



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report 29N.247325.

---

<b>Development</b>	Attic conversion and roof dormer extension to rear.
<b>Location</b>	87 Grange Abbey Grove, Dublin 13.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	3351/16
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Mark Kinsella
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant subject to conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Mark Kinsella
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	December 5 <sup>th</sup> , 2016
<b>Inspector</b>	Breda Gannon

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located at 87 Grange Abbey Grove, Dublin 13. It accommodates a mid terrace two-storey dwelling that backs onto Donaghmeade Park. The external finishes are a combination of brick and plaster with a tiled roof. There is a small enclosed area to the front of the house incorporating a paved parking area. To the rear there is a more recent single-storey extension. The rear garden is enclosed by walls with a shed located along the back boundary.
- 1.2. The area is residential in character with houses arranged primarily in terraces facing onto the local road network. The area is well served by community facilities including Donaghmeade Shopping Centre and Donaghmeade Church to the southwest and Grange Community College on the opposite side of Grange Road to the north.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development as described in the public notices submitted with the application seeks the conversion of the attic space and the provision of a roof dormer extension to the rear. The proposal, which will extend horizontally by over 5m, would deliver 18 m<sup>2</sup> of additional floor space.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to grant permission for the development subject to 7 no. conditions. Of relevance are the following;

**Condition No 2** – The attic space shall be used for storage purposes only.

**Condition No 3** - The development shall be revised as follows:

- a) The rear dormer structure shall not be wider than 50% of the existing roof plane; be centred on the rear roof plane; and be no closer than 1.0 m from any party boundary,
- b) Any window or windows shall be no wider than the largest existing first floor window below.

- c) All elevations; fascia/soffits; rainwater goods; window frames and any glazing bars shall be finished in a dark colour so as to blend with the existing roof treatment.
- d) No flat roofed area shall be used to accommodate solar panels whether or not it would be exempted development under the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended.

Development shall not commence until revised plans, drawings and particulars showing the above amendments have been submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority, and such works shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the buildings.

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

#### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

The Planning Officer's report of 7<sup>th</sup> September 2016, notes that the proposed development would be permissible under the Z1 zoning objective. The development plan requires that extensions/amendments including roof extensions respect the character of the main dwelling, which is considered can be best achieved by adopting the subordinate approach to their form. The close replication of roof profiles, detailing, window proportions and finishes etc also contribute towards design continuity, especially where the addition is prominent in the public realm.

It is stated that this would appear to be the first such development along the rear roofscape of this terrace block and along the entirety of this side of the street. While the rear 2<sup>nd</sup> floor dormer extension will not breach the existing primary ridge height, it has not been designed in a subordinate manner and will form a second storey which would visually coalesce to terrace with any similar proposal to either side of the site.

No significant additional issues arise regarding access to sunlight/daylight to third party properties. The proposed development will be used for non habitable purposes and with a set back of c. 10.5m from the rear boundary and overlooking public amenity space, will not result in overlooking of private property.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

The Drainage Division in their report raised no objection to the development.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

## 4.0 Planning History

There are no details of any relevant planning history relating to the site or the immediate vicinity.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

5.2. The operative development plan is the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, which came into effect on October 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016.

5.3. The site is located in an area zoned Z1 - Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods. with an objective 'To protect, provide and improve residential neighbourhoods'

5.4. Section 16.10.12 (Volume 1) and Appendix 16 (Volume 2) of the recently adopted Plan are relevant to the consideration of the proposed development. Relevant extracts from the plan are appended to the back of the report for the information of the Board.

### 5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

None.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- The appeal is against Condition No's 2, 3(a) (b) on the grounds that it denies the use of the roof for leisure and study as well as storage. It limits access to the existing trap door and ladder usage unless costly changes to the original first floor plan, including the loss of either bedroom 3 or wardrobe space are made.
- Traditionally, attic conversions and extensions can provide quality stair accessible space either temporarily for leisure activities or study or permanently for storage. This could be achieved with the application as it stands, or, with changes to Conditions No 2 and 3(a)(b), that would accommodate the planning officer's view that a part of the roof should remain visible and unaffected.
- Wider stair accessible roof and dormer extensions have been permitted in the area and applicant cannot understand why it should be different in his case. Whilst the arguments for a controlled roof dormer design are understood, and favouring the original roof as submitted, the applicant would settle for the alternative proposal as shown on amended A3 plan.
- The applicant requests An Bord Pleanála to permit the development as proposed, or to amend Conditions 2, 3(a)(b) to enable the development to be implemented without unreasonable restriction, excessive internal changes and additional costs.

