



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report 306174-19

Development	Demolish and replace existing ground floor extension to the rear and ancillary works
Location	27 Glencorp Road, Whitehall, Dublin 9
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	4204/19
Applicant(s)	Brendan & Mary White
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission subject to conditions
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Brendan & Mary White
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	16 th March 2020
Inspector	Louise Treacy

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site has a stated area of 323 m² and is located at No. 27 Glencorp Road, Whitehall, Dublin 9. The existing property is a two-storey, mid-terrace dwelling of 79 m² with a rear garden of c. 45 m in length.
- 1.2. The dwelling accommodates a living room, kitchen/dining area and sunroom at the ground floor level, with 2 no. bedrooms and a bathroom at first-floor level.
- 1.3. The adjoining properties to the north-east and north west, Nos. 26 and 28 Glencorp Road respectively, have not been extended to the rear. A detached single-storey shed structure is located in the rear garden of No. 26 Glencorp Road adjacent to the rear boundary wall.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development consists of the demolition of the existing ground floor extension to the rear of the house and its replacement with a new ground floor extension of 46 m² and all ancillary works.
- 2.2. The proposed extension has a width of 5.2 m across the entire site and extends to 14.4 m in length. The extension will accommodate 1 no. double bedroom, a kitchen/dining area and bathroom. An internal courtyard and link corridor will separate the existing accommodation and the proposed extension. The extension has a pitched roof with an overall height of 3.69 m, reducing to 2.9 m to eaves level along the shared property boundaries.
- 2.3. The existing kitchen/dining area at ground floor level will be repurposed as a sunroom on foot of the proposed development, while the rear garden will be reduced in length to 35.178 m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Notification of the Decision to Grant Planning Permission subject to 8 no. conditions issued on 9th December 2019.

3.1.2. Condition no. 2 requires the development to be reduced in length to a maximum of 10 m from the original rear building line of the dwelling, including the courtyard.

3.1.3. All other conditions are generally standard in nature.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.2. Basis of Planning Authority's decision.

3.2.3. Dublin City Council's Planning Officer considered that the extension was not subordinate to the dwelling and was excessive in length, notwithstanding the generous rear garden of over 45 m. Having regard to the narrow plot width of the subject site and adjoining sites, the absence of any extensions to the adjoining properties and recent precedents for rear extensions of c. 10 m in length, it was considered reasonable to reduce the extension to a maximum of 10 m.

3.2.4. Other Technical Reports

3.2.5. Engineering Department Drainage Division (19th November 2019)

3.2.6. No objection to the proposed development subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.4. **Irish Water:** None received.

3.5. Third Party Observations

3.5.1. None.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. None.

5.0 Policy and Context

5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022

5.2. Zoning

- 5.2.1. The site is subject to land-use zoning 'Z1' (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods) which has the objective "to protect, provide and improve residential amenities". Residential land uses are permissible under this zoning objective.

5.3. Alterations and Extensions

- 5.3.1. The policy regarding extensions and alterations to dwellings is set out in Sections 16.2.2.3 and 16.10.2 and Appendix 17 of the development plan. In general, applications for planning permission to extend dwellings will only be granted where the planning authority is satisfied the proposal will: (1) not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the dwelling, and (2) not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy and access to daylight and sunlight.
- 5.3.2. The subordinate approach to development is discussed in Appendix 17, Section 17.8, wherein it is stated that the extension should play more of a 'supporting role' to the original dwelling. In general, an extension should be no larger or higher than the existing dwelling.

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.4.1. None.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. The grounds of this first party appeal are concerned solely with condition no. 2 of Dublin City Council's Notification of the Decision to Grant Planning Permission, which restricts the rear extension to a maximum length of 10 m from the original rear building line, including the courtyard.

- 6.1.2. The appellants submit that there is ample remaining garden space to facilitate the proposed development and that no objections have been raised in relation to same by the adjoining neighbours.
- 6.1.3. The appellants further submit that they have resided in the dwelling for 45 years and wish to make the best use of the ground floor accommodation to meet their current needs.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- 6.2.1. A response was received from the planning authority on 13th January 2020. It states that the decision of the planning authority was made on the grounds of allowing the applicants to extend their dwelling, while at the same time, ensuring that the amenities of the adjoining properties were protected now and into the future.

6.3. Observations

- 6.3.1. None.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. This first party appeal relates to condition no. 2 of Dublin City Council's Notification of the Decision to Grant Permission, which requires the rear extension to be reduced in length to a maximum of 10 m from the original rear building line. Based on the floorplan drawings which have been submitted with the application (drawing no. 201 refers), the requirements of this condition would result in the omission of the proposed kitchen/dining area.
- 7.2. Following my examination of the planning file and grounds of appeal, I consider it appropriate that the appeal be confined to condition no. 2 only. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the determination by the Board of this application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and that the Board should determine the matters raised in the appeal only in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.
- 7.3. In considering the configuration of the proposed development, I note that the subject site is narrow in width, extending to just 5.2 m. The proposed internal courtyard will

provide natural light to the retained ground floor accommodation and will enable a window to be provided to the proposed double bedroom. In the absence of the courtyard, the ability to deliver extended accommodation to the rear of the building would be significantly reduced and would result in the creation of an internal room in the area of the existing kitchen/dining space.

- 7.4. In reviewing the development plan policy which applies in this case, I note that residential extensions should not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling and should not adversely affect the amenities of adjoining dwellings. Extensions should also be subordinate to, and no larger or higher than the existing dwelling.
- 7.5. In considering the foregoing, I note that the existing dwelling has a floor area of 79 m². The proposed single-storey extension has a floor area of 46 m² and as such, would provide additional accommodation which is both smaller in scale and height than the existing dwelling. While the 14.4 m length of the proposed extension is acknowledged, I consider that the proposed development is a reasonable design response to the site constraints in seeking to improve the existing standard of accommodation. In this regard I note that the appellants have lived in the dwelling for 45 years and that the proposed development will enable them to make the best use of the ground floor accommodation to meet their current needs.
- 7.6. In considering the impact of the proposed extension on the amenities of the adjoining properties at No. 26 and 28 Glencorp Road, I note that the proposed extension has a height of 2.9 m to eaves level. I further note that the subject site and adjoining properties have extensive rear gardens, which extend to approximately 35 m in length beyond the proposed extension. In this particular site context, it is considered that the proposed extension would have no undue negative impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of overshadowing or overbearing impacts.
- 7.7. I consider that the proposed development represents an acceptable design response on the subject site. The site is zoned for residential purposes (Z1) and the proposed development will enable the dwelling to be improved to meet the occupant's current living requirements. I further consider that the proposed development will significantly improve the quantum and standard of accommodation within the

dwelling and as such, would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7.8. Thus, in conclusion, I am satisfied that the application of condition no. 2 is unnecessary and unreasonable in this instance and would serve to undermine the ability to deliver an improved standard of residential accommodation on the subject site.

7.9. **Appropriate Assessment**

7.10. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the residential land use zoning of the site, and its location relative to Natura 2000 sites, no appropriate assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on a European site.

8.0 **Recommendation**

8.1. It is recommended that the Planning Authority be directed to omit condition no. 2 for the reasons and considerations set out hereunder.

9.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

9.1. Having regard to the residential land use zoning of the site, the nature and scale of the proposed development and the remaining rear garden in excess of 35 m, it is considered that the modifications required by the Planning Authority in its imposition of condition no. 2 are not warranted, and that the proposed development, with the omission of condition no. 2, would not have a significant negative impact on the character and scale of the existing dwelling and the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. Therefore, the proposed development would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Louise Treacy
Planning Inspector

19th March 2020