



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500471-DR-25

Development	Dormer window to front, extension to dormer to rear (previously granted under Reg Ref: D21A/0769), window to side, with associated site works.
Location	1, Ailesbury Lawn, Dundrum, Dublin 16, D16HT95
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25B/0534/WEB
Applicants	Niamh McCourt and John McCarrick
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellants	Niamh McCourt and John McCarrick
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	13/02/2026
Inspector	Rosemarie McLaughlin

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	5
5.0	Policy Context	6
6.0	EIA Screening	7
7.0	The Appeal.....	7
8.0	Assessment	8
9.0	AA Screening	13
10.0	Water Framework Directive	14
11.0	Recommendation	15
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	15
13.0	Conditions	16
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening.....	17

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The public notices and planning application documents refer to No. 1 Ailesbury Lawn, Dundrum, Dublin 16, D16HT95 however the submitted site location map and associated drawings relate to No. 1A Ailesbury Lawn, Dublin 16 (the subject site), which has a different Eircode. For clarity, I will refer to the subject site as No.1A. The subject site is the former side garden of No.1 Ailesbury Lawn (to the west), which is a detached bungalow with a rear dormer extension. A shared driveway serves No.1 and No. 1A.
- 1.2. The subject site (0.020 ha) is located in a mature residential area c 300 m southwest of Dundrum Town Centre. No.1A is a modern detached dormer bungalow on an infill corner site, fronting Ailesbury Lawn to the north, at a T junction with Ballinteer Road (R826) to the east. To the south (rear) of the site is the front open space/parking area of a two storey semi-detached house. Opposite No.1A is a new two storey, detached house. To the north of that house is a terrace of houses with their rear elevations backing onto Ballinteer Road behind a high wall. On the opposite side of Ballinteer Road to the east, is a grassed area bounding the Lynwood housing estate featuring mature trees.
- 1.3. A historic letterbox is located in the boundary wall of the subject site, fronting Ballinteer Road and a small ESB substation.
- 1.4. No.1A Ailesbury Lawn consists of a pitched roof bungalow with a rear dormer. Further details about the design of the house are provided in the assessment below.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Dormer window to front, extension to dormer to rear (previously granted under Reg Ref: D21A/0769), window to side, with associated site works.
- 2.2. The applicant has provided 2 options for the Commission to consider as an alternative to the proposed development. The rear dormer in option 1 is substantially the same width and height as the application, and the drawings illustrate marginally changes to the floor to ceiling heights at ground floor and first floor. Option 2 creates a second rear dormer located up to the eastern gable, providing a small gap between the

existing and proposed dormer. The front dormer is marginally reduced in height in both options.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Permission was refused by the planning authority (PA) for one reason.

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its excessive bulk and mass and its location on a prominent corner site, would give rise to overbearing visual impacts onto Ballinteer Road and would represent overdevelopment of the subject site. The cumulative effect of the proposed front and rear dormer additions would cause the dwelling to appear as a two-storey flat-roof structure, which is not in keeping with the established bungalow typology along this section of Ballinteer Road. The proposal would fail to comply with Section 12.3.7.1 (iv) Alterations at Roof/Attic Level of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

3.2.2. The relevant planning history, relevant County Development Plan (CDP) zoning, objectives and policies are referred to. The report noted that the statutory notice refers to a 2021 grant of permission however the development was permitted under PA ref. D19A-0600. During the D19A-0600 application, further information (FI) was sought, and permission was granted for a dormer that was reduced in scale. The PA raised concerns during that application that the Planner considered relevant to this application. The report raises significant concerns in relation to the proposed development and compliance with section 12.3.7.1 of the CDP. The Planner considered the front and rear elements would dominate the entirety of the respected roof slopes and would be excessive in size and bulk. The Planner had a concern with an undesirable precedent. It was considered in the report that the cumulative effect would make the dwelling appear as a two storey flat roof building, which is not in

keeping with the established bungalow typology. Permission was recommended to be refused.

3.2.3. Other Technical Reports

Drainage report: No objection

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None on file

3.4. Third Party Observations

None on file.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject site 1A Ailesbury Lawn

D21A/0769: Retention for a pedestrian access in the front wall was granted on 9/11/2021.

D19A/0600: Permission was granted 15/01/2020 (parent permission) for 1 no. two storey dormer dwelling to include modifications to existing car parking, including demolition of existing garden wall. This application was in the former side garden of No.1 Ailesbury Lawn.

FI was sought inter alia, for a revised design to the proposed dormer window “which will reduce its scale as well as reducing its visual dominance of the pitched roof, so as to ensure that the proposed dormer element is more in keeping with the remainder of the proposed elevation and surrounding dwellings”.