The appeal is accompanied by revised drawings.

### 6.2. Planning Authority Response

No response to the grounds of appeal were submitted by the planning authority.

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1. The proposal is to convert the existing attic space for storage purposes and to provide a dormer extension to the rear.

7.2. A new Dublin City Council Development Plan has been adopted since the planning officer's report was prepared and the planning authority's decision was made on the application. The general provisions in the newly adopted plan (section 16.10.12) regarding extensions and alterations to dwellings remain largely unchanged i.e that extensions should not result in any adverse impact on the scale and character of the dwelling and that the amenities of adjacent buildings (privacy, access to sunlight and daylight ) are not compromised. The plan also specifies similar requirements with respect to the appearance and finishes of extensions and that they are subordinate to the main dwelling.

7.3. The previous development plan also set out guiding principles regarding roof extensions and these are replicated in the recently adopted plan (section 17.11).

7.4. The plan (Appendix 17) recognises that there are a wide variety of house types and styles within Dublin city and that it is not possible to deal with every type of addition. The plan sets out the general principles that should be addressed in all cases such as residential amenity issues, privacy, relationship between dwellings and extensions, daylight and sunlight, appearance, subordinate approach and materials.

7.5. There has, therefore, been no significant alteration to Dublin City Council's policy regarding extensions/alterations to dwellings as it applies to the proposed development.

The appeal is against Condition No 2 and 3 (a) and 3(b) only. Condition No 2 restricts the use of the proposed converted attic to storage purposes only. The converted attic cannot be used for habitable purposes as it does not comply with the Building Regulations. The planning authority's condition restricted its use for storage purposes is therefore considered to be entirely reasonable.

Condition No 3 (a) and (b) is designed to reduce the dominance of the proposed dormer extension, which is also considered reasonable in light of the development plan guidance. The proposal extends across the entire span of the roof, with little of the original roof remaining visible and incorporating windows which are at variance with the design and proportions of the existing openings at ground and first floor level.

The Board will note that the applicant has submitted a revised proposal for its consideration showing a reduced dormer extension. The overall length of the extension has been reduced by 1.5m to 3.5m and the floor area has been reduced to c.10m<sup>2</sup>. However, the dormer is aligned to the west in close proximity to the adjoining dwelling in the terrace and incorporates a window which is considerable larger than the windows in the existing dwelling. Whilst the revised proposals reduces the overall scale of the proposal, I consider that it remains an excessively dominant feature in the roof, in this otherwise intact terrace.

I would point out to the Board that the rear of the terraces face onto Donaghmeade Park and is visible in the public domain. Whilst there is a plethora of sheds and ground floor extensions to the rear of the properties, I note that there are no examples of similar interventions. Whilst I accept that a dormer extension is acceptable in principle, I concur with the planning authority that it should be designed in a subordinate manner and accordingly I consider that it reasonable to attach Condition No 3 (a) and (b).

## **8.0 Appropriate Assessment**

The nearest Natura 2000 sites are Baldoyle SAC and SPA to the east and North Dublin SAC and North Bull Island SPA to the south. Having regard to the location of the development within a built up area, the nature and scale of the development and the separation distance from the Natura 2000 sites, it is considered that the proposed development either alone, or, in combination with other plans or projects does not have the potential to adversely impact on the qualifying interests of any Natura 2000 site. Appropriate Assessment is not, therefore, required.

## **9.0 Recommendation**

- 9.1. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development and the nature of the conditions the subject of the appeal, it is considered that the determination by the Board of the application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted. It is recommended, therefore, that the appeal be considered on the basis of the appealed conditions only pursuant section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended.

## 10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the floor to ceiling height that will result from the proposed development, which will not adhere to the requirements for habitable rooms established by the Building Regulations it is considered reasonable to direct the planning authority to ATTACH Condition No.2.

Having regard to the pattern of development in the vicinity and the requirements of the development plan to ensure that roof extensions are visually subordinate to the main roof slope and that new windows relate to the shape, size, position and design of the existing windows and doors on lower floors, it is considered that Condition No 3(a) and 3(b) is appropriate to ensure that the development integrates with existing development and does not detract from the amenities of the area or of neighbouring structures. I recommend that the planning authority be directed to ATTACH Condition No 3(a) and 3 (b).

---

Breda Gannon  
Planning Inspector

15<sup>th</sup> December, 2016.