



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501587-DF-26

Development

Re-modelling of the existing roof to change the hipped design to a gabled design, including a dormer window at the front and rear of the roof and a rooflight at the rear of the roof and the insertion of two new windows at the gable side of the house, replacing one existing window and all associated site works

Location

32 Riverwood Green, Dublin 15, D15
K0V1

Planning Authority

Fingal County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

FW26A/0158E

Applicant(s)

Graham Fennell & Rebecca Fennell Connolly.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant with conditions

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Graham Fennell & Rebecca Fennell Connolly.

Observer(s)

N/A.

Date of Site Inspection

1st September 2026.

Inspector

R Taylor

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0	Planning History	5
5.0	Policy Context	5
6.0	EIA Screening	7
7.0	The Appeal	8
8.0	Assessment	9
9.0	AA Screening	17
10.0	Water Framework Directive	18
11.0	Recommendation	19
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	19
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 32 Riverwood Green, Dublin 15. This comprises a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling finished in brick at ground floor and smooth render at first floor, with a hipped and pitched roof with concrete roof tiles. There is a driveway and garden area to the front. There is a single storey extension to the rear with garden area beyond. The gable of the dwelling of the appeal site is adjacent to the public road with the boundary comprising a wall approximately 2m in height. The site is orientated broadly east (front) to west (rear). The site and neighbouring properties have broadly level topography.
- 1.2. The site and immediately adjacent dwelling are located within a housing development of similar design and layout. Riverwood Green is a cul-de-sac and is broadly “T” shaped. To the rear/west there is a further residential street of 2 storey semi-detached dwellings of similar design to the appeal site, known as Riverwood Gardens, with the remainder of the estate beyond including a large area of communal amenity space.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Re-modelling of the existing roof to change the hipped design to a gabled design, including a dormer window at the front and rear of the roof and a rooflight at the rear of the roof and the insertion of two new windows at the gable side of the house, replacing one existing window and all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.2. The Planning Authority notification of granted permission is dated 05 June 2026 and includes 10 conditions.
- 3.2.1. Conditions attached to the decision are broadly of a standard nature, except for Conditions 2 and 3 which are subject of this appeal and are as follows:

2. The dormer proposed to the front shall be omitted.

REASON: in the interest of clarity and visual amenity.

3. The dormer proposed to the rear shall accord with the following:

- (a) Be set down 300mm from the ridgeline of the dwelling.
- (b) The external width of the dormer shall not exceed 3m.
- (c) The proposed window to the dormer shall be no more than 1.1m in height and 1.5m in width to match existing fenestration and be centrally positioned on the dormer structure.
- (d) The dormer to the rear shall be centrally located on the roof scape.

REASON: in the interest of clarity and residential and visual amenity.

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Reports

3.3.2. In recommending a grant of permission, a single planning report notes the following:

- No pre-planning consultation undertaken.
- Consultation with Departmental water services, conditions recommended.
- No third-party submissions received.
- No significant effects on protected European sites.

3.3.3. No site planning history. Planning history for similar proposals in the area including a condition restricting dimensions similar to condition 3 are referenced.

3.3.4. The proposed finishes, design of the revision from hipped to pitched, and associated impact on character and amenity are acceptable. Neighbouring amenity will not be adversely affected. Separation distances are acceptable.

3.3.5. The proposed front dormer window would adversely impact on amenity and be prominent/incongruous at this location. Front dormers are not a feature of the area. Roof forms are uniform, balanced and proportionate. The dormer would be contrary to the zoning objective. Recommended this part of the proposal is removed by condition.

3.3.6. A rear dormer window is acceptable in principle. The proposed rear dormer dimensions are unacceptable resulting in a dominant and disproportionate feature within the roofscape. The window opening sizes are excessive and uncharacteristic, resulting in overlooking. The dormer is unacceptable and adversely impacts on

amenity and therefore contrary to 14.10.2.5. If permitted the dormer would result in an undesirable precedent but acceptable if dimensions are reduced/amended by condition.

3.3.7. Other Technical Reports

- Water Services: no objection subject to conditions.

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

None.