4.2. Adjacent house No.1 Ailesbury Lawn

D19A/0008: Permission granted 11/4/2019 for single storey extension to the rear, conversion of attic space, insertion of dormer window to the rear, alterations to layout and elevations, 3 no. Velux windows, external wall insulation and associated site development works.

4.3. Relevant sites in area

D15B/0344: Permission granted inter alia for loft conversion and 2 rear facing windows in rear dormer and provision of first floor bedroom and ensuite to No.2 Ailesbury Lawn (adjacent to No.1).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. The Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 (CDP) applies. The zoning objective is 'A' which seeks 'to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities'. Residential development is permitted in principle under this zoning objective. Chapter 12 of the CDP provides development management details. Section 12.3.7.1 relates to extensions to dwellings and relevant subsections are (i) Extensions to the Front: (ii) Extensions to the Rear: (iii) Extensions to the Side and (iv) Alterations at Roof/Attic Level.

5.1.2. Section 12.3.7.5: Corner/Side Garden Sites.

5.1.3. Policy Objective CA8:Sustainability in Adaptable Design.

5.2. Policy Objective HER23: Industrial Heritage. It is a Policy Objective to inter alia, have regard to items identified in the Industrial Heritage Survey (Appendix 4) when assessing any development proposals. Site Number 944, refers to a Letter Box, on the boundary wall of the property on Ballinteer Road opposite the junction with Lynwood.

5.2.1. Relevant sections of the CDP are expanded in the assessment below where relevant.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1. The appeal site is not located in or immediately adjacent to a designated European Site, a Natural Heritage Area (NHA) or a proposed NHA. The closest designations are South Dublin Bay SAC [000210] and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA [004024] c 4.28 km to the northeast.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 7.1.1. The house was constructed in 2020 and bookends an existing row of bungalows where many have been converted to dormer bungalows. The Planner's report is summarised. The development is permitted in principle and has no negative climate action impacts. The provisions of the CPD are set out.
- 7.1.2. The applicant is happy to split the dormer and create two smaller dormers which could be done by way of condition. The applicant has provided 2 options for the Commission to consider.
- 7.1.3. The rationale for the proposed development is that the existing house is incompatible with a growing family, and a better head height is required for the two upstairs bedrooms. The design rationale is to design a suitable family home for today and the future. The young children using the space are outgrowing it.
- 7.1.4. The applicants are happy to compromise and find a solution. The mission statement of the CDP has not been applied as the well-being and citizens' needs have not been sufficiently considered.
- 7.1.5. Excessive bulk and mass are very subjective and not measurable. The applicants do not propose the application lightly, but the house is too small for a growing family.
- 7.1.6. The PA consider the proposed dormer as overbearing to the adjoining road network. It is submitted that there are dormers of varied sizes in the area. The proposed dormer to the front is far smaller than others in the area. No. 28A Sweetman Drive is one example.
- 7.1.7. The consideration of setting a precedent is not valid as there are many precedents already established. On the opposite side of the road there are two storey, detached

houses with hipped roofs. Permission was granted for a detached gable ended slate roof house which bears no resemblance to the other properties and this architecturally enhances the streetscape.

- 7.1.8. The dormers do not increase the floor area and the increase in height is to make the bedrooms more usable.
- 7.1.9. The development does not undermine the design rationale of the original permission as everyday houses are reinvented by alterations etc., and a house should have the ability to grow with family needs.
- 7.1.10. The specific requirements of the CDP for alterations at roof attic level can be achieved. Permission is requested to be granted

7.2. **Planning Authority Response**

- 7.2.1. The PA refers to the Planner's report and does not consider the appeal raises any matter that would justify a change in attitude.

7.3. **Observations**

- 7.3.1. None.

8.0 **Assessment**

- 8.1. I consider that the assessment may be considered under the following headings.

- Principle of development
- Reason for refusal relating to bulk and mass on a corner site, visual appearance, and provisions of CDP.
- Precedent.
- Procedural issue (new issue)

8.2. **Principle of development**

The site is zoned 'A' in the CDP, which seeks 'to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities'. Policy Objective CA8, 'Sustainability in Adaptable Design', allows the improvement of

habitable accommodation, by allowing dwellings to be flexible, accessible and adaptable in their spatial layout and design. Accordingly, the development is acceptable in principle subject to compliance with the applicable criteria outlined in the next sections.

8.3. Reason for refusal

8.3.1. The reason for refusal included the following interrelated design issues.

Excessive bulk and mass and location on a prominent corner site.

