



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL29N.248084

Development	Construction of a 2-storey extension with associated internal and external alterations and all associated site works.
Location	15 McAuley Road, Artane, Dublin 5
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1494/16
Applicant(s)	Richard and Michelle Brereton
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Richard and Michelle Brereton
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	7 th April 2017
Inspector	Donal Donnelly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located on McAuley Road in Artane approximately 5km north-east of Dublin City Centre. McAuley Road was developed as part of a local authority housing project to the north of the railway line and to the west of the Santry River. Two-storey pitched roof dwellings are laid out in terraces along roads and open spaces or sitting perpendicularly around culs de sac. Some dwellings have been altered over time and others retain their original appearance. McAuley Road is one of the main distributor roads through the estate.
- 1.2. No. 15 McAuley Road is a semi-detached 2-storey dwelling located at the western side of a large open space and at the corner of a junction providing access to residential development to the west. The dwelling sits perpendicular to a row of dwellings to its rear. To the south of the semi-detached pair is a detached dwelling located at the end of a “L” shaped layout of dwellings overlooking a small green space. There are a number of buildings in community/ institutional and neighbourhood uses in the vicinity to the north and south.
- 1.3. At the time of my site visit, works to the dwelling were in progress and a single storey rear extension had been mostly constructed. Otherwise, the dwelling is largely unaltered and retains its distinctive painted dashed upper level and brick ground level. The site is “L” shaped with western and northern boundaries adjoining No. 28 Mask Crescent. The stated area of the dwelling is 109 sq.m. and the site area is given as 443 sq.m.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for the following:
 - A 2-storey side extension (52 sq.m.);
 - Associated internal and external alterations;
 - External render to existing front façade; and
 - All associated site development works to dwelling house.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Dublin City Council issued notification of decision to grant permission for the proposed development subject to eight conditions. Condition 2 states as follows:

“The proposed development shall be revised as follows:

- a. The proposed side extension shall be set back behind the primary front building line by at least 0.5 metres.*
- b. The overall width of the development shall be reduced from 6 metres to 4 metres.*
- c. The roof pitch of the extension shall maintain the angle of the existing roof pitch; the proposed front eaves line shall be no higher than the existing front eaves line.*

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 occupation of the buildings.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.”

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. The recommendation to grant permission, as outlined in the Planner’s Report, reflects the decision of the Planning Authority.
- 3.2.2. Under the assessment of the application, it is stated that there are concerns that the extension may appear overbearing in relation to the adjoining property at No. 26 Mask Crescent. In addition, there are concerns that the proposed extension will dominate the scale and overall proportion of the existing house.
- 3.2.3. It is therefore considered that the extension should be stepped back 0.5m from the front building line and the overall width should be reduced to 4m to preserve the proportions of the existing dwelling, the rhythm of the streetscape and the residential amenity of the adjoining property.

- 3.2.4. It is considered that the proposed rendered finish will impact on the scale and symmetry of the semi-detached dwellings and affect the overall character of the street. Thus, a ground level redbrick finish should be retained and the finishes of the proposed extension should match the existing.
- 3.2.5. The proposed extension is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenities enjoyed by adjacent buildings in terms of privacy and access to daylight and sunlight.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. No planning history.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The appeal site is zoned “Z1” where the objective is “to protect, provide and improve residential amenities”.
- 5.1.2. It is stated under Section 16.10.12 that applications for planning permission to extend dwellings will only be granted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposal will:
- Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the dwelling;
 - Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, access to daylight and sunlight.
- 5.1.3. Guidelines for residential extensions are included in Appendix 17. A subordinate approach is encouraged, whereby the extension should play more of a supporting role to the original dwelling. It is recognised in Section 17.11 that the roofline of the building is one of its most dominant features and any proposal to change the shape, pitch, cladding or ornament of a roof should be carefully considered.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The appeal site is located approximately 2.4km north-west of the North Dublin Bay SAC and the North Bull Island SPA.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. A first party appeal against Condition 2(b) only of the Council's decision was submitted on behalf of the applicant. The grounds of appeal and main points raised in this submission can be summarised as follows:

