



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL06F.247973

---

<b>Development</b>	1st floor side extension over existing and attic conversion with dormer roof and raised gable wall with a dutch hip roof and site works.
<b>Location</b>	312 Sutton Park, Sutton, Dublin 13.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Fingal County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	F16B/0102
<b>Applicant</b>	Hugh Grennan
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant subject to conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Party v. condition
<b>Appellant</b>	Hugh Grennan
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	27/04/17
<b>Inspector</b>	Pauline Fitzpatrick

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. No 312 Sutton Park is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling within the mature estate of Sutton Park, located c.150 metres to the south of Bayside DART station. The dwelling entails a recessed 1<sup>st</sup> floor design with a window in the gable of the 2 storey element (serving the landing and stairs) overlooking the flat roof. A ground floor extension has been constructed to the rear. The dwelling backs onto an open space at Bayside Park with a 1.6 metre high block wall delineating the rear boundary.
- 1.2. The dwelling type in the immediate vicinity comprises of two storey semi-detached in varying designs with those to the north not having the 1<sup>st</sup> floor recessed feature of the appeal site.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The application was lodged with the application on the 26/04/16 with further details received 12/12/16.
- 2.2. As amended the proposal entails the provision of a 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension to the side to bring the wall flush with the front elevation, attic conversion to be served by dormer windows to the rear and change of hipped roof to a Dutch hip.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Grant permission subject to 10 conditions:

*Condition 3:* the grant of permission relates only to the development as described in the public notices.

*Condition 4:* (a) dormer extension to rear to be omitted and replaced by 2 no. dormers. The length of the dormer not to exceed 2.5m., to be inset a minimum of three tile courses from the eaves and set a minimum of 300mm below the ridge line of the dwelling.

(b) the Dutch hip roof to the side extension to be omitted and roof of the extension to be hipped at an angle which reflects the roof of the existing dwelling.

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The *1<sup>st</sup> Planning Officer's* report recommends revised plans delineating the rear extension and boundary walls as constructed on site. The dormer is considered to be a significant addition to the rear of the dwelling and would be visually incongruous when viewed from the surrounding area. A reduction in its scale is warranted. Amendments including setting it a minimum of 300mm below the ridge line, reduction of its overall length and provision of two smaller dormer windows is recommended. As the attic space is not to be used for habitable purposes the required amendments are not considered unduly prohibitive. Given the required amendments to the scale of the dormer extension it is considered that there is scope to omit the Dutch hip style roof and provision of a hipped roof which is more in keeping with the roof of the existing dwelling. A Dutch hip roof is considered visually incongruous, would imbalance the relationship of the roofscapes and would be out of character with development in the immediate vicinity. No.29 Sutton Park does not necessarily set a precedent. The proposed window in the side elevation to serve the bedroom should be omitted due to its proximity to the boundary. A request for FI is recommended. The *2<sup>nd</sup> report* following FI maintains that the dormer, whilst reduced in height, is excessive in length and its visual prominence would not be reduced. The views as expressed on the Dutch hip roof remain. The side window in the rear extension is only 900mm from the boundary and thus is not exempted development. The issue of the rear boundary and encroachment on open space has not been resolved. A grant of permission subject to conditions is recommended

#### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

### 3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None

## 4.0 **Planning History**

None pertaining to the application site.

PL06F.224523 – permission granted for 1st floor extension, attic conversion with altered hip and gable dormer to rear and 5 roof lights at 29 Sutton Park.

## 5.0 **Policy Context**

### 5.1. **Development Plan**

Since the lodgement of the application the new Fingal County Development Plan was adopted and has come into force. The land use zoning for the site is the same as previously delineated namely 'RS' to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity.

Development Management Standards are set out in Section 12.

First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. Though in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front facade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall generally match the existing.

Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles, for example, changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/'A' frame end or 'half-hip', will be assessed against a number of criteria including:

- Consideration and regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
- Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
- Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
- Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures and prominence.

Dormer extensions to roofs will be considered with regard to impacts on existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. The design, dimensions and bulk of any roof proposal relative to the overall size of the dwelling and gardens will be the overriding considerations. Dormer extensions (whether for functional roof space or light access) shall generally not form a dominant part of a roof.

Consideration may be given to dormer extensions proposed up to the ridge level of a house, but in all cases no dormer extension shall be higher than the existing ridge height of the house. The proposed quality of materials/finishes for dormers will be considered carefully as this can greatly improve their appearance. The level and type of glazing within a dormer structure should have regard to existing window treatments and fenestration of the dwelling.

**Objective DMS41** - Dormer extensions to roofs will only be considered where there is no negative impact on the existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. Dormer extensions shall not form a dominant part of a roof. Consideration may be given to dormer extensions proposed up to the ridge level of a house and shall not be higher than the existing ridge height of the house.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The 1<sup>st</sup> Party appeal is against condition 4 attached to the planning authority's notification of decision to grant permission. The condition requires the omission of the dormer as proposed and its replacement and omission of the Dutch hip roof and replacement with a hipped roof. The appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The dormer has been designed to be complimentary to the linear element of the ground floor extension, providing a visual reference between the two.
- The extension would complement the urban landscape.
- The extension would provide additional storage which is needed.
- By restricting the height of the dormer roof below that of the existing roof it is important to locate the south/west windows in the dormer to maximise light to the space.

