



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL 29S 248576

Development	Two Storey extension to side, single storey extension to rear, attic conversion with dormer windows, widening of vehicular entrance and site development works.
Location	20 Auburn Avenue, Donnybrook, Dublin 4.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
P.A. Reg. Ref.	2421/17.
Applicant	Ciaran Cassidy
Type of Application	Permission
Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeals	Three Third Parties:
Appellant	David Lawler and Mary Cryan, Con and Patricia O'Leary and, Ferga and Harry Lynch.
Observer	Colm O'Gorman and Clare McCarthy,
Date of Inspection	28 th August, 2017.
Inspector	Jane Dennehy.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site of the proposed development has a stated area of 194 square metres and is located on the north west side of Auburn Avenue in Donnybrook and is that of a semi-detached, two storey house with a garage to the side. The houses along this side of Auburn Avenue are pairs of semi-detached houses with garages to the side constructed in the 1930s. These houses incorporate a two storey bay feature to the front and garage and utility space to the side extending beyond the rear building line of the house. Cast iron railings are located along the site frontage along with a vehicular entrance gate circa two metres in width. There is a small rear garden, the depth of which is circa 7.5 to 8 metres and it is enclosed by boundary walls along the sides and rear.
- 1.2. Edwardian red brick faced terraced houses are located along the opposite, south side of Auburn Avenue and as is the case on the north side of the street. There is a distinct homogeneity in plot width, house type, materials and finishes in the streetscapes on each side of the road.
- 1.3. Pay and display and residential permit parallel parking is available along both sides of Auburn Avenue.

2.0 The Proposed Development

- 2.1. The application lodged with the planning authority indicates proposals for:
 - a two storey side extension with a hipped roof, (including demolition of the existing garage and ancillary structures) two opaque glazed windows are to be provided in the front elevation of the extension.
 - alterations to the existing front façade window opens, insertion of an additional window to the front elevation and in the extension,
 - A single storey flat roofed rear extension with a roof light,
 - An attic conversion with two dormer windows to the rear
 - A roof light to the north east roof slope and
 - Widening of the existing vehicular entrance (from 2.2 metres to 3 metres.)

The applicant has obtained written consent of the owner of the property to the lodgement of the application.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated, 28th April, 2017 the planning authority decided to grant permission subject to conditions all of which are of a standard nature except the requirements under condition No 3 and Condition No 8 (i).

There are requirements under Condition No 3 for modifications to the proposed development consisting of reduction in the width of the dormer box in the rear roof slope for the attic to a maximum of four metres and an upper limit of 3.2 metres for the height of the rear extension for reasons of protection of residential amenity of adjoining properties.

There is a requirement under Condition No 8 (i) for a maximum width of 2.6 metres for the proposed widening of the existing entrance.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

Planning Reports

- 3.2.1. The planning officer considers the proposal acceptable and consistent with the relevant policies and objectives of the development plan, subject to the modifications required under Condition No 2 to maintain the residential amenities of adjoining properties and Condition No 8 the requirements of which include restriction to a maximum width of 2.6 metres for the entrance. In addition, he states that he considers that the requirements of the Roads and Traffic Division regarding the entrance, (see section 4.3.3 below) can be addressed by condition.

Other Technical Reports

- 3.2.2. Roads and Traffic Planning Division. A recommendation is made in the report in which the existing vehicular entrance is acknowledged. It is recommended that the applicant be issued with a request for additional information and to provide a swept

path analysis for the entrance and to restrict the entrance width, so that disruption to the supply of existing on street parking facilities could be avoided.

The report of the Drainage Division indicates no objection subject to conditions.

Third Party Observations

- 3.2.3. Third party submissions were received from three parties. The submission of the occupants of the property at No 21 Brendan Road indicates support for the proposed development. Either one or both the parties comprising the occupants of No 19 Auburn Avenue and No 15 Brendan Road indicate concerns about the scale and size of the proposed development and impact on visual and residential amenity having regard to the size of the dormer extension, the two storey extension at the side facing towards the street and the depth and height of the single storey extension.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. There is no record of planning history for the appeal site.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The operative development plan is the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022 according to which the site is subject to the zoning objective, Z1: *“to protect, provide for and or improve residential amenities”*. Relevant policies, objective and standards for extensions to residential development are set out in Section 16. (Of particular reference is section 16.2.2.3 with a requirement for sensitive design that respects the character and context of the existing building and the amenities of adjoining properties Section 16.10.12, and Appendix 17 which provides supporting guidance and standards.)

