



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501310-DS-26

Development	Dormer window and associated works
Location	322 Clonard Road, Dublin 12
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1551/26
Applicant	Aine Hennessy
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission subject to conditions
Type of Appeal	First Party v. condition
Appellant	Aine Hennessy
Observer	Philip O'Reilly
Date of Site Inspection	17 July 2026
Inspector	B. Wyse

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. No. 322 Clonard Road is a two bedroom mid-terrace house in the established inner suburb of Dublin 12. The property is on the south west side of the road. In common with the properties in the general vicinity it is modest in scale with front and back gardens, the latter being particularly long. The house appears to be more or less in its original condition in terms of general layout. The adjoining houses have been extended at ground level to the rear and the house to the north west, No.320, also includes a dormer extension to the rear. A number of other houses in the general vicinity also have similar dormer extensions.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is stated to comprise the construction of a dormer window in the main roof to the rear of the house and the provision of a rooflight to the main roof to the front of the house.
- 2.2. The application cover letter indicates that the works are required to facilitate work-from-home space independent of the bedrooms. The drawings indicate an attic room accessed by a staircase from the landing and via space taken from the rear bedroom. The proposal includes a separate WC/shower room, lit by the proposed rooflight. Maximum ceiling height is indicated as 1714mm. The dormer would rise to ridge height and extend 3550mm across the roof plane. Proposed external finish is to be selected cladding.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The decision to grant permission is subject to nine conditions, eight of which are standard.

Condition 2, the condition under appeal, reads as follows:

2. The development hereby permitted shall incorporate the following amendments:

(a) The height of the dormer shall be reduced to at least 0.2 metres below the ridge line of the roof. Revised drawings showing this shall be submitted to the

Planning Authority and written agreement obtained prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

Basis for decision. Includes:

- *The proposed dormerrepresents another example of dormer development on Clonard Road, generally matching the existing built form of existing dormers to the rear of No. 320, 310 and 306 Clonard Road.*
- *The dormer is not shown to be below the ridgeline of the dwelling and does not successfully integrate into the subject roof profile (roof ridge). The applicant should make a minor amendment to the dormer and site it at least 0.3 metres below the ridgeline to ensure the dormer successfully integrates into the roof profile. This will be addressed as a conditional requirement in the event of a grant. [Note: the recommended Condition 2 is as in the Managers Order and refers to reducing the height of the dormer by 0.2 metres below the roof ridgeline].*
- No requirement for appropriate assessment or environmental impact assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division – recommends standard conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann – no response received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

PA Ref. 3865/16

This is a 2016 permission for a part single storey/part two storey rear extension at the subject property. It has not been carried out.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

Zoning: Z1 (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods) – to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.

Appendix 18 Ancillary Residential Accommodation

Section 4.0 Alterations at Roof Level/Attics/Dormers/Additional Floors

The roofline of a building is one of its most dominant features and it is important that any proposal to change the shape, pitch or cladding of a roof is carefully considered. Alterations at roof level can include the conversion of an attic space and inclusion of dormer windows or the provision of an additional storey modifying the roof profile entirely.

The following criteria will be considered in assessing alterations at roof level:

- *Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.*
- *Existing roof variations on the streetscape.*
- *Distance/ contrast/ visibility of proposed roof end.*
- *Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence.*

Section 5.0 Attic Conversions/Dormer Windows

Includes:

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.

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

Guidelines for attic conversions and the provision of dormer windows include:

- *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.*
- *Do not obscure the main ridge and eaves feature 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.*

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

None relevant.

6.0 **Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)**

- 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. See Form 1 in Appendix below.

7.0 **The Appeal**

7.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The appeal is made to request that Condition 2 of the planning authority decision is removed in its entirety or, in the alternative, that it is amended to allow the dormer to be constructed flush with the ridgeline and consistent with the dormer at the adjoining property (No.320). The main grounds can be summarised as follows:

- The dormer at the adjoining property was granted retention permission in 2000 under PA Ref. 2197/00.
- A 200mm differential would create a visual misalignment on what is otherwise a continuous and uniform terraced roof. The planning authority Planners report

acknowledges that the proposed dormer would also generally match the built form of other dormers on Clonard Road.

