



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL06D.249100

Development

Alterations to existing roof to provide attic accommodation to a house with all associated site works.

Location

10 Cluain Na Greine Court, Co.
Dublin.

Planning Authority

Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County
Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D17B0273

Applicant(s)

Bill & Katy Stanley

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse

Type of Appeal

First-v-Refusal

Appellant(s)

Bill & Katy Stanley

Date of Site Inspection

26th October 2017

Inspector

Colin McBride

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1 The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.0483 hectares, is located in Shankill, Co. Dublin. The appeal site is located on the eastern side of the Main Street in Shankill (R119). The appeal site is part of small housing development of two-storey semi-detached and detached dwellings. The site is occupied by no. 10, which appears to have been extended to the rear with a single-storey extension. To the north east of the site is no. 9, which is a similar dwelling to no. 10. To the south west is a two-storey structure that appear to be in residential use. To the west and north west is an apartment development that fronts onto the R119.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1 Permission is sought for the rebuilding of the two-storey roof to a higher level to provide attic accommodation with a dormer window on the front elevation and a three-storey elevation to the rear. The proposal entails an extension of the existing dwelling by 49sqm and an increase in the ridge height of the dwelling from 7.187m to 8.928m. The accommodation to be provided at second floor level includes two bedrooms and a bathroom.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission refused based on one reason...

1. The Planning Authority has serious concerns that the proposed development would result in a significantly altered roof design and form, which by virtue of its height, scale and design, would be overly prominent and highly visible from adjacent properties, would not visually harmonise with the existing dwelling or adjacent dwellings and would have a visually overbearing and injurious impact on the visual amenities of the area and the visual character of the existing

streetscape. The proposed development, therefore, would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of this area.

3.2. Local Authority and External reports

3.2.1. Planning Report (26/07/17): The proposal would not be in compliance with Development Plan policy regarding extensions (Section 8.2.3.4) and would have an adverse visual impact and be visually overbearing in relation to adjoining properties. Refusal was recommended based on the reason outlined above.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 No planning history.

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'.

5.1.2 Section 8.2.3.4 of the County Development Plan relates to extensions.

(i) Extensions to Dwellings

First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can often have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be 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 will 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 will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining.

Side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation), and impacts on residential amenity. First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable, though in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front facade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.

Any planning application submitted in relation to extensions shall clearly indicate on all drawings the extent of demolition/wall removal required to facilitate the proposed development and a structural report may be required to determine the integrity of walls/structures to be retained and outline potential impacts on adjoining properties. This requirement should be ascertained at pre-planning stage. A structural report must be submitted in all instances where a basement or new first/upper floor level is proposed within the envelope of an existing dwelling.

Side gable, protruding parapet walls at eaves/gutter level of hip-roofs are not encouraged. The proposed construction of new building structures directly onto the boundary with the public realm (including footpaths/open space/roads etc) is not acceptable and it will be required that they are set within the existing boundary on site. The provision of windows (particularly at first floor level) within the side elevation of extensions adjacent to public open space will be encouraged in order to promote passive surveillance.

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' for example – 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.

The proposed quality of materials/finishes for dormers will be considered carefully as this can greatly improve their appearance. The level and type of glazing within a dormer structure should have regard to existing window treatments and fenestration of the dwelling.

Particular care will be taken in evaluating large, visually dominant dormer window structures, with a balance sought between quality residential amenity and the privacy of adjacent properties. Excessive overlooking of adjacent properties should be avoided unless support by the neighbours affected can be demonstrated.

More innovative design responses will be encouraged, particularly within sites where there may be difficulty adhering to the above guidance and where objectives of habitability and energy conservation are at stake.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1 Grounds of appeal

6.1.1 A first party appeal has been lodged by Peter Oakes Architects on behalf of Bill & Katy Stanley, 10 Cluain Na Greine Court, Shankhill, Co. Dublin. The grounds of appeal are as follows...

- It is noted that the site adjacent apartment development of much larger scale that dwarfs the surrounding houses with the houses in Cluain Na Greine overlooked by apartment windows.
- It is noted that the design continues the existing form and materials and that the proposal would be no more visible than the existing dwelling and would not be visually obtrusive or visually overbearing at this location.
- It is noted there is no additional overlooking or overshadowing of the adjoining properties.
- It is noted that a considerable amount of new dwellings granted by Dun Laoghaire Rathdown are three-storeys and that the proposal would be acceptable in the context of its impact on the streetscape.
- It is noted that extending over the existing single-story rear extension would have a more pronounced impact on the amenities of adjoining properties.

6.2 Responses

6.2.1 Response by Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council.

- It is considered that the proposal would have an adverse and visually obtrusive impact, be injurious to the amenities of adjoining properties and set an undesirable precedent for similar development.

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/residential amenity

Appropriate Assessment

7.2 Design/scale and visual/residential amenity:

7.2.1 The proposal is an increase the ridge height to provide accommodation at first floor level from 7.187m to 8.928m. To front the angle of the roof plane is steeper with a new dormer window placed centrally on the roof plane. The rear roof plan is at a shallower angle with the rear wall and gable built up to allow for additional accommodation at second floor level. The dwelling appears to be a dormer style dwelling when viewed from the front and a three-storey dwelling when viewed from the rear.

7.2.2 The proposal is located in a small housing scheme that is not a prominent development in the wider area and is well sheltered by virtue of the lower ground level relative to the Main Street in Shankill to the west, existing boundaries including trees and vegetation and the scale of the dwellings relative to adjoining structures which are larger in scale including the apartment development to the west and north west of the site. I would consider that the proposal would not have a significant visual impact in the context of the wider area. Notwithstanding such, I would have concerns that the way in which the dwelling is being extended would be visually obtrusive at this location and out of character with existing development. The proposal is for a significant increase in ridge height over and above the existing dwellings at this location. The proposal is extended in such a manner than provides an unattractive and lopsided roof profile from front to back due to the attempt to maximise the floor space. I would consider that the proposal would be visually obtrusive at this location, grossly out of character with the existing dwellings and contrary to the Development Plan policy as set down under Section 8.2.3.4 in relation to extensions. The proposal

would also set an undesirable precedent for similar extensions to existing dwellings and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7.2.3 The refusal reason notes concern regarding impact on residential amenities. The proposed extension does not increase the footprint of the existing dwelling and is extending upwards. The proposal does provide for new windows on the front and rear elevation, however such are in keeping with the orientation of the existing dwelling and consistent with the pattern of development. I am satisfied that the proposal would have no significant or adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining properties and is satisfactory in the context of the amenities of 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.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1 I recommend a refusal based on the following reasons...

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposal entails a significant increase in ridge height over and above the level of existing dwellings at this location that are characterised by their shallow pitch roof profiles. The proposal is to be extended in such a manner than provides an unattractive and lopsided roof profile from front to back due to the attempt to maximise the floor space provided. The proposal would be visually obtrusive at this location, grossly out of character with the existing dwellings and contrary to Development Plan policy as set down under Section 8.2.3.4 in relation to extensions. The proposal would also set an undesirable

precedent for similar extensions to existing dwellings and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Colin McBride
Planning Inspector

21st November 2017