3.5. **Third Party Observations**

None.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. No relevant site history.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Development Plan**

5.1.1 The Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 was made on 22nd February 2023 and came into effect on 5th April 2023. 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:

5.1.2 Zoning Objective: RS – Residential: Objective: Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity. Objective Vision: Ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity.

5.1.3 Chapter 3: Sustainable Placemaking and Quality Homes.

5.1.4 3.5.13.1 Residential Extensions: The need for people to extend and renovate their dwellings is recognised and acknowledged. Extensions will be considered favourably where they do not have a negative impact on adjoining properties or on the nature of the surrounding area.

5.1.5 Policy SPQHP41 – Residential Extensions: Support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

5.1.6 Objective SPQHO45 – Domestic Extensions: Encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area.

5.1.7 Chapter 14 Development Standards:

5.1.8 14.10.2 Residential Extensions:

The need for housing to be adaptable to changing family circumstances is recognised and acknowledged and the Council will support applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend as the needs of the household change, subject to specific safeguards. In particular, the design and layout of residential extensions must have regard to and protect the amenities of adjoining properties, particularly in relation to sunlight, daylight and privacy. The design of extensions must also have regard to the character and form of the existing building, its architectural expression, remaining usable rear private open space, external finishes and pattern of fenestration. Additionally, careful consideration should be paid to boundary treatments, tree planting and landscaping.

5.1.9 14.10.2.5 Roof Alterations including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions: Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles, for example, changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/'A' frame end or 'half-hip', will be assessed against a number of criteria including:

- Consideration and 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.

Dormer extensions to roofs will be evaluated against the impact of the structure on the form, and character of the existing dwelling house and the privacy of adjacent properties. The design, dimensions, and bulk of the dormer relative to the overall extent of roof as well as the size of the dwelling and rear garden will be the overriding

considerations, together with the visual impact of the structure when viewed from adjoining streets and public areas.

Dormer extensions shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries and shall be set down from the existing ridge level so as not to dominate the roof space.

The quality of materials/finishes to dormer extensions shall be given careful consideration and should match those of the existing roof.

The level and type of glazing within a dormer extension should have regard to existing window treatments and fenestration of the dwelling. Regard should also be had to extent of fenestration proposed at attic level relative to adjoining residential units and to ensure the preservation of amenities.

Excessive overlooking of adjacent properties should be avoided.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

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

Special Area of Conservation:

Rye Water Valley/Carton Sitecode 001398 c.6km SW

Special Protection Area:

South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Sitecode 004024, c. 10km SE

Proposed Natural Heritage Areas:

Royal Canal Sitecode 002103 c.0.39km N

Liffey Valley Sitecode 000128 c.1.48km S

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

- The applicant is the appellant, and the grounds of appeal are submitted by Raymond McGinley Architects on their behalf. The appeal relates to conditions 2 and 3 of the decision.
- The requirement of the condition limits the use of the space and would make the proposal unviable. Setting down the proposed dormers by 300mm is unworkable due to the existing restricted attic headroom of 2m.
- Appeal against condition 2 (removal of front dormer):
 - Precedent is cited as supporting the front dormer at:
 - 33 Sycamore View (FW24A/0493). Overturned on appeal. Ref: ABP-321-816-25 (front photograph included);
 - 32 Sycamore Avenue (FW23B/044) (front photograph included);
 - 33 Sycamore Avenue (FW22A/0302) (not built).
 - The proposed front dormer is in scale with the dwelling and designed to avoid dominance. Dark colour will assist blending with roofscape.
 - There is no housing facing the appellants house and therefore no overlooking.
 - The appellant has a young growing family and requires additional space to serve their needs.
- Appeal against condition 3 (revised dimensions):
- Condition 3a: set down 300mm from ridge:
 - This is problematic and renders the proposal unworkable resulting in headroom of approximately 1.7m. The dormer can be set below the ridgeline but should sit at base of the ridge tile which would not reduce attic space.
 - 300mm set down is not a requirement of paragraph 14.10.25 of the plan.

