



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500567-SD-26

Development	Attic conversion with hip to gable roof and dormer
Location	11, Priory Way, Dublin 12, D12YX80
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD25B/0608W
Applicant(s)	Jason O'Donnell.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Approval
Type of Appeal	Third Party v Decision
Appellant(s)	William and Anne Donegan.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	20 th March 2026.
Inspector	R Taylor

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision.....	4
4.0	Planning History	6
5.0	Policy Context	6
6.0	EIA Screening	10
7.0	The Appeal	10
8.0	Assessment.....	12
9.0	AA Screening	17
10.0	Water Framework Directive	17
11.0	Recommendation	18
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	18
13.0	Conditions	19
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	21

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at 11 Priory Way, Dublin. It comprises a broadly rectangular shaped site and a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with hipped and pitched roof and finished in brick to the front elevation with render to the gable. There is a garden to the front including a driveway/parking area. Whilst the address relates to Priory Way, the site is accessed from Whitehall Road and to which the front elevation is orientated. There is a grassed verge with mature street trees along the appeal site side of the road. The site is broadly orientated northwest (front) to southeast (rear).
- 1.2. To the rear of the site there is a single storey extension with a small hard surfaced garden area. All rear elevations are finished in render. Boundary treatments comprise timber panel fencing approximately 1.8m along the side boundaries, with a rendered wall on top of which is timber trellis type fencing with a total height of approximately 2.2m. A small timber shed is also located in the southwestern corner of the rear garden. The topography of the site and environs is broadly level.
- 1.3. The appeal site is located within a row of 21 dwellings of similar design, layout, and relationship to the Whitehall road adjacent, and to further residential development to the rear. There are further dwellings opposite the site that also access the Whitehall Road. These are predominantly detached and vary between single storey and two storey. All also have hipped and pitched roofs and have broadly rectangular shaped sites.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The application assessed by the Planning Authority (PA) is described as “attic conversion with hip to gable roof and dormer.”
- 2.2. The proposal comprises a dormer window to the rear roof elevation. The dormer is c. 3.6m in width, 0.15m from the ridge, 0.94m from the roof boundary with the adjacent semi-detached dwelling, 1.28m from the gable, with a ridge height of 2.47m above the eaves of the rear elevation and a depth of 3.22m at the widest point. It has a stated floor area of 26.71 sqm. Render finish to the external walls of the dormer is stated to match the existing dwelling.

- 2.3. The proposal also includes conversion of the existing hipped roof profile to pitched, with a ridge height of 7.95m and eaves height of 5.4m. 2 roof lights to the front roof elevation are also proposed.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The PA granted permission for the proposal subject to 2 conditions which are standard in nature:

1. Development in accordance with the plans, and
2. External finishes to the development permitted shall harmonise in colour or texture that is complementary to the house or its context;
3. Restriction on Use. The house and the extension(s) hereby permitted shall be jointly used as a single dwelling unit for residential purposes and shall not be sub-divided or used for any commercial purposes, and the extension shall not be sold, let (including short-term letting), leased or otherwise transferred or conveyed, by way of sale, letting or otherwise save as part of the single dwelling unit.
4. Drainage;
5. Minimise Air Blown Dust;
6. Construction Noise and Hours.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- In recommending a grant of permission a single planning report notes the following:
- One third party submission received raising issues including overlooking/loss of privacy, visual impact, out of character, undesirable precedent / overdevelopment.
- No planning history for the site.

- Planning history including granted and refused permissions on Whitehall Road and Priory Way are noted.
- Residential extensions to an existing dwelling is 'permitted in principle' under the subject zoning, subject to its design in accordance with 2022-2028 South Dublin County Development Plan and the SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025).
- The attic space would accommodate non-habitable storage, with a floor to ceiling height to the attic conversion/dormer element of 2.2m.
- The proposed dormer, by reason of scale and siting, would accord with the provisions of BFP5 of the SDCC House Extension Design Guide.
- The finishes as detailed are considered acceptable with regard to the visual amenities of the area, and accord with BFP1 and BFP5 of the House Extension Design Guide.
- The rear facing window of the rear dormer structure would be located approximately 12.18m from the rear boundary of the subject site. Having regard to the existing built form of the subject dwelling and adjacent properties, the proposal would not adversely impact on the amenities of existing adjacent properties by way of significantly increased levels of overlooking, overbearing appearance or overshadowing, and would integrate satisfactorily. The proposal complies with BFP1 of the SDCC House Extension Design Guide.
- The proposed roof lights would not detract from the streetscape, and would not adversely impact on the amenities of adjacent properties, in accordance with BFP1 of the House Extension Design Guide.
- The amended roof profile as proposed would not significantly detract from the subject streetscape, would not adversely impact on the amenities of adjacent properties, would be acceptable with regard to the existing amenities of the area, and accord with BFP5 and BFP1 of the House Extension Design Guide.
- The proposal would not include any alterations to the existing access or egress arrangements of the site. The development is therefore acceptable.