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Third Party Appeal

6.1.1. An appeal was received from Dr Diarmuid O'Grada on behalf of:

David Lawler and Mary Cryan No 15 Brendan Road,
Con and Patricia O'Leary No 11 Brenda Road and,
Ferga and Harry Lynch of Mullingar Co. Westmeath.

6.1.2. It is submitted in the appeal that three additions to the house are proposed in the application and that they would cause extreme loss of residential amenity at the properties at Nos 11, 13 and No 15 Brendan Road. These properties are located to that the rear and to the south of the appeal site property on Auburn Avenue.

6.1.3. According to the appeal, the proposed development in entirety results in an increase in the total floor area to 176 square metres from 103 square metres and is excessive. There is particular concern on the part of the Appellants about the potential impact on their properties on Brendan Road due to:

- the proposed replacement of the existing rear roof slope with an enlarged roof slope providing for a second floor of habitable accommodation,
- the insertion of a large rear facing window in the replacement roof slope and,
- the limited size of the remaining rear garden space that would be retained.

6.1.4. The issues raised in the appeal can be divided with regard to the two main elements of the proposed development which give rise to the Appellant party's objections.

6.1.5. With regard to the proposed dormer element it is submitted that:

- The proposed additional floor and dormer window at the rear would adversely affect the proportions, architectural form of the house and the streetscape and would have negative visual impact on views and outlook from the gardens and houses on Brendan Road. This is particularly due to the width and height of the insertion into the terracotta tiled roof slope which is disproportionate as well as the extent of the flat roof over the dormer and the external finish to the facade.

- The Brendan Road properties would be seriously overlooked from the proposed large window in the rear roof slope which has a low cill height. In failing to achieve a subordinate approach which harmonises with the existing dwelling, the proposed second floor/dormer element is entirely at odds with standards in Appendix 17 of the development plan, especially Para 17.3 according to which dormers should be subordinate to and, set back behind the eaves level with a large proportion of the roof slope remaining visible. (An artist's impression is provided in the appeal.)
- The development is a visually dominant third storey which cannot be obscured in the short distance to the properties at the rear by trees. The proposed second floor façade amounts to sixty-two per cent of the rear elevation. (Drawing No 16-63-P-10 refers)
- There is scope for more modest and restrained extensions. An attic conversion served by roof lights would be feasible. Extra bed spaces could also be achieved by dividing bedroom No 3 which has a floor area of seventeen square metres into two bedrooms similar to Bedroom No 1.
- In his report the planning officer acknowledges the requirements for sensitivity in design for extensions and alterations to dwellings with regard to scale and character and with regard for the amenities of adjoining properties in section 16.10. 12 of the development plan. but fails to deduce the salient guidance. He also refers to the criteria for proposals for roof extensions involving alteration to shape, pitch, cladding or ornamentation as provided for in Appendix 17. The planning officer's assessment, (extracts from which are reproduced in the appeal) is erroneous. Significant contextual points are identified in the report and then discarded.

6.1.6. With regard to the single storey rear extension to the rear it is submitted that:

- Some of the houses on Auburn Avenue have rear extensions at ground floor level with pitched roofs and with terracotta tiles. The proposed extension is excessive in scale for a domestic extension, extensively alters the rear elevation and ruptures the balanced layout and arrangement of buildings along Auburn Avenue with setback rear windows which are confined to specified heights.

- The five metre depth of the proposed ground floor extension at the rear will have a separation distance of 2.9 metres from the rear boundary which will be of little active or passive utility lacking in access to sunlight except in the mid to late afternoon. The loss of private open space is not justified.

6.1.7. In the concluding remarks it is stated that the proposed development is not consistent with the terms of reference for domestic extensions and the relationship of such development with adjoin properties with regard to several relevant criteria set out in the Dublin City Development Plan especially Appendix 17.

Observer Submission,

6.2. A submission was received from Clare McCarthy and Colm O’Gorman of No 19 Auburn Avenue the property to the north east side of the appeal site, on 19th June, 2017. It is requested that,

- at a minimum, the requirement (under Condition No 3 of the planning authority’s decision) that the ground floor extension should not exceed a 3.2 metre height be included, should permission be granted.
- the rear extension should match the existing building as much as possible by use of similar pebble dash finishes and, omission of the parapet or use of matching capping to reflect the appearance of the existing house.

