



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL06D.249084

Development	Permission for a rear extension, bay window, new external wall finish, 4 new roof lights with all associated site works.
Location	6 Seafield, Shankill, Dublin 18.
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D17B/0263
Applicant(s)	Deidre Ni Bhroin
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third-v-Grant
Appellant(s).	Mary Anderson & Anne Thompson
Observers	Janice Homan
Date of Site Inspection	26 th October 2017

Inspector

Colin McBride

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1 The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.05625 hectares, is located to north east of Shankhill. The site is located within an established residential development of gable fronted dormer style dwellings that are orientated east -west and face onto a green area and beyond it the coastline. The site is occupied by no. 6, to the south is no. 5 and to the north is no. 7. To the west of the site is 21 Corbawn Avenue, which is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling that backs onto the appeal site.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought for a single-storey extension to the rear of an existing dwelling, replacement of the roof on the main house with increased eaves level while maintaining the existing ridge height, a new bay window extension and patio to the front at ground floor level, alteration to windows at first floor level to the front to provide a larger window including a corner section onto a new balcony, new external wall insulation with white Cornish granite finish or similar and 4 new roof lights (3 on the single-storey extension to the rear and 1 on the side of the main house). The extension has a floor area of 15.6sqm and a ridge height of 3.4m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission granted subject to 4 conditions, the conditions are standard in nature.

3.1 Local Authority reports

3.1.1. Drainage Planning (19/07/17): No objection.

3.1.2. Planning Report (19/07/17): The proposal was considered acceptable in the context of the visual amenities of that area and the residential amenities of adjoining

properties. A grant of permission was recommended subject to the conditions outlined above.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 D95B/0408: Permission granted to convert garage to living accommodation

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The relevant development plan is the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022. The site is zoned Objective A with a stated objective 'to protect and/or improve residential amenity'.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1 Grounds of appeal

6.1.1 A third party appeal has been lodged by Mary Anderson, 9 Seafield, Shankhill, Co. Dublin, Anne Thompson, 10 Seafield, Shankhill, Co. Dublin. The grounds of appeal are as follows...

- It is noted that there are errors in the drawings and documents submitted. This relates to no. 7 including indication that there is an existing patio, which is not the case, misrepresentation of the size and scale of the eaves of the existing dormer windows. It is also noted that there is planning history on site but such was not indicated on the application form (ref D95B/0408 and D12B/1412).

- It is noted that the alterations including the balcony area and new windows would have an adverse impact on a significant number of the adjoining properties.
- It is noted that design of the proposal is out of character with adjoining properties.
- It is noted that the appellants' submission to the Planning Authority was not taken into account or addressed in the assessment of the proposal.
- It is noted that there are errors and contradictions in the planning report including lack of acknowledgement of the planning history, failure to acknowledge the impact of the proposal on residential amenity and visual amenity and the assessment of overlooking of the proposed balcony area.

6.2 Responses

6.2.1 Response by Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council.

- It is noted that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matters, which would justify a change in attitude to the proposed development.

6.2.2 Response by Pat O'Brien Architect on behalf of Deidre Ni Bhroin.

- It is noted that the reference to a patio at no. 7 is an error and is not reflected in the drawings, the applicant notes that the issues raised regarding the drawings of the adjoining property are not clear with it noted that the drawings submitted are accurate. It is noted there was one previous application on site and ref no. D12B/1412 does not exist and appears to be reference to a Section 5 application in 2012.
- It is noted that the proposal deals inherent problems with the design of the existing dwelling including the lack of useable space at first floor level. It is noted that proposal increases the amount of useable space at first floor level

without increasing the ridge height. It is noted that the proposal improves the design and has no adverse impact on adjoining amenities.

- It is noted that proposal would be acceptable in regards to the visual amenity of the area, the provision of bay windows to maximise sea views would not be out of character in this area, and would not be obtrusive at this location.

6.3 Observations:

6.3.1 An observation has been received from Janice Homan, Windycliff, 5 Seafield, Shankhill, Dublin 18.

- It is noted that the planning assessment did not address the concerns raised by the observer in their submission to the Planning Authority.
- It is noted that the proposal is a major redesign of the existing dwelling and would have a substantial negative impact on the observer's privacy and residential amenity including in her house and her front garden.
- It is noted that permitted proposal would open the door for a major alteration to other dwellings at this location and the proposal would out of character with the existing houses.

6.4 Submissions to Local Authority:

6.4.1 3 submissions were received by the Local Authority and the issues raised be summarised as follows...