- Proposed amendment would result in the loss of a walk-in wardrobe and en-suite.
- Neighbouring houses have not been conditioned in this way (precedent study attached).
- This is the type of building construction that is required after the economic downturn – applicant has decided to extend dwelling rather than build a side garden house.
- Applicant considers that the massing, size and design of the extension is appropriate to the location.
- Reference made to extensions at No's. 8 & 10 Mask Crescent, 12 Mask Green, 91 Mask Avenue, 32 Mask Road and 30 Mask Avenue as precedent.
- Proposed development is substantially similar in size, appearance and character to existing established residences in the surrounding area.
- Board is asked to at least amend Condition 2b to reduce the 2m reduction required.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- 6.2.1. The Council has no further comment to make and considers that the Planner's Report on file adequately deals with the proposal.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. This is a first party appeal against Condition 2(b) only attached to Dublin City Council's decision to grant permission for the construction of 2-storey side extension with associated internal and external alterations and all associated site development works to a semi-detached pitched roof dwelling in Artane, Dublin 5.
- 7.2. Under Condition 2(b), the applicant is required to reduce the overall width of the extension from 6m to 4m. The applicant does not appear to have any issue with parts (a) and (c) of Condition 2 which require the side extension to be set back behind the primary front building line by at least 0.5m, and for the roof pitch of the extension to maintain the angle of the existing roof, with front eaves line no higher than the existing.
- 7.3. I concur with the Planning Authority that the principle of extending the dwelling to the side is acceptable and that the proposal will not have any adverse impact on the residential amenities of surrounding properties other than those issues to be addressed within this appeal.
- 7.4. Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that an assessment of the case *de novo* would not be warranted, and that the Board should determine the matters raised in the appeal only, in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended). It should also be noted that there were no objections to the proposed development or observations on the appeal.
- 7.5. It is noted in the Planner's Report that the rear wall of the proposed extension is located 1.275m from the side boundary of No. 26 Mask Crescent and there are concerns that the extension may appear overbearing in relation to this property. There are also concerns that the design of the proposed extension would dominate the scale and overall proportions of the existing house.
- 7.6. Appendix 17 of the Development Plan (Guidelines for Residential Extensions) states that extension proposals should not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the dwelling and should have no unacceptable effect on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings. With respect to appearance, it is stated that *"the extension should not dominate the existing building and should normally be of an overall shape and size to harmonise with the existing house and*

adjoining buildings; the original appearance should be the reference point for any consideration of change that may be desired.”

- 7.7. The proposed extension will increase the width of the existing dwelling by 6m to form a dwelling with overall width of 14m. There would appear to be no other dwellings in the immediate area that are as wide. The appeal submission includes a precedent study of side extensions around the McAuley Road area; however, none of these dwellings are as wide as 14m over 2-storeys. No. 30 Mask Avenue is approximately 12m in width and all other dwellings are of a similar width or less. It should be noted that the surrounding area comprises mostly of terraces containing dwellings with widths of approximately 6-7m.
- 7.8. I would also have concerns regarding the imbalance and disproportionate appearance of the extended dwelling visible over a wide area. The appeal site is at a prominent location at the entry point into residential development to the rear, and to the front is an extensive open space area. I also consider that an end of terrace dwelling may be more capable of absorbing what would essentially be an extension to the terrace rather than the current case, where a substantial extension is proposed to one side of a semi-detached pair.
- 7.9. Having regard to the above, I would be in agreement with the Planning Authority that the proposed extension should be reduced in width to respect the proportions of the original dwelling and the overall rhythm of the streetscape. The reduction in width would also reduce any overbearing impacts on the adjoining dwelling on Mask Crescent.
- 7.10. Overall, I consider that the Planning Authority is correct to attach Condition 2(b) to its decision and that the resultant loss of internal floor space will not greatly affect the internal layout of the dwelling.

Appropriate Assessment

- 7.11. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development proposed and to the nature of the receiving environment, namely a suburban and fully serviced location, no appropriate assessment issues arise.

8.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the nature of condition no. 2(b) the subject of the appeal, the Board is satisfied that the determination by the Board of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) to RETAIN said condition for the reasons and considers hereunder.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed extension, to the proximity of the adjoining property to the west, and to the prominent location of the site, it is considered that it is appropriate to retain Condition no. 2(b) to protect the visual and residential amenities of the area and in the interests of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Donal Donnelly
Planning Inspector

27th April 2017