Applicant Response

6.3. A submission was received from Hughes Planning Consultants on 26th June 2017. It includes drawings in which revisions consistent with the requirements under Condition No 3 of the planning authority’s decision to grant permission are shown. The dormer extension is reduced from 5.5 metres to four metres in width and the single storey extension at the rear is reduced in height from 3.5 metres to 3.2 metres. It is confirmed in the submission that the applicant has no objection to the Conditions attached to the decision to grant permission including the modifications required under Condition No 3.

6.4. According to the submission:

- The aerial photograph which was included in the appeal is inaccurate because recent development at the rear of properties are not shown. A

recent aerial photograph is provided in which development at the rear of the adjoining property at No 19 Auburn Avenue is shown.

- Nos. 11 and 13 Brendan Road are not directly to the rear of the appeal site.
- There is no undue loss of amenity at the appellant properties and the proposed extensions are modestly scaled and informed by previously permitted development in the area.
- The proposed development is a residential extension. It is consistent with the actively encouraged intensification of residential use by development of extensions and, increased density in metropolitan areas in planning policy.
- There are several similar or more extensive extensions which include dormer elements within the vicinity of the appeal site from which precedent can be taken. Detailed accounts and commentary with illustrations on these previously permitted developments at Nos, 2, 4, 9, 11, 12 and 14 Auburn Avenue, and at properties on Brendan Road, Pembroke Cottages, Beech Hill Drive, and a property at 138 Morehampton Road, (which is in a Residential Conservation Area) are included in the submission. Precedent can be taken from these examples in that elements of these permitted developments and/or various aspects of their impact on amenities are comparable to those of the proposed development. The design and layouts are directly informed by the need to protect and enhance the residential amenities of the area in accordance with the zoning objective.
- The proposal accords with the Provisions of Appendix 17 and section 16.10.12 of the development plan.
- The single storey rear extension is appropriately setback from the boundary. It does not obstruct daylight and sunlight. The dormer window is designed to a high standard and positively contributes to the dwelling and to the aspect from adjacent gardens.
- Undue overlooking is avoided through sufficient window to window separation distance, the dormer setback and, the reduced four metre width distances. The dormer design is in accordance with Appendix 17 (Section Drawing AA refers.)

- The proposed development will not have overbearing or adverse visual impact affecting amenities of adjoining properties. The dormer appears subordinate to the house.
- The attic conversion with a dormer window does not entail construction of a second floor and replacement of the roof slope as contended in the appeal. An illustration in figure 7 of the appeal is inaccurate. The illustration in the appeal shows the modified dormer required under condition No 3 with the reduced width and omission of one window. It is an appropriately scaled and designed dormer which will not affect residential amenities of adjoining property. The illustration in the appeal is misleading as does not show the modified width required in Condition No 3.
- The single storey extension provides 23.7 square metres of accommodation and is designed and scaled to avoid adverse impact on residential amenities and the height does not exceed 3.2 metres. It integrates satisfactorily with the existing house and adjoining house at No 21 and is below the roof form. The use facilitates the applicant's requirements for the internal layout and interface with the garden.
- The two storey side extension, mimics and complements the existing front elevation in scale, design, materials and finishes and with similar roof form. It is subordinate to and respects the character of the main house and orientation and fenestration avoids undue impact on adjoining property.
- The site coverage (55%) and plot ratio at 0.96 accords with development plan standards. Private open space consists of a total area of 45 square metres high quality space at the rear which was considered adequate by the planning officer.
- Off street parking accords with the requirement in Table 16.1 of the development plan at on space per dwelling for Category 2 areas. with Area 2 standards
- The planning officer had no concerns about design and quality or scale and character of the existing dwelling. The only issues of concern which relate to the height of the single storey extension and the dormer window were conditioned

- The various properties along Auburn Avenue which have been extended to the rear since 2000 are shown in a recent aerial photograph included in the submission. The aerial photograph included in the appeal dates from 2000 and is therefore is out of date and misleading.
- No 15 Brendan Road, (at the rear of the appeal site) is higher than the Auburn Road houses and has three storeys at the rear.