- Adequacy of information submitted, visual impact of the proposal and impact on adjoining amenities.

7.0 Assessment

7.1 Having inspected the site and examined the associated documentation, the following are the relevant issues in this appeal.

Design, scale, visual impact, adjoining amenity

Appropriate Assessment

Other Issues

7.2 Design, scale, visual impact, adjoining amenity:

7.2.1 The proposal is for alterations and extension of an existing dormer style dwelling. The existing dwelling is a gable fronted dwelling with the first floor within the roof space and a dormer window on each side. The dwelling is part of a small housing development of similar dwellings. The proposal has a number of elements, which include a single-storey extension to the rear, alterations and replacement of the roof with an increase in the eaves level, but no increase in the overall ridge height. The proposal also entails the provision of a bay window on the front elevation. This also facilitates the provision of a first floor balcony on the front elevation with new glazing including corner window at first floor level. The proposal also entails alterations to the windows on the side elevation at first floor level and the provision of 4 no. roof lights.

7.2.2 One of the main issues raised in the appeal and the submission to the Planning Authority relates to visual impact and the fact that the proposal is out of character with the existing dwellings at this location. Seafield is a small housing development characterised by gable fronted dwellings with dormer windows on each side of the roof plane. I would note that the design of the dwellings is distinctive but would also note the dwelling are not protected structures or within a designated Architectural Conservation Area. The overall design of the proposal provides for a significant update of the style of the dwelling, which is dated in appearance, while at the same

having regard to the design and scale of existing structures and the overall visual impact of the proposal. I would firstly note that the extension to the rear is modest in scale, subordinate to the existing dwelling and has no significant visual impact. The main changes are to the existing structure. Although the proposal changes the eaves level, the ridge height remains the same meaning the dwelling is still a gable fronted dwelling similar in scale to the adjoining dwellings. Changes are proposed to the windows including the provision of the bay window and the external finish. I would consider that such changes although they are noticeable, are not significant enough to be severely obtrusive or out of character at this location and I would note not all of the dwellings are identical with variation in windows styles and external finishes. I would consider that the proposal is a well-designed and considered alteration/update of an existing dwelling.

7.2.3 The other main issue relates to residential amenity and in particular appear to relate to the provision of the bay window on the front elevation and balcony at first floor level. I would note that the proposal does not entail a significant alteration in the footprint of the existing dwelling with increased floor area provided by the single-storey extension to the rear, the bay window on the front elevation and the increased eaves height allowing for more useable space at first floor level. The single-storey extension is modest in scale and subordinate to the existing dwelling and has no impact adverse or otherwise on the amenity of adjoining properties. The increase in the eaves level is modest and does not alter the footprint or building line of the existing dwelling. It does provide for an increase in the height and scale of the window on the northern elevation the first floor landing (the one on the southern side is similar in size to the existing one), however such does not deviate from the existing pattern of development for windows on the side elevation.

7.2.4 The ground floor bay window is single-storey in height and does not project significantly beyond the front building line (1m). At first floor level a large window is to be provided with a corner element (northern elevation) to maximise views of the sea to the east and access to a balcony area with a glazed balustrade on the roof the bay window. The appellant's raise concerns regarding the impact of such in terms of overlooking of their properties. I would note that the balcony area is to the front and

is designed to allow for views of the sea to the east, south east and north east and that such does not overlook any area of private open space. I would note that front gardens associated with the dwellings at this location are not private and are easily viewed from the roadway and footpath along the front of the dwellings. I do not consider that the provision of the balcony would diminish the amenities of adjoining properties and the overall design of such has adequate regard to the visual amenities of the area. I would consider the design and scale of the proposal has adequate regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and would have no significant impact in regards to overlooking/loss of privacy and overshadowing/overbearing impact relative to the adjoining properties.

7.3 Appropriate Assessment:

7.3.1 Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and its 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 European site.

7.4 Other Issues:

7.4.1 the appeal submission raises a number of concerns regarding the assessment of the proposal including accuracy of documentation and drawings. I would first note that in regards to planning history, the relevant planning history is outlined above and that the proposal has been assessed on its merits. In relation to the drawings submitted, I am satisfied that the drawings are accurate and satisfactory to fully assess the impact of the proposal in relation to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1 I recommend a grant of permission subject to the following conditions.

9.0 Reason and Considerations

9.1

Having regard to the provisions of the current Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022, to the pattern of development in the area and to the nature, form, scale and design of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1. The proposed 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 construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including noise management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.

3. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0900 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

4. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including 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.

5. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

Colin McBride
Planning Inspector

06th November 2017

