



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL 29N 247866

Development	One two storey and two single storey extensions.
Location	1 Tranquillity Grove, Coolock, Dublin 5.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council.
P. A. Reg. Ref.	4008/16.
Applicant	Mr and Mrs Peter Masterson.
Type of Application	Permission.
Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party against Condition No 3.
Appellant	Mr and Mrs Peter Masterson
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	3
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy Context.....	4
5.1. Development Plan.....	4
6.0 The Appeal	4
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	4
6.3. Planning Authority Response	5
7.0 Assessment.....	5
8.0 Recommendation.....	7
10.0 Draft Condition	8

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The site which has a stated area of 300 square metres is that of two storey house with a porch which has a total stated floor area of 111 square metres. There is a large front and side curtilage under hard standing providing for off street parking and a rear garden close to the junction with Kilmore Road, Coolock. Timber fencing is located along the west front side boundary adjoining two properties (Nos. 198 and 196 Kilmore Road) which face onto Kilmore Road.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The application lodged with the planning authority indicates proposals a two storey side and rear extension for a single storey extension to the front of the dwelling and the proposed side extension and for a single storey sunroom extension to the rear of the existing house along with associated alterations inclusive of roof lights in the existing and proposed roof extensions. The total stated floor area of the extension is fifty-seven square metres.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated, 13th December, 2016. The planning authority decided to grant permission for the proposed development subject to conditions of a standard nature apart from Condition No 3, the appealed condition in which a setback from the side boundary and front building line for the two storey side extension is required along with modifications to the single storey extension to the front.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The planning officer in his report indicates concerns that the side extension lacks of separation from the side boundary with the properties on Kilmore Road and about the impact on the existing dwelling and rhythm on the street of the front extension, forward of the building line. The proposed development was otherwise considered

satisfactory and modification to address the concerns were included in Condition No 3 attached to the decision to grant permission.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. There is no record of any planning history on file.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. The operative development plan is the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 and the site location comes within an area subject to the zoning objective Z1: “*Sustainable residential neighbourhoods*”, with the objective, “*To protect, provide and improve residential amenities.*” Chapter 16 provides for policies, objectives and standards for residential development. Appendix 17 (Residential Extensions) supplements and provides elaboration on the policies, objectives and standards within Chapter 16.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

An appeal was received by David Coffey and Associates on behalf of the applicants on 16th January, 2017 attached to which are photographs of extensions at properties in the vicinity. The appeal is against the imposition of Condition No. 3. The contents of the appeal are outlined below.

- Two storey extensions have been permitted and built at Nos 8 Tranquillity Grove, No. 10 Tranquillity Grove and No 15 Tranquillity Grove and a single Storey extension has been built at No 31 Tranquillity Grove. Permission has also been granted for an extension to the side of No 4 Tranquillity Grove without any setback condition. (WEB 1086/16 refers.) The proposed extension is in keeping with existing extensions.

- The proposed side extension is subordinate and in harmony with the existing house. It is only four metres wide at the front and tapers back to 1.7 metres at the rear. The setback required at the front is not in keeping with other houses on Tranquillity Grove or Aldrin Walk and it will adversely impact on the continuity and appearance of the extension.
- The extensions are required to meet and improve the applicants' accommodation needs and the reduction in floor space that results with the required modifications in place renders to purpose of the proposed development pointless.
- There are no third party objections to the proposed development.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

In letter received on 2nd February 2017 the planning authority confirms that it has no comments are no comments on the appeal.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. The appeal is solely against Condition No 3 in which the following modifications are required:

Setback of the side extension to the front building line with eaves height and roof pitch to match that of the existing house.

Setback the single storey extension to the front of the proposed two storey extension to the side by one metre.

Setback the two storey extension from the side boundary by a minimum of 1.2 metres.

- 7.2. Having reviewed the application on a *de novo* basis, that is as if the application had been made to the Board in the first instance, it has been concluded that the appeal against the condition only would be appropriate and that the decision can therefore

be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 139 of the Act. The issues considered central to the determination of the decision are as to whether the required modifications are warranted having regard to visual impact and compatibility with the existing dwelling and the rhythm of the street, and to the protection of the residential amenities of adjoining properties.

- 7.3. The permitted extensions constructed at other properties in Tranquillity Grove referred to in the appeal have been reviewed. These developments are not fully comparable to the proposed development and therefore precedent cannot be taken from any of them. The proposed development is different because none of the examples referred involve a combination of all the elements in the form of additions and extensions that are proposed at the appeal site property. The issue of concern in the subject proposal is the cumulative impact of all the elements of the proposed development.
- 7.4. The combination of a two storey extension with a four metre width to the side resulting in a considerably increased two storey width the impact of which is exacerbated by the proposed single storey extension forward of the front building line across the entire width of the existing and proposed development has a profound cumulative impact. The cumulative impact is quite considerable in terms of the increase in the massing of the existing dwelling and proportion in the context of the pair of semi-detached dwellings.
- 7.5. Taking this and in particular the front single storey extension forward of the front building line across the entire width of the existing and proposed two storey side extensions into account, the rhythm and relative homogeneity in the streetscape would also be eroded to an undue degree. The original front building line would be breached in entirety and no longer recognisable by substantially larger and dominant two storey dwelling. The visual impact is a particular concern given the prominent position of the appeal site property in views from Kilmore Road and on approach on approach into the estate off Kilmore Road.
- 7.6. It is considered that sufficient amelioration of the adverse cumulative impact can be achieved with some modification to the requirements of Condition No 3. To this end, it is considered that omission of the single storey front extension across the width of the two storey side extension should be omitted from the development and that the

footprint of the two storey side extension should correspond to the original front building line of the existing house. (A setback behind the front building line would not be required.) It is considered that the setback from the north west side boundary is justified on account of the the height and depth of the two storey side elevation resulting in side elevation of considerable mass which is obtrusive in visual impact on the adjoining properties

7.7. It is acknowledged that the purpose of the proposed development is to provide for the additional accommodation needs of the applicant and that modifications would result in significant reduction in the total are of internal floor space relative to the original proposal. However, the modifications are warranted from a planning perspective although The recommended modifications to the condition would allow for less reduction in the overall internal floor area and more scope for the utility of the internal accommodation than the modifications required in the appealed condition.

7.7.1. Appropriate Assessment.

Having regard to the location of the site in an established residential area in Coolock and to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development 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

9.0 Given the foregoing, it is recommended that the planning authority be directed to Revise Condition No 3, the appealed condition to provide for the modifications recommended above. A draft revised condition and reason for the condition are set out below:

10.0 Condition

The front single storey extension shall be confined to the width of the existing house only. The two storey side extension shall be setback to the original front building line of the existing house and by a minimum distance of 1.2 metres from the north west side boundary with the adjoining properties. Prior to the commencement of the development the applicant shall submit and agree in writing with the planning authority revised plan, elevation and section drawings.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenities and established character and pattern of development in the area.

Jane Dennehy
Senior Planning Inspector
16th March, 2017.