



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL29N.248472

Development	Change of roof type from hipped to gable-end with half-hip and side window, rear dormer window extension and attic conversion.
Location	1 Chapel Crescent, Riverston Abbey, Dublin 7
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2286/17
Applicant(s)	Helen O'Callaghan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First-Party
Appellant(s)	Helen O'Callaghan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	12 th July 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.....	6
5.1. Development Plan.....	6
6.0 The Appeal	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
6.2. Planning Authority Response	7
6.3. Observations	7
7.0 Assessment.....	8
7.2. Principle of the Development	8
7.4. Residential Amenity	11
8.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	11
9.0 Recommendation.....	11
10.0 Reasons and Considerations	11
11.0 Conditions	12

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located on Chapel Crescent within the Riverston Abbey residential estate, which is accessed off the Navan Road (R147) and is approximately 800m to the west of Broombridge railway station and 4.5km northwest of Dublin city centre.
- 1.2. The appeal site is situated on the junction of Chapel Crescent and Abbey Drive and contains a two-storey hipped-roof four-bedroom dwelling with single-storey rear-infill extension and two-storey front bay projection. The external finishes to the dwelling include red-brick façade to the front elevation and dashed render to the side and rear elevations, with the roof finished with flat concrete tiles. To the front of the house there is a small garden enclosed by a hedgerow and low wall and a hardstanding to accommodate a vehicle. A timber shed is situated in the side garden and the boundary onto Abbey Drive comprises a 1.8m-high red brick wall with trellis panel mounted onto this.
- 1.3. The surrounding area is generally characterised by staggered pairs of semi-detached dwellings of similar styles, fronting onto residential culs-de-sac. Ground levels in the vicinity are relatively level to the south with a gradual drop to the north along Abbey Drive.

2.0 Proposed Development

The proposed development comprises:

- extension of the dwelling at roof level, incorporating replacement of the existing hipped roof with a gable-end and (Dutch-style) half-hipped roof;
- rear dormer window extension;
- window to side elevation at roof level.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to refuse permission for one reason:

- The proposed development would be an inappropriate and obtrusive element in the streetscape, detracting from its established character and prevailing pattern of development in the area and would set an undesirable precedent for similar future developments in the area. It would seriously injure the amenities of the area and of property in the vicinity and would be contrary to the zoning objective for the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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 in their report:

- Serious concerns regarding significant alteration of the existing roof profile;
- Subject site is located in a row of semi-detached houses characterised by hipped roofs, with a pitched element to the front;
- Proposed roof alterations would significantly unbalance the composition and appearance of the pair of houses;
- No objection in principle to the provision of a dormer window to the rear.

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

4.1.1. The following applications to extend the subject dwelling in the 2000s, were initially approved by Dublin City Council and subsequently refused on appeal by An Bord Pleanála:

- PL29N.228137 (DCC Ref. 6572/07) – Permission **refused** (May 2008) for two-storey extension to rear of dwelling;

Reason No. 1: Proposed two-storey rear extension would have an unacceptably obtrusive and overbearing appearance from No. 3 Chapel Crescent and would result in a significant loss of light to No. 3.

- PL29N.223695 (DCC Ref. 2343/07) – Permission **refused** (November 2007) for change of roof type from hipped to gable-end with half-hip and side window, rear dormer window extension and attic conversion and two-storey rear extension to rear of dwelling;

Reason No. 1: Proposed roof alterations would significantly unbalance the composition and appearance of the dwelling and, therefore, would seriously injure the amenities of the area;

Reason No. 2: Proposed two-storey rear extension would have an unacceptably obtrusive and overbearing appearance from No. 3 Chapel Crescent and would result in a significant loss of light to No. 3.

