonskeagh road is very varied, and the house itself is not in keeping with the much earlier Richview housing to the north and west. To the south and east are office and commercial buildings of varying height, levels and design; with the adjoining commercial property to the south having three storey commercial with a stone and glass finish at a raised level.

8.3 Precedent set.

The appellants list a number of completed permissions within the wider area, with one accompanying photograph, of large dormer windows where a number extend along a significant part of the roof profile.

The cases identified by the appellant are:

- D14A/0334- 10 Embassy Lawn, Clonskeagh- Permission GRANTED for dormer extension on both sides of existing roof.
- D25B/0403/WEB- 7 Leinster Lawn, Clonskeagh- retention GRANTED for 10m wide side dormer
- D20A/0360- 24 Leinster Lawn, Clonskeagh- permission GRANTED for side dormer extension.
- D17B/0222- 26 Leinster Lawn, Clonskeagh – permission GRANTED for dormer extension to side.

Whilst all of the cases named are for dormers at first floor level, the issue under consideration here is the precedent of the ratio of dormer to the main roof. These cases clearly demonstrate that the Planning Authority already has established the precedent and granted permission for large flat roof dormer windows of larger scales within the roof profile, on side elevations; with the set back from the eaves and below the ridge line. For each of the examples given; all are visible from the public road.

8.4 Impact on Trees

As referred to above, this is not identified as a reason for refusal, but the issue is raised in the planners report and also the appeal statement. Having examined the site, and the accompanying appeal and planning application documentation including the site layout; it is clear that most if not all of the trees are located in the adjoining garden, with overhang from their substantial size extending into the application site. The trees frame the southern edge of the large sunken garden of the adjoining property to the north. Therefore I consider that, whilst some appropriate pruning may be necessary; overall the impact on the trees at this location is not at risk from the proposed works on the dormer windows.

8.5 Potential Residential Amenity Impact

The planners report raises a concern in relation to potential negative impact on residential amenity as the “side elevation may present as a three-storey façade when viewed from No.8 Richview Villas which could be considered overbearing and potentially detrimental to the residential amenity of that property.” This is linked to the risk of tree removal from the boundary in the planners report.

The point regarding risk from tree loss is addressed above. However in the longer-term there is always a possibility that some of the trees may need to be removed in the future; and therefore it is prudent to consider the impact of the development in the absence of a screen of trees. The planners report suggests that a “*more modest*” redesign of the dormer windows on the *southern* elevation would be acceptable; clarifying that principle of dormers on this house is not raising a negative impact. The development will result in a two storey with dormer at third floor level

with a separation distance between houses of 23m. This falls above the requirements of a general standard of circa 22m separation for windows at first and above floor levels in infill housing and new apartments (stated in 12.3.5.2 and 12.3.7.6). At three storeys in height the dwelling is still below the considered appropriate height range of up to 4 storeys for housing within suburban areas as described in the Section 28 Guidelines '*Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities*'. I consider therefore that the principle of dormer windows creating a third storey at this location, taking into account the significant separation distance between both houses and the scale of the house within the site that the development of the dormers would not create the risk of a negative impact on residential amenity for the adjoining property at No. 8 Richview Villas.

9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed alterations to the dwelling and widening of entrance in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located within a well serviced contiguous suburb of Dublin and is circa 2.4km from the closest European Sites at Dublin Bay and Booterstown Marsh.

The proposed development comprises of (i) widening the driveway to 3.5m; (ii) conversion of car port to the front of the house into a home office and (iii) addition of three dormer windows to the north roof and rooflights flush with the roof on the southern roof as described in Section 2.0 of this report. 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 reason for this conclusion is as follows

- The limited scale and nature of the works
- The location of the site within an established, serviced residential area
- Lack of connection to nearest European sites.

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. 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

The subject site is located in Richview, Clonskeagh, a built-up suburb of Dublin and is approx. 315m to the south of the River Dodder. The proposed development comprises of works to an existing dwelling; (see Section 2 above for detailed description.) No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal or the planners report.

I have assessed the works proposed to the dwelling 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.

The reason for this conclusion is the nature of the works proposed, which are modest in scale and are for the most part contained within the existing footprint of the dwelling and adjoining car-port.

10.1. 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

I recommend that permission be granted for the proposed development subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028 and to the nature and scale of the proposed development on residentially zoned land, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028 and 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, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 18th day of July 2025, 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 entire premises shall be used as a single dwelling unit apart from such use as may be exempted development for the purposes of the Planning and Development Regulations.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
3	<p>Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of orderly development.</p>
4	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.</p> <p>Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
5	<p>The site development works and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the adjoining streets are kept clear of debris, soil and other material and if the need arises for cleaning works to be carried out on the adjoining public roads, the said cleaning works shall be carried out at the developer's expense.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.</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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Deirdre Scully
Planning Inspector

27th January 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL- 500024-DR
Proposed Development Summary	Widening of vehicular access, conversion of carport to home office, alteration to front elevation windows, attic conversion including three dormer windows on north elevation
Development Address	
	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'. <input type="checkbox"/> No.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	No, not a class for Part 1
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1.	
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.	No, not a class for Part 2
<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

No

No, Schedule 7A information not provided.

Inspector: _____

Date: _____