



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500212-DF-25

Development	Conversion of attic with all associated site works
Location	10 Maple Close, Castleknock, Dublin 15, D15 C6TV
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	FW25A/0353
Applicant(s)	Leona Nally
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal and Third Party
Appellant(s)	Leona Nally
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	30 th January 2026
Inspector	Paul O'Brien

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site contains a two-storey semi-detached house located on the north western side of this residential street. Maple Close is located in Carpenterstown, Dublin 15 and forms part of a large residential development located to the south of the Dublin to Sligo railway line and to the north west/ west of Carpenterstown Avenue. The site is approximately 1.5km to the south of Blanchardstown Centre, shopping centre and 1.3km to Blanchardstown village. Castleknock village is approximately 1.46km to the south east and which is located on the opposite side of the M50 to the subject site.
- 1.2. The subject site is located towards the southern end of Maple Close. The area is characterised by similar two storey semi detached houses. The houses on Maple Close, including the subject, are characterised by having hipped roofs, though other houses in the area, including Maple Grove and Maple Glen, which project from Maple Close, are provided with gable ended roofs.
- 1.3. The subject site area is given as 0.0203 hectares and the existing floor area of the house is given as 110.3sq m.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of:
 - The modification of the roof profile from a hipped end to form a gable ended roof.
 - The provision of a dormer box window in the rear/ north western roof profile.
 - The provision of two rooflights to the front/ south eastern roof profile.
 - All associated site works.

The above works allow for the provision of a store/ office in the attic space, with a stated floor area of 19.7sq m. Maximum floor to ceiling height in this space is indicated to be 1.995m but the majority of the floor to ceiling height is indicated to be 1.861m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Fingal County Council decided to grant permission subject to conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The Planning Authority assessed the development against Section 14.10.2.5 of the Fingal Development Plan – See Section 5.1 of my report for full details. The development was generally compliant with the listed criteria, though revisions were made to the design of the dormer to ensure that it would be subordinate to the main roof of the house.
- The Planning Authority reported that the low floor to ceiling height would not satisfy the requirements for habitable rooms and they also reported that there were no directly opposing upper floor windows that would give rise to issues of overlooking.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Water Services Department: No objection in relation to Flood Risk and no objection in relation to surface water subject to standard conditions.

3.2.3. Conditions

A total of nine conditions were included, and I note the following, summarised, as relevant:

Condition no. 3: The proposed dormer to be revised as follows:

- a) the dormer to be aligned centrally on the roof plane.
- b) the dormer to be set down from the roof ridge line by at least 30cm.

Condition no. 4: The attic level gable windows to be fitted with obscured glass and the use of film is not acceptable.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No reports requested and none received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Three separate letters of objection were received from residents in the area and the following comments, summarised, were made:

- Loss of residential amenity through overlooking leading to a loss of privacy. Reference is made to overlooking from the rear/ side and front with loss of privacy in Maple Close, Maple Avenue, Maple Drive and Maple Glen.
- The issue of overlooking would be contrary to the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 which seeks to protect residential amenity and privacy.
- The proposed dormer and associated roof alterations are not in keeping in character with the existing street/ form of development.
- The proposed development would leave the adjoining house, No.9, with an asymmetrical appearance.
- The proposed hip roof is not in keeping in character with the established roof form on Maple Close.
- The proposed development does not demonstrate compliance with Section 14.10.2.5 of the Fingal Development Plan in relation to extension/ roof alterations.
- The proposed development would result in a loss of light to multiple windows in No. 11 Maple Close, specifically a bathroom and a shower room.
- Reference is made to the Land and Conveyancing Law Reform Act 2009 giving a right to light and Section 3 of the Prescription Act 1832 which also gives a right to light.
- Concern about the use of the attic space, proposed for use as a store but also a home office which implies it will be for habitable use.
- The development should be referred to in the public notices as for non-habitable use.

- There is no need for the roof alterations or to provide the dormer in order to convert the attic space for non-habitable use.
- Potential for negative impact on the structural integrity of the roof for the adjoining no. 9 Maple Close.
- Uncertain if the proposed development complies with the relevant building regulations and fire safety requirements.

Request that permission be refused or else grant on condition that it complies with the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 and the other referenced legislation in the letters of objection.

4.0 **Planning History**

There are no recent, relevant applications on this site.

