



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL29. 248653

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Development | Extension to house |
| Location | 28 Innisfallen Parade, Dublin 7 |
| Planning Authority | Dublin City Council |
| Planning Authority Reg. Ref. | 2511/17 |
| Applicant | Brian Kelly |
| Type of Application | Permission |
| Planning Authority Decision | Grant permission subject to conditions |
| Type of Appeal | First Party vs. condition |
| Appellant | Brian Kelly |
| Observers | None |
| Date of Site Inspection | 30 th August 2017 |
| Inspector | Stephen J. O'Sullivan |

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The site is the curtilage of a single storey terraced house in the north inner city of Dublin. It has a stated area of 86m². The existing house has a pitched roof over the main terrace and single storey return along the western boundary to the back of the site. Its floor area is given as 57m². The neighbouring house to the east has an extension with an 'A-line' roof.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. It is proposed to build a two-storey rear extension with a flat roof running back from the apex of the existing roof for c7.8m across the width of the site, leaving 3m open at the back of the site. The extended house would have a living area and kitchen on the ground floor, and two bedrooms and a bathroom on the first floor. The front bedroom would be lit by a rooflight, the rear one by window in the back wall. .

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to grant permission subject to 8 conditions.

Condition no. 2 is –

The development shall be revised as follows:

a) The rear extension shall consist of a single storey extension with 'A' type roof above, which may be used to provide for accommodation in the roofspace with a window in the rear gable.

b) The attic space in the front roof shall be used for non-habitable purposes only.

Development shall not commence until revised plans, drawings and particulars showing the above amendments have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority, and such works shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the buildings:-

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

There is concern that the proposed extension and alteration to the roof would be out of keeping with the scale and character of the existing house and roofscape. The flat roof would be clearly visible at footpath level due to the elevation drop of No. 27.

There is no known precedent in the vicinity and the proposal could have an overbearing impact on views from neighbouring dwellings. The permission granted at No. 16 required a significant reduction in the scale of the proposed extension. An extension to the house on the site should be more modest in scale and reflect the existing roof profile. The back of the existing roof should be retained with a single storey extension with an apex roof. This would allow a bedroom in the roof space lit by a window in the gable. This can be achieved by condition. A grant of permission was recommended.

3.3. Third Party Observations

None

4.0 Planning History

No previous history on the site was cited by the parties. The board determined the following cases on this street –

PL29. 247242, Reg. Ref. 3216/16 – the planning authority granted permission for a two storey extension with a flat roof to the rear of 16 Innisfallen Parade with a condition that the rear extension be reduced to single storey one with an ‘A’ type roof. On appeal the board directed that the condition be amended to

The proposed development shall be amended as follows:

(a) The rear extension shall consist of a single-storey extension with ‘A’ type roof above, which may be used to provide for accommodation in the roofspace with a window in the rear gable.

(b) The use of the area in the front roof shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority.

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 and residential amenity.

PL29N. 243537, Reg. Ref. 2513/14 – The planning authority granted permission for a development that included a flat roofed first floor extension to the main house at No. 41 Innisfallen Parade, subject to a condition that it be reduced in width to 3.6m. On appeal the board directed that this condition be omitted.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 applies. The site is zoned residential under objective Z1. Section 16.10.12 of the plan refers to extensions and alterations to dwellings. It states *inter alia* that the scale and form of the existing building should be followed as closely as possible, the extension should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar finishes and windows, and should be subordinate in terms of scale to the main unit.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

None.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- The appeal is against condition no. 2 of the planning authority's decision
- The property has not been upgraded for many years and would not be suitable for habitation. Condition no. 2 of the decision would reduce the property to a one bedroom house that would limit its long term viability.

- The appellant needs a two bedroom house which requires a flat roof structure. The proposed development is similar to many other extensions on the same street at Nos. 3, 5, 23 and 41 authorised under Reg. Ref. Nos. 3888/05, 3938/80, 1056/83 and 2516/14 respectively.
- The proposed development would be in line with the Guidelines for Residential Extensions for an inner city development and the development plan. It would also comply with 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines 2007'. The private open space is larger than that of similar properties approved in the area.
- The proposed extension strives to regenerate a small property for years to come. It would not be visible from the street. It is modest in scale.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The authority's response refers to its planner's report.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. The existing house on the site is relatively small, and a significant extension to it could be justified to improve the standard of amenity for its occupants even if this altered the form of the roof at the back of the house, as was the case in the extension authorised under PL29N. 243537, Reg. Ref. 2513/14. A flat roof also extends back from the ridge of the house at No. 23, although not beyond the back wall of the main terrace. However the form and scale of the development proposed in this application would be substantially out of keeping with that of the existing house and those around it. It would also be likely to have an overbearing impact on neighbouring residential properties, including that at No.19 Glengariff Crescent from which this the extension would be set back by 3m. The extension would be visible, if not obtrusive from the street to the east of the site,. The provision of a rooflight only to serve a habitable bedroom would not provide an adequate amenity for its occupants due to the absence of an outlook. In these circumstances condition no. 2 of the planning authority's decision is considered reasonable and necessary. Its retention would also be consistent with the approach adopted by the board to

proposals to extend the house at No. 16 nearby under PL29. 247242, Reg. Ref. 3216/16 which was cited in the council planner's report.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that the board direct the planning authority to attach condition no. 2 of its decision to the permission.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the small scale of the existing house, and the scale and two-storey height of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed development would not constitute a subordinate extension, would adversely affect the scale and character of the existing house, and would contravene the provisions of Section 16.10.12 (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 – 2022. Furthermore, having regard to its proximity to existing dwellings, it is considered that the scale and height of the proposed development would result in an overbearing impact on neighbouring residential amenity. The attachment of a condition in this respect was, therefore, considered appropriate.

Stephen J. O'Sullivan
Planning Inspector

30th August 2017