



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL29N.248393

Development	Conversion of garage to habitable room, front bay-window extension, first-floor rear extension, single-storey rear extension and hip-roof extension.
Location	69 Kincora Road, Clontarf, Dublin 3
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2184/17
Applicant(s)	Ann Louise Mulhall
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	First-Party
Appellant(s)	Ann Louise Mulhall
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	26 th June 2017
Inspector	Colm McLoughlin

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
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	4
3.4. Third-Party Submissions	4
4.0 Planning History.....	5
4.1. Subject Site	5
4.2. Surrounding Sites.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	5
5.1. Development Plan.....	5
6.0 The Appeal	6
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	6
6.2. Planning Authority Response	6
6.3. Observations	6
7.0 Assessment	6
7.1. Introduction	6
7.2. Existing Pattern of Development	7
7.3. Visual Impact.....	8
8.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	9
9.0 Recommendation.....	9
10.0 Reasons and Considerations	10
11.0 Condition	10

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located on the northside of Kincora Road, which is accessed off Vernon Avenue in Clontarf, approximately 4km northeast of Dublin city centre.
- 1.2. It contains a two-storey four-bedroom semi-detached dwelling with two-storey flat-roof side extension and front-bay windows. The external finishes to the dwelling include a combination of facing brick to the front at low-level with render above and concrete profile tiles on the roof. To the front of the dwelling is a garden and driveway to accommodate cars and to the rear of the site the garden extends to a depth of approximately 35m.
- 1.3. The surrounding area is generally characterised by rows of semi-detached dwellings of differing styles, fronting onto narrow tree-lined streets. Ground levels in the vicinity are relatively flat with a slight drop in levels towards the south.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the conversion of the integral garage to a sitting room, front bay-window extension at ground and first floor-level, first-floor rear extension, single-storey rear extension and hipped-roof extension over the existing two-storey side extension.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to grant permission subject to 7 conditions, most of which are of a standard nature, but also including the following requirements:

- Condition No 2: The development hereby approved shall incorporate the following amendments:
 - a. The extension of the hipped roof over the proposed and existing extension shall be omitted from the development. The flat roof shall be continued over the first floor extension to the rear.

b. The two storey bay window shall be omitted from the development. The garage doors shall be replaced with a suitability sized window which matches the cill and head heights of the ground floor windows.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planning Officer reflects the decision of the planning authority. The Planning Officer notes the following:

- Given that the adjoining dwelling to the east No. 71 Kincora Road has a two storey flat roof extension which adjoins the front flat roof extension of the subject site, there are concerns that the extension of the hipped roof would have an adverse impact on the character, scale and overall proportion of the existing dwelling and the adjoining property. Furthermore, if repeated the roof extension would result in a roof valley between the subject site and adjoining property to the east No. 71, Kincora Road which is likely to harm the character of the street;
- It is noted that the proposed bay windows differ in proportions from the existing bay window. It is therefore considered that the repetition of this bay window feature will negatively impact on the proportions of the dwelling and would be likely to have a negative impact on neighbouring dwellings.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Engineering Department (Drainage Division) - no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third-Party Submissions

None.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject Site

There have been no recent relevant planning applications on the subject site.

4.2. Surrounding Sites

There have been numerous planning applications approved by the planning authority for residential extensions on neighbouring sites, including two-storey side extensions. Many of these permissions for hipped roof two-storey side extensions date from the mid-1990s¹.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The appeal site has a zoning objective 'Z1' 'Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' within the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 with a stated objective "to protect, provide and improve residential amenities".
- 5.1.2. Under Section 16.10.12 of Volume 1 to the Development Plan it is stated 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;
 - Have no unacceptable effect on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy and access to daylight and sunlight;
 - Achieve a High Quality of Design.
- 5.1.3. Appendix 17 (Volume 2) of the Development Plan provides guidance on residential extensions.

¹ Including: 77 Kincora Road – Ref. 2974/98; 83 Kincora Road – Ref. 0600/93; 120 Kincora Road – 0361/94 and; 51 Kincora Road – 0740/96.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first-party appeal has been lodged only against Condition 2 attached to the planning authority decision, with the following grounds raised:

- Significant variety and style of housing along Kincora Road;
- Extensive precedent in the immediate vicinity;
- Proposals tie in with the character of the area;
- Proposals do not impact on the scale and character of the dwelling on site;
- Proposals do not adversely impact on the amenities of occupants of neighbouring dwellings.

Photographs of extensions of a similar nature and scale accompany the grounds of appeal.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

Planning authority has no further comment on the grounds of appeal.

6.3. Observations

None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. This is a first-party appeal only against Condition 2 attached to the planning authority's decision to grant permission. Condition 2 generally requires:

- a) Hipped-roof extension to be omitted,
- b) Two-storey bay window feature to be omitted.

7.1.2. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the absence of third-parties to the appeal and the nature of condition number 2, it is considered that

the determination by the Board of the application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted, and therefore the Board should determine the matters raised in the appeal only in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning & Development Act, 2000 (as amended).