6.5. It is requested that the appeal be rejected and that the planning authority decision to grant permission be upheld.

Further Submission of the Observer Party.

6.6. A submission with observations on the response to the appeal by the applicant was received from Clare McCarthy and Colm O’Gorman on 19th August, 2017. They confirm that they do not agree that the proposed development is sensitive to the amenities of adjoining properties. They also consider that the permitted developments provided as examples from which precedent can be taken are not comparable. In addition, they contend that the examples provided for Auburn Avenue are properties located on the opposite side of the road. In concluding remarks, they state that they hope that the applicant can achieve a development at No 20 which is consistent with the protection of the amenities of their property. (No 19.)

Further submission of the Appellant

6.7. A further submission was received from the agent for the Appellant on 18th August, 2017. The contentions in the appeal that the proposed development is over sized, dominant and fails to comply with section 16.2.2.3 are reiterated.

6.8. According to the submission:

- Auburn Avenue has particular design constraints because it is the exception to the typical established context of roads with fine red brick, two story houses with slate roofs in the surrounding area.
- The roof level development amounts to an additional floor for habitable use with excessive enlargement, substantially replacing the roof slope.

- It is not accepted that the reduced width dormer would result in reduced overlooking. This can only be overcome by setting the window back and by installation of frosted glass. The claim that the roof level interventions are not an attic conversion are reiterated, it being contended that the dormer element is a “shed-like structure on the roof slope”. It substantially raises the roof profile, incorporates a two metres high new façade at the rear and turns the house into a three storey building. The Drawing No 16-63-P09 shows a material like a raised seam membrane and Drawing 16-63-10 indicates “concrete roof tiles to match existing” but the flat roof cannot be tiled. The diagram link extends to the existing roof slope therefore relating to a different surface. The bulk of the extension prevents tiles from supporting the integration.
- The roof level structure that is proposed does not follow the form of the existing dwelling as sought in the development plan. The majority of the attic level where reasonable floor to ceiling height is achievable is allocated to the master bedroom which is only slightly reduced in size by the requirements of Condition No 3. A simple attic conversion would have been much reduced in width and height with a small change to the roof slope.
- The aerial photograph in the response to the appeal shows five pairs of semi-detached houses but there are no roof slopes at the rear of these houses so it is not clear why the photograph was used to illustrate that there is precedent development.
- Substantial loss of rear garden space would be incurred.
- Some of the statements in the response to the appeal with regard to the design intent to protect amenities of adjoining properties are exaggerated and there is also overemphasis on the existing finishes.

Planning Authority Response

6.9. There is no submission from the planning authority on file.

7.0 Assessment

The proposed development is essentially for three extensions apart from the proposed widening of the entrance, demolition of the garage and utility area and site works. In this instance, consideration of each of the three distinct extensions in the proposal separately on their own merits is practicable and appropriate. Therefore, the issues central to the determination of a decision can be considered under the following subheadings:

- Architectural Style and size of existing development relative to the proposed development.
- Precedent.
- The proposed two storey extension to the side.
- The proposed dormer development in the roof slope.
- The proposed single storey extension to the rear.

For each of the three proposed additions to the house, impact on the integrity, character and amenities of the existing property, impact on established pattern and character of development on Auburn Avenue and the adjoining road network and, impact on residential amenities of adjoining properties are considered. In addition, a brief comment is made on the proposed widening of the vehicular entrance and on appropriate assessment.

Architectural Style and size of existing development relative to the proposed development.

- 7.1. The proposed development overall is extensive, especially when considered in the context of the relatively modest size of the existing dwelling. However, it is not accepted that consideration of a proposed development should be ruled out, in principle, solely on the basis of the proportion of additional floor area relative to that of existing development or the extent of variation in the plot ratio.
- 7.2. The appellant's agent in his submissions draws particular attention to somewhat non-conforming characteristics by reason of the architectural style of the streetscape along the north side of Auburn Avenue, especially the terracotta roof tiles. In contrast development on the south side of the road comprises redbrick faced terraced,

Edwardian houses similar to residential development of that period along many inner suburban residential roads.

