



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-300734-18

Development	Attic conversion with dormer windows to rear and side; 2 no rooflights to front
Location	4, Hollybrook Grove, Clontarf, Dublin 3
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1548/17
Applicant(s)	Damian Kelly and Aideen Colgan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Damian Kelly and Aideen Colgan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	3 rd May 2018
Inspector	Una O'Neill

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	3
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	4
3.4. Third Party Observations	4
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy Context.....	4
5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