



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL29S.248678.

---

<b>Development</b>	Permission for a first floor dormer extension to the rear.
<b>Location</b>	12 Elm Park Terrace, Terenure, D6.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2545/17.
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Gerry Kidd.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party.
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Gerry Kidd.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	30 <sup>th</sup> of August 2017.
<b>Inspector</b>	Karen Hamilton

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The site contains a single storey end of terrace dwelling within a small residential cul-de-sac, close to the Terenure centre, Dublin 6. The dwelling faces directly onto an internal access road which also accommodates a new infill development to south, Terenure Square, comprising of six two storey dwellings with associated shared courtyard parking. The subject dwelling has been previously extended to the rear, which encompasses the majority of the rear garden. Car parking for the dwelling is along the front, on the internal laneway.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development includes a 10m<sup>2</sup> first floor dormer to the rear of a single storey end of terrace dwelling.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Decision to refuse permission for reason of inappropriate design and the negative impact on the character and setting of the streetscape which would set an undesirable precedent for similar development.

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the area planner reflects the decision to refuse permission and may be summarised as follows:

- Section 17.11 of the development plan provides guidance for roof extensions which should be visually subordinate and reflect the character of the area.
- The design and the materials used for the dormer are not in keeping with the dwelling.
- The proposed development does not meet the requirements of the development plan.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division: No objection subject to conditions.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None requested.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

None received.

## 4.0 Planning History

None on the site.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022

The site is zoned as Z1 *“To protect, provide and improve residential amenities”*

- **Section 16.10.12:** Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings: Design of extensions should be subordinate in approach to the main dwelling and not have an adverse impact on the existing or adjacent dwellings.
- **Appendix 17:** Guidelines for residential extensions.

17.8 Subordinate Approach: the extension should play a supporting role to the original dwelling and not be higher.

17.11 Roof Extensions: The roofline of a building is one of its most dominant features and it is important that any proposal to change the shape, pitch and cladding a roof is carefully considered. If not treated sympathetically, dormer extensions can cause problems for immediate neighbours and in the way a street is viewed as a whole.

When extending in 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 level to minimise their visual impact and reduce the potential for overlooking of adjoining properties.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

The grounds of appeal are submitted from the applicant in relation to the refusal which may be summarised as follows:

- A revised design of the dormer has been submitted to include a new roof slope connecting the pitch of the existing roof with the parapet line of the proposed dormer roof.
- The amended design now reflects the character of the area and is visually subordinate to the roof slope of the existing dwelling and the materials match the roof.
- The proposed dormer projects 1m in height above the existing dwelling and the adjoining dwelling, to the south, is 1.8m higher with a flat roof design.
- The modest dormer is only 10m<sup>2</sup> in size.
- There were no submissions received in relation to the proposed development.

- The proposed development should be assessed on its own merits and not on the precedence it sets for the remaining dwellings.

## 6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

A response from the planning authority refers to the planners report on file.

## 6.3. **Observations**

None received.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. The applicant has submitted revised elevations and cross-sections drawings which illustrate a change in the slope of the front of the dormer, connecting to the pitch of the existing roof and a change in the materials from a plaster finish to tiles matching the existing roof. I have based my assessment on the amended plans and particulars submitted with the appeal.

7.2. The main issues of the appeal can be dealt with under the following headings:

- Impact on Residential and Visual Amenity
- Appropriate Assessment

### **Impact of Residential and Visual Amenity**

7.3. The existing dwelling is a single storey end of terrace dwelling, located within a small cul-de-sac. A two storey flat roof dwelling is located to the south of the site, recently developed as part of a small infill development. There are six single storey dwellings along either side of Elm Terrace, each with similar characteristics. There have been no dormer extensions on any of the existing dwellings in the vicinity.

7.4. The proposed development includes a first floor dormer extension which will extend c. 1m above the existing roofline, with a slope to connect both the roof pitch and the top of the first floor extension. The dormer will extend out to the rear by 3.5m, and includes three large windows. As stated above the amended design includes materials along the front to match the roof tiles although the rear elevation has a plaster finish.

- 7.5. Section 16.10.12 of the development plan provides guidance for the appropriate development for alterations to existing dwellings, where they should be subordinate and not have an adverse impact on the existing or adjacent dwellings. In addition, detailed guidance for roof extensions is provided in section 17.11 of Appendix 17 which states that the extensions should be subordinate, not be higher than the original dwelling and should be sympathetic to the existing and surrounding dwellings by respecting the shape, pitch and cladding. The grounds of appeal argue the change in design and the location of the dwelling adjacent to an existing two storey dwelling enables the proposed development to be sufficiently integrated.
- 7.6. I note the amended design submitted to the Board includes a slope to match the shape of the roof and materials to match the existing roof, although I consider the height of the proposed first floor extending 1m above the roofline of the dwelling, is not in keeping with the guidance provided in the development plan, is not subordinate to the main dwelling, and I consider it has a significant negative impact on the character of the dwelling and the surrounding area. I do not consider the location of a two storey dwelling to the north of the site would mitigate against the negative impact of the first floor projection above the dwelling.
- 7.7. Therefore, having regard to the single storey design of the existing dwelling and those within the surrounding area, I consider the design of the proposed development above the roofline of the existing dwelling would have a negative impact on the residential and visual amenity of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area and to grant permission would set an undesirable precedent for further developments in the vicinity which would further impact on the character of those dwellings in the vicinity.

### **Appropriate Assessment**

- 7.8. Having regard to as the nature and scale of the proposed development and 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 or projects on a conservation objectives of a European site.

## 8.0 Recommendation

I recommend that planning permission should be refused for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

### **Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the pattern of development in the area, to the extent of the scale and bulk of the proposed development and Section 17.8 and 17.11, guidelines for residential extensions, of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, it is considered that the proposal would seriously injure the residential amenities of the property in the vicinity by virtue of visual obstruction and impact on the streetscape. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

Karen Hamilton  
Planning Inspector

30<sup>th</sup> of August 2017.