



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL29N.248615

Development

Raised gable end and change of roof type to dutch hipped roof type, new dormer roof window to rear, new rooflight to the front and side to accommodate new attic room.

Location

8 Oakwood Park, Glasnevin, Dublin 11.

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2471/17.

Applicant

Linda Bailey.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse.

Type of Appeal

First Party -v- Refusal

Appellant

Linda Bailey.

Observers

None.

Date of Site Inspection

17th August, 2017.

Inspector

Paul Caprani.

Contents

1.0 Introduction	3
2.0 Site Location and Description	3
3.0 Proposed Development	3
4.0 Planning Authority's Decision	4
5.0 Planning History.....	5
6.0 Grounds of Appeal.....	5
7.0 Appeal Responses.....	5
8.0 Development Plan Provision.....	5
9.0 Planning Assessment	7
10.0 Conclusions and Recommendation.....	8
11.0 Reasons and Considerations	9
12.0 Appropriate Assessment	9

1.0 Introduction

PL29N.248615 relates to a first party appeal against the decision of Dublin City Council to refuse planning permission for an extension involving a raised gable end and a change of roof type at No. 8 Oakwood Park, Glasnevin, Dublin 11. Dublin City Council refused permission for a single reason arguing that the proposed development would be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area and would set an undesirable precedent for similar type developments. As such it would impact on the amenities of the area and would be contrary to the zoning objectives.

2.0 Site Location and Description

8 Oakwood Park is located in the northern environs of Glasnevin approximately 6 kilometres north of the city centre. Oakwood Park forms part of a large suburban area comprising of rows of terraced houses and semi-detached dwellings. No. 8 Oakwood Park is located on the eastern side of the road, just north of the junction with Oakwood Avenue. The site accommodates a two-storey dwellinghouse which forms part of a pair of semi-detached dwellings. A narrow laneway runs along the northern boundary which provides access to a garage to the rear. The roof of number 8 rises to a ridge height of just under 8 metres and incorporates a single-storey extension to the rear. The ground floor accommodates general living accommodation while three bedrooms and a bathroom are located at first floor level. The roof profile currently comprises of a hipped gable roof incorporating a 30-degree angle. The existing roof profile of No. 6 and No. 8 (the pair of semi-detached dwellings) are currently symmetrical.

3.0 Proposed Development

- 3.1. Planning permission is sought for an alteration of the roof profile to incorporate a new bedroom at second floor level. The attic area is to accommodate a new bedroom and will result in a dormer type extension to the rear with a new window and the incorporation of a new Dutch half-hipped gable end on the northern gable of

the dwelling. The new dormer extension to the rear incorporates a height of 2.146 metres and a width of 2.2 metres. The new bedroom at attic level is also to accommodate a walk-in wardrobe and a bathroom. The stairwell leading to the attic and the bathroom is to incorporate a roof light within the front roof-pitch to provide natural daylight and ventilation. The overall ridge height is to remain the same.

4.0 Planning Authority's Decision

Dublin City Council refused planning permission for the single reason set out below.

“The proposed development which involves the raising of the gable end and a change of the roof profile to the side would be visually obtrusive and would be out of character with the 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 property in the vicinity and would be contrary to the zoning objectives for the area which is to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

4.1. Planning Authority's Assessment

- 4.1.1. The planning application was lodged on 15th March, 2017. The planning application form indicates that the floor area proposed within the attic space is 11 square metres.
- 4.1.2. A report from the Engineering Department – Drainage Division, states that there is no objection to this development subject to conditions.
- 4.1.3. The planner's report sets out the site description and proposal and also sets out the policies contained in the development plan as they relate to extensions, alterations and roof extensions.
- 4.1.4. It states that while a dormer to the rear is generally permissible the proposal in question also involves significant alteration to the existing side roof profile. This would significantly alter the existing side roof profile and render it out of character with those in the area. It is noted that the original hipped profiles have remained unaltered in the immediate area. It is therefore recommended that the proposal is unacceptable and that planning permission should be refused.

5.0 Planning History

There appears to be no relevant planning history in relation to the subject site or its environs.

6.0 Grounds of Appeal

The decision of Dublin City Council to issue notification to refuse planning permission for the proposed development was appealed on behalf of the applicant by Gavin Kirwan Engineering Services. The grounds of appeal are outlined below:

It is stated that the prevailing pattern of roof profiles in the area is changing with the incorporation of varying styles of attic conversions in order to keep up with the required need for additional accommodation. It is stated that within a radius of approximately 145 metres from the subject site there have been numerous changes in roof profiles.

Also attached to the grounds of appeal is a letter drafted by the appellant which provides photographs and details of various styles of roof alterations and extensions in the area. The proposal in this instance is appropriate and would give rise to much additional accommodation which provides a healthier living space and environment to grow up in. It is considered that the proposed extension fully complies with Policy H16 and the other policies in relation to house extensions. There is a genuine need for extending the home to accommodate a growing and aging population.

7.0 Appeal Responses

Dublin City Council submitted a response stating it has no further comments to make in respect of the appeal.