- 7.3. There is a clearly recognisable 1930s suburban typology to the semi-detached pairs of houses along the north side of Auburn Avenue in which the appeal site is located. There is a distinct homogeneity to the streetscape to either side, the south side comprising uniform, Edwardian, terraced two storey houses in contrast to the 1930s semi-detached houses on the north side.
- 7.4. It is also of note that the existing development on the appeal site does not benefit from statutory protection through inclusion on the record of protected structures, through coming within a statutory architectural conservation area or within an area subject to the residential conservation area zoning objective in the development plan.

Precedent.

- 7.5. The applicant's agent has included comprehensive details of several previously permitted developments at properties within the vicinity of the site description and accompanying commentaries in support of the case made that there is precedent for the proposed development. Direct precedent cannot be taken from any of these previously permitted developments in that the site location, site configuration, existing development and additional developments are not comparable to those of the subject application either by way of the individual or, the combined elements of permitted developments. It also appears that none of the site locations for the selected cases are located on the north side of Auburn Avenue. The developments on Auburn Avenue referred to in the applicant's submissions all relate to the Edwardian properties on the south side of Auburn Avenue.

Proposed two storey extension to the side

- 7.6. The proposed two storey extension which would infill the space occupied by the garage and utility area (to be demolished) and side passage as far as the side boundary with the observer party property at No 19 Auburn Avenue is appropriate in form and design. However, complete infill to the front building line at two storey level is unacceptable in that a strong streetscape feature of the homogeneity and symmetry of the semi-detached houses on this side of the road is the space between the pairs at either side above the original garages. The proposed development

would materially alter the established presentation in the streetscape and create precedent for similar infill at the other properties on the north side of the street. This would potentially replace the existing feature of the streetscape with a continuous unbroken terraced presentation that materially affects the architectural style and characteristics of the streetscape.

- 7.7. This issue can be addressed by a significant setback of the upper floor element of the side extension at this location which can be achieved by omission of the first floor space allocated for a first floor bathroom. Some rearrangement of the internal layout may be necessary to provide for a first floor bathroom. It may be feasible for this matter to be addressed by condition as otherwise, the design and form, especially the hipped roof, satisfactorily integrates with the original dwelling form and the setback would be immaterial to the streetscape presentation.
- 7.8. It is acknowledged that this matter does not appear to be a specific objection of the appellant and observer parties although they do express concerns as to adverse impact on the established architectural style and characteristics of the streetscape and that the planning officer did not indicate any concerns. The modification recommended is potentially a new issue and further notification to the parties may be necessary prior to determination of a decision, should a favourable decision on the proposed development be under consideration.

The proposed dormer development in the roof slope.

- 7.9. The main objection of the Appellant party is the provision for habitable accommodation, (a bedroom and bathroom) in a new rear elevation dormer element. The proposed interventions radically alter, (with or without the modifications required under Condition No 3 of the planning authority decision) the roof slope the terracotta roof tiles on which are major feature of the existing house and other houses along the north side of Auburn Avenue. Such an intervention interferes with the characteristics and integrity of the roof slope and the terracotta roof tiles, and has negative visual impact, especially on views from the adjoining properties to the north on Brendan Road. However, negative visual impact on views from private properties or outside the public realm is not a material planning consideration whereas consideration of an overbearing impact is reasonable if material negative effect on residential amenities is demonstrated.

- 7.10. The properties on Brendan Road incorporate two storey returns. The level of the upper floor rear elevation windows is higher than that of the upper floor windows in the rear elevation of the appeal site property. There is fourteen metres separation distance from the rear return and nineteen metres separation distance from the rear elevation of the dwelling at No 15 Brendan Road directly to the rear of the appeal sites and the rear building line of the existing house on the appeal site. These distances fall short of recommended minimum twenty-two metres separation distance between first floor windows for acceptability within urban areas according to section 16.10.2 of the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022 and an increased separation distance is advisable where fenestration at second and higher levels is involved
- 7.11. While there is an element of reciprocity in overlooking at first floor level between first floor windows, the depth of the rear garden of the existing development, at eight metres, falls short of the recommended minimum depth of eleven metres. Therefore, the pre-development scenario whereby potential for undue overlooking from the appeal site property is marginally greater than the reciprocal scenario, would be considerably exacerbated by overlooking from a second floor dormer window.
- 7.12. There are no design mitigation measures for the proposed fenestration for the attic level dormer window as originally proposed or modified to comply with the requirements of Condition No 3 attached to the planning authority decision. It is concluded that the proposed dormer window would give rise to undue overlooking of properties on Brendan Road.
- 7.13. It is agreed with the appellant that the proposed upper floor habitable accommodation does necessitate significant intervention to the rear roof slope and that this is a radical and negative intervention to the integrity of fabric and character of the original dwelling. The predominance of the terracotta roof tiled slope is altered by insertion of the considerably sized dormer element by reason of the width depth and height extending from a point slightly above the eaves to a point just below the roof ridge. The modifications required under Condition 3, as is demonstrated in the revised drawings submitted with the response to the appeal, are relatively effective but do not eliminate the impact. The argument that the proposed dormer element is effectively an additional floor rather than an attic conversion is reasonable. To this end the description in the notices may be somewhat conservative.

