



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL-500615-DS-26

---

<b>Development</b>	Revisions to previously approved Reg Ref. 3890/22 which include dormer structure and window to the front elevation and elevational alterations.
<b>Location</b>	9, Bremen Avenue, Irishtown Dublin 4
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	WEB5441/25
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Paula Bradshaw
<b>Type of Application</b>	Planning permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Paula Bradshaw
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	13 <sup>th</sup> March 2026
<b>Inspector</b>	Ronan O'Connor

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is located on Bremen Avenue, mature residential estate located north-west of Sean Moore Park and is accessed off the R131. On site is a two-storey semi-detached property. There is informal parking on the roadside.
- 1.2. The site lies to the west of the R131. On the eastern side of same is the former Glass Bottle site, where a large-scale development is nearing completion.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Revisions to previously approved Reg Ref. 3890/22 which include dormer structure and window to the front elevation and elevational alterations.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The Planning Authority decided to REFUSE permission for 1 no. reason as follows:

1. The front dormer, in its scale, height and extent, would be a visually dominant structure, and would in combination with the permitted rear dormer, create an effective third floor to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The dormer would not be in accordance with Appendix 18, in regard to form and design, and would not be a subordinate element within the roof form. The proposed dormer and permitted dormer, in itself, and by the precedent established for such overscaled structures to the front of dwellings, would cause serious injury to the residential amenities of the area and would be contrary to the policies and objectives of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The site is zoned Z1. Permitted in principle.

- Notes previous permission for a rear dormer to provide for a bedroom at attic level.
- Applicants now seeking to add a dormer structure to the front and include a separate study at attic level.
- Considered the proposed dormer is not visually subordinate to the roof slope nor does it relate to the shape, size, position and design of the existing doors and windows on the lower floors.
- Proposed dormer is level with the ridge, which is a concern.
- Does not retain a large proportion of the original roof that is visible/required under Table 18.1 of Appendix 18.
- No clear precedent for a front dormer within this estate.
- Is not visually subordinate to the roof plain, coupled with the previously approved dormer/will create a new 3 storey element within the roof.
- Immediate area comprises 2 no. storey dwellings.
- Recommendation was to refuse permission as per the reason for refusal cited above.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Engineering Department – Drainage Division: No objection subject to conditions.

### 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. None.

### 3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. None.

## 4.0 Planning History

### 4.1. Appeal Site

3890/22 RETENTION & PERMISSION Granted comprising retention of rooflight to the front slope, front porch, front bay window and lean-to roof and permission for new rear extension consisting of a ground floor rear extension, first floor rear extension, attic level dormer structure and first floor side window to the gable.

[Decision date 28<sup>th</sup> November 2022]

- Condition 4 The attic space hereby approved shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with the current building regulations.

Reason: To provide for an adequate standard of development.

- Condition 5 All external finishes shall harmonise with the existing finishes of the house in respect of materials and colour.

Reason: To protect existing amenities

### Surrounding Area

23 Bremen Avenue, Sandymount, Dublin 4

WEB1091/25 Permission granted for attic conversion with a box dormer to the front and rear of the property, Removal of existing bay window at ground level. Enlarging existing window openings which will have Juliet balconies at first floor. Removal of a pitched roof on existing rear extension and replace with flat roof, new internal layout design and all ancillary site development works. [Decision date 31<sup>st</sup> July 2025].

Condition 3 of same states the following:

*3. The development hereby approved shall incorporate the following amendments: -  
The hereby permitted front dormer shall be set 200 mm below the roof ridge, 500 mm above the eaves level and shall have a maximum width of 3500 mm. Reason: In the interests of orderly development and visual amenity*

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028

The appeal site and surrounding residential area are zoned Z1 ‘To protect, provide and improve residential amenities’.

Section 15.11 of the Development Plan states that “for guidance and standards relating to ancillary residential accommodation including: residential extensions, detached habitable rooms, porches, alterations at roof level/attics/dormers /additional floors [...] see Appendix 18”.

The following sections of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan, entitled ‘Ancillary Residential Accommodation’ are noted:

- Section 1.0: Residential extensions.
- Section 4.0: Alterations at roof level / attics / dormers / additional floors.
- Section 5.0: Attic conversions / dormer windows.

