



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL06.248797

### Development

Extend Ridge Line to form new roof structure, extend side structure up to soffit level, two windows in side structure, conversion of attic and internal alterations at 29 Cherryfield Avenue, Walkinstown, Dublin 12.

**Planning Authority**

South Dublin Co. Co.

**Planning Authority Reg. Ref.**

SD17B/0137

**Applicant(s)**

Vincent McElwee

**Type of Application**

Permission

**Planning Authority Decision**

REFUSE

**Appellant(s)**

Vincent McElwee

**Observer(s)**

None

**Date of Site Inspection**

11<sup>th</sup> of September 2017

**Inspector**

Caryn Coogan

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

29 Cherryfield Avenue, Walkinstown, Dublin 12 is an end of terrace two storey dwelling located within a mature residential area of Walkinstown.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

Planning permission is sought to extend existing ridge line to form a new Dutch type roof structure, extend the existing side structure up to new soffit level, install 2No. windows in side structure, external finishes to match existing, conversion of attic area for additional storage area and internal alterations.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1 Decision**

Permission was refused by South Dublin Co. Co.

1. Having regard to the consistency in house design and in particular to the predominant hipped roof treatment throughout the Cherryfield Avenue area, the proposed half hipped roof profile would be at odds with the established character and seriously diminish the visual amenity of the area.
2. The proposed roof development would contravene Council policy as set out House Extension Design Guide 2010 which states extending a hopped roof to the side to create a gabled or half hipped is rarely accepted, particularly of the hipped roof is visually prominent and typical of other houses along the street.
3. Undesirable precedent.

### **3.2 Planning Authority Reports**

The proposal is consistent with the zoning objective. The proposal is visually obtrusive and not in keeping with the character of the existing house or the character of the area. There will be no overshadowing or overlooking of adjoining properties as a result of the proposal.

### **3.2 Other Technical Reports**

3.3 No objections form Drainage Department.

### **3.4 Third Party Submissions**

No third party submission.

### **4.0 Planning History**

There is no relevant planning history associated with the subject site.

#### **SD14A/0237 (PL06S.244542)**

House, vehicular Entrance to existing dwelling and associated site works at 3 Cherryfield Avenue, Dublin 12 was refused by the planning authority and granted on appeal by the Board.

### **5.0 Policy Context**

#### **5.1 Development Plan**

##### **South County Dublin Development Plan 2016-2022**

The subject site is zoned RES – To protect and/ or improve Residential amenity.

##### **Section 2.4.1 Extensions to Dwelling Houses**

It is the policy of the Council to support the extension of existing dwelling houses in principle subject to safeguards contained within this plan and within the House extension design Guide documents contained in appendix 5.

##### **Policy H18 Extensions to Dwellings**

Domestic extensions are an effective way for homeowners to provide extra space without having to move house when their accommodation needs change. A well

designed extension can personalise and enhance the appearance of the house. Proposals for domestic extensions should have regard to House Extension Design Guide documents contained as Appendix 5 and safeguards set out in the plan include the following:

- Contemporary design is promoted with a building language that is varied and forward looking rather than repetitive and retrospective;
- The house and the extension should be used as a single dwelling unit
- In all instances the design and scale of domestic extensions should have regard to adjoining properties;
- The extension should integrate fully with the existing building. External finishes should harmonise in colour, texture and materials with existing building;
- In general dormer extensions should not be such as to obscure the main features of the existing roof i.e. should not break the ridge or eaves line of there off.
- In all cases a minimum private rear garden area must be retained.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1 The Proposed Design of the Extension**

The site is a mature residential area. The dwelling on the site is setback from the public road and is not visually prominent. The proposed floor area is only 23sq.m. for storage and this represents a minor alteration. There are similar extensions in the area.

### **6.2 Visual Impact**

The scale of the proposal is domestic in character and is visually acceptable. It will not adversely impact on the character of the area. The area is characterised by a variety of roof shapes including full roofs and hipped roofs. The Board should consider the similar roof at 1 Cherryfield Avenue (SD15B/149).