- The development will not result in a significant loss of any grassland or permeable surfaces and minimal impact to the existing green infrastructure network and runoff from the site.
- The floor space at attic level would not be habitable, and no contribution is levied on this floorspace.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None requested.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None received.

4.0 Planning History

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

4.2. Granted permissions in the locality including roof extensions at following addresses listed: 97 Whitehall Road, 89 Whitehall Road, 105 Whitehall Road and referenced in the planning report.

4.3. A refusal for a second storey extension at 33 Priory Way and granted permissions, also for second storey extensions, at 1 and 6 Priory Way are also noted.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 was made on 22nd June 2022 and came into effect on 3rd August 2022. It has regard to national and regional policies in respect of residential development. The following policy considerations are relevant based on the nature of the proposal:

Zoning: Objective RES: To protect and/or improve residential amenity.

Policy QDP7: High Quality Design – Development General

Promote and facilitate development which incorporates exemplary standards of high-quality, sustainable and inclusive urban design, urban form and architecture.

Policy QDP11: Materials, Colours and Textures

Promote high-quality building finishes that are appropriate to context, durable and adhere to the principles of sustainability and energy efficiency.

Policy H11: Privacy and Security

Promote a high standard of privacy and security for existing and proposed dwellings through the design and layout of housing.

Policy H14: Residential Extensions

Support the extension of existing dwellings subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

H14 Objective 1:

To favourably consider proposals to extend existing dwellings subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities and compliance with the standards set out in Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring and the guidance set out in the South Dublin County Council House Extension Design Guide, 2010 (or any superseding guidelines).

Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring:

12.6 Housing - Residential Development

12.6.7 Residential Standards

12.6.8 Residential Consolidation

Extensions

The design of residential extensions should have regard to the permitted pattern of development in the immediate area alongside the South Dublin County Council House Extension Guide (2010) or any superseding standards.

SDCC House Extension Design Guide 2025

2.5 Managing Visible Interventions

2.5.1 General Principles

2.5.4 Privacy, Overlooking and Perceived Overlooking

New extensions must avoid direct overlooking and can do so by using sensitively sited and designed solutions.

Section 3.0 Built Form Principles

3.1 General Considerations Relating to All Extensions

3.1.2 Residential Extensions

3.1.5 Main Considerations

3.1.6 Elements of Good Extension Design

3.1.7 Built Form Principle (BFP) 1 - All Extensions and Alternations to Houses

3.2.1 General Considerations relating to all front extensions

3.5.1 General Considerations Relating to Roof Alterations

Attic conversion, including roof alterations and/or extension, is generally acceptable to the Planning Authority, subject to accordance with associated Built Form Principles.

The quality of materials/finishes for dormers should be considered carefully as this can greatly improve their appearance.

3.5.2 Built Form Principle (BFP) 5 - Roof Alterations and Extensions

Rear Dormer Elements:

- Should be located below the ridge line of the main dwelling.
- Should be set back at least 3 no. tile courses from the eaves line of the dwelling.
- Should be inset from party boundaries and side wall/ roof hip of dwelling.
- Should be appropriately scaled so as not to read as an additional storey to the dwelling, or obscure the main features of the roof.
- Should consider quality of external finishes/materials and window proportions relative to main house.

Roof Profile Alterations

- Should tie in with the original ridge height and ridge position of the dwelling.
- Should be finished with materials that match the main roof of the dwelling.
- Any window provided in an extended gable elevation that faces an adjacent house should be fitted with obscure glazing.

Roof lights

- Should be appropriately sited on the roof plane of the dwelling.
- Should not provide for an excessive degree of glazing on the roof of the dwelling.

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

None.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not within or immediately adjacent to a designation. The closest Natural Heritage designations are as follows:

Glenasmole Valley SAC	Site Code	001209 c. 4.7km N.
The Wicklow Mountains SAC	Site Code	002122 c. 8.45km S.
The Wicklow Mountains SPA	Site Code	004040 c. 8.45Km S.