- The planning authority Planners report recommends a 300mm lowering while the decision refers to 200mm. This suggests that the figure is not derived from any objective measure of visual amenity specific to the terrace.
- The 200mm reduction would result in clear headroom of the order of 1.5 to 1.6m. This is below the average adult standing height and would make the conversion unviable.
- The proposal would be consistent with Section 4.0, Appendix 18 of the development plan.
- The proposed dormer would not be visible from Clonard Road or any other public vantage point.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

7.3. Observation

This is lodged by Phillip O'Reilly, Gandon Close, Harold's Cross. The main points raised include:

- Dormer elements should be subordinate to the roof profile which is not the case here.
- The proposal is not in accordance with the objectives of the development plan.
- Older examples should not be taken as constituting precedents.
- That the proposed dormer would not be visible from the public road is not relevant.
- At a minimum the Commission should uphold the planning authority condition.

8.0 **Assessment**

- 8.1. This is an appeal against Condition 2 only of the planning authority decision. I am satisfied, having regard to the nature of the condition, that determination of the application as if it had been made to the Commission in the first instance is not warranted. The appeal, therefore, can be dealt with under the terms of Section 139 of the Act.
- 8.2. I agree with the applicant that the required lowering of the proposed dormer by at least 200mm would render the dormer extension unviable as it would result in a very low internal ceiling height. In this context the assertion in the planning authority Planner's report that the amendment would be minor is not correct – it would fundamentally deny the purpose of the development that is to provide for home-working, essentially a home office and which obviously requires a reasonable degree of comfort, not least the facility for an average adult to access and circulate within the space while in a relatively normal posture.
- 8.3. Noting that the development plan requirements as set out at Section 5.0 of Appendix 18 in relation to attic conversions and dormer windows are in the nature of guidelines (see Section 5.1 above) I am satisfied that the proposed development can be considered to be reasonably compliant.
- 8.4. The proposal does avoid extending above the ridgeline – and which in itself calls into question the reasoning behind the planning authority condition. The other areas of contention relate to the advice that the dormer should be subordinate to the roof slope and not be over dominant. While it could be argued that the proposal fails these tests they are not absolute requirements. And the advice must be balanced against the benefits to the occupier and to the property itself. The proposal, in my view, represents a very reasonable attempt to maximise the living accommodation within the house. Given the small size of the house the attic space is, by definition, limited and, therefore, necessitates the dormer extending to the ridgeline in order to achieve adequate ceiling height. It also needs to extend a considerable distance across the roof in order to achieve a reasonably workable floor area. All of this is achieved, in my view, without giving rise to any significant visual amenity issues or other residential amenity concerns. While of course every proposal must be assessed on its own

merits, it is also the case in this instance that there are several very obvious similar dormer extensions in the general vicinity.

8.5. It follows that I do not agree with the points of objection raised by the observer.

8.6. I conclude that the appeal should be upheld and that the planning authority should be directed to remove the condition.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

9.1. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project within an established and serviced urban area, and taking account of the screening determination of the planning authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

9.2. 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. Appropriate Assessment, therefore, is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. 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.

10.2. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project in a serviced urban area, 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.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that the Commission should direct the planning authority to remove Condition 2.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the guidance contained in Appendix 18, Section 5.0 of the current city development plan in relation to attic conversions and dormer windows, the form and design of the proposed dormer extension and the absence of any significant negative effects on properties in the vicinity or on the amenities of the area, it is considered that the imposition of the said Condition 2 is not warranted and that it is excessive, in that it would render the proposed development unviable.

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.

B. Wyse
Planning Inspector

7 August 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501310-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	Domestic dormer window
Development Address	322 Clonard Road, Dublin 12
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?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2
	☐ 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)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
☒ 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?	
☒ 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.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☐ 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 ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ B. Wyse Date: _____ 7 August 2026