



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL29N.248717

---

<b>Development</b>	Conversion of attic space to storage, alterations to roof profile and the provision of 3 new rooflight windows to rear and new dormer type roof structure to side.
<b>Location</b>	313 Charlemont, Griffith Avenue, Dublin 9.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2602/17.
<b>Applicant</b>	Maria Byrne.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party Appeal -v- Condition No. 2
<b>Appellant</b>	Maria Byrne.
<b>Observers</b>	None.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> August, 2017.
<b>Inspector</b>	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.....	6
8.0 Development Plan Provision.....	7
9.0 Planning Assessment .....	8
10.0 Recommendation .....	9
11.0 Reasons and Considerations .....	9

## **1.0 Introduction**

PL29N.248717 relates to a first party appeal against Condition No. 2 attached to a grant of planning permission issued by Dublin City Council to convert an attic space to storage and to incorporate alterations to the roof profile including the provision of three rooflight windows at an existing dwelling at No. 313 Charlemont, Griffith Avenue, Dublin 9. Condition No. 2 requires a reduction in the size and scale of the dormer proposed at roof height.

## **2.0 Site Location and Description**

No. 313 Charlemont is located in a large residential estate to the north of Griffith Avenue and to the south of Collins Avenue approximately 5 kilometres north of the city centre. The Charlemont estate is accessed off Griffith Avenue to the south. It comprises of a series of cul-de-sacs linking up with the main distributor/collector route which links up with Griffith Avenue to the south. No. 313 Charlemont is located on the eastern side of one of these cul-de-sacs. It comprises of the southern house in a pair of semi-detached dwellings which face westward. The existing dwelling comprises of a two-storey structure with a hipped roof profile and A shaped gable on the front elevation. A side passage to the rear garden runs along the southern side of the house and a similar side passage is located in the dwelling to the immediate south. The dwelling has both a front and back garden and room for one off-street car parking space in the front garden. No. 313 has a shared chimney stack with the adjoining dwelling to the north. The dwelling accommodates a sittingroom and hallway together with a kitchen and diningroom area to the rear of the dwellinghouse at ground floor level, and three bedrooms and bathroom at first floor level. The kitchen and diningroom area is accommodated in a single-storey extension to the rear.

## **3.0 Proposed Development**

Planning permission is sought to incorporate a new storage area within the roof pitch of the existing house. The storage area will involve the alteration of the existing roof

profile, replacing the existing hipped roof profile with a new gable end profile. The new roof profile will incorporate a new dormer window in the south elevation of the building overlooking the pitched roof of the adjoining dwellinghouse to the south. This new dormer window will provide appropriate headroom for a new staircase to be constructed to provide access to the attic space. It is also proposed to incorporate three new rooflight windows on the rear pitch. The proposed roof alterations will result in the extension of the ridge line of the roof along the entire length of the building. The new storeroom accommodates an area of 20 square metres (excluding stairwell) and rises to a maximum floor to ceiling height of 2.3 metres.

#### **4.0 Planning Authority's Decision**

- 4.1. The planning application was lodged with the Planning Authority on 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2017. It was accompanied by a covering letter by MARA Architects which sets out details of the nature and extent of the development together with planning history relevant to the property. It concludes that many neighbouring properties have already been granted planning permission for similar type dwellings in the area.
- 4.2. The planner's report prepared on foot of the planning application notes that there is extensive precedent in the Charlemont area for side dormers. However, it is stated that the side dormer should be subordinate to the main form of the dwelling including the roof profile. Furthermore, the dormer would be required to be reduced in size to no wider than 2.5 metres. These amendments would be consistent with recent permitted side dormers in the vicinity.
- 4.3. In its decision Dublin City Council issued notification to grant planning permission subject to seven conditions. Condition No. 2 required the following:

*The development hereby approved shall incorporate the following amendments.*

- (a) *The ridge height of the side dormer shall be lowered in height to a minimum of 200 millimetres below the main roof ridge.*
- (b) *The width of the side dormer shall be reduced to a maximum external width of 2.5 metres.*

- (c) *The roof of the side dormer shall therefore sit fully within the slope of the side roof plane. The applicant is directed to decisions 2614/15 and 5025/07 as examples of what is required.*

**Reason:** *In the interest of visual amenities and to comply with development plan policy in particular Appendix 17.11.*

## 5.0 Planning History

- 5.1. One relevant history file is attached under PL29N.243348. Dublin City Council granted planning permission for a conversion of an attic to storage area including dormer windows at No. 211 Charlemont, Griffith Avenue, Dublin 9. In granting planning permission Dublin City Council incorporated the following condition.
2. (a) The ridge line of the side dormer shall be pulled down to a minimum of 300 millimetres below the height of the main ridgeline.
- (b) The side walls of the side dormer shall be pulled in by 1 metre from each side ridgeline so that the dormer sits fully within the existing side roof plane.
- (c) The roof of the side dormer shall be hipped to match the existing main roof hip.
- 5.2. The decision was subject of a first party appeal specifically in relation to Condition No. 2. The grounds of appeal argue that the condition as attached particularly the drop in the ridgeline will impact on the practicality of access to the storage area and it is noted that similar type extensions and alterations to the roofline were permitted in the Charlemont Estate which did not attract conditions requiring the lowering of the ridgeline.
- 5.3. The Board in its decision removed Condition No. 2 in its entirety.