- 2 examples are cited at 105 Burnell Park Lawn (FW12B/0015) and 27 Bramley Crescent (FW12B/0075). Both were granted by the Council with widths of c.4.2m and set down from ridge and set down from ridge of less than 300mm and 150mm respectively.
- The proposed width of 3.89m is proportionate to the existing design.
- Condition 3 (c) proposed window not more than 1.1m in height and 1.5m in width...
- The design width is 3.89m with 2.1m glazing width. The design is proportionate and provides more natural light. The reduction would limit natural light.
- Condition 3 (d) rear dormer centrally located:
- The proposal is centrally located, and the appellant has no issue with this requirement.
- No observations were received and no objections from any Council Departments.
- Appendix 1: list of 6 sites/similar proposals. 3 included similar conditions overturned on appeal.
- Appendix 2: photographs of site and locality including internal photograph of the attic.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- The Council remains of the opinion as set out in the planning report and have no further comments. (dated 13th July 2026).

7.3. Observations

- None received

7.4. Further Responses

- None received.

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. This is a first-party Section 139 (Planning and Development Act, 2000 [as amended]) appeal against conditions. The conditions under appeal are Conditions 2 and 3 attached to the Planning Authority's (PA) decision to grant permission. The wording of these conditions is set out above at Section 3.1 of this Report.

- 8.2. Having regard to the nature of the Conditions the subject of the Appeal, it is considered that the determination by the Commission of the application, as if it had been made to it in the first instance, would not be warranted. Therefore, in my opinion, the Commission may determine the matters raised in the appeal only, in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), and I intend to limit my consideration to the matters raised in relation to the terms of those conditions.
- 8.3. Having examined the application details, and all other documentation on file including the submission received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be assessed are as follows:
- Condition 2: Removal of Front Dormer and Design Considerations
 - Condition 3: Design revisions to the rear dormer window.; and
 - Planning history in the area and Precedent.

Condition 2: Removal of Front Dormer and Design Considerations

- 8.4. The grounds of appeal include removal of condition 2 which requires the omission of the front dormer window. The Planning Authority (PA) report concludes this element is contrary to policy including the RS zoning impacting on visual amenity and character. The appellant contends that the proposal is appropriate.
- 8.5. As referenced in Section 5.1 of this Report, the key policy consideration in the assessment of dormer window proposals is set out in Section 14.10.2.5, 'Roof Alterations Including Attic Conversions and Dormer Extensions' in Chapter 14: 'Development Management Standards' of the Development Plan. This policy provides that dormer windows will be evaluated against the impact on the form and character of the existing dwelling, the privacy of adjacent properties, and the visual impact of the structure when viewed from adjoining streets and public areas.
- 8.6. 14.10.2.5 must also be read in context with the overall policy for extensions at paragraph 14.10.2, the third sentence of which states:

The design of extensions must also have regard to the character and form of the existing building, its architectural expression, remaining usable rear private open space, external finishes and pattern of fenestration.

- 8.7. The policy context set out above is permissive for roof alterations but does not stipulate dimensions or detailed requirements such as further design guidance for both front and rear facing dormer alterations and I have not been directed to any such requirements by either party. Accordingly, I conclude that a front dormer window is supported in principle subject to design considerations and impact on character as discussed in section 14.10.2.5.
- 8.8. The appeal site is within a larger housing development mostly of similar house types, design, and layout. Riverwood Green comprises 3 streets accessed off the main estate access road in a broadly “T” shaped alignment with the northern and southern sections comprising a shared surfaced cu-de-sac open plan arrangement. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling located on a corner site within Riverwood Green. Public views of the front elevation and roof plane are not possible from the main estate road and limited to a short stretch of Riverwood Green along the frontage of the site, becoming more restricted from within/from the north, south and east of the northern and southern sections of Riverwood Green relative to the site. From my visit I noted that there are no front roof dormers present within Riverwood Green, or on dwellings fronting the estate access roads, Riverwood View and Gardens, on approach to the site.
- 8.9. I note that the PA have no objections, subject to design revisions by condition 3, of the rear dormer that is also proposed. At this location a rear dormer would be subject to medium and restricted long distances views on approach from the main estate road, Riverwood View. In my opinion, the rear dormer would be more publicly visible than the proposed front dormer.
- 8.10. I also noted existing rear dormers similar to the proposal in close proximity to the site. 6 Riverwood Green, to north of the site, is visible from Riverwood Green and Riverwood View on approach from the west due to the set back and layout of adjacent dwellings to the west. This is not referenced in the planning report.
- 8.11. 4 Riverwood Gardens, to the southwest of the appeal site, also has a rear roof dormer of similar design. This is noted in the planning history section of the report. The rear

elevation is clearly visible above first floor from within the southern access road section of Riverwood Green as this site abuts the terminus of the cul-de-sac.

