



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL 29N 247851

Development	Conversion of attic space and associated site works.
Location	89 Ashcroft, Raheny, Dublin 5.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
P. A. Reg. Ref.	3971/16
Applicant	John and Amanda Langan,
Type of Application	Permission
Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party against Refusal
Appellant	John and Amanda Langan,
Date of Site Inspection	3 rd March, 2017.
Inspector	Jane Dennehy

Contents:

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision.....	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy Context.....	4
5.1. Development Plan.....	4
6.0 The Appeal	5
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	5
6.2. Applicant Response	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3. Planning Authority Response	5
7.0 Assessment.....	6
8.0 Recommendation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	7
10.0 Conditions	7

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site which has a stated area of 281.5 square metres is that of a two storey, three-bedroom end of terrace house with a stated floor area of 88.5 square metres. There is a front garden and driveway for off street parking, a side passage and a deep rear garden extending as far as the boundary with the road serving Tuscany Downs an adjoining residential development to the north. The floor levels of the dwellings and their corresponding stepped heights roughly correspond to the slope in the ground level of the street.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The application lodged with the planning authority indicates proposals for the conversion of the attic into habitable accommodation. The plans indicate installation of a staircase and use of the attic space as an attic playroom with a stated floor area of 19.5 square metres. The proposals include installation of a dormer window, (2980 mm) centrally positioned in the roof slope to the rear the width of which is 5945 mm and for two velux rooflights in the front roof slope. The existing Dutch hip to the roof over the gable end is to be removed to allow for the gable end to be built up to the ridge line. The dormer, the width of which is 3935 mm and height of which is 2500 mm is to be positioned centrally within the rear roof slope just above the eaves line extending up to height at +107.870 exceeding the existing roof ridgeline height of + 107.395.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated, 8th December, 2016, the planning authority decided to refuse permission on the basis of the reason which is reproduced below:

“It is considered that the proposed raising of the existing ridge line to accommodate an attic room would undermine the character of the dwelling the adjoining properties and the streetscape and as a consequence seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and of property in the vicinity. In

addition, the proposed rear dormer due to its bulk and scale, would result in an overscaled and imbalanced form of development on the dwelling's rear elevation. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the provisions of section 16.10.12 and Section 11 of Appendix 17 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, would result in an undesirable precedent for further such development, would depreciate the value of property in the vicinity and, as such would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area."

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports.

The planning officer in concluding that permission should be refused remarks that the proposed development is a radical alteration to the existing ridge line which contrasts radically with other attic conversions at properties on the street involving minor alternations to the ridge line. He also indicates concern as to potential precedent for further similar development.

4.0 Planning History

There is no record of any planning history according to the planning officer report.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The operative development plan is the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 according to which the site location comes within an area subject to the zoning objective Z1: *to protect, provide for and improves residential amenities*". Residential Quality standards are set out in section 16.10.2 and Appendix 17 in which guidance on roof extensions is set out in section 17.11

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

An appeal was received from Eamonn Doyle Associates on behalf of the applicant on 12th January, 2017. It is stated that the applicants require additional habitable space within their dwelling to provide for their accommodation needs and that the proposed utilisation of the attic space is the most cost effective solution. The applicants are disappointed that the planning authority did not issue a request for further information on the original proposal and note that no third parties have objected to the proposed development. According to the appeal,

- A modified design is proposed in the appeal providing for a reduced size dormer window positioned centrally and mid slope and has a reduced width of 2980 mm relative to the 3935 mm width of the window proposed in the application. Two options are proposed. Option 1 provides for the height of the dormer to match that of the existing roof ridge at + 107.395. Option 2 which is the applicant's preferred option provides for the height of the dormer eaves at +107.545 exceeding the height of the roof ridge which is + 107.395. The total stated floor area of the internal accommodation is 18.5 square metres. It is submitted that the modified proposals for the dormer window are consistent with the requirements of section 16.10.12 and Appendix 17 of the current development plan and would not have adverse impact on visual and residential amenities.
- Reference is made to a dormer development at No 70 Ashcroft permitted under P. A. Reg. Ref.3757/03 in which there is a nominal ridge height increase similar to that proposed in Option 2 within the appeal. This option provides for a preferable floor to ceiling height to that of the Option 1 in which the floor to ceiling height is 1.85 metres.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

There is no submission on file from the planning authority.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. It is agreed with the planning officer that the dormer window shown in the original application is excessive in size and proportion to the roof slope and in addition lacks sufficient setback from the eaves and the degree to which it exceeds the height of the roof ridge is significant. It is understood from the appeal submission that the applicant is not disputing or appealing against the proposed design for the dormer window shown in the original application.
- 7.2. The modifications to the proposed dormer in both Option 1 and Option 2 proposed in the appeal are considered acceptable. The significantly reduced size dormer is set well set back and positioned at the centre of the slope. Visually it is subordinate to the roof slope and it would not give rise to overlooking or reasonable perceptions of excessive overlooking of the rear gardens of the adjoining properties to either side.
- 7.3. The dormer window constructed on the rear slope of the property at No 70 Ashcroft, on the opposite side of the road involving which slightly exceeds the roof ridge height is visually marginal in the streetscape views owing in particular to the variation in floor levels of the houses which correspond to the sloped ground level along the road. In the streetscape views in either direction it is considered that that the applicant's preferred proposal in Option 2 can be accepted in that, in conjunction with the proposed raised gable end, the visual impact would be minimal and acceptable. It is also considered that the revised proposals for Option 1 and Option 2 are fully consistent with the relevant guidance and requirements in the Appendix 17 of the current development plan which supports section 16.10.2 on qualitative standards for residential development.
- 7.4. There is no objection to the two velux roof lights proposed for the front roof slope of the existing dwelling.

7.4.1. **Appropriate Assessment.**

Having regard to the location of the site in an established residential estate and to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development which involves no ground works no appropriate assessment issues arise. The proposed development would

not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

In view of the foregoing it is recommended that the decision to refuse permission be overturned and that permission be granted for the proposed development incorporating the modified proposals included in the appeal the comments of the planning officer in his report and the decision of the planning authority decision to refuse permission is supported. It is therefore recommended that the appeal be rejected and the at permission be refused. A draft reason for a grant of permission and draft conditions are set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

It is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be satisfactory in proportion and in design to the existing roof slope, would integrate satisfactorily with the existing dwelling and the adjoining and surrounding dwellings along the street, would be in accordance with the standards set out section 17.11 (Roof Extensions) of Appendix 17 of the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022 and would not be seriously injurious to the visual and residential amenities of property in the vicinity. As a result, the proposed development would 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 as amended in the plans and particulars lodged with An Bord Pleanala on 12th January, 2017

and as 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 in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity

2. The dwelling shall be occupied as a single dwelling unit only

Reason: In the interest of clarity and the residential amenities of the area.

Jane Dennehy
Senior Planning Inspector,
15th March, 2017.