- 7.1.3. The Development Plan recognises that there are a wide variety of house types and styles within Dublin city and that it is not possible to deal with every type of addition. The Plan sets out general principles that should be addressed in all cases such as residential amenity issues, privacy, relationship between dwellings and extensions, daylight and sunlight, appearance, subordinate approach and materials. The primary issues for assessment relate to the character of the area, visual impact and design of the proposals.
- 7.1.4. It is reasonable to concur with the planning authority assessment that the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy and access to daylight and sunlight.

7.2. Existing Pattern of Development

- 7.2.1. With regards to the proposed hipped-roof extension, the rationale for the planning authority attaching this part of the condition relates to their concerns that this feature would have an adverse impact on the character, scale and overall proportion of the existing dwelling and the adjoining property, and if repeated on the adjacent property would cause a 'roof valley effect', which is likely to harm the character of the street. In relation to the rationale for attaching the condition omitting the proposed front bay-window extension, the planning authority considered that this would have negatively impacted on the proportions of the dwelling and would be likely to have a negative impact on neighbouring dwellings. The appellant asserts that housing along Kincora Road and the wider area varies considerably and that this provides extensive precedent for removal of both items within the subject condition.
- 7.2.2. It is acknowledged that there are extensive numbers of two-storey side extensions to dwellings along Kincora Road, and these include a variety of roof types including flat, hipped, half-hipped and gable-end roofs. In the area immediate to the appeal site, it is also noted that there is variety in the style of semi-detached houses, with only a

small number featuring bay-windows. It is noted that there is also variety in terms of how extended dwellings along Kincora Road relate to their respective side boundaries, with some set away from the side boundary, while others are built directly onto the side boundary. There are existing examples on Kincora Road of what the Planning Officer refers to as a 'roof valley effect'. The vast majority of extensions are not of recent construction and would have been considered under the terms of previous statutory Plans for the area.

7.3. Visual Impact

- 7.3.1. The subject dwelling is built on a similar level to the neighbouring property to the east, No. 71 Kincora Road, and on a similar building line. No. 71 includes a two-storey side extension with flat roof built onto the boundary with the subject site. The Planning Officer was concerned that should both adjoining properties comprise a hip-roof extension built up to the side boundaries, this would invariably create a **roof valley effect** between the properties and would be likely to harm the character of the street. This potential scenario would not result in a terracing effect along the street and in my opinion would not unduly impact on the character of the street, which has already been significantly altered as a result of various interventions to the dwellings over recent decades.
- 7.3.2. The Planning Officer states that the proposed bay-windows do not match the proportions of the existing bay windows on site. I would suggest that the proposed and existing bay windows do match, but the position of the proposed bay windows do not horizontally-align with the existing bay windows. Bay window projections are a typical feature in a suburban context such as this, and it is noted that the side extension to No. 51 Kincora Road features a two-storey front-bay window with sill and head height matching the original window. I recognise that the existing windows on the subject dwelling are not horizontally aligned with the original windows and I note that the proposed rear bathroom window has been aligned to match the adjacent first-floor windows. Floor levels do not appear to restrict the proposed sill and head height from corresponding with the original first-floor bay window. Accordingly, subject to this amendment in window position, in my opinion the proposed development would not unduly impact on the character of the dwelling on site, the adjoining dwellings or the street.

- 7.3.3. The Development Plan requires a residential extension to be 'subordinate' to the original dwelling. The Planning Officer asserts that the hipped-roof element of the proposals would be out of character, scale and proportion with the existing and adjoining dwelling. In my view, it would be more preferable to replace the flat roof element of the existing side extension with a hipped roof to match the pitch on the main roof, as proposed. While this may not fully abide by the subordinate approach, I note that the Plan recognises variety in housing in the city and I also note that the hip-roof and front bay affords a more balanced appearance to the front façade of the dwelling. Furthermore, I note that the Development Plan seeks to resist extensions to the front, which significantly break the building line. The proposed front bay window would not significantly break the building line, it matches the depth of the existing bay window projection and would not significantly detract from the appearance of the dwelling on site.
- 7.3.4. In conclusion, I am satisfied that condition 2 requiring the omission of the hipped-roof extension and front bay-window projection would not be warranted, as its attachment would not significantly reduce the impact of the proposed development on the existing dwelling, neighbouring properties and the street and would have negligible impact in protecting the visual amenities of the area.

8.0 **Appropriate Assessment**

Having regard to the minor nature of the proposed development and the location of the site in a serviced urban area and the separation distance to the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

9.0 **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the planning authority be directed to **AMEND** condition number 2 for the reasons and considerations hereunder.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that Condition 2 requiring the omission of the hip-roof extension and the front bay-window extension is not warranted as the proposed development is complementary to the existing dwellinghouse and neighbouring properties and would not seriously injure the amenities of the area. It is, therefore, considered that subject to compliance with the condition set out below, the proposed development would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Condition

2: The proposed development shall be amended as follows:

- a) The proposed first-floor front window shall be repositioned to match the sill and head height of the existing first-floor bay window on site.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

Colm McLoughlin
Planning Inspector

17th July 2017