8.3.2. The view of the appellant is summarised above, and this issue relates to visual impact on the property and the surrounding area. The area is zoned 'A' in the CDP and no protected views or prospects apply. No conservation issues arise on the site save the historical post box in the boundary wall which will not be altered. The subject house on a corner plot, reads as a modern dormer bungalow from the south and southeast on Ballinteer Road. The main part of the house (with a pitched roof) is set back from the side boundary with a subservient rear dormer. The house has a high single storey element with a flat roof at the side/rear, extending to the Ballinteer Road boundary, which runs at an angle to the main part of the house.

8.3.3. The proposal to extend the rear dormer as submitted to the PA would increase the width of the existing dormer from 2.750m to 5.583m an increase of 2.833m and would extend across the entire pitched roof profile of No.1A. The adjacent house, No.1 Ailesbury Lawn has a larger dormer at the rear c 7.325m wide (PA Ref. D19A/0008) which is a quite a dominant feature when viewed from the south and south eastern parts of Ballinteer Road. No.1 can be distinguished from No.1A as it is a double fronted and larger house and the dormer at No.1 extends approximately over one third of the roof.

8.3.4. The PA are concerned about the bulk and mass on a prominent corner site and the Planner's report refer to the reduction of the dormer that was required in the FI in the parent permission (D19A/0600). While this is a corner site, I do not consider that it is a particularly prominent, owing to the pattern of development in the area.

8.3.5. While I accept the view in the appeal that the subject site bookends a row of houses, and is capable of an independent design, the existing dormer bungalow was sought

and permitted by the PA, with a reduced rear dormer and therefore any design alterations now must be appropriate to the existing house and CDP. I note, along the road to the west of the appeal site, there are a variety of dormers, but these are gable facing house and not on a corner site.

8.3.6. While the area demonstrates a considerable mix of housing typologies, I consider that the proposed extended rear dormer it is inconsistent with the CDP provisions regarding flat roofs as detailed below and I consider it would read as prominent feature as it extends across the width of the pitched roof. I note the example provided in the appeal of a corner site at Sweetman Avenue and I consider what distinguishes that house from the proposal is that the front dormer has a gentle slope within the pitched roof and does not read as a flat roof.

8.3.7. The proposed dormer to the front of the house is c 3 m wide, just over half of the roof width, and just below the ridge line with 3 tiles above the eaves. The proposed front dormer is also set back from the gable walls. There is an existing flat roof small dormer element on the front pitch, and the elevation is visible at the T junction with Ballinteer Road when viewed from the north. In this regard, I consider that the visual impact is modest and presents as a modest extension at front roof level. I do not consider that this front dormer extension by virtue of bulk or mass would damage the visual amenity of the area or the residential amenity of the surrounding properties.

Would fail to comply with Section 12.3.7.1 (iv) of CDP.

The cumulative effect of the proposed front and rear dormer additions would cause the dwelling to appear as a two-storey flat-roof structure, which is not in keeping with the established bungalow typology along this section of Ballinteer Road.

8.3.8. The above issues are interrelated. The CDP provides that dormer extensions to roofs to the front and rear, will be considered regarding impacts on existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. The CDP provides design, dimensions, and bulk of any roof proposal relative to the overall size of the dwelling as key considerations. There is no doubt the proposed extended rear dormer relative to the existing roof is very substantial and the CDP requires this to be an overriding consideration.

- 8.3.9. Dormer extensions per the CDP “shall” be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries. In this regard, I consider the front dormer as proposed in the application is consistent with these requirements. In relation to the rear dormer, I consider that option 1 is substantially the same as the application and option 2 creates a second dormer up to the eastern gable allowing a small section of the pitch roof remain between the dormers (and adds another window facing south overlooking the front of the property to the rear). The existing dormer at the western side extends to the gable of the existing house and the proposed rear dormer in all options extends to the eastern gable. What appears to be the fascia board extends beyond the gables. In this regard, I do not see how the proposed dormers in all the configurations can be achieved without a condition setting the eastern gable of the dormer back from the gable and meet the requirement of the CDP.
- 8.3.10. Dormer extensions should be set down from the existing ridge level in the CDP, to not read as a third storey extension at roof level. The proposed development and options show the extension as on the same line as the existing, just below the ridge.
- 8.3.11. The proposed materials are considered acceptable per the CDP, and the submitted options illustrate a fascia at the roof of the dormer.
- 8.3.12. The CDP provides that the level and type of glazing within a dormer extension should have regard to existing window treatments and fenestration of the dwelling and regard should be had to adjoining residential amenities. The proposed rear dormer to the PA and Option 1 has no additional overlooking windows to the house to the south and a triangular window facing Ballinteer Road is considered acceptable. Option 2 submitted with the appeal would introduce a new window on the south elevation overlooking the front garden of the property to the rear and in my opinion this element of the development would require the application to be readvertised if considered by the Commission.
- 8.3.13. The proposed rear dormer extension would change the rear profile of the house to a flat roof profile over the pitched roof contrary to the CDP provisions. The original pitched roof would be discernible on the gable viewed from Ballinteer Road owing to the strong colour of the of the fascia board, but the rear roof would read as a first floor flat roof. The high single storey section to the east is at an angle to the two storey element and is a design feature of the presentation onto Ballinteer Road. To extend

the rear dormer to the gable onto Ballinteer Road would undermine the design of the building and would in my opinion increase to an unacceptable level the visual mass and undermine the design coherence. I do accept the point of the appellant, that mass is a subjective matter.