The following are noted:

PA Ref. FW25A/0433E refers to a January 2026 decision to grant permission at 14 Maple Drive for the conversion of an existing attic space and which included the modification of the roof structure, the raising of existing gable window, new access stairs, two rooflights to the front roof profile and a flat roof dormer to the rear roof profile. Condition no. 4 required the converted attic space to not be used for habitable purposes.

PA Ref. FW25A/0109E refers to a June 2025 decision to grant permission at 17 Maple Drive for an attic conversion with hip to gable roof and dormer to rear roof profile to accommodate stairs to allow access to attic conversion as a non-habitable storage space with roof windows to front roof profile and associated ancillary works. Condition no. 5 required the converted attic space to not be used for habitable purposes.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- The subject is zoned with the land-use zoning objective RS, 'Residential' in the Fingal Development Plan 2023 - 2029, the objective of which seeks to 'Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity.'

The following chapters/ sections of the Written Statement are relevant to this development:

Chapter 3: Sustainable Placemaking and Quality Homes –

'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.

- 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.
- 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.'

Chapter 14: Development Management Standards

The following sections of Chapter 14 is relevant to the proposed development:

'14.6.6.3 Separation Distances' and specifically the following Objective:

'Objective DMS023 – Separation Distance

A separation distance of a minimum of 22 metres between directly opposing rear first floor windows shall generally be observed unless alternative provision has been designed to ensure privacy. In residential developments over three-storeys in height, minimum separation distances shall be increased in instances where overlooking or overshadowing occurs.'

'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.'

National Guidance

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)

SPPR 1 - Separation Distances 'It is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that statutory development plans shall not include an objective in respect

of minimum separation distances that exceed 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units or apartment units above ground floor level. When considering a planning application for residential development, a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units and apartment units, above ground floor level shall be maintained. Separation distances below 16 metres may be considered acceptable in circumstances where there are no opposing windows serving habitable rooms and where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme to prevent undue overlooking of habitable rooms and private amenity spaces.

There shall be no specified minimum separation distance at ground level or to the front of houses, duplex units and apartment units in statutory development plans and planning applications shall be determined on a case-by-case basis to prevent undue loss of privacy.

In all cases, the obligation will be on the project proposer to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the planning authority or An Bord Pleanála that residents will enjoy a high standard of amenity and that the proposed development will not have a significant negative impact on the amenity of occupiers of existing residential properties.'

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The Royal Canal pNHA (Site Code 002103) is located approximately 195m to the north of the subject site.

The South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) is located approximately 10.5km to the east of the subject site. The South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) is approximately 12.4km to the south east of the subject site.

5.3. 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 this report.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. The first party appeal refers specifically to Condition 3 (b) and the requirement to lower the height of the dormer such that it is 30cm below the existing roof ridgeline. This would make the converted attic space unusable for its intended purpose, and it is considered that the condition would not serve any useful purpose. It is not proposed that the dormer would project above the ridgeline of the roof, this was never the intention.

A number of similar developments permitted/ constructed in the area are identified and full details including an aerial photograph are provided of these.

Request that condition 3(b) be omitted from the grant of permission.

- 6.1.2. A single Third Party appeal opposing the development was received from John McGuane. Issues raised are similar to those raised in the third party objections to the application and include:

- Concern about the impact of the development on the visual character of the area.
- The development would be incompatible with the existing streetscape. Specifically, the provision of a gable ended roof in place of a hipped roof, which is characteristic of these houses on Maple Close, would be out of character with the established design. These houses have been in place for 36 years.
- The proposed development would be contrary to the requirements of the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 for extensions/ alterations to roof profiles. The Planning Authority have gone against their own criteria for such development.
- There are houses with gable ended roofs, but these were built by a different builder, and the overall design is different to that on Maple Close.
- The proposed development would give rise to overlooking of adjoining properties which in turn would lead to a loss of privacy of these properties. Concern was raised about the overlooking of a bathroom and shower room in the appellant's house.