Proposed Natural Heritage Area:

Dodder Valley	Site Code	000991 c. 2.54km SW.
Grand Canal	Site Code	002104 c. 3km N
Glenasmole Valley	Site Code	001209 c. 4.7km S.
Liffey Valley	Site Code	000128 c. 6.14km NE.
Lugmore Glen	Site Code	001212 c. 7.54km SW

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 this report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1 The grounds of appeal are submitted by the third-party appellant and includes an appended photograph. Their statement confirms the grounds are as follows:

7.1.2 The proposal is contrary to SDCC guidelines, dormers must not overlook, overshadow or have an overbearing effect on neighbouring properties. The proposal would adversely impact on privacy and result in a loss of skyline. During hours of darkness, artificial light will intrude on privacy, including when combined with light emitted from the existing ground floor extension.

7.1.3 Plans indicate the attic is for storage use. The dormer windows seem unnecessary and could be addressed by a more acceptable design.

7.1.4 The sites referenced at 89, 97, and 105 Whitehall Road are not relevant. The extensions referenced either overlook the main Whitehall Road, gable of adjacent properties, or where to the rear, gardens are of sufficient length that overlooking/privacy does not arise.

7.1.5 The other histories referenced at 1 & 6 Priory Way do not involve plans as proposed by the applicant and are not relevant.

7.1.6 Application reference: SDCC17B/0183 33 Priory Way was refused by the Bord due to overbearing and injuring amenity of properties in the area.

7.2. Applicant Response

7.2.1 The Chief Executive's assessment is comprehensive and conclusive. The proposal was assessed under the correct framework. The PA expressly assessed all relevant

considerations including zoning and policy, residential and visual amenity. Substantial weight should be attached to this detailed professional assessment unless compelling contrary evidence is presented, which has not occurred in this appeal.

- 7.2.2 The appellant's primary concern relates to overlooking and loss of privacy. These have been objectively assessed by the PA. The assessment reflects the Plan's emphasis on protecting amenity including policy H11 Privacy and Security and policy HR14 Residential Extensions.
- 7.2.3 In this suburban environment of closed spaced, back-to-back- dwellings, absolute or guaranteed privacy is neither realistic or achievable. The planning system does not seek to prevent reasonable domestic development because some degree of mutual awareness is inherent in urban living. The test is whether impacts are reasonable and the PA has found that the proposal does not seriously injure amenity.
- 7.2.4 The appellant misquotes the guidelines, relying on a sentence relating to overlooking as if it were a prohibition. The guidelines do not prohibit windows or dormers. The guidance provides a context-based design framework and not an absolute ban. The PA applied the guidance to the application and concluded it would be acceptable.
- 7.2.5 The dormer is subordinate in form, and the PA applied the design criteria of the guidance in BFP5. The hip-to-gable alteration maintains the ridge line, uses matching materials and does not detract from the streetscape or amenity.
- 7.2.6 The case at 26 Priory Way 2017 referenced by the appellant predates the current Development Plan and design guidance. It is different comprising a second storey rear extension rather than an attic conversion and dormer and is not therefore comparable.
- 7.2.7 The applicant references a comparable case approved at 26 Priory Way (Ref: SD24B0502W) which supports their proposal.
- 7.2.8 The alleged loss of sunlight is not supported by technical evidence and is unsound. The appellant's garden is north facing and receives limited direct sunlight due to orientation. The proposal is modest in scale, height, and positioning will have no meaningful impact. No shadow analysis, sunlight/daylight diagrams or objective data has been provided and should be afforded no evidential weight.
- 7.2.9 The appellants argument that artificial light from the proposal would invade privacy was not raised in the original submission. There is no policy, guideline or precedent that

treats normal domestic light emissions as a material planning harm. There is no evidence for this as a planning consideration and should be dismissed.

7.2.10 The appellants appear to have a misconceived understanding of the proposal. It does not involve the creation of a new dwelling, the introduction of a full additional storey, or overdevelopment of the site. The proposal is modest and designed to comply with the Plan and guidance and confirmed by the PA in granting permission.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

There is a single response from the Planning Authority. It states that all issues are considered in the assessments set out in the planning report and confirms its decision.

7.4. Observations

None.

7.5. Further Responses

None.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the submission received in relation to the appeal, site inspection and having regard to the relevant policies, objectives and guidance, I am satisfied that the main issue to be considered is that raised in the Third Party grounds of appeal, being the Planning Authority (PA) reason for refusal and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise. The main issues in determining this appeal are as follows:

- a) Principle;
- b) Design and Impact on character;
- c) Amenity impacts;
- d) Need for the proposal;

e) Planning History of the Area.

a) Principle;

8.2. The site is within a zoning which comprises an objective to protect and/or improve residential amenity. Residential development is 'permitted in principle' within this zoning objective. Policy H14: Residential Extensions supports house extensions in principle, subject to design and other considerations set out in the SDCC Design Guide 2025. Therefore, I consider that the extension to a dwelling is acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with the parameters set out in the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 and Design Guide.

b) Design and Impact on character;

8.3. 3.5.1 General Considerations of the Design Guide relates to roof alterations and confirms attic conversion, including roof alterations and/or extension, is generally acceptable to the Planning Authority, subject to accordance with associated Built Form Principles. The proposal includes a rear dormer and therefore 3.5.2 Built Form Principle (BFP) 5 is applicable. 5 criteria are listed and are set out above at section 5.1.