### **6.3 Impact on Residential Amenity**

There is no adverse impacts as a result of the proposal. The planning authority has exaggerated the impact. The development is not visually prominent.

### **6.4 Precedents**

The Board shall consider a similar development permitted 15b/149 at No. 1 Cherryfield Avenue, and a new house permitted at 3 Cherryfield Avenue which has a completely different roof style to the existing profile.

### **6.1 Planning Authority Response**

The planning authority did respond and there was nothing further to add to the planning report on file.

## **7.0 Assessment**

7.1 The planning authority refused the modest extension (23sq.m.) and a new roof structure to provide additional attic space to this end of terrace dwelling for three reasons. The reasons essentially stated the dwelling is visually prominent along the streetscape and the new roof profile will not be in keeping with the area. In addition the proposed half hipped roof is contrary to the design Guide in the Development Plan and will set an undesirable precedent.

7.2 I visited the site on the 11<sup>th</sup> of September 2017 which is 29 Cherryfield Avenue. This is an end of terrace dwelling which is setback from the road considerably and the front building line of the dwelling is almost in line with the original rear building line of the contiguous dwelling to the south at 31 Cherryfield Avenue. This tiered front building line and setback effectively, greatly reduces the prominence of the subject dwelling along the streetscape. Furthermore, there is a triangular grassed area fronting the terrace which includes a number of mature trees, and the clear views towards the subject site are restricted by the trees. Therefore, the planning authority has greatly exaggerated the significance of the prominence of the site and the architectural significance of the roof profile of the dwelling. The proposed development is very modest in scale, the half hipped roof extension is slight, it will greatly improve the residential amenities of the subject dwelling by providing 23sq.m. additional storage space. There is no overlooking or shadowing or adjoining properties as a result of the development. There were no third party objections to the proposal from the neighbours. Therefore, I do not consider the proposal will negatively impact on the visual amenities or residential amenities of the area. The proposal will be in keeping with the prevailing **RES** zoning for the area under the current *South Dublin County Development Plan 2016-2022*.

7.3 In terms of the development plan requirements for House Extensions I consider the proposed development meets with the following criteria:

- *Contemporary design*
- *The design and scale of domestic extension has regard to adjoining properties, because they are minor alterations to existing extensions;*
- *The extension will integrate fully with the existing building. External finishes will harmonise in colour, texture and materials with existing building;*
- *The minimum private rear garden area will be retained.*

7.4 There is a new dwelling within the side garden area of No. 3 Cherryfield Avenue which is within the same residential triangular configuration of No. 29 Cherryfield Avenue. The roof design and solar panels to the front of the new dwelling at No. 3 are completely different to the general roof pattern of the area, and yet the dwelling does not detract from the visual amenities of the area and the site is more prominent than the subject site. In addition, one can clearly see from within Cherryfield Avenue at No. 1 Cherryfield Avenue, a half hipped Dutch style roof similar to the current proposal. Therefore the second and third reasons for refusal should be dismissed by the Board for been inconsistent with permitted developments in the immediate area.

## **8.0 Recommendation**

Permission be granted subject to the following reasons and considerations.

### **Reasons and Considerations/ Reasons**

Having regard to the scale and proportions of the proposed extension relative to the existing dwelling on site, the area of the site and the established character and pattern of development in the vicinity of the site, including the separation distance from adjoining dwellings and the existing boundary treatment between these dwellings, it is considered that the proposed extension would not seriously injure the amenities of the neighbouring dwellings by reason of overshadowing or overlooking or the visual amenities of the area, and will be in keeping with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 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. All necessary measures shall be taken by the contractor to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay rubble or other debris on adjoining roads during the course of the works.

**Reason:** In the interest of residential amenity.

3. 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.

---

**Caryn Coogan**  
**Planning Inspector**  
**12<sup>th</sup> of September 2017**