- Notes the condition included by the Planning Authority to provide for obscured glazing, however this would be negated through the ability to open the window.
- The proposed development would give rise to a loss of sunlight to neighbouring properties. The hipped roof design ensures that houses will receive appropriate levels of sunlight.
- A loss of sunlight would impact on the house in terms of heat, light and moisture control and could have an adverse effect on the BER rating of their property.
- Refers to a number of sections of the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 that reference daylight and sunlight. The proposed development does not demonstrate compliance with these requirements. Photographs are provided to illustrate the impact of the development on a bathroom and an ensuite shower room.
- The proposed development would impact on the appellant's heating system as air flows to a chimney would be rerouted/ changed due to the new roof profile.
- Refers to attic conversions in the area that have not had a negative impact on the character of houses or on the character of the area that they area located within. There is no need for the submitted alterations, and the proposed development is considered to be excessive and not required.

Requests that permission be refused for this development as would be out of character with the prevailing form of development and would have a negative impact on residential amenity.

The appeal is supported with a number of photographs.

6.2. Applicant Response

The First Party has submitted a response to the third party appeal and the following points are made:

- Permission was granted for this development by Fingal County Council; however, the applicant has appealed the inclusion of Condition 3 (b) which seeks to lower the floor to ceiling height of the dormer.
- Concern was raised in the third party appeal about impact of the development on the visual amenity of the area. The applicant has outlined that similar

developments have been permitted and constructed in the area and the proposed development would not have an undue negative impact on the visual amenity of the area.

- In terms of overlooking leading to a loss of privacy, considering the nature of the development and the location of the development, it is considered that this objection is vexatious and should be overturned.
- The issue of loss of light is noted. The rooms which are the subject of concern are a bathroom and a shower room, and which are not habitable rooms. No specific details have been provided to demonstrate that there would be a loss of daylight.
- The proposed development would set a positive precedent for similar development in the area, and which would be a positive in terms of residential amenity.
- The applicant notes the appeal response of Fingal County Council and the request to lower the floor to ceiling height by at least 15cm. There is no requirement for this amendment.

Requests that permission be granted for this development.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

Report that the development was assessed in accordance with the policies and objectives of the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 and all relevant national and regional policies/ guidelines. Specific comments are made on the first and third party appeals:

- First Party: The development was assessed in terms of Section 14.10.2.5 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029. It is standard that dormers be set back from eaves/ gables and set down from roof ridgelines. Request that if permission is to be granted a minimum set down of 15cm be conditioned.
- Third Party: Notes the variety of roof types in the area. It is not expected that the proposed development would give rise to undue overshadowing of neighbouring houses. A clarification was made that permission for an attic conversion at 14 Maple Drive under PA Ref. FW25A/0433/E had not been granted at the time of

preparation of the CE report, however permission has since been granted for this development.

6.4. Third Party Response to First Party

Notes the proposal for this space to be used as a home office which would change the area from residential to commercial use. Whilst accepting that some working from home takes place, the proposal is not acceptable in terms of impact on the established character of the area.

Queries the comments made by the applicant that the provision of this extension would 'ensure the ongoing viability of their home'. These are four bedroom houses and there is no issue in relation to viability. The subject house was occupied by up to ten persons during one period and has been significantly extended over time. These are large houses well able to accommodate regular needs.

Disagrees that there is a requirement for the proposed head height within the converted attic space. The proposal appears to be excessive having regard to the submitted details and permitted developments in the area. The third party has provided an overview of the precedents referenced by the applicant in their appeal response. There are specific differences in some of these examples.

In conclusion the proposed development would have a negative visual impact on the character of the area, would have a negative impact on the neighbouring properties and would have a negative impact specifically on the appellant who lives at number 11 Maple Close.

6.5. Oral Hearing Request

The third party requested that an oral hearing be held. The Assistant Director of Planning recommended that an Oral Hearing not be held as sufficient information was provided on file to determine the acceptability or not of this development. The Commission decided that sufficient information was available to enable an assessment of the issues raised and directed that an Oral Hearing not be held.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. The main issues that arise for consideration in relation to this appeal can be addressed under the following headings:

- Nature of Development
- Impact on the Character of the Area
- Impact on Residential Amenity

7.2. **Nature of Development**

7.2.1. The proposal is for the conversion of an attic space for non-habitable purposes within an existing two-storey semi-detached house. In order to provide for this conversion, a box dormer is to be provided to the rear roof profile, the existing hipped roof is to be replaced with a gable ended roof and two rooflights are to be provided in the front roof profile.

7.2.2. The principle of development is considered to be acceptable. The site is zoned for residential use with an objective to 'Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity'. The conversion of an attic clearly comes within the objective to improve residential amenity as it allows for the improvement of the existing house through its extension.