8.4. Following review of the proposed plans I am satisfied that the rear dormer satisfies these requirements in terms of design. The dormer is sufficiently set back from the eaves, common boundary with the adjacent property, and gable of the roof. The finishes include render which is present on the host dwelling and are therefore acceptable.

8.5. The proposal also includes revision of the roof profile from hipped to pitched. BFP 5 also includes reference to this type of alteration and includes 3 criteria, of which 2 are relevant to the appeal. The increase in height will match the existing ridgeline of the dwelling and therefore is compliant with the first criterion. Materials will match those existing via planning condition 2 as listed by the PA. The second criterion is therefore satisfied.

8.6. The third-party grounds of appeal include reference to visual and streetscape impacts. The Plan and design guidance does not preclude hip to gable roof alterations. There are no criteria precluding this alteration type within BFP 5. This design approach appears to be supported by the graphical illustration and annotation "if house is hipped roof consider hip to gable extension" noted 3.5.3 at page 39 of the guide.

- 8.7. Notwithstanding this, I note from site visit that the immediate character of roofscapes almost exclusively comprises hipped and pitched roof forms. Views of the roof from the adjoining public street, Whitehall Park East to which the front of the appeal site is orientated, are largely obscured from mid and long-distance views in both directions by street trees and the close proximity spacing between dwellings along the appeal site side of this street. Clear views are limited to broadly from directly opposite the appeal site and over a short distance. I note that the pitch of the hipped section is reasonably shallow. The resulting roof alteration would not therefore be significant alteration in the Whitehall Park East context due to the restricted public views. The proposed rooflights/windows to the front roof elevation are also appropriately sited and do not comprise excessive glazing. They are acceptable in terms of the design guidance and will not adversely affect character or amenity.
- 8.8. The roofscape/rear of the appeal site, and 3 adjacent dwellings to the west, is evident from public views from the rear from a short stretch of Priory Way and cul-de-sac to the southwest due to the alignment/orientation of the road. From this section of the public road the dormer and pitched alteration would be visible. In this context, the pitch conversion would be at odds with adjacent dwellings. However, I do not consider that this would be unacceptable and cause sufficient detriment to character taking account of the requirements of BFP 5 as discussed above. Mid and long-distance views on approach from both west and east are obscured by existing dwellings to the rear of the appeal site therefore visual impacts would be limited.
- 8.9. The appellant considers the proposal is overdevelopment of the site. However, I consider that the proposal satisfies relevant design criteria as discussed above and the issue of overdevelopment does not arise in these circumstances.
- c) Amenity impacts;
- 8.10. The appellant consider that the proposal would adversely affect their amenity in terms of privacy, overbearance, and loss of skyline. The applicant and PA considers the proposal acceptable in relation to these issues.
- 8.11. The appellants' property is located to the rear of the appeal site. There is a separation distance of approximately 20.5m between the respective rear elevations. The rear elevation of the proposed dormer would be approximately 21.65m from the rear elevation of the appellants' property.

- 8.12. 2.5.4 of the Guide relates to privacy, overlooking and perceived overlooking stating that “new extensions must avoid direct overlooking and can do so by using sensitively sited and designed solutions”. The proposed attic conversion is sought for storage purposes and could not therefore be regarded as a habitable room. Views from the dormer to the rear garden area of the appellant’s property would be obscured to a degree by existing timber fencing and wall along the rear common boundary. The ground floor internal accommodation of the appellant’s property would be subject to limited views from the dormer due to the location of window openings within a single storey extension and associated close proximity to the rear common boundary. The relationship between the dormer and first floor windows of the appellants’ property would not be materially different to the existing relationship between respective windows at first floor on the rear elevations both from the appeal site and adjacent dwellings. A degree of overlooking within the urban area is commonplace and I conclude that the impact is acceptable given separation distances and associated resulting relationships.
- 8.13. Built Form Principle (BFP) 1 provides criteria for “All Extensions and Alternations to Houses”. Overbearance is a criterion, stating (proposals) “Does not adversely impact on adjacent properties by way of significant overbearing visual appearance”. As discussed above, the attic conversion is compliant with the relevant specific policy design criteria for the type of development proposed. The pitch conversion will not result in a significant increase in height or roofscape and the dormer is a subordinate feature within the revised roofspace. Separation distances also mitigate the impacts of the proposal to the appellant’s property. I conclude that the proposal will not result in significant overbearance.
- 8.14. I am also satisfied that the proposal will not adversely impact on any adjacent properties, including that of the appellant’s, in terms of overshadowing due the layout/aspect of the site. The application site is broadly orientated northwest (front) to southeast (rear). Daylighting will therefore be largely unaffected for the majority of the day. The pitch conversion is a minimal increase in height and impacts will further be mitigated by separation distances between the respective properties.