4.2. Surrounding Sites

4.2.1. There have been numerous recent planning applications on neighbouring dwellings for roof extensions similar to the subject proposals:

- 39 Abbey Drive – WEB1217/15 – Permission **granted** (September 2015) for change of roof type from hipped to gable with half hip and side and front rooflights, and for a rear dormer window extension;
- 4 Riverston Gardens – PL29N.244595 (DCC Ref. 3913/14) – Permission **granted** (June 2015) for rear single-storey rear extension and permission

refused for change of roof type from hipped to gable with half-hip and for a two-storey front bay extension;

- 18 Abbey Drive – 3705/13 – Permission **granted** (April 2014) for change of roof type from hipped to gable with half hip and for a rear dormer window extension;
- 18 Abbey Drive – 2849/13 – Permission **refused** (August 2013) for change of roof type from hipped to gable and for a rear dormer window extension;
- 37 Abbey Drive – 3745/11 – Permission **granted** (April 2012) for change of roof type from hipped to gable with half hip, a rear dormer window extension and a front porch;
- 38 Abbey Drive – 3698/10 – Permission **granted** (January 2011) for change of roof type from hipped to gable with half hip and two front rooflights and for a rear dormer window extension;
- 7 Chapel Crescent – 1540/08 – Permission **granted** (May 2008) for change of roof type from hipped to gable with half hip and side rooflight and for a rear dormer window extension;
- 8 Rectory Green – 4910/07 – Permission **granted** (March 2008) for change of roof type from hipped to gable and for a rear dormer window extension;
- 20 Chapel Crescent – 5836/06 – Permission **granted** (February 2007) for change of roof type from hipped to gable with half hip;
- 24 Abbey Drive – 5892/05 – Permission **granted** (March 2006) for change of roof type from hipped to gable with half hip and side rooflight and for a rear dormer window extension.

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, with Section 17.11 addressing roof extensions.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. The principal grounds of appeal to the proposed development can be summarised as follows:

- Roof types in the vicinity generally alternate between full hip and truncated hip, with the later in the majority;
- Subject proposals would match the roof types of the two other dwellings on the junction of Abbey Drive and Chapel Crescent;
- Extensive precedent in the immediate vicinity with planning references, photographs and locations provided for same;
- Proposals would be in keeping with the general pattern of development.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1. The planning authority responded by stating that they consider the Planner's Report on the file to comprehensively address issues raised and request the Board uphold refusal of the permission.

6.3. Observations

None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

- 7.1.1. The Development Plan sets out general principles for consideration in extending dwellings, such as residential amenity issues, privacy, relationship between dwellings and extensions, daylight and sunlight, appearance, the subordinate approach and materials. For the city to achieve compact, quality, accessible and affordable residential neighbourhoods, the Plan sets out, amongst other criteria, that dwellings should be adaptable and flexible to cater for changing needs over time.
- 7.1.2. The main issues arising in the grounds of appeal are as follows:
- Principle of the Development;
 - Established Character & Visual Amenity;
 - Residential Amenity;

7.2. Principle of the Development

- 7.2.1. The applicant is looking to improve the residential amenities of their property, meeting 'Z1' zoning objectives for the area. I note that a previous application for a similar development on the appeal site was refused planning permission by An Bord Pleanála for two reasons in November 2007 (Ref. PL29N.223695 & DCC Ref. 2343/07). This previous application included a two-storey rear extension that was the subject of one of the reasons for refusal. The other more pertinent reason for refusal related to the change of roof type from hip to gable-end with half-hip and side window. This element was refused permission on the grounds that it would significantly unbalance the composition and appearance of the dwelling and, therefore, would appear as an obtrusive element in the streetscape.
- 7.2.2. Within the Inspector's Report regarding the previously refused appeal, there is only specific reference to a revised gable-end roof type on No. 13 Chapel Crescent. Subsequent to November 2007, planning permissions have been either granted or completed for a change of roof type from hip to gable-end with half-hip to various properties in the immediate vicinity, including 39 Abbey Drive (WEB1217/15 – September 2015), 18 Abbey Drive (3705/13 – April 2014), 37 Abbey Drive (3745/11 -

April 2012), 38 Abbey Drive (3698/10 – January 2011), 7 Chapel Crescent (1540/08 - May 2008), 8 Rectory Green (4910/07 - March 2008), 20 Chapel Crescent (5836/06 – February 2007) and 24 Abbey Drive (5892/05 - March 2006). There are numerous other similar developments in the wider estate.

7.2.3. It is noted that permission for extensions to 4 Riverston Gardens (PL29N.244595 refers), including a Dutch hip to the side with raised gable wall, was refused within a split decision by An Bord Pleanála in June 2015. The proposed roof extension was refused permission along with a two-storey front extension, as it was considered that they would render the house inconsistent with neighbouring properties on a small cul-de-sac of uniform houses. Hip to gable-end roof extensions have not occurred in Riverston Gardens to the same extent as the area immediate to the appeal site.

