



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL91.246855.

Development	Alterations to house at 20 Avondale Drive, Greystones, Limerick City.
Planning Authority	Limerick City and County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	16/348.
Applicant(s)	Breda & Gerard Enright.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission subject to conditions.
Appellant(s)	Breda & Gerard Enright.
Type of Appeal	1 st Party versus condition
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	1 September 2016.
Inspector	Stephen Rhys Thomas.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site which is the subject of the appeal is located at 20 Avondale Drive, Greystones, a north western suburb of Limerick City. The subject site is a semi-detached dwelling with a gable roof profile. There is a garage and porch projection at ground level with a nap plaster finish and a roughcast render to the first floor. The area is characterised by houses of similar form and design, set back from the street along an established building line. For the most part, dwellings have been modified by the addition of ground floor porch extensions and garage conversions with separate access doors.
- 1.2. Appendix 1 contains photographs of the site and surrounds.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for:
- alterations to the front porch by the provision of a new door to the side and windows,
 - to replace the existing porch flat roof with a pitched roof,
 - the conversion of the garage to a dining room,
 - the removal of garage doors and replacement with a new entrance door and stepped entrance,
 - the relocation of steps to existing hall entrance from front to side,
 - a decrease in the height of a rear chimney stack,
 - to raise the flat roof of a rear shed and raise the patio area to the rear.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority decided to grant permission subject to conditions, the relevant condition is summarised below:

- Condition 6 refers to a requirement to replace a door, which serves the proposed dining room with a window. Only one door shall serve the front elevation. In the interests of orderly development.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1 Planning Report

The basis of the planning authority decision includes:

Presentation of the City Development Plan standards with regards to extensions.
Identification of the area of the site and that the proposed extension is acceptable.
There is no reference to a request for additional information and the recommendation was to grant permission subject to six conditions.

3.3. Other Technical Reports

3.3.1 Air, Noise and Water Pollution and Public Health Department. Required further information with regard to the proposal to reduce the height of a chimney stack. In the event of a grant of planning permission standard conditions should be attached.

3.3.2 Irish Water. No objection subject to standard conditions with regards to water supply and foul water connections.

3.4. Third Party Observations

There are no third party observations.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. Planning authority register reference 96770318, permission for the conversion of existing attic space to attic store room and retention of existing boiler house/shed.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1 Limerick City Development Plan 2010-2016 – site is subject to zoning objective 2A Residential - To provide for residential development and associated uses.

5.1.2 Section 16.30 Dwelling Extensions

The design and layout of extensions to houses should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards sunlight, daylight and privacy. The character and form of the existing building should be respected and external finishes and window types should match the existing.

Proposed Extension design shall comply with the following:

- o Follow the pattern of the existing building as much as possible.
- o Be constructed with similar finishes and with similar windows to the existing building so that they will integrate with it.
- o Roof form should be compatible with the existing roof form and character. Traditional pitched roofs will generally be appropriate when visible from the public road. High quality mono-pitch and flat-roof solutions will be considered appropriate providing they are of a high standard and employ appropriate detailing and materials.
- o Care should be taken to ensure that the extension does not overshadow windows, yards or gardens or have windows in flank walls which would reduce the privacy of adjoining properties.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant to this suburban site.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- A request to remove condition 6 which requires the replacement of a door with a window.
- A wish to retain a service entrance to the dwelling (for objects like household fuel/turf, refuse and lawnmower), rather than be restricted to a single entrance doorway.
- The proposal to install a doorway will not increase the number of existing doorways to the dwelling.
- The proposed dining room doorway will not lead to use for a secondary dwelling unit, the intention has always been to use the house as a single dwelling.
- There are numerous examples of this form of development in the wider area, where two access doorways are the norm.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority has no further comment.

6.3. Observations

There are no observations with reference to this appeal.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development and the specific issue arising, that being a first party appeal against Condition number 6 of the planning authority decision, I am of the opinion that the determination of the application as if it had been made to the Board in the first instance is not warranted. In that regard I note the provisions of section 139 of the Planning & Development Act 2000 (as amended). This assessment will therefore be confined to the specific appeal of Condition number 6 of the planning authority decision.

I consider the key issues in determining this appeal are as follows:

- Visual and residential amenity
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Visual and Residential Amenity

7.2.1 The subject condition required the removal of the door serving a dining room and replace it with a window and that only one door should serve the front elevation. Based on the Planner's Report on file and also based on the reason given for the subject condition in the planning authority's decision, the planning authority's decision related only to orderly development. All other aspects of the applicant's development proposal were considered acceptable. The planning authority attached a condition which relates to the use of the dwelling as a single unit, this condition has been accepted by the applicant and is not at issue.

7.2.2 Houses on both sides of the street in the vicinity of the subject site exhibit a variety of elevations, most with front doors and either garage doors or converted garages accessed by a door. Houses also exhibit front porches which present a front door at a ninety-degree angle to the front building line. I therefore consider that the prevailing character of houses along this street is one and two front doors either fully

or partially glazed and also forward facing or at right angles to the dwelling. The visual amenity of the area, as viewed from the street is therefore defined by a variety of ground floor elevations all different in design combined with first floor elevations which have largely remained unaltered. It is considered that the provision of a dining room door in this instance, will in itself not impact on orderly development and consequently will have no impact upon the visual amenity of the area. In addition, it is considered that the proposed porch extension and dining room door would accord with Development Plan design guidance insofar as the works would follow the pattern of the existing building as much as possible and be constructed with similar finishes and with similar windows to the existing building so that they will integrate with it. Therefore, the provision of a fully glazed door which allows access to the dining room in combination with a separate front door at right angles to the dwelling is acceptable from a visual amenity perspective.

7.2.3 The land use zoning seeks to provide for residential development and associated uses. The applicants are seeking to improve their residential development by the works proposed, the applicants reside in the house, it is their family home and they wish to avail of a remodelled second door to provide convenient access to the rear of their property. If their means of access is restricted to a single doorway then bulky items such as refuse bins, garden equipment and household fuel/turf, would have to be wheeled/carried through the more sensitive portions of the home. The proposed works will facilitate access to the rear of the property and significantly improve the residential amenity afforded to the residents of the dwelling and are therefore acceptable.

7.2.4 There is no third party appeal in relation to the planning authority decision and there were no objections or observations made to the planning authority during the application period. The proposed dining room door, which is an integral element of the front porch extension will not impact upon the orderly development, visual and residential amenity of the street, because the defining character of the area is front elevations with one and two front doors arranged around a variety of porch projections and garage conversions.

7.3. Appropriate Assessment.

7.3.1 Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and nature of the receiving environment, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend that the Board consider the appeal in the context of section 139 of the Planning & Development Act 2000 (as amended). I further recommend that the Board direct the planning authority to remove Condition No. 6.

9.0 REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Having regard to the design and nature of the dining room door proposed and the existence of similar front and ancillary doors in the area, and also having regard to the residential amenity being provided for by the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed dining room door will not adversely impact on the visual amenities of the area, would not set an undesirable precedent and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Stephen Rhys Thomas
Planning Inspector

5 September 2016