8.15. The grounds of appeal refer to loss of skyline and impact from artificial light. I have carefully considered these issues, however there are no grounds within the relevant policy considerations to withhold permission on this basis.

d) Need for the proposal;

8.16. The grounds of appeal question the need for the proposed dormer given the storage use. Need for the proposal does not require to be demonstrated within the relevant policy provisions. Accordingly, there are no grounds to withhold permission on this basis.

e) Planning History of the Area

8.17. The appellant refers to planning history listed in the PA report as irrelevant to the proposal due to differing characteristics. They highlight a refused 2017 application and appeal at 25 Priory Way. The applicant considers that case irrelevant and cites a granted permission at 26 Priory Way, similar to the appeal proposal, but also includes a single storey extension.

8.18. The appellant has not provided the details of the 2017 application approved on appeal. The applicant's evidence states that application related to a second storey extension rather than an attic conversion and dormer window which is subject to appeal in this case. It is apparent from the evidence provided that the case cited by the appellant and those listed in the PA report, pre-date the current Development Plan and, regardless of the nature of the proposals, were subject to differing policy considerations to the current appeal case. Accordingly, I do not consider these cases as materially relevant to the considerations for this appeal and cannot be afforded any determining weight.

8.19. Full details of the application cited by the applicant at 26 Priory Way have not been provided. I therefore cannot attribute any determining weight to that decision in this appeal.

8.20. Whilst I note the referred cases by all parties in support of the respective arguments, each case must be considered on its merits and associated considerations.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1 I have considered the proposed access and associated works in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2 The subject site is located in an existing residential development within an urban/residential area of Dublin.
- 9.3 The proposed development comprises alterations and works within the curtilage of an existing dwelling as described at section 2.0 above.
- 9.4 No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.5 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- small scale nature of works and nature of the development;
 - distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.
- 9.6 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 9.7 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The subject site is located in an existing residential development within the urban/residential area of Dublin.
- 10.2. The proposed development comprises alterations and works within the curtilage of an existing dwelling as discussed at section 2.0 above.
- 10.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.4. I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent

deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

10.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- small scale nature of works;
- The location of the site and distance from nearest Water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.

10.6. Conclusion

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. Following the above assessment, I recommend that permission be GRANTED.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regards to the scale, and nature of the development , the residential zoning objective, the established pattern of development in the area, the policy framework provided by the South Dublin Development Plan 2022-2028 including the requirements of the South Dublin County Council House Design Guide 2025, it is considered that subject to conditions the proposed development would represent an appropriate extension to the existing dwelling, would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties including 32 Priory Way and the area, and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable 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 planning authority, 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 interests of clarity.

2. The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles/slates) shall be the same as those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

3. The house and the extension(s) hereby permitted shall be jointly used as a single dwelling unit for residential purposes and shall not be sub-divided or used for any commercial purposes, and the extension shall not be sold, let (including short-term letting), leased or otherwise transferred or conveyed, by way of sale, letting or otherwise save as part of the single dwelling unit.

REASON: To prevent unauthorised development and in the interests of orderly development and residential amenities.

4. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

5. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1800 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.

The applicant or developer shall also endeavour to engage in local consultation in respect of any noise sensitive location within 30 metres of the development as approved prior to construction activity commencing on site. Such noise sensitive locations should be provided with the following:

- Schedule of works to include approximate timeframes
- Name and contact details of contractor responsible for managing noise complaints
- Hours of operation- including any scheduled times for the use of equipment likely to be the source of significant noise.

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

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.

R Taylor
Planning Inspector

20 April 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL06S.500567-SD-26
Proposed Development Summary	Attic conversion with hip to gable roof and dormer
Development Address	11, Priory Way, Dublin 12, D12YX80
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.	
<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.	not a Class
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: R Taylor Date: 20/04/2026