8.0 Development Plan Provision

- 8.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 – 2022. The site is governed by the land use zoning objective Z1 with the objective to “*protect, provide and improve residential amenities*”.

8.2. General guidance for residential extensions in all zones throughout the city are set out in Section 16.10.12. It requires that all extensions and alterations should protect the amenities of adjoining dwellings in particular the need for light and privacy. The form of the existing building should be followed as much as possible and similar finishes should be used on the extension. Applications for proposals will be granted provided that:

- the proposed development has no adverse impact on the scale and character of the dwelling.
- Has no unacceptable effect on the amenities enjoyed by occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy and access to daylight and sunlight.
- Paragraph 17.11 of Appendix 17 specifically relates to roof extensions. It notes that the roofline of a building is one of its most dominant features and it is important that any proposal to change the shape, pitch, cladding or ornament of a roof is carefully considered. If not treated sympathetically, dormer extensions can cause problems for immediate neighbours and the way the street is viewed as a whole.

8.3. When extending the roof, the following principles should be observed.

- The design of the dormer should reflect the character of the area, the surrounding buildings and the age and appearance of the existing building.
- Dormer windows should be visually subordinate to the roof slope enabling a large proportion of the original roof to remain visible.
- Any new window should relate to the shape, size, position and design of the existing doors and windows on the lower floors.
- Roof materials should be covered in materials that match or complement the main building.
- Dormer windows should be set back from the eaves levels to minimise their visual impact and reduce the potential for overlooking of adjoining properties.

9.0 Planning Assessment

- 9.1. Dublin City Council refused planning permission for a single reason stating that the change in roof profile to the side would be visually obtrusive and out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area. The grounds of appeal argue that there are numerous precedents in the wider area where similar type roof extension/alterations have taken place. I would generally be in agreement with the decision of Dublin City Council that the alteration in the roof profile in this instance is unacceptable and would have profound and material impact on the character of the area. While the applicant makes reference to numerous extensions in the wider area there are no such extensions or alterations to the roof profile in the immediate vicinity of the subject site.
- 9.2. No. 8 Oakwood Park forms part of a pair of semi-detached dwellings which incorporate a symmetrical roof profile. I consider that the proposed dutch hipped gable end would be incongruous in the context of the existing roof profiles and would alter the balance and symmetry in the roof. While there should be a reasonable expectation that the applicant in this instance can extend the dwellinghouse in order to accommodate the growing needs of a family, I consider that other options should be explored particularly to the rear of the roof in order to ensure that the roof profile is not altered as dramatically as proposed under the current application. I do not consider that the design of the roof profile as proposed sufficiently reflects the character of the area or of the buildings in the immediate vicinity. The overall size and scale of the alterations would ensure that the extension in this instance would not be subordinate or ancillary to the main roof profile. The subject site is located in a row of semi-detached dwellinghouses which are characterised by uniformed hipped roofs and for this reason the proposed roof type in my opinion is out of character with the general area. I therefore consider that the Planning Authority's decision should be upheld in this instance and planning permission should be refused for the proposed extension and alteration.
- 9.3. I wish also to bring the Board's attention to a new issue in respect of the application and appeal. The drawings submitted quite clearly indicate that the extension and alteration to the roof profile is proposed in order to accommodate an additional bedroom, en-suite, bathroom and wardrobe. While the drawings indicate that the

area is to be used for attic storage only, it is quite clear that the incorporation of an en-suite bathroom and wardrobe suggests that the additional space is to be used to accommodate a bedroom. The drawings submitted indicate that the floor to ceiling height in the case of the bedroom is 2.181 metres in height. The Dublin City Development Plan in Chapter 16 sets out guidelines in relation to ceiling heights. It notes it is a specific planning policy requirement in the Department of Environment, Community and Local Government Apartment Guidelines that the minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.7 metres shall be required for ground floor level units and 2.4 metres for all other levels measured from the finished floor level to the finished ceiling height. While the current development does not specifically relate to an apartment, I nonetheless consider that requisite floor to ceiling heights should be provided in accordance with the above guidelines in the case of all habitable rooms to ensure an acceptable level of amenity is provided. The Board may consider refusing planning permission on the grounds that the proposed development does not comply with the minimum floor to ceiling heights as set out in Section 16 of the development plan. I do acknowledge however that this constitutes a new issue and therefore the Board may wish to seek parties comments in relation to this issue prior to determining the application and appeal.

10.0 Conclusions and Recommendation

Arising from my assessment above I consider that the Board should uphold the decision of the Planning Authority and refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below.

11.0 Decision

Refuse planning permission for the reasons and considerations set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development which involves the fundamental alteration to the roof profile would be visually obtrusive and out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area and would set an undesirable precedent for similar type developments in this suburban residential area. The proposed development would therefore seriously injure the amenities of the area and property in the vicinity and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Appropriate Assessment

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the nature of the receiving environment together with the proximity to the nearest European site, no appropriate assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans and projects on a European site.

Paul Caprani,
Senior Planning Inspector.

11th September, 2017.