

# Inspector's Report PL29N. 247641

**Development** Granny flat extension

**Location** 8 Ennafort Grove, Dublin 5

Planning Authority Dublin City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref. 3712/16

**Applicants** Angela Moulds

Type of Application Permission

Planning Authority Decision Grant permission subject to conditions

Type of Appeal First Party vs. condition

**Appellant** Angela Moulds

**Observers** None

**Date of Site Inspection** 10<sup>th</sup> February 2017

**Inspector** Stephen J. O'Sullivan

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The site is in a suburban area in north Dublin. The site occupies a corner plot and has a stated area of 380m<sup>2</sup>. It consists of the curtilage of a semi-detached two storey house in an area characterised by other such houses. The house has a stated floor area of 100m<sup>2</sup>.

## 2.0 **Proposed Development**

- 2.1. It is proposed to building a single storey extension to the site of the house to provide a granny flat. The extension would have a floor area of 63m² and would contain one bedroom, bathroom and a kitchen/living area. It would be internally connected to the main house but would include an additional front door. A pedestrian gate would be provided on the northern boundary onto Ennafort Road.
- 2.2. Revised plans were submitted with the appeal which omitted the proposed second front door and established a 1m setback from the northern side boundary, reducing the floor area of the extension to 59m<sup>2</sup>

# 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

#### 3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to grant permission subject to 8 conditions.

Condition no. 3 is as follows-

The development shall be revised as follows:

- The development shall be off-set from north boundary along Ennafort Road by 2 metres and the existing boundary wall and hedgerow shall be retained.
- The second front door on the front (east) elevation shall be omitted from the development
- The height of the proposed standing seam of the projecting bay window shall match the height of the plaster band which marks the first floor level of the existing dwelling. Development shall not commence until revised plans, drawings and particulars showing the above amendments have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by

the Planning Authority, and such works shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the buildings.

Reason: in the interests of visual and residential amenity

## 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

## 3.2.1. Planning Reports

In order to integrate the extension to the main house the proposed second front door should be omitted. The width of the extension would be more than the main house and would dominate the scale of the existing dwelling. It would extend beyond the building line established along Ennafort Road. The existing should therefore be set back 2m from the northern boundary of the site. The contemporary design is acceptable. The projecting front bay on the extension bears no relation to the proportions of the existing house. Its height should be reduced to match the plaster band on the main house over its ground floor window. A grant of permission was recommended, subject to a condition requiring those changes.

# 4.0 **Planning History**

No previous planning applications were raised by the parties.

# 5.0 **Policy Context**

#### 5.1. **Development Plan**

The Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 applies. The area is zoned Z1 – residential. Section 16.10.14 of the plan deals with ancillary family accommodation. It states that favourable consideration will be given if a valid case is made of the need for such, it would have direct access to the rest of the house and would not be a separate dwelling, and it could be integrated to the family home when no longer required. More generally section 16.2.2.3 states that extensions to houses should respect the context of the existing building and surrounding area and the amenities of neighbours.

## 6.0 **The Appeal**

## 6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

- The appeal is against condition no. 3 of the planning authority's decision. Revised drawings are submitted which would respond to the concerns underlying that condition by omitting the second front door and lowering the height of the projecting window at the front. A setback of 1m to 2.96m would be provided from the north boundary allowing the existing hedge to be maintained.
- The proposed development would accord with the residential zoning of the site and the standards and principles for domestic extensions set out in the development plan. It would be modest in form and scale and its design would protect the character of the area and adjoining residential amenity.
- The revised proposal would comply with the requirements of the second and third dot points of the condition under appeal. The proposed setback from the northern site boundary would allow the existing wall and hedge to be retained and would ensure a graduated or transitioned building line along Ennafort Road. The revised design will provide a high standard of residential accommodation and design while addressing all the concerns associated with visual amend residential amenity.
- There are many similar side extensions in the area, including one at 488
  Howth Road authorised under reg. Ref. 2573/15

## 6.2. Planning Authority Response

The response stated that the authority had no further comments

## 7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. The revised proposals are a reduction of the development proposed in the original application and do not introduce significant new elements. No observations were made to the planning authority by third parties. It would not be necessary, therefore, for the application to be re-advertised before a grant of permission based on the those drawings was considered.
- 7.2. There is an established building line along the southern side of Ennafort Road. It was reasonable for the planning authority to have regard to it when making its decision. However there is extensive space between the pairs of semi-detached houses. The line is also broken by the series of side streets and junctions on this side of the road at which the corner houses are set at an angle. So the building line is not as dominant a feature here as it might be on a street with a more formal or denser layout. The revised proposal submitted with the appeal would be acceptable in this context. It would achieve an adequate setback that protected the residential and visual amenities of the area. The second front door would be omitted and the seam over the front window would be at the same height as the plaster band on the front of the existing house. As such it would meet the concerns stated in the reason for condition no. 3 of the planning authority's decision.

## 8.0 **Recommendation**

8.1. I recommend that condition no. 1 of the planning authority's decision be amended to specify that the development is carried out in accordance with the revised drawings submitted with the appeal and should read as follows-

The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application as amended by the further plans and particulars received by An Bord Pleanála on the 25<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2016, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions.

**Reason**: In the interest of clarity.

and that condition no. 3 be omitted and the other conditions re-numbered accordingly.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development, as amended by the details submitted with the appeal, would respect the established building line along Ennafort Road and its scale, design and function would be subservient to those of the main house on the site. As such it would be in keeping with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Stephen J. O'Sullivan Planning Inspector

13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.