8.3.14. On balance, I concur with the PA that the proposed extension to the rear dormer extension does not comply the CPD standards for dormers and I consider it is visually incoherent with the design of the recently built house. I consider the dormer to the front as acceptable owing to the scale and location.

8.3.15. I do not consider that front elevation would read as flat roof as the dormer is c 3 m wide, is set back from the gable and is above the eaves, presenting as a non-dominant front dormer extension. I concur with the appellant that in so far is reasonable and having regard to the pattern of development in the area, a house may be altered over time. As above, there is a great variety of house types in the area and I consider the corner site at the T junction which bookends the south side of the road, is not constrained by the low density bungalow typologies and can have a distinct design. While a full two storey house may have been an appropriate approach in the first instance, the applicants now find themselves in a new property that is too small for their needs. I consider that the front dormer would accord with the CDP and when taken in conjunction with the existing rear dormer would clearly retain a portion of the pitched roof on the rear and front profile, preventing an overall flat appearance.

8.4. **Precedent**

8.4.1. The PA consider the proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for similar development. As this is a unique corner site, I do not consider that the proposed development would give rise to a precedent.

8.5. **Procedural issue –part new issue**

8.5.1. The public notices and planning application refers to No.1 Ailesbury Lawn, Dundrum, Dublin 16, D16HT95. The site outlined in red is No.1A Ailesbury Lawn, Dublin 16, with a different Eircode and is adjacent to No.1. The public notice refers to a permitted development, and this appears to be an error as it relates to another decision as raised by the PA. Notwithstanding these errors, I consider that the public notices are

sufficient as the dwelling is in the former side garden of No.1 Ailesbury Lawn and the wording is satisfactory about the nature of the proposed development.

8.6. Conclusion

- 8.6.1. I recommend a split decision where the front dormer is permitted in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted to the PA, and the rear dormer extension is refused.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed residential extension in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

- 9.2. The subject site is located c 4.28 km south-west of South Dublin Bay SAC [000210] and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA [004024] c 4.28 km to the northeast.

- 9.3. The proposed development comprises a dormer window to front, extension to dormer to rear (previously granted), window to side, and associated site works.

- 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:

- Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development
- Location-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

- 10.1.1. The subject site is located c 105 m north of River Waterbody Code IE_EA_09D010900 EPA name, Wyckham Stream with a moderate status. The subject site is separated from that waterbody by houses and roads in an urban area.
- 10.1.2. The proposed development comprises proposed domestic alterations at roof level.
- 10.1.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.1.4. 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.
- 10.1.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows :
- The small scale and nature of the development
 - The location-distance from nearest Water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.

10.2. Conclusion

- 10.2.1. 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. I recommend a split decision as follows:

1. It is recommended that permission **be granted** for the provision of the proposed dormer to the front of the dwelling in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged to the Planning Authority for the reasons and considerations marked (1) under and subject to the condition set out below.
2. It is recommended that permission **be refused** for the proposed extension to the dormer to the rear of the dwelling for the reason and consideration marked (2) below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Grant

1. Having regard to the provisions of the Dun Laoghaire County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the pattern of development in the vicinity, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the condition set out below, the proposed dormer to the front of the dwelling (north) does not visually dominate the front elevation, is consistent with Section 12.3.7.1 of the County Development Plan, would not seriously injure the character of the area or residential amenities of property in the vicinity, and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Refusal

2. Having regard to the pattern of development in the vicinity and the location of the dwelling on a corner site, it is considered that the proposed extension to the dormer to the rear of the dwelling (south) would represent an over development of the site by the creation of a dominant flat roof on the rear elevation, which is inconsistent with Section 12.3.7.1 of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, would be visually incoherent with the design of the house, and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

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.

Rosemaire McLaughlin

Inspector

25th February 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500471-DR-25
Proposed Development Summary	Dormer window to front, extension to dormer to rear window to side, with associated site works
Development Address	1, Ailesbury Lawn, Dundrum, Dublin 16 (1A)
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 Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(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)	
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.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
<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)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
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"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____