Appendix 18, Section 5.0 relates to Attic Conversions/Dormer Windows and states the following:

*‘The conversion of attic spaces is common practice in many residential homes. The use of an attic space for human habitation must be compliant with all of the relevant design standards, as well as building and fire regulations. Dormer windows, where proposed should complement the existing roof profile and be sympathetic to the overall design of the dwelling. The use of roof lights to serve attic bedrooms will be considered on a case-by-case basis.*

*Where it is proposed to extend the ridge height to accommodate an increased floor-to-ceiling height, the design should avoid an overly dominant roof structure. The proposed scale of the roof should retain similar proportions to the building where possible.*

*Dormer windows may be provided to the front, side or rear of a dwelling’.*

Dormer Window Guidance in Table 18.1 Guidance states the following:

- Use materials to complement the existing wall or roof materials of the main house.

- Meet building regulation requirements.
- Be visually subordinate to the roof slope, enabling a large proportion of the original roof to remain visible.
- Relate to the shape, size, position and design of the existing doors and windows on the lower floors.
- Be set back from the eaves level to minimise their visual impact and reduce the potential for overlooking of adjoining properties.
- In the case of a dormer window extension to a hipped/ gable roof, ensure it sits below the ridgeline of the existing roof.
- Where a side dormer is proposed, appropriate separation from the adjoining property should be maintained.
- Side dormers should be set back from the boundary.
- Do not obscure the main ridge and eaves features of the roof, particularly in the case of an extension to the side of a hipped roof.
- Avoid extending the full width of the roof or right up to the gable ends.
- Avoid dormer windows that are over dominant in appearance or give the impression of a flat roof.
- Avoid extending above the main ridge line of the house.
- Side dormer windows shall not be located directly on the boundary of adjoining/ adjacent property

## 5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The site is not within or close to any sites with a natural heritage designation. The closest such sites are South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, South Dublin Bay SAC and South Dublin Bay pNHA, all located c500m to the south-east of the site.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. A first party appeal was lodged by Paula Bradshaw on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2026 against the council's decision to refuse permission. The Grounds of Appeal are as follows:

#### Urban Grain

- Neighbourhood exhibits a fine to medium urban grain, characterised by 2 and 3 storey dwellings.
- Majority are three storey elements provided in larger terraces.
- Glass Bottle site should be considered.

#### Planner's Report

- Report states that there is no precedent for a front dormer.
- Permission was granted at No. 23 Bremen Avenue for a front dormer.
- Was granted on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2025 and is near completion (WEB1091/25).
- Construction of the front dormer would have been visible in the weeks leading up to the signing of the planner's report.

#### Dublin City Development Plan

- Relevant section of the Development Plan is Appendix 18, Section 5.
- Notes that, *inter alia*, dormers may be provided to the front, side or rear of a dwelling.
- Dormer is calculated at 55% of the overall roof/is subordinate.
- Rear dormer has already been approved.
- Height of the front dormer is in line with the ridge/but does not exceed it/to achieve a usable room height below the dormer roof.
- Proposed to set back from the eaves.
- Are of the opinion that proposal complies with guidance in Development Plan, where applicable.

- Reference to the permission at No. 23 Bremen Avenue (WEB1091/25) for a front dormer in the planning application appears to have been ignored (for a front dormer/photograph of same enclosed).
- This permission was the basis for the design proposed here/Condition 3 of this permission proposes setbacks from the eaves and ridge, and limits the width.
- Other previously approved cases include:
  - Web 1227/24 – 22 Hastings Street, D4 – for front and rear dormer, first floor extension to rear
- Photograph showing locations of similar front dormers on houses in the area
- Having regard to the granted permission at No. 23 Bremen Avenue, the proposed development would not detract from the existing residential amenities of the area.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. None.

## 6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. The Planning Authority request that their decision be upheld and that a section 48 development contribution condition be attached, if permission is granted.

## 6.4. Observations

6.4.1. None.

## 6.5. Further Responses

6.5.1. None.

## 7.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

7.1. 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 (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 Appendix 1 of report.

## 8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. Having examined the appeal and all other documentation on file, having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant policy context, I consider that the main issue in this appeal is as follows:

- Scale and Design of the Front Dormer

### 8.2. **Scale and Design of the Front Dormer**

8.2.1. I note that the elements to the rear have already been consented under Planning Ref 3890/22, and I note no objection to any element of same was raised as a concern by the Planning Authority. The Planning Authority's main concern was the scale and design of the front dormer, and this is reflected in the reason for refusal as noted in Section 3.1 above.

8.2.2. The main argument as set out in the first party appeal is that the proposal is consistent with the relevant criteria as set out in the Development Plan, and that, furthermore, a precedent for such a dormer has already been set, namely at No. 23 Bremen Avenue, where a front dormer has been recently granted permission and is substantially completed.<sup>1</sup>

8.2.3. In relation to the scale and design of the front dormer proposed here, I note that the same is set back 950mm from the eaves, is set back 960mm from the side adjoining No. 10, is set back 890mm from the opposite side, and is in line with ridge of the dwelling. The applicant has stated that the dormer accounts for 55% of the roof space, and, therefore, should be considered subordinate to the overall roof.