- The alterations would have no effect on the principle of providing dormer windows to the rear of the property which overlooks a private rear garden and public open space.
- The removal of the Dutch hip would interfere with the proposed stairs to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.
- A Dutch hip was used at No. 29 Sutton Park
- The Dutch hip would complement the traditional hipped roof.
- There is a physical break between No.312 and adjoining No.313 which has a different roof style. The different roof styles between the two properties would be considered to be in comparable to the situation at No.29 Sutton Park.

## 6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

It is considered that no new issues are raised in the appeal. The Planning Authority seeks that its decision is upheld. If upheld it is requested that condition 10 be included in the Board's decision.

## 6.3. **Observations**

None

## 7.0 **Assessment**

- 7.1. The proposal for the extension and alteration to an existing dwelling is acceptable in principle and accords with the zoning objectives for the area. I note that issues arising regarding the ground floor extension and the rear boundary as detailed in the planning officer's reports on file as summarised in section 3.2 above are not matters subject of this application. I am satisfied, having examined the details of the application and having visited the site, that the determination of the application by the Board, as if it has been made to it in the first instance, would not be warranted. Accordingly, I consider that it is appropriate to use the provisions of Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and to consider the issues arising out of the disputed condition only.

- 7.2. As amended a large dormer extension with four window openings with a height of 1.5m. and length of 6.7m is proposed to the rear of the dwelling to serve the roof space which is to be used for storage/studio purposes. The dormer is to be set back 0.3 m. from the ridge of the dwelling. The agent for the appellant states that the dormer has been designed to compliment the linear element of the ground floor extension providing a visual reference between the two.
- 7.3. The new County Development Plan states that the design, dimensions and bulk of any roof proposal relative to the overall size of the dwelling and gardens will be the overriding considerations and dormer extensions shall generally not form a dominant part of a roof. The level and type of glazing within a dormer structure should have regard to existing window treatments and fenestration of the dwelling.
- 7.4. I submit that the dormer as designed, notwithstanding its setback from the ridge line, constitutes a significant and material change and will form a dominant part of the roof. By reason of the location of the dwelling backing onto a public open space it would be clearly visible from same and would be out of character with the pattern of development in the immediate vicinity. Taking into consideration the fenestration to the ground floor extension as developed I would not subscribe to the view that the dormer as proposed would complement same.
- 7.5. I have serious concerns that the box dormer to the size and scale proposed, if allowed, would set an undesirable precedent for similarly scaled and inappropriately designed attic conversion development. The alterations as stipulated by the planning authority in condition 4 (a) are considered a reasonable compromise and would provide for a more appropriately scaled intervention in the roof space so as to allow it to appear subsidiary to the main roof profile whilst providing adequate light to the storage/studio use. It would also assuage perceptions of excessive overlooking of the rear gardens of the adjoining properties to either side.
- 7.6. The proposal also entails the provision of a Dutch hip gable to the new extension. Due regard is had to the criteria against which a proposal is to be assessed as set out in the current development plan namely (a) character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures, (b) existing roof variations on the streetscape (c) distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end and

(d) harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures and prominence.

These considerations are considered reasonable.

- 7.7. No.312 is within a mature residential estate with the dwellings to the south including that to which it is attached having the same recessed 1<sup>st</sup> floor feature and hipped roof design. The dwellings immediately to the north do not have the said recessed arrangement but also have hipped roofs. On inspection I did not identify other examples of such a Dutch hip design in the immediate vicinity. I submit that such an intervention will be at odds with that prevailing in the immediate vicinity. Reference is made to the use of such a design solution at No. 29 Sutton Park which was subject of an appeal under ref. PL06F.224523. No. 29 which is c.500 metres to the south-east is immediately abutted on the east side by a material change in building form, namely from two storey to single storey. Whilst I note the difference in terms of house design between the appeal site and those to the north, I do not consider that it is afforded the same latitude as in the referenced case at No.29. By reason of the extension the juxtaposition of the Dutch hip and the hipped roof of the adjoining dwelling would be evident. I consider that the modifications as required by the planning authority, namely provision of a hipped roof finish, can be accommodated without having an adverse impact on the extension and is therefore reasonable.

#### *AA – Screening*

- 7.8. Having regard to the location of the site on zoned and serviced lands and the nature and scale of the proposed development 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 a European site.

## 8.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the documentation on file the grounds of appeal, the grounds of appeal, my site inspection and the assessment above I recommend that the planning authority be directed to **ATTACH** condition 4 for the following reasons and considerations.



## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the 'RS' zoning for the site in the current Fingal County Development Plan the objective for which is to protect and improve residential amenity and to the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the proposed amendments to the dormer extension and alterations to the roof line as required by condition number 4, would result in a development which would not detract from the character and pattern of development in the immediate vicinity and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

**Pauline Fitzpatrick**  
**Senior Planning Inspector**

**May 2017**