- 7.14. A modest attic conversion whereby roof lights are substituted for the dormer element should provide for some habitable accommodation with adequate headroom and address the issue of undue degree of overlooking of properties on Brendan Road.

The proposed single storey extension to the rear.

- 7.15. The dwelling with the proposed extensions in place, (with or without modification) provides for seven to eight bed spaces generating a requirement an area private open space provision at the rear of seventy square metres. A total area of forty-five square metres is available with the proposed development in place. Some flexibility in the application of the requirement for ten square metres per bed space, particularly if high quality private amenity space can be provided is reasonable but this is not achieved in the current proposal. In spite of the case made on behalf of the applicant as to a quality interrelationship between the internal and external space the configuration is restrictive. The narrow 'L' shaped strips adjacent to the west and north site boundaries have poor amenity potential and very limited access to sunlight. This can be effectively addressed by a reduction in the depth of the single storey extension to the rear by 1.5 metres resulting in an increase to 3.5 metres in the width adjacent to the rear boundary area and increased sunlight access.
- 7.16. A reduced depth is of some advantage to the amenity potential of the private open space at the adjoining property at No 19. The reduction in the depth of the proposed single storey extension allows for sizeable open plan internal living accommodation and adequate quantity and quality of private open space provision. This matter could be addressed by condition.

Widening of the Proposed Vehicular Entrance.

- 7.17. The applicant sought to increase the width of the entrance from 2.2 metres to three metres. Although the Traffic and Transportation Department recommended that a swept path analysis be sought, owing to the narrow width of the road and availability of on-street parallel parking on both sides. However, the planning authority decision to allow for an increase in width to 2.6 metres is reasonable in that it facilitates the applicant but retains most of the existing front boundary railing. The increased width does involve a little overlap with the paid parallel parking area but as it is not subdivided into individual car spaces, the effect of the potential encroachment is minor. An increase in width to 2.6 metres is therefore considered acceptable.

Appropriate Assessment.

- 7.18. Having regard to the location within an established inner suburban area and to the nature of the proposed development involving extensions and alterations to an existing residential property it is considered that no appropriate assessment issues arise. The proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

It has been concluded that major modifications to the proposed development are required to render it acceptable to protection of the established character and integrity of the existing house, the architectural characteristics of the streetscape, and the protection of the residential amenities of adjoining properties. In the event of favourable consideration of the proposed development subject to the recommended modifications, it may be advisable for section 132 notification to be issued to the parties in the first instance because, omission of part of the first floor of the two storey extension to the side would be a new issue and, because the extent of combined modifications recommended is considerable, that is, omission of part of the first floor element to the front in the two storey side extension, the substitution of an attic conversion with roof lights for the dormer element and, the reduction in the depth of the single storey extension to the rear.

It would be inappropriate for these matters to be addressed by condition but refusal of permission without opportunity for further submissions is not recommended.

Draft reasons and considerations are set out below for a decision to refuse permission.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the existing pattern and architectural style of development in the area, and to the standards for residential extensions set out chapter 16 and Appendix 17 in the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022, it is considered that the proposed development would:

- constitute over development due to the excessive proportion of the proposed dormer element relative to the existing roof, the depth of the proposed rear extension resulting in substandard private open space provision in quality and quantity, -
- by reason of the proposed infill as far as the side boundary at the front building line, would not integrate satisfactorily with the existing house and the established architectural style in the streetscape of pairs of semi-detached two storey dwellings.

As a result, the proposed development would be seriously injurious to the visual amenities of the area and residential amenities of properties in the vicinity, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Jane Dennehy
Senior Planning Inspector.
30th August, 2017.