7.2.4. Consequent to the proliferation of hip to gable-end roof extensions in the immediate area, in my opinion the character of the area has been significantly altered in the intervening period since refusal of the previous planning permission on site in November 2007 and this provides ample justification for overcoming the previous reason for refusal. Furthermore, unlike the previously refused applications to extend the subject dwelling, it is noted that there have been no third-party submissions to the subject application. While I recognise that the subject site occupies a corner location, I do not believe that this is an overly-prominent site given its central location within the network of residential streets and given the restricted broader views of the property within the streetscape. A more detailed assessment of this context is set out below (see Section 7.3.3).

7.3. Established Character & Visual Amenity

7.3.1. The planning authority raised concerns regarding the revised roof type proposed and its resultant impact on the character of the area, which is not provided with any conservation status. The subject property occupies a corner site on one of the main residential streets leading through the Riverston Abbey estate, serving over 200 dwellings and the Dominican Sisters Convent to the south and east of the appeal site. It backs onto the side boundary of No. 49 Abbey Drive, a detached property, although housing in the area is dominated by semi-detached pairs, alternating between hipped roofs and gable-end roofs featuring Dutch-style half hips.

- 7.3.2. As noted above, the influx of gable-end half-hip style roofs in the vicinity has altered the character of the area immediate to the subject site and in my opinion these developments have had limited impact on the form, design and rhythm of the streetscape, primarily due to the staggered housing layout, a growing prevalence of half-hipped roofs and maturing street trees. Accordingly, I do not consider that the subject development would detract from the character of the area by serving as an inappropriate or obtrusive element in the streetscape and the proposed development should not be refused for this reason.
- 7.3.3. The planning authority consider that when viewed from the neighbouring streets the proposed gable-roof extension would form a visually incongruous element to the streetscape when viewed alongside the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, No. 3 Chapel Crescent. The gable-end roof extension would be visible from the northern and southern approaches to the site along Abbey Drive. However, views of the subject pair of semi-detached dwellings, Nos. 1 & 3, would be very much limited to the public realm to the south at the junction of Abbey Drive and Chapel Crescent, and from a very small number of neighbouring dwellings, as a result of existing dwellings and maturing street trees. I also note that No. 7 Chapel Crescent, which is one of a pair of semi-detached houses immediately to the east of the subject site, has already been extended at roof level in a similar manner to that now proposed on the subject site. Given the limited views of the subject dwelling alongside No. 3 Chapel Crescent and the now established alternating roof types in the immediate vicinity, including roofs extended to form gable-ends with half hips, I consider that the proposed development would not form a visually incongruous element in the streetscape and would, therefore, not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area.
- 7.3.4. There are two main elements to the proposals; the replacement of the hipped roof with a gable-end and half-hipped roof and the rear dormer window extension. In my opinion, the dormer is visually subordinate to the roof slope and complies with the requirements for roof extensions, as set out in Appendix 17 of the Development Plan. I also note the Planning Officer's comments regarding the principle of the rear dormer window extension. In relation to the 'Dutch-style' half-hip feature, these can often look incongruous in a context such as this, but in this context its omission is not

warranted, as it would be more consistent with existing roof forms, including recent permissions, and would result in less visual clutter.

7.4. Residential Amenity

- 7.4.1. A window to serve the attic is proposed in the new gable elevation overlooking the street, offering additional surveillance of the public realm. New windows would also be introduced at roof level in the rear dormer extension, and I do not believe that this would lead to increased overlooking of neighbouring properties. The proposed development would, therefore, not seriously injure the residential amenity of property in the vicinity and should not be refused for this reason.

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

I recommend that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions, as set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the zoning, nature and scale of the proposed development, and the existing pattern of development in the vicinity, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions below, the proposed development would not be out of character with development within the area, would be acceptable in terms of visual impact and would not seriously injure the residential amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The external finishes of the proposed extensions including roof tiles/slates shall be the same as those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

3. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure a proper standard of development.

4. The site development works and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the adjoining streets are kept clear of debris, soil and other material and if the need arises for cleaning works to be carried out on the adjoining public roads, the said cleaning works shall be carried out at the developer's expense.

Reason: To ensure that the adjoining roadways are kept in a clean and safe condition during construction works in the interest of orderly

development.

5. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0700 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

Colm McLoughlin
Planning Inspector

26th July 2017