7.2.3. I note the comments made by the third party appellant regarding the change of this house from residential to more commercial in character. The submitted details indicate that the attic space is for use as a store/ home office. There is no indication that this is for commercial use. No details are provided on the occupations of the applicants and there is no indication that this space is to be used to such an extent that the character of the house will change. The use of rooms as a home office has become more established in recent years and I have no objection to the use of this space as proposed in the public notices. There is no indication that this area will be visited by members of the public, such a use was not applied for, and considering the location/ layout of the office space, such a use is unlikely as it would not meet the relevant accessibility/ building regulation requirements. I therefore have no objection to the proposed conversion of the attic space, and I do not foresee that this use would have a negative impact on the character of this residential area.

7.3. Impact on the Character of the Area

- 7.3.1. The issues raised in the first and third party appeals will be considered in this part of my report, as well as the comments made by the Planning Authority. No issues of concern were raised about the rooflights to the front roof plane, and I consider these to be acceptable and will not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the house/ streetscape.
- 7.3.2. The Fingal Development Plan makes full consideration of extensions to existing houses under Section 14.10.2 but of more relevance is Section 14.10.2.5 referring to roof alterations that include attic conversions and provision of dormer extensions. There are two separate elements in this development that provide for an extension to the existing roof; a box dormer to the rear and the replacement of the hipped side roof with a gable ended roof.
- 7.3.3. As the dormer is located to the rear roof profile, it would have no impact on the visual amenity of the area when viewed from the street. The window provided in the dormer will be approximately 13m from the boundary it faces. The design of the dormer is such that it is set back from the eaves, and I am satisfied that it would not have a negative impact when viewed from rear gardens. The scale of the dormer is such that it will be subordinate to the rear roof profile and does not dominate the house. The dormer is reasonably centrally located on this rear roof profile.
- 7.3.4. I note Condition 3(b) and the comments made by the Senior Planner of Fingal County Council in relation to the setting down of the roof of the dormer below that of the existing house with a minimum of 15cm recommended. I also note the comments of the applicant and the third party in relation to this aspect of the development. Whilst I appreciate that there are good design/ visual impact reasons for setting down the roof of the dormer, in reality there is little benefit to be got from this from a visual amenity point of view. The roof of the house is relatively low with a ridgeline of 1.995m over the attic floor level. A reduction in height by 15 or 30cm would not be easily visible when viewed from adjoining rear properties and I would be of the opinion that there would be no negative impact from retaining the height of the dormer as proposed. The more significant impact would be a dormer that projects over the existing roof ridgeline, this is not proposed and if such were to

occur, this would be a matter for the Planning Authority Enforcement Section to address.

7.3.5. The second issue, and probably the most visually evident, is the replacement of the hipped roof with a gable ended roof. The Planning Authority raised no issue of concern in this regard. I note the comments made in the third party appeal and previous letters of objection about the impact this element of the proposal would have on the character of the area and also note the history of development in the area. It was evident from the site visit that there is a mix of house types and roof profiles in the area. Whilst the houses on this side of Maple Close are provided with hipped roofs, those on the opposite side of the road, though on separate streets, are provided with gable ended roofs. In the wider area, houses have been extended to the side, roofs altered and gables replace hipped roofs.

7.3.6. Separation distances of 2.3m are required under Objective DMS026 of the Fingal Development Plan between the side walls of semi-detached houses. The subject house and the neighbouring no. 11, the appellant's property, have a separation of between 1.8m and 1.9m. This separation distance has the effect of 'tightening up' the distance between houses when viewed from the street and as a consequence the hipped roof is not as prominent as would be the case with houses with a greater side separation distance. I therefore consider that the proposed gable ended roof is acceptable in this location and would not have an adverse impact on the streetscape or visual character of the area. Any perceived negative visual impact would be localised and would not be evident to the general public passing through Maple Close.

7.4. Impact on Residential Amenity

7.4.1. The third party appeal referenced a number of issues of concern including loss of daylight/ sunlight, overlooking leading to a loss of privacy and impact on their property. The Planning Authority raised no specific issues of concern in relation to impact on residential amenity.