- 8.12. On this basis, these considerations also support the principle of a front dormer at the site subject to detail design considerations.
- 8.13. The site comprises a 2-storey semi-dwelling, with a hipped and pitched roof form. The roof pitch is reasonably shallow. The proposed front dormer is a typical “box” design set within the front and rear roof elevations. Based on the submitted proposed roof plan, the roof of the dwelling has a stated width of 6.665m with proposed area of c. 8.33 sqm. The width of the dormer is stated as 3.875m with proposed area of c. 3.94 sqm. The length of the proposed dormer equates to 58% of the length of the revised roof design and 47.3% of the revised roof area. Measured dimensions indicate the front dormer is c. 1.8m in height. The highest part of the dormer measures approximately 0.1m below the ridge of the dwelling with a flat/monopitch roof falling towards the front elevation.
- 8.14. The third paragraph of 14.10.2.5 broadly stipulates spatial/design requirements for dormer windows:
- Dormer extensions shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries and shall be set down from the existing ridge level so as not to dominate the roof space.*
- 8.15. Based on the area and length calculations set out at above and site visit assessment, I conclude that the design of the front dormer structure would be sufficiently subordinate to the dwelling roof and rear elevation. The design as proposed would not be dominant on the architectural composition of the elevations and dwelling or character of the area. The set down of 0.1m from the ridge is sufficient, taking account of the design details and public views of the other 2 existing dormers in close proximity to the site at Riverwood Green and Gardens discussed above.
- 8.16. In terms of glazing, the policy requires that the level and type of glazing ‘should have regard’ to existing window treatments and fenestration. The proposed front dormer window opening/glazed area has dimensions of approximately 2m in width and 1.02m in height based on the rear elevation. These windows would exceed the width

dimensions of all windows, with the large window on the front elevation at first floor measuring c.1.85m.

- 8.17. I consider that the width of the glazing as proposed would have an unbalancing impact on the composition of the front fenestration and would not follow the architectural design approach/convention of reduced openings at each floor level. I therefore consider that the width of the glazing is inappropriate. However, a reduction to 1.7m would sufficiently address these issues. I note the appellant comments in relation to loss of internal daylighting, however I do not consider that this reduction would be significant and an appropriate design response outweighs these concerns to safeguard character which is in the public interest. A reduction in glazing could be secured by planning condition.
- 8.18. Having regard to the existing first floor windows and separation distances to adjacent properties, and that the front of the appeal site is oriented toward the gable of 19 Riverwood Green opposite, I am satisfied that the proposed will not result in excessive overlooking or loss of privacy.
- 8.19. The proposal would also not result in unacceptable overshadowing of adjacent properties given the nature, design, and location of the proposal within the roofscape and taking account of the aspect of the site.
- 8.20. I conclude that the front dormer is acceptable, subject to further design revisions by condition, and would not adversely impact on amenity. Therefore condition 2 attached to the decision is not necessary.

Condition 3: Design revisions to the rear dormer window.

- 8.21. The PA consider that the rear dormer window is acceptable subject to design revisions set out in condition 3 attached to the decision. The condition includes four stipulations: (a) set down of 300mm from the ridge, (b) reduction in width to 3m, (c) revision of the window opening to 1.1m in height and 1.5m in width, and (d) dormer to be centrally located on the roofscape. In summary, the appellant considers requirements (a), (b), and (c) are unnecessary and that the proposal meets policy as presented.
- 8.22. Rear dormer windows and associated roof alterations are subject to the same policy considerations discussed in paragraph 14.10.2.5 of the plan and as discussed above

in relation to the front dormer window. This paragraph requires a set back from gables and boundaries and a set down from the ridge to achieve an appropriate solution in relation to “the form, and character of the existing dwelling house” as discussed in the second paragraph of 14.10.2.5 and at 14.10.2.

