



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL06F.247625.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Development | Demolition of a single storey extension and lean-to shed and construction of two storey extension. |
| Location | 2 Martello Terrace, Strand Road, Sutton, Dublin 13. |
| Planning Authority | Fingal County Council. |
| Planning Authority Reg. Ref. | F16A/0231. |
| Applicant(s) | Pete Donohue. |
| Type of Application | Permission. |
| Planning Authority Decision | Grant permission. |
| Type of Appeal | Third Party |
| Appellant(s) | James Ryan. |
| Observer(s) | None. |
| Date of Site Inspection | 24 th of February 2017. |
| Inspector | Karen Hamilton. |

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The subject site is a single storey mid terrace dwelling fronting onto Strand Road at Howth, Dublin 13. The Strand Road radiates from Howth Village along the coastline of Dublin Bay. The dwelling forms part of a terrace listed as an Architectural Conservation Area and built in the 19th century for the coastguards. The dwelling has a large front garden and small rear courtyard, which is a characteristic of the terrace. Private parking for the dwelling is currently at the bottom of the front garden, directly off Strand Road.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development includes the follow:

- Demolition of single storey extension and lean to shed.
- Construction of a two-storey extension (32m²) with finished floor level 1.1m below the existing yard.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Decision to grant permission and condition of note include:

- C 4: Works shall be carried out in accordance with Consulting Engineers report.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the area planner reflects the decision to grant permission following the submission of further information to include:

- Internal design changes including the reorientation of the kitchen and bedroom.

- Revision to the depth of the extension so the enclosing wall is inside the boundary wall.
- Submission of construction methodology from an engineer on the stability of the sub floor construction.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Section- No objection to the proposal.

Conservation Officer- Concern raised on the design of the initial submission.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Irish Water- No objection subject to the proposal.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One submission received and the issues raised have been dealt with in the grounds of appeal.

4.0 Planning History

No planning history on the site.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2004. Development guidelines for Protected Structures and Areas of Architectural Conservation.

- Chapter 3: Architectural Conservation Areas.
- Chapter 13: Curtilage and attendant grounds.

5.2. Fingal County Development Plan 2011-2017.

The site is zoned as “RS” Residential with an objective to *“ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity”*.

The site is located within an Architectural Conservation Area, therefore the following polices apply.

- Objective AH 17: Ensure that any new development or alteration of a building within or adjoining an ACA positively enhances the character of the area and is appropriate in terms of the proposed design, including: scale, mass, height, proportions, density, layout, materials, plot ratio, and building lines.

Residential Amenity

- Objective OS38: 3 bedroom houses or less to have a minimum of 60 m² of private open space located behind the front building line of the house.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is located 10m from the North Dublin Bay SAC and 20m from North Bull Island SPA.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal are submitted from the resident of the property to the east of the site and may be summarised as follows:

- The two storey extension is to the east of the site and will cause overshadowing particularly in the morning.
- The large size and location of the extension along the boundary will have a negative impact on the dwelling.
- The extension will lead to overdevelopment of the site and overall the proposed development will have a negative impact on residential amenity.

6.2. Applicant Response

The agent on behalf of the applicant has responded which may be summarised as follows:

- The proposed design is modest and subservient to the original building and similar to that which is developed at No 1.
- The extension at the appellant's dwelling is unauthorised and does not respect the ACA.
- The proposed development is lower than No 3 & 4 and there will be minimal overshadowing on adjoining properties due to the orientation of the site.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

The planning authority have responded to state that the design of the extension includes a setback of the first floor element with the property to the north, it is acceptable and will not cause any overshadowing.

6.4. **Observations**

None received.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. The main issues raised in the grounds of appeal may be addressed under the following headings:

- Built Heritage
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Appropriate Assessment

Built Heritage.

