



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report 06D.248795

Development	Extension to house and conversion of garage
Location	16 Glenabbey Road, Mount Merrion, County Dublin
Planning Authority	Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D17B/0179
Applicant(s)	Giuseppina & Sivakumar Sethuraman
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refusal
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Giuseppina & Sivakumar Sethuraman
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	18 th September, 2017
Inspector	Kevin Moore

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. No. 16 Glenabbey Road comprises a two-storey, semi-detached, three-bedroom house with attached garage on the north side of the street in Mount Merrion, County Dublin. The house has previously been extended to the rear and a side roof dormer has also been constructed. It has curtilage to the front to accommodate two cars and it has a deep back garden. Dwellings in the vicinity are similar in form and character to the existing house.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development comprises a ground floor extension to the front, a first floor extension to the side, a two-storey extension to the rear, an extension of the attic study/store with a side dormer roof relocated, and the conversion of the garage to a habitable room. It also includes an extension to the flat roofed dormer window on the rear and additional velux rooflights to the front, side and rear. The proposed development would increase the gross floor space of the house by 51.64 square metres (excluding the attic) and would provide an additional bedroom and utility space at ground floor level, an additional bedroom and an extended bedroom at first floor level, and extended floor space at attic level.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On 2nd June, 2017, Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council decided to refuse permission for the development for one reason relating to the visually obtrusive and dominant impact on the street and overbearing impact on neighbouring properties.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner referred to development plan provisions, the site's planning history and interdepartmental reports received. It was noted that there are a number of examples in the area of properties that have been extended to the side at first floor level where

there is no set back or set down from the roof. It was acknowledged that the character of the area varies in terms of style of dwellings and style of extensions. The proposed extension to the front was considered bulky and dominant when viewed from the street. It was considered that the extension being built up to the shared boundary with No. 14 Glenabbey Road would have an overbearing impact and would harm visual amenity and that the parapet wall would be highly visible from the street. Examples of parapet walls in the area were considered to be a poor precedent and reference was made to development plan provisions discouraging protruding parapet walls. With regard to the proposed enlargement of the dormer to the rear, reference was made to the requirement in a previous planning application to reduce the overall width of that dormer to 2.5m. The 3.8m width proposed was considered excessive and it was submitted that it would dominate the rear roof in conflict with development plan guidance. There were no concerns about proposed rooflights. A refusal of permission was recommended.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

The Drainage Engineer set out surface water requirements to be met.

4.0 Planning History

P.A. Ref. D13B/0286

Permission was granted for the conversion of the attic to a study, with dormer windows and a velux rooflight to the front. Condition 2 of that permission required modifications to the rear dormer and side element.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. **Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022**

Zoning

The site is zoned 'A' with the objective "To protect and/or improve residential amenity."

Extensions to Dwellings

Plan provisions include:

First floor rear extensions are to be considered on their merits, noting that they can often have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and are only permitted where the planning authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors are to be considered:

- Overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking - along with proximity, height and length along mutual boundaries.
- Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability.
- Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.
- External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.

Ground floor rear extensions are to be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining.

Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles - changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/'A' frame end or 'half-hip' will be assessed against a number of criteria including:

- Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
- Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
- Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
- Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures and prominence.

Dormer extensions to roofs will be considered with regard to impacts on existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. The design, dimensions and bulk of any roof proposal relative to the overall size of the dwelling and gardens will be the overriding considerations. Dormer extensions shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appellants' submission includes the following:

- Neighbours were consulted regarding the proposal, were happy with the proposal and there is no third party objection.
- A large number of dwellings along the road have extended above the garage and have added a single-storey extension to the front as proposed. These extensions do not have an overbearing impact on the streetscape.
- The Planner's report is misleading, stating the side dormer will increase in width when a rear dormer extension is proposed only. The proposed roof shape to the rear remains as previously granted.
- The proposed parapet wall along the side extension is visible from the street in end profile only. Planting in the front garden break up the streetscape and prevent dwellings dominating the appearance on the street.
- The development will not cause any new or greater overshadowing or overlooking. Private open space is not reduced.

It is submitted that, if the Board considers it desirable, the proposed first floor extension above the existing garage could be set back with its roof by 250mm behind the façade to create some variation, although it is considered that this would be inappropriate, creating an awkward visual step. It is also suggested that the existing side dormer, which is finished in a dark material, could be changed to a small roof tile to match the main roof tile colour or rendered to match existing walls.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority considers the appeal does not raise any new matter which would justify a change in attitude to the proposed development.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1 Glenabbey Road is a mature residential street of semi-detached houses. Very many of the houses along this street have undergone development changes. An examination of the street will show that there are many different types of porches to be found, a wide range of garage conversions have been undertaken, and verandas have been introduced to frontages in some instances. Importantly in the consideration of this appeal, there are many examples of garage conversions with first floor extensions overhead, such as at Nos. 6, 8, 10, 28 and 54 to the north side of the street and in close proximity to the appeal site. I note the inclusion of the first floor dormer on the side of the existing house on the appeal site.
- 7.2 It is my submission to the Board that, excepting the side dormer element, the proposed development could not in any way be considered to be out of context, be any more visually intrusive or have any more overbearing impact when viewed from the streetscape and when compared to other properties along this street. I do not understand how one could come to any other conclusion in light of the form, character and pattern of development that has evolved along this street. Thus, I must reasonably conclude that the proposed conversion of the garage, first floor extension, and treatment along the frontage of the house is wholly acceptable.
- 7.3 In considering the proposed side dormer changes, I acknowledge that the side dormer is an element not widely prevalent in the overall streetscape. However, I do acknowledge that the planning authority previously permitted the side dormer under P.A. Ref. D13B/0286 and, therefore, considered such an element to be acceptable on the streetscape. With due regard to this, I note that the proposed development effectively reflects the scale of the side dormer that is in existence. It is accepted that this component of the development would not cause any adverse impact by way of overshadowing or overlooking. Acknowledging the proposed development now brings the side dormer closer to the flank boundary, I note that it is set back from the main gable wall of the house, from the party wall with No. 14 and from that adjoining house. It would have no demonstrable adverse overbearing impact and, in the context of the streetscape, would not result in the development being any more

overbearing than other established residential properties that have had garage conversions and first floor extensions.

7.4 With regard to the rear dormer extension, this proposed element of the development is not visible from the public realm and has no adverse impacts on adjoining residential amenity. In the context of the extension to the side of the house and the new first floor component, the scale of the dormer is not out of context and merits no alteration.

7.5 Finally, I do not consider that the overall design requires modifications and am satisfied that the proposal is compatible with development plan requirements for extensions to dwellings, has no adverse impact on established residential amenities, and does not have visually obtrusive or overbearing impacts on the streetscape or neighbouring properties.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1 I recommend that permission is granted in accordance with the following reasons, considerations and conditions.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the established dwelling on the site, to the form, design, and character of previously permitted alterations to the dwelling and the compatible design and limited scale of the proposed development, and to the pattern of development change that has evolved with residential properties in the immediate vicinity of the site, it is considered that the proposed development would not adversely impact on the visual amenity of the streetscape or the residential amenities of adjoining properties by way of an overbearing impact, and would otherwise be in accordance with the provisions of the current Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The external finishes of the proposed extension shall harmonise in colour and texture with the existing finishes on the house.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

3. The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure a proper standard of development.

4. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to

An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

Kevin Moore
Senior Planning Inspector

18th September 2017