



An  
Coimisiun  
Pleanála

# Inspector's Report

**PL-500755-DN-26**

---

<b>Development</b>	Attic conversion and rear dormer, installation of solar PV panels and rooflights to front. Retention of a green roofed bicycle shed to the front garden and all associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	2 Temple Villas, Arbour Hill, Dublin 7,
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	WEB5860/25
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Fabrizio Venturelli Valeria Lorenzi
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission and Retention.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant Permission and retention Permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Gareth Wood & Aoife Maher
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	3P <sup>1</sup> March 2026.
<b>Inspector</b>	Una Smyth

## 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.....	9
7.0	The Appeal .....	9
8.0	Assessment.....	10
9.0	AA Screening.....	17
10.0	Water Framework Directive .....	17
11.0	Recommendation.....	18
12.0	Reasons and Considerations .....	<b>18Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
13.0	Conditions.....	18
	<b>Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening.....</b>	<b>21</b>

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located at Arbour Hill, Dublin 7. The site, with a given area of 0.015 Ha, is the second in a terrace of four two storey red brick dwellings designated as a Residential Conservation Area (RCA) known as Temple Villas. The flanking dwellings of Nos 1 and 4 have a hipped roof, while Nos 3 and 4 are stepped down from Nos 1 and 2. The appeal dwelling is No 2. Directly opposite and east of the appeal site lies an Architectural Conservation Area containing the National Museum of Ireland and Colins Barracks. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in use. The RCA terrace of 4 dwellings is flanked to the north by a 3 and 4 storey, red brick and rendered apartment block with flat roof and front and rear balconies known as Arbour Court. Immediately south lies the entrance to Dawson Place, a gated residential development of 2 and 3 storey dwellings which sits to south and west (rear). Further south on Arbour Hill is another 3 storey apartment block, red brick and black slate finish with flat roof.
- 1.2. To the front of the appeal dwelling at road level is the bicycle storage area (subject to the planning application), a bin storage area and a small hard surfaced parking area, (classified as being below standards for vehicle parking by Transport Planning Division.) 8 stone steps lead from the footpath to the front door due to the elevated nature of the finished floor level.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of the construction of a dormer window to rear roof plane to create a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor room. The description of the proposal is for construction of a non-habitable attic conversion, and this is annotated on the floor plans, yet the same floor plan clearly illustrate a bedroom with en-suite. Plans denote an obscured window in the illustrated ensuite and a larger window/door with balustrade in the bedroom. Conditions attached to the PA's approval restrict the attic to non-habitable, the dormer width reduced to 4.755m and materials to be dark colour to match the existing roof.
- 2.2. The proposal also includes 3 no velux type rooflights, and 6 solar PV panels to the front plane elevation. The application also seeks retention permission for the

installation of a green roofed bicycle shed to the front garden off-street parking space along with all ancillary and associated site work.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

On the 03<sup>rd</sup> of February 2026, Dublin City Council issued a decision recommending the granting of permission and grant retention permission for the development sought subject to conditions.

##### **3.1.1. Conditions**

1 - Adherence to the plan, other than where required by the conditions

2 - Amendments, in the form of a) The dormer reduced by 500mm in width to the southern elevation (adjacent to no 3 Temple Villas) b) The dormer's elevations, finished in dark colour to blend with the existing slate roof. c) The front facing roof lights shall be as flush as possible d) The Bicycle shed shall not open out on to the public footpath,

3 -Details of the materials, colours and textures submitted to and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

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

#### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. Planning Reports. The planning report dated 28<sup>th</sup> January 2026 forms the basis for the decision by the PA to grant permission. In making this recommendation, the planning officer assessed the information submitted by the applicant against the relevant policy objectives as well as considering the third -party concerns. The report included the following comments:

- The principle of an extension to the existing residential property is considered acceptable in terms of residential and visual amenity.
- Inconsistency on the application regarding description referencing non-habitable attic conversion and the drawings illustrating bedroom with ensuite. Absence of rear continuous elevations and inaccurate site frontage plans.