- 8.23. The dimensions and design of the proposed rear dormer on the supporting plans broadly repeat those of the front dormer and discussed above. The roof of the rear elevation has a stated width of 6.665m and roof plane area of c. 8.33sqm. The width of the dormer is stated as 3.875m with internal room stated area of 7.82 sqm. The length of the proposed dormer equates to 58% of the length of the revised roof design. The external area of the dormer equates to c. 3.94sqm, or c.47.3% of the rear roof plane area. Measured dimensions indicate the dormer is c. 1.8m in height. The highest part of the dormer measures approximately 0.1m below the ridge of the dwelling with a flat/monopitch roof falling towards the front and rear elevations. As stated above, public views of the proposed rear dormer would be possible on approach to the site from the west from Riverwood View and Riverwood Green.
- 8.24. Based on the area and length calculations set out at above and site visit assessment, I conclude that the design of the rear dormer would be sufficiently subordinate to the dwelling roof and rear elevation. The design as proposed would not be dominant on the architectural composition of the elevations and dwelling or character of the area. The set down of 0.1m from the ridge is sufficient, taking account of the design details of the other 2 existing dormers in close proximity to the site at Riverwood Green and Gardens. I therefore recommend that parts (a) and (b) of condition 3 are amended to reflect the design as proposed for clarity.
- 8.25. In terms of glazing, the policy requires that the level and type of glazing ‘should have regard’ to existing window treatments and fenestration. The existing windows in the rear elevation are typical of windows found in suburban dwellings and are largely of vertical-emphasis design. Condition 3 (c) requires a reduction in the extent of glazing to 1.5m in width with height of no more than 1.1m.
- 8.26. The proposed dormer window opening has dimensions of approximately 2.1m in width and 1.02m in height based on the rear elevation. This window would exceed the width dimensions of all rear windows. Rear elevation windows are generally c. 1.53m in width, save for ground floor patio doors which are c. 1.75m in width.

- 8.27. I consider that the width of the glazing as proposed would have an unbalancing impact on the composition of the rear fenestrations and would not follow the architectural approach of reduced openings at each floor level. I therefore agree with the PA that the width of the glazing is inappropriate, however a reduction to 1.7m would sufficiently address these issues. I therefore recommend that condition 3 (c) is amended to this effect. The proposal does not contravene the required height of 1.1m of the condition and therefore this requirement is acceptable. There is no comment from the appellant on this requirement.
- 8.28. There is a dwelling to the rear of the site, 1 Riverwood Garden with a separation distance of c. 17m at the closest point, with a slight offset in the layout alignment relative to the rear elevation of the dwelling at the appeal site. I consider the proposed relationship to be acceptable within this urban context and that the rear dormer would not result in an unacceptable amenity impact in terms of overshadowing or loss of privacy on properties to the rear or adjacent.
- 8.29. The proposed conversion from hipped to pitch roof form is acceptable and will not adversely impact on character or amenity. The additional height is located adjacent to the public road which provides adequate separation to the nearest dwelling to the north, 5 Riverwood Green. There are also several examples of this roof form in close proximity to the site and area/estate to the west.
- 8.30. I therefore conclude that the proposed roof alterations and dormer windows are compliant with policy requirements and recommend that condition 3 parts (a), (b) and (c) are amended to reflect the dimensions as discussed above for the reasoning stated.
- 8.31. Part (d) of condition requires the rear dormer to be centrally located. The appellant does not object to this requirement and is not included within the grounds of appeal. I consider that both the front and rear proposed dormers are appropriately located and do not unbalance or detract from the respective roofscapes.

Planning History in the Area and Precedent.

- 8.32. The appellant refers to other 3 other examples in the area which are considered as precedent in supporting the proposed front dormer window. These are located at

Sycamore View and Avenue (c. 1.3km due NE). The PA have not commented on these cases.