7.4.2. I have already referenced the separation distance between the subject house and that of the appellant's house. There is no indication that the proposed window in the gable end would give rise to overlooking leading to a loss of privacy. Overlooking is generally considered in terms of directly opposing windows and the new window in

the gable is located higher than those in the appellants house. The Planning Authority conditioned that the window in the gable be permanently fitted with obscured glazing and I am satisfied that such a measure is appropriate.

- 7.4.3. The appellant is concerned about the loss of daylight/ sunlight to rooms in their house, specifically a bathroom and shower room. Loss of daylight/ sunlight to habitable rooms should be assessed if there is a concern that the reduction in standards is such as to have an adverse impact on residential amenity. The referenced rooms are not considered to be habitable rooms and there is no requirement to undertake an assessment of potential daylight/ sunlight loss. To refuse permission for the change in roof in roof profile due to concern about the loss of daylight/ sunlight to non-habitable rooms would not be appropriate.
- 7.4.4. The referenced windows in no.11 are located in the south west elevation. The existing narrow separation distance remains the significant determinant in how much daylight/ sunlight is received here. Any increase in daylight loss would be limited to the middle of the day for a short period of time; any impact would not be significant. Similarly, the proposed gable and dormer would have minimal if any impact on the residential amenity of the rear garden of no.11.
- 7.4.5. Other issues of concern were raised in the third party appeal about the impact on residential amenity from the proposed development including impact on property value and reduction in BER standards. I consider that such issues have been overstated and I do not foresee that there will be any such negative impacts on the third party appellant.

7.5. **Conclusion**

I note in full the issues raised in the third party appeal, but I am satisfied that the proposed extension of this house would not have an adverse impact on the residential or visual amenity of the area. In addition, I agree with the applicant, through their first party appeal, that there is no requirement from a visual or residential amenity point of view for an increase in the reduction in height of the dormer below the existing roof ridgeline. The development as submitted to the Planning Authority is considered to be acceptable, demonstrates compliance with the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 and would not have an adverse impact on the visual or residential amenity of the area.

8.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposal comprising the conversion of attic, including dormer to the rear/ rooflights to the front of the house and replacement of side hipped roof with gable ended roof and all associated site works at no. 10 Maple Close, Castleknock, Dublin 15 in light of the requirements of Sections 177S and 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

The proposed development is not located within or immediately adjacent to any European Site. The South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) is located approximately 10.5km to the east of the subject site and the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) is approximately 12.4km to the south east of the subject site.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Relatively small scale and nature of the proposal.
- Location-distance from nearest European Site.
- Absence of any meaningful direct and indirect pathways to any European Site.
- Taking into account the screening determination of the planning authority.

I conclude, 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 any other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended) is not required.

9.0 Water Framework Directive Assessment Screening

- 9.1. The appeal site is located in a serviced suburban area in Maple Close, Dublin 15, a considerable distance from any surface water feature. The proposed development comprises the conversion of attic, including dormer to the rear/ rooflights to the front of an existing house and replacement of side hipped roof with gable ended roof and all associated site works.

- 9.2. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.3. I have assessed the proposed 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 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. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of works: e.g. small scale and nature of the development.
 - Location-distance from nearest Water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.
- 9.4. 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.

10.0 Recommendation

- 10.1. I recommend that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Fingal Development Plan 2023 - 2029, to the location of the site in an established residential area, the residential zoning objective and to the nature, form, scale and design of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1. 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The attic level gable window shall be permanently fitted with obscured glazing. The use of film is not permitted.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

3. The attic space shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with the current Building Regulations.

Reason: To provide for an adequate standard of development.

4. The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles) shall harmonise with those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

5. 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.

Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

6. The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.

7. The developer shall prevent any mud, dirt, debris or building material being carried onto or placed on the public road or adjoining property as a result of the site construction works and repair any damage to the public road arising from carrying out the works. Storage of construction materials is not permitted on the public road/footway unless agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area and in the interests of road safety.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Paul O'Brien

Inspectorate

3rd February 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1
EIA Pre-Screening

An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	ACP-PL-500212-DF-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Conversion of attic, including dormer to the rear/ rooflights to the front of the house and replacement of side hipped roof with gable ended roof and all associated site works.		
Development Address	10 Maple Close, Castleknock, Dublin 15. D15 C6TV		
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	√	
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	√	No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
			Conclusion
No	√	N/A	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
			No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required

			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.	
Yes				

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	√	
Yes		

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____