- Front parking space does not comply with standards set out in Appendix 5 of the City Development Plan.
- The ensuite window is acceptable and shall be condition as obscured, while the larger non-habitable/bedroom window is more problematic in that it resembles a door which is not in keeping with the rear first floor fenestration and has the provision of an unnecessary balustrade. The balustrade should be removed in its entirety and the window replaced by one of a more appropriate scale. Ceiling height is also below minimum building regulations for a habitable room.
- The dormer is not visible from the public road, only from properties on Dawson Place. It is set on the ridge line, with 445mm separation distance to north and 540 separation distance to south, immediately adjacent to the chimney stack. The visual impact of the dormer should be reduced by increasing the separation distance from the chimney stack to 500mm.
- The materials for the dormer are considered to be visually dominant and dark pressed colours which blend in with the original slate should be conditioned.
- No objections to the front facing solar panels or roof lights.
- The bicycle shed to the front is finished with a rustic steel appearance, with green roof which assists in shrouding the visual appearance of the shed. With its given height of 1.4m it is located just below the height of the front boundary wall. Transport Planning Division had issues with the doors opening onto the public footpath, however this can be covered by condition.
- Considering the site zonings and provision of the 2022-2028 City Development Plan, the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions.

### 3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

- Transport Planning Division: Further information required as parking area does not meet minimum standards and bike shed doors opening onto public street not acceptable.
- Drainage Division: No objection subject to conditions Archaeology: No comments received

### 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- Uisce Eireann: No comment received
- Dept. of Housing, Local Government and Heritage: No comment received

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

3.5. Two third party submission were received from the neighbouring properties

- Mr Gareth Wood & Ms Aoife Maher of 19 Dawson Place Arbour Hill
- Ms Niamh Mulkerrin of 20 Dawson Place Arbour Hill.

Mr Wood and Ms Maher proceeded to submit a Third-Party Appeal raising similar issues to those raised in the observations which are detailed in Section 7.1.

## 4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. No recent relevant history other than current application/appeal.

## 5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1.1. **Development Plan** Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is the statutory plan for the area. The appeal site is located within Zone Z2 -Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) -with the stated objective To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas. Z2 zonings are extensive throughout the city and are recognised as areas that have conservation merit and importance and warrant protection. The special interest/value of these areas lies in their historic and architectural interest, design and scale, which is such that they require special care in terms of development proposals. The planning authority will encourage development which enhances the setting and character of conservation areas.

5.1.2. Chapter 3 Climate Action

CA? -Energy Efficiency in Existing Buildings - It is a priority of the Council to support high levels of energy conservation, energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources in existing buildings and to actively retrofit housing stock.

CA11 -Energy from Renewable Sources - To support, encourage and facilitate the production of energy from renewable sources, such as from solar energy...subject to normal planning and environmental considerations.

#### Chapter 11 Built Heritage and Archaeology

SHA? -Architectural Conservation Areas (ACA). To protect the special interest and character of all areas which have been designated as an ACA. Development within or affecting an ACA must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area.. Ensure that any new development or alteration of a building ... immediately adjoining an ACA, is complementary and/or sympathetic to their context, sensitively designed.

Policy BHA9 - Conservation Areas (CA). To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's CA's. Development within or affecting a CA must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.

BHA22 -Upgrading Environmental Performance. To ensure a sustainable future for historic and other buildings subject to heritage protection, the City Council will encourage and support works to upgrade the environmental performance of the existing building stock. The installation of renewable energy measures and equipment will be acceptable where sited and designed to minimise the visual impact and does not result in any significant loss of historic fabric or otherwise affect the significance of the structure.

#### Volume 2 Appendix 5: Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements

4.3 Parking in Front Gardens. Planning Permission is required for the alteration of a front garden in order to provide car parking by creating a new access, or by widening of an existing access.

4.3.1 Dimensions and Surfacing. Vehicular entrances shall be designed to avoid creation of a traffic hazard for passing traffic and conflict with pedestrians. For a single residential dwelling, the vehicular opening proposed shall.....not have outward opening gates.

#### Volume 2 Appendix 18: Ancillary Residential Accommodation -

##### Section 1.0 Residential Extensions

Section 1.1 General Design Principles - Applications for extensions to existing residential units should not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling and not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight and achieve a high quality of design.

Section 1.4 Privacy and Amenity - Extensions should not result in any significant loss of privacy to the residents of adjoining properties. Generally, windows overlooking adjoining properties should be avoided.