## 6.0 Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1. The decision of Dublin City Council was the subject of a first party appeal specifically in respect of Condition No. 2. The grounds of appeal request that Condition No. 2 be omitted in any revised decision issued by the Board on the following grounds.

- 6.2. It is stated that the construction of the dormer roof to the side of the main roof will facilitate sufficient head clearance height to extend the staircase up into the attic space. It is stated that it will not be possible to make the geometry of the staircase align over the footprint of the existing stairs as a result of the condition and this in turn will impinge on the space and layout of the bedrooms at first floor level. It is stated that throughout the estate, many houses have been extended by way of a dormer roof to the side of the original roof. The appeal includes a survey of houses within the Charlemont Estate where permission for roof extensions were granted where the ridge height permitted was the same as the existing roof.
- 6.3. While the grounds of appeal acknowledge the provisions contained in the Dublin City Development Plan in relation to roof profile extensions, and the addition of dormers into existing roofs, it is argued that this policy is of no relevance in the case of the Charlemont Estate due to the lack of visibility of houses from anywhere other than within the estate itself. It is argued that throughout the residential estate of Charlemont many houses are now characterised by the addition of a side dormer which forms a continuation of the main ridge of the roof.
- 6.4. Specific reference is made to No. 211 Charlemont, the details of which are set out on the previous section on Planning History above. Reference is also made to Planning Reg. Ref. 2765/12 at 360 Charlemont where again it is stated that a successful appeal was taken to An Bord Pleanála resulting in the omission of a condition which required alterations to the design. Reference is made to other developments in Charlemont which were granted planning permission by Dublin City Council and no condition was attached affecting the proportions of the dormer roof.
- 6.5. The Board are therefore respectfully requested to omit entirely Condition No. 2 in accordance with the arguments set out in the grounds of appeal.

## 7.0 **Appeal Responses**

Dublin City Council have not submitted a response to the grounds of 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.
- 8.3. 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.
- 8.4. 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. I have read the entire contents of the file and have visited the site in question. Having regard to the planning precedent for similar type developments in the area together with the fact that no objections or observations were lodged by third parties in respect of the proposal, I do not consider that a de novo assessment of the application is warranted or justified in this instance and that the Board can restrict its deliberations to the issues raised in the grounds of appeal; namely the appropriateness or otherwise of omitting Condition No. 2.
- 9.2. Condition No. 2 requires that the ridge of the side dormer should be lowered in height to be a minimum of 200 metres below the main roof ridge and that the width of the side dormer shall be reduced to a maximum internal width of 2.5 metres. Both of these stipulations would have significant and material implications on the layout and configuration of the proposed storage area. The reduction in the width of the side dormer from 4.5 metres to 2.5 metres would significantly impinge on the ability to construct a stairwell leading to the storeroom without requiring alterations to the internal configuration of the rooms at first floor level. In particular, the alterations may well require a reduction in the size of bedroom no. 3 at first floor level. Bedroom No. 3 as currently laid out only marginally meets the minimum bedroom floor area of 7.1 square metres as set out in the Departmental Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Design Standards for New Apartments. The reduction in the width of the dormer window is likely to result in a commensurate reduction in size in bedroom no. 3 so as to fall below the minimum guidelines.
- 9.3. Furthermore, a reduction in the ridge height of the proposed extension would also result in a commensurate reduction in the floor to ceiling height of the storeroom from 2.3 metres to 2.1 metres. This again would have a material impact on the size and volume of space available within the storage area.
- 9.4. The Board have accepted in previous applications and appeals and specifically Reg. Ref. 29N.243348, that there is a precedent for similar type roof alterations in the vicinity. It notes that there are precedents in terms of side dormer roof extensions of



similar size and scale within the estate. Having visited the site and its surroundings I would agree with such conclusions. There are numerous similar type extensions throughout the Charlemont Estate. Full details of the precedents are set out in the Grounds of Appeal. I would also refer the Board to Photo No. 4 attached to the inspector's report in respect of Reg. Ref. 29N.243348. It clearly indicates that numerous dwellings in the Charlemont Estate have incorporated roof extensions of similar size and scale to that currently proposed. There is therefore undoubtedly a precedent in respect of such extensions in the immediate area.

- 9.5. Furthermore, having inspected the site and its surroundings I am satisfied that any such extension will not result in a visually incongruous addition to the house in question. Furthermore, any such extension will not be readily visible from the wider area and will only be visible from public vantage points in the immediate vicinity of the subject site.

## 10.0 Recommendation

Arising from my assessment above therefore, I consider that the Board should omit Condition No. 2 based on the reasons and considerations set out below.

## 11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the existing pattern of development in the vicinity of the appeal site together with the limited scale of the proposed development and the precedent in the Charlemont area for similar side dormer roof extensions, it is considered that the development, as proposed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the Planning Authority would be compatible with the established streetscape character at this location, would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. It is considered therefore that the modifications required as set out in Condition No. 2 would not be justified or warranted in this instance.

---

Paul Caprani,  
Senior Planning Inspector.  
October 5th, 2017.

