



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL29S.248242

Development	Double storey dormer style extension and internal alterations at rear.
Location	4 Priestfield Cottages, South Circular Road, Dublin 8
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2017/17
Applicant(s)	Sheila Greene
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	First V Conditions
Appellant(s)	Sheila Greene
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	31 st May 2017
Inspector	Rónán O'Connor

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
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	4
3.4. Third Party Observations	4
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy Context.....	4
5.1. Development Plan.....	4
6.0 Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022	4
6.2. Natural Heritage Designations	4
7.0 The Appeal	5
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	5
7.2. Planning Authority Response.....	5
7.3. Observations	5
8.0 Assessment.....	6
9.0 Recommendation.....	7

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling located on a small road between the South Circular Road and the Grand Canal. The property is currently in a poor state of repair and is vacant. There is small yard to the rear and parking to the immediate front of the dwelling.
- 1.2. Opposite the dwelling is an An Post delivery office, accessed off the South Circular Road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Double storey dormer style extension and internal alterations at rear.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Grant Permission. A condition of note and the subject of this appeal is Condition No. 2 which limits the first floor rear extension to a maximum width of 4.4m; requires a setback of 1.6m from the boundary with No. 5; requiring similar window types to that of neighbouring properties.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the planning officer reflects the decision of the planning authority. Points of note include:

- No planning history for extensions on neighbouring properties.
- Required a condition requiring amendments to maintain consistency in appearance.
- Notes the extension is subordinate in scale and configuration with the existing cottage.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage – No objection

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

None

4.0 Planning History

None

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

6.0 Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022

6.1.1. The site is located in an area that is zoned Objective Z2 (To Protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas) under the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022. Under this land use zoning objective residential development is a permissible use.

6.1.2. Relevant sections of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 include:

- Paragraph 16.10.12 of the Plan relates to extensions to residential properties
- Appendix 17 of the Plan provides guidance on residential extensions

6.2. Natural Heritage Designations

None

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal, as submitted by David Coffey & Associates, on behalf of the appellant, and as submitted by the applicant directly, are as follows:

- The appeal relates to Condition No. 2 of the Planning Authority's decision relating to the amendments required the first floor extension.
- Condition would render it impossible to provide a family bathroom.
- Is substantially within the overall footprint of the existing property.
- Neighbouring properties have similar extensions.
- Proposed windows are similar to existing cottage windows.
- No observations or submissions during the planning process.
- Condition was based on flawed logic.
- Reasons for condition are stated as 'in the interest of residential amenity'.
- Cottages are arranged as pairs of mirror images.
- Condition will result in the cottage being totally different to others on the terrace.
- Extensions at No. 3 and 5 protrude further than proposed.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

None

7.3. Observations

None

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1.1. The first party appeal relates solely to Condition 2 attached to the Notification of Decision to Grant Permission issued by the Planning Authority which relates to reducing the width and appearance of the rear extension.
- 8.1.2. I am satisfied that no amenity impacts will result from the two-storey extension.
- 8.1.3. I consider it appropriate, therefore, that the scope of the assessment is restricted to the consideration of Condition 2 as attached to the Notification of Decision issued by the Planning Authority, in accordance with S.139 of the Planning and Development Act (as amended).
- 8.1.4. Condition 2 relates to the amendments to the extension, reducing its width to 4.4m and requiring a setback from the neighbouring property of 1.6m. Amendments to the design are also required to be more in keeping with neighbouring extensions.
- 8.1.5. Immediately adjoining the property to the south, No. 5 Priestfield Cottages has a large dormer and two-storey extension that is slightly deeper than that proposed here. This is set back from the boundary with No. 7 Priestfield Cottages. No. 3 to the north has a dormer and two-storey rear extension with a set back from the boundary of the appeal site of approximately 2.1m. I note that there is no planning history on file in relation to these neighbouring sites.
- 8.1.6. Having regard to the above, I do not consider that the amendments to the width of the extensions are required in this instance, given the large extensions in place at Nos 3 and 5. While the dormer and two-storey extension proposed here are wider than neighbouring extensions, the extensions do not sit as deep these extensions. Therefore, the overall scale of the extensions are similar.
- 8.1.7. I do not consider the desire for consistency in appearance of extensions is warranted in this instance. While the neighbouring extensions each has a setback from a neighbouring boundary, other cottages along this terrace (1, 2, 6 and 7) do not have extensions at all to the rear. No 289 South Circular Road, which is visible from the rear of this property has a markedly different appearance than the more traditional cottages. Therefore, a full width dormer extension at No. 4 would not be markedly out of place given the disparity that already exists. Furthermore, the rear of the property has limited visibility from the streetscape, visible only from points along

Priestfield Drive, and therefore the visual impact of the extensions is subsequently limited.

- 8.1.8. I consider the scale of the extension is in keeping with the existing dwelling, allowing it to function as a family home, and all of the rear garden remains.
- 8.1.9. Furthermore, I do not consider the amendments to the fenestration pattern of the extension is warranted. The desire for a uniformity in window patterns along the terrace is unjustified in my opinion, given the disparity that already exists.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. Having regard to the above it is recommended that the Planning Authority be directed as follows:

That Condition No. 2 be removed from the grant of permission.

Rónán O'Connor
Planning Inspector

15th June 2017