Section 1.7 Appearance and Materials - The extension should not dominate the existing building and should normally be of an overall scale and size to harmonise with the existing house and adjoining buildings; The materials used should complement those used on the existing building; features such as windows and doors on the new extension should relate to those on the original building in terms of proportion and use of materials.

Section 4.0 Alterations at Roof Level/ Attics/ Dormers/ Additional Floors - Alterations at roof level can include the conversion of an attic space and inclusion of dormer windows.

Section 5.0 Attic Conversions/ Dormer Windows The use of an attic space for human habitation must be compliant with all 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. The proposed scale of the roof should retain similar proportions to the building where possible. Guidelines for attic conversions and the provision of dormer windows is set out as follows:

- 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.
- 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.

## **5.2. Natural Heritage Designations**

There are no SPA's or SAC's within proximity of the site.

## **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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is 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. One Third party appeal has been received from a property located in Dawson Place, to the rear (west) of the appeal site and can be summarised as follows:
- The planners report did not address the key planning issue of negative impact on the residential amenity on the residents of Dawson Place from overlooking and loss of privacy and would devalue their property. The large attic directly overlooks the garden and looks straight into the living room.
  - The report referred to the removal of the balustrade and use of obscured glazing for the bathroom window however such conditions were not included in the permission.
  - A continuous elevation of the rear has not been included.
  - Dormer not assessed against the policy criteria. The minor reduction in size does not address issues raised. The proposed development is contrary to the Dublin City Development Plan.
  - With 3 velux windows to the front, there is no requirement for such large windows to the rear.

- The splayed design consolidates the direct overlooking of Dawson Place.
- Extension so large and prominent it would be visually domineering on the neighbouring properties to the rear.
- The issues raised by the Roads Section have not been addressed.
- Concerns the PA has granted development that cannot meet building regulations.
- The drawings indicate bedroom and ensuite while the application is for non-habitable room. Appeal decision on dormers Ref 2041/25 ACP 323176-25 has not been considered.
- Condition 2 would also fail OPR guidance as it is not precise.
- The development would set an undesirable precedent.
- Dawson Place is situated on a lower level than 2 Temple Villas and has already had a single storey extension and a home office in the rear garden.
- The rear roof profile and materials do not accord with the residential conservation objectives of the land zoning, due to size, height, depth, materials, colour and design.

## **7.2. Applicant Response**

None

## **7.3. Planning Authority Response**

No response was received from the Planning Authority.

## **8.0 Assessment**

8.1. I have examined the application and conditions attached, appeal documents on file, undertaken an inspection of the site and have had regard to the relevant local development plans policies and guidance. The appeal refers to an attic conversion in the form of a rear dormer, front roof lights and front solar PV panels, and retention of a bike shed to the front of the dwelling I consider the issues of this appeal are not limited to those raised in the grounds of appeal. The substantive issues in this appeal relate to the following matters: -

- Principle of Development

- Residential Amenity
- Visual Amenity
- Discrepancy between drawings and description,
- Widening of the access to facilitate the bicycle shed
- Z2 Zoning Residential Conservation Area.- Rooflights

I will deal with each matter in turn.

## **8.2. Principle of Development**

The proposed development site is located within an area designated with zoning objective Z2, in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 which seeks 'To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas'. Chapter 3 of the Plan Climate Action, CA? -Energy Efficiency in Existing Buildings and CA11 Energy from Renewable Sources support the production of energy from renewable. Chapters 11 Built Heritage and Archaeology and Appendix 16 favour suitably design schemes.

- 8.2.1. There were no objections to the bike shed (other than concerns with widening access) subject to a condition regarding doors opening onto the public footpath. I find the principle of this element of the proposal acceptable subject to its position on site and alteration of the front doors. BHA22 -Upgrading Environmental Performance encourages and supports works to upgrade the environmental performance of the existing building stock with the caveat that the works shall not adversely affect the special interest of the structure. The solar panels on the front elevation do not detract from the character of the dwelling and terrace and are such considered acceptable.
- 8.2.2. The effects of the attic conversion rear dormer and front roof lights on the visual and residential amenity of the Residential Conservation Area must be balanced against the benefits of additional non-habitable space on a domestic dwelling.