7.2. The subject site is a single storey mid terrace dwelling which forms part of an Architectural Conservation Area. The dwellings are modest coastguard cottages with large front gardens and small rear gardens. The proposed development includes the demolition of a single storey rear extension and the construction of a two storey extension. It is proposed to excavate 1.1m under the current rear yard to achieve the two storey extension whilst not protruding above the ridge line of the current dwelling. The use of the first floor as a kitchen was included following a response

from the Conservation Officer on the availability of light into the ground floor rooms. I note the Conservation Officer has no objection to the design of the extension.

- 7.3. Objective AH17 of the development plan requires that new development within ACAs are sympathetic and positively enhances the character of the area in terms of the proposed design, including: scale, mass, height, proportions, density, layout, materials, plot ratio, and building lines. As stated above the proposed development does not protrude above the ridge line of the dwelling and therefore will not be visible from the front of the terrace. In order to achieve the reduction in height of the proposed development, excavation at a depth of 1.1m below ground level is required and the applicant was required to submit an engineer's report on the impact on neighbouring properties. The submitted engineers report details the construction of the extension and Condition No 4 requires all development to comply with this report. I consider the inclusion of this condition reasonable. I note from the aerial photography a significant number of the dwellings along the terrace have extended to the rear into the small rear courtyards, which I do not consider has have a negative impact on the character of the ACA. Therefore, based on the design and location of the proposed development I do not consider it would have a negative impact on the character of the ACA.

Impact on Residential Amenity

- 7.4. This mid terrace dwelling fronts onto the Strand Road at Howth and faces south onto Dublin Bay. There is a small rear courtyard and the main open space for the terrace of dwellings are located to the front of the houses facing onto Strand Road. Those dwellings at No 1, 3 & 4 have been previously extended to the rear and the two storey extension to the rear of No 3 is visible from the rear of the subject site. I note the planners report refers to the lack of planning history for other extensions in the vicinity. The grounds of appeal submit the two storey extension will have a negative impact on their residential amenity. I will address this issue under the following headings.
- 7.5. Overlooking: The proposed extension is two storey and includes excavation 1.1m below the current ground level in order to kept the height of the extension to match the existing ridge level. There are no windows proposed along the north or south

elevations on the upper floor, therefore I do not consider the proposed development would cause any overlooking on adjoining properties.

- 7.6. Overbearing: The proposed extension is located approx. 1 m from a 2m high boundary wall. The height of the proposed extension is approx. 4.5m above ground level and 1m above the existing rear extension. I note the proposed elevation facing onto No 3, the appellant's site, is not a continuous elevation and is 2.9m from the rear boundary and includes a courtyard adjacent to the existing dwelling. I consider this design details will remove a significant amount of bulk and massing from the proposed development. Therefore, based on the distance from the boundary, the inclusion of a 2m high wall between the sites and the height to match the current ridgeline I do not consider the proposed development will cause any overbearing on surrounding properties.
- 7.7. Overshadowing: The subject site is located to the south of No 3, the appellants dwelling. There is a small rear courtyard alongside a rear extension at No 3, the main garden space is provided to the front of the dwelling, the same as the majority of the dwellings within the terrace. As previously stated the proposed extension is located approx. 1m from the north boundary and will have a flat roof. Based on the orientation of the site, to the south, and the limited size of the rear garden spaces along the terrace and the height of the extension 2.5m above the boundary wall, I consider there would be an element of overshadowing on the rear courtyard of No 3, although I consider based on the layout of the sites and the open space to the front of the dwelling, the impact on the residential amenity would not be so significant to warrant a refusal.

Appropriate Assessment.

- 7.8. The subject site is 10m from the North Dublin Bay SAC and 20m from North Bull Island SPA although, having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development within a serviced urban area, 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 the conservation objectives of any European site.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions, as set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the pattern of development in the vicinity and the policies of the current Fingal County Development Plan it is considered that the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenity of the area and would not detract from the character or setting of the Architectural Conservation Area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed out in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

- 2 Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the

vicinity.

3. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health

4. The recommendations set out in the report prepared by Eamonn Doyle Associates Consulting Engineers shall be adhered to in the course of the development.

Reason: In the interest of the prosper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Karen Hamilton
Planning Inspector

24th of February 2017