8.2.4. I am of the view that the overall scale of the proposed front dormer would be appropriate and is line with that criteria as set out in Table 18.1 of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan. I would note same is setback from the eaves , and from the sides, with a large proportion of the roof slope remaining visible. While a setback from the ridgeline is not proposed, this is a not a strict requirement of Table 18.1, for

---

<sup>1</sup> From my observations on site, this front dormer appeared to be completed.

dormers that do not involve a 'hipped to gable' roof extension, and I, in this regard, I note that a 'hipped to gable' roof extension is not proposed here. The main criteria as relates to the ridge line is that the ridge remains visible and, in this case, the ridge line remains visible with the proposed front dormer in place.

- 8.2.5. I would note that the scale of same would appear to be smaller than that permitted at No. 23 Bremer Avenue (PA Reg Ref Web1091/25), noting Condition No. 3 attached to same, which required a setback of 200mm from the ridge, 500mm from the eaves and a maximum width of 3500mm. In this instance, the width of the dormer proposed here is 3.7m but there is a greater setback from the sides, and from the eaves, when compared to what was permitted at No. 23 Bremer Avenue. As such, the visual dominance of the proposed front dormer would be less than that at No. 23 in my view, and there is sufficient roofscape that is unobscured with the proposed front dormer in place.
- 8.2.6. In relation to the overall visual impact of the front and rear dormers, I do not concur with the view expressed in the Planner's Report that same would be read as an additional storey to the structure, noting the setbacks proposed from the eaves and side, for both the rear and the front dormers.
- 8.2.7. In terms of precedent, a precedent for such a front dormer in this immediate area has already been set, with the permission at No. 23. The applicant has also indicated that other front dormers exist in the immediate area and the location of these are set out in the appeal submission. I note that same are located on Doris Street, Penrose Street, South Dock Street and Hastings Street, some 1km from the site, within a different architectural context and, as such, I would not concur that they would relate to the context that is under consideration here.
- 8.2.8. Notwithstanding, I am satisfied that, with the permission granted at No. 23 Bremen Avenue, a precedent has been set and the front dormer proposed here is broadly consistent, if not smaller than that permitted at No. 23.
- 8.2.9. In conclusion then, I consider that the proposed dormer window on the front roof profile is fully consistent with the advice contained in Section 5.0 of Appendix 18 and in line with the guidance as set out in Table 18.1, in that it will be visually subordinate to the roof slope, is set back from both the eaves and the sides, will not obscure the ridge or eaves features and will not be over dominant in its appearance. I am

satisfied that the proposed front dormer is acceptable in terms of its design and that it will not be injurious to visual and residential amenities in the area, and noting the previous permission on this site (PA Ref 3890/22), which permitted those elements to the rear, I am of the view that the proposed development in its entirety (i.e. those elements to the rear and front) are acceptable.

## **9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening**

- 9.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of s.177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.1.2. The appeal site is located in a serviced suburban area in Dublin, and the proposed development comprises an extension and other works to an existing house.
- 9.1.3. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.1.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that 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:
- Nature of the works: e.g. small scale and nature of the development.
  - Location in a suburban area at a remove from the nearest European site and with a lack of potential connections.
- 9.1.5. 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 other plans or projects.
- 9.1.6. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## **10.0 Water Framework Directive**

- 10.1.1. The appeal site is located in a serviced suburban area in Dublin, a considerable distance from any surface water feature. The proposed development comprises an extension and other works to an existing house.
- 10.1.2. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.1.3. 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.

10.1.4. 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.

## 11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that planning permission is granted for the reasons and considerations set out below.

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development and the pattern of development in the area, I consider that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or property in the vicinity 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 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 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.

3. 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.

4. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of: Mondays to Fridays - 7.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m, Saturday - 8.00 a.m. to 2.00 p.m. and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.

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

**Reason:** To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

**Reason:** It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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.

---

Rónán O'Connor  
Senior Planning Inspector

---

18<sup>th</sup> March 2026

**Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening**

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500615-DS-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Revisions to previously approved Reg Ref. 3890/22 which include dormer structure and window to the front elevation and elevational alterations.
<b>Development Address</b>	9, Bremen Avenue, Irishtown Dublin 4
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.	
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>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?</b>	
<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. <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. <b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b>	
<b>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)?</b>	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b>
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b>

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_