- 8.33. 33 Sycamore View ref FW24A/0493 was granted by the PA subject to conditions which were overturned at appeal. A photograph of the front dormer is included within the evidence however supporting plans and reports are not provided.
- 8.34. I agree with the appellant that this is a material consideration insofar as it confirms that front dormer windows are acceptable in principle in the area and was approved within the same policy context as the appeal proposal. This approval is also in a location subject to more extensive public views than the appeal site. The photograph indicates similar design details to the appeal site. However, the extent of glazing appears smaller than the appeal proposal. Notwithstanding this, I do not consider that determining weight can be applied given the location of the site relative to the appeal site and full details have not been provided.
- 8.35. A front dormer is also cited at 32 Sycamore Avenue, approved by the PA under reference FW23B/0044 with a photograph provided as supporting evidence. Full details are not provided. The approval differs from the proposal in terms of dimensions and indicates a similar set down distance from the ridge, closer proximity to the front elevation eaves, and smaller extent of glazing relative to front elevation windows, save for 1 opening at first floor. Again, this confirms front dormers are acceptable in principle. I also do not consider that determining weight can be applied for the same reasons as discussed above.
- 8.36. The third example refers to 33 Sycamore Avenue approved by the PA under reference FW22B/0302. The appellant indicates this is not built. I do not consider any weight can be afforded to this decision as no details have been provided. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that this case was determined under the same policy context as the appeal proposal. The reference number suggests that this was considered in 2022 and would therefore pre-date the current plan which came into effect on 5th April 2023.
- 8.37. In regard to the rear dormer, two examples are cited as supporting the proposal located at 105 Burnell Park Lawn (FW12B/0015) and 27 Bramley Crescent (FW12B/0076). Whilst dimensions are cited, supporting details are not provided. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that these cases were determined under the

same policy context as the appeal proposal. The reference numbers suggest that they were considered in 2012 and pre-date the current plan which came into effect on 5th April 2023.

- 8.38. I do not consider that the proposed dormer windows would set an unacceptable precedent following the above assessment and particular circumstances of the site. Any further proposal within the wider area would require assessment on their merit against the same policy considerations and associated design and visual impacts.

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 within an urban area of Fingal and c. 6km and c.10km to the nearest European Sites.
- 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 alterations to an existing dwelling within a large suburban residential estate;
 - 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 within an urban area of Fingal. There are no water bodies adjacent or in close proximity to the appeal site. The nearest water body to the site is the Royal Canal, approximately 0.39km to the north.
- 10.2. The proposed development comprises alterations and works to the roof 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 alterations to an existing dwelling within a large suburban residential estate;
 - The location of the site and distance from nearest Water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.
- 10.6. Conclusion
- 10.7. 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 the Council is directed under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to

- (a) REMOVE condition number 2 and the reason therefor;
- (b) AMEND condition number 3 and the reason therefor.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, residential land use zoning for the site, to the pattern of development in the area, the planning history of the area, and the scale, massing and design of the site, it is considered that the proposed dormer extensions, by reason of its scale and design, would not impact amenity or detract from the character of the dwelling or the area. The Planning Authority's Condition 2 requiring the removal of the front dormer window is not warranted in this case.

Having regard to the development plan objectives of supporting domestic extensions, and that the proposal would not be detrimental to amenity, subject to the amendment of the Planning Authority's Condition 3 (a), (b) and (c), the development would accord with the provisions of the development plan and therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

- 3. The developer shall amend the design of the proposed development to accord with the following:
 - (a) The maximum width of the front and rear dormer structures shall be 3.875m externally;
 - (b) The front and rear dormers shall be set down a minimum 0.1m from the existing ridge of the principal dwelling.

(c) The proposed window to each dormer structure shall be no more than 1.1m in height and 1.7m in width to match existing fenestration.

(d) The front and rear dormers and be centrally positioned on the roof structure.

REASON: In the interest of clarity, residential and visual amenity and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

11 September 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501587-DF-26
Proposed Development Summary	Re-modelling of the existing roof to change the hipped design to a gabled design, including a dormer window at the front and rear of the roof and a rooflight at the rear of the roof and the insertion of two new windows at the gable side of the house, replacing one existing window and all associated site works
Development Address	32 Riverwood Green, Dublin 15, D15 K0V1
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? (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)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. ☐ No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, 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 <u>Part 2</u>, 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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: R Taylor Date: 11/09/2026