## **8.3. Residential Amenity**

- 8.3.1. Annex 18, Section 1.4 Privacy and Amenity states that extensions should not result in any significant loss of privacy to the residents of adjoining properties The appellants have raised their concerns regarding overlooking from the dormer into their private amenity space. Separation distance is around 18m which is not insubstantial in an inner-city location. The dwellings at Dawson Place are located at a lower level than

those at Temple Villas, which, in the absence of levels, I can only estimate at approximately 1.5m. Two windows are proposed, a smaller window into what is indicated as an ensuite and a larger, double window/window door with balustrade into what is indicated as a bedroom (albeit floor plans annotate the space as non-habitable). I consider levels and separation distance are sufficient to warrant suitably sized dormer windows acceptable on this elevation. The windows are set back from the eaves and overlooking of adjacent properties is limited. The lower level of dwellings on Dawson Place aids with the screening of the private amenity space from high level, as does the single storey office room in the rear garden of the appeal site. From this elevated position, there will be limited views into the rear gardens of properties at Dawson Place.

- 8.3.2. Context for separation distance and overlooking is provided by the relationship between the 3 and 4 storey apartment development with balconies at Arbour Court and properties at 17 and 16 Dawson Place with a separation distance of around 11m. Given the compact urban grain at this location, a degree of overlooking can be expected and is already experienced. Additional windows at second floor level, particularly from a second-floor non-habitable room would not give rise to an increased loss of privacy and is therefore acceptable in policy terms. No devaluation of property would be anticipated.

#### **8.4. Residential Amenity**

- 8.4.1. The Development Plan encourages development which enhances the setting and character of Conservation Areas. It is policy that development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness of the area and, where possible, protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting.
- 8.4.2. The character and distinctiveness of this Residential Conservation Area is primarily provided by the streetscape, profile, symmetry and architectural features of the 4 properties comprising the terrace. The rear of the terrace is not visible from Temple Villas and Arbour Hill but is clearly visible from public and private viewpoints in Dawson Place and a limited number of dwellings on Arbour Terrace. The drop in roof profile between No 2 and No 3 is visible on approach from the South.

- 8.4.3. Guidance with respect to roof dormers is set out in Appendix 18 of Volume 2 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, particularly table 18.1. It states that dormers should be visually subordinate to the roof slope enabling a large proportion of the original roof to remain visible. They should not be overly dominant in appearance or give the impression of a flat roof and windows should relate to the shape, size, position and design of the existing doors and windows on the lower floors.
- 8.4.4. My site inspection revealed limited views of the dormer from public viewpoints. Due to the stepping of Nos 3 and 4, glimpses of the side profile of the proposed roof apex dormer will be visible on approach from the south between No 51 Arbour Street and the entrance to Dawson Place. Residents of 7 and 8 Arbour Hill Terrace will have views from the frontage of their dwellings. There are much clearer views of the dormer and rear of the dwelling from an approximately 20m stretch of entrance road and parking bay located within the gated development of Dawson Place.
- 8.4.5. The PA considered a dormer reduced in width and constructed with dark materials to be acceptable. The rear dormer has a box type profile, the top of which is set at ridge level with the bottom some 0.550m from the eaves. Width is 5.255m on a dwelling with a given width of 6.24m. It will be indented some 0.445m from the northern boundary with No. 1 Temple Villas, and 0.540m to the southern boundary with No. 3 Temple Villas, flush with the roof stack on this southern elevation. Given its size in relation to overall roof, little of the original roof will remaining visible while construction from the roof apex will give the appearance of a flat roof dwelling in the terrace. This is acerbated given the adjacent ridge at No 3 is positioned lower due to topography of the area. No contextual drawings have been provided showing the dormer adjacent to the lower ridge of No 3.
- 8.4.6. The Planning Officers report refers to the dormer windows and balustrade as 'problematic', yet no conditions were attached to the planning approval to reduce size, remove balustrade or use obscure glazing. The guidance states that windows should relate to the shape, size, position and design of the existing doors and windows on the lower floors. The size and location of the windows do not relate to the fenestration pattern on floors below, and the solid to void ratio is out of character with the host property. I consider this contrary to Section 5.0 of Annex 18, Attic Conversions/ Dormer Windows.

- 8.4.7. The third party referenced a previous dormer decision from An Coimisi(m Pleanala at Donnybrook ref 323175-25 and they acknowledge applications differ from each other. I do not find the context of the two sites directly comparable, given the more limited views of this appeal dormer, however the interpretation of the Development Plan policy is relevant in respect of scale and impact on existing roof form.
- 8.4.8. Policy objective for RCA dictates that new development should contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness. I consider the dormer as proposed would add an unsympathetic feature to the rear elevation of the dwelling, and by way of its location on a small conservation designated terrace, would also detract from and adversely impact the character of the RCA Chapter 11 and Annex 18 of the Development Plan. However, I consider a lower and smaller dormer would be visually subordinate to the host dwelling, particularly given its limited views from the surrounding area. I recommend the ridge reduced in height by 0.2m , which will remove the impression of a flat roof. Width should be reduced by providing a 0.5m separation distance from the chimney stack, and the frontage altered by removing the 'wings' element so it runs parallel with the eaves. These reductions will enabling a larger proportion of the original roof to remain visible so the dormer would not have a dominant appearance. agree with the PA that the proposed materials are not acceptable but a condition ensuring the dormer materials should be of a dark colour to match the existing roof will again reduce dominance. The dormer window require to be reduced in scale and the balustrade removed to reflect the fenestration and solid to void ratio of windows on the floors below. I consider a reduced and amended would not detract from the character of the area, while providing additional storage to a residential dwelling, thereby complying with policy. Should the commission be minded to approve, conditions to reflect the above should be attached.

#### **8.5. Discrepancy between drawings and description.**

The description of the application is for a non-habitable attic conversion, and the floor plans annotated as such, however, the same floor plans clearly illustrate a bedroom and ensuite layout. Ceiling height has been given as 1.9 metres which is below the minimum building regulations of 2.4metres for a habitable room. It is noted that a grant of planning permission does not relieve the developer of the requirements that exist under other codes, including building regulations. Section 5.0 Attic Conversions/

Dormer Windows states that the use of an attic space for human habitation must be compliant with all the relevant design standards, as well as building and fire regulations. I am satisfied that, should the commission be minded to approve, a condition is attached dictating that the attic shall not be used for human habitation unless it has received the appropriate building and fire regulations.

#### **8.6. Bicycle shed and widening of access.**

8.6.1. The PA had no issues with the principle of the bicycle shed at its current location given its scale and materials, subject to a condition requiring the doors not to open onto the public footpath. I would agree with their assessment that the principle of the bike shed with green roof, tucked tightly along the western boundary is acceptable as it is minor and has no impact on the character of the area.

8.6.2. The Third Party has not raised concerns regarding the bicycle shed but taken umbrage at the lack of address to the issues raised by the Transport Planning Division (TPD) regarding the parking and vehicular access being substandard. No drawings have been submitted with the application to indicate original and current access and parking arrangements, and such matters are not included within the description of the application. The matter therefore does not fall within the parameters of the application hence lies outside the remit of this planning appeal. I can only assess the proposal as described and detailed. My consideration on this issue refers solely to the acceptability of the bike shed in its current position. I note TPD have acknowledged a substandard parking bay in situ since 2009 but widened in 2021 to facilitate the bike shed. Width of the access is given as 3.450, while Annex 5 standards state an access should not be greater than 3m. As the positioning of the bike shed at the entrance does not result in diminished width of access, I consider the position of the bike shed acceptable. The matter regarding the increase in width of the access is an enforcement matter for the Council to consider.

#### **8.7. New issues-22 Zoning - Residential Conservation Area.**

8.7.1. **Roof lights.** Section 5.0 Attic Conversions/ Dormer Windows states that the use of roof lights to serve attic bedrooms will be considered on a case-by-case basis. The site is located opposite an Architectural Conservation Area. BHA07 states 'development within or affecting an ACA must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and

appearance of the area'. The site is also within a Z2 Conservation Zoning, the objective of which seeks 'To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas'

8.7.2. BHA09 also dictates that new development should contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness of the RCA. The appeal dwelling is the middle of an RCA terrace of only 4 properties, therefore works to any of the properties has the potential to negatively impact the RCA. Despite the zonings, the PA has not assessed the elements of the development to the front of the property (rooflights and solar panels), either individually or combined against Chapter 11 of the Dublin City Development Plan - Built Heritage and Archaeology. They raised no issue with the development to the front plane of the roof, despite the size and number of rooflights on a RCA dwelling, particularly one in proximity to an Architectural Conservative Area (Collins Barracks). The three rooflights are located close to the ridge, in a prominent position stretching across over 4m of the 6.2m roof. Window size is not consistent with a smaller window located over the proposed stairwell. The openings do not relate to the pattern of fenestration on the ground and first floor front elevation. There are no rooflights on any of the other dwellings in the row, and, in the immediate area I observed only one property with rooflights - No. 2 Arbour Terrace albeit that this property is not located within a Z2 RCA. The two small front facing rooflights on 2 Arbour Terrace are modest in size, subordinate to the overall roof and add character while the proposed large, varying sized rooflights are dominant and incongruous on the roof plane, detracting from the character of the house and the RCA terrace, particularly when considered in combination to the solar panels proposed on the lower plane of the roof. As a result of the combined rooflights and solar panels, a significant element of the roof is lost or obscured, which I consider will have a detrimental impact on the both the dwelling house and the wider conservation terrace There is a balance to be made in relation to upgrading a residential dwelling to improve residential amenity and protecting the character and visual amenity of conservation properties and areas. I consider 3 rooflights to provide light into a non-habitable room which is already serviced by a dormer to be excessive, but permitting one single rooflight (the smallest of the three) positioned over the stairwell will meet the needs of upgrading the property, while still protecting the character of the dwelling and surrounding area.

## 9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposal for the attic conversion, dormer, solar panels, velux type windows and the retention of a bike store at an existing dwelling in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and development Act 2000 as amended.

- The subject site is not located within or adjoining any European designated site.
- The proposed works are modest in scale and are domestic in purpose.
- No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the domestic nature and modest scale of the project, its location and the screening report of the LPA, I can 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.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177 V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

The subject site is located approximately 206m north from the River Liffey.

The proposed development is the construction of a rear dormer to facilitate attic conversion with the installation of solar PV panels and velux type rooflights to front. The application also seeks retention of a green roofed bicycle shed (2.3sqm - 2.8x.850x1.4) located within the front garden/parking area along with all associated site works.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning application or appeal.

I have assessed the proposal 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 bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows

- the modest nature, limited scale and domestic use of the development sought.
- the distance from the nearest water body
- the nil concern from the LPA

I conclude that 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 the granting of permission with conditions for the proposed development and retention of the bike shed.

## 12.0 Reasons and considerations

12.1.1. Having regard to the Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) (to protect and/ or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas) and the policies and objectives as set out in the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2022 2028 and the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the proposed retention of the bicycle shed with green roof would not significantly detract from the residential or visual amenities of the area and would be acceptable on planning grounds. The proposed attic conversion, with conditions to reduce the size, materials and fenestration on the dormer and reduce the number of front rooflights will result in a form of development which respects the surrounding area and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area subject to the condition below.

## 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
----	--

	<p>otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed development shall be amended as follows. The proposed rear dormer shall be reduced in height by at least 0.2metres, separated by a minimum of 0.5 metres from the southern chimney stack, square off dormer by removing protruding wings and removal of two rooflights on front roof plane. Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.</p>
3.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dormer and window size and position in dormer shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>Retention of the bicycle shed development shall be amended as follows:</p> <p>(a)Doors of the Bicycle Shed onto the public footpath shall be permanently sealed.</p> <p>Revised drawings showing compliance with this requirement shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority within 3 months from the date of this permission.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of road safety.</p>

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'U. Smyth', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is cursive and includes a small loop at the end.

U Smyth

22<sup>nd</sup> April 2026

## Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500755-DN-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	The proposed development is the construction of a rear dormer to facilitate attic conversion with the installation of solar PV panels and velux type windows to front. The application also seeks retention of a green roofed bicycle shed (2.3sqm - 2.8x.850x1.4) located within the front garden/parking area along with all associated site works.
<b>Development Address</b>	2 Temple Villas, Arbour Hill, Dublin 7, D07 N2F4.
<b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX/ OR LEAVE BLANK</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,</li> <li>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)</li> </ul>	
<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>	
<b>D</b> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<b>I Z </b> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	

<p><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></p>	
<p><input 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.</p> <p><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	<p>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</p>
<p><b>D</b> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b></p>	
<p><b>D</b> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	
<p><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></p>	
<p><b>Yes D</b></p>	<p><b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b></p>
<p><b>No <input type="checkbox"/></b></p>	<p><b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b></p>

**Inspector: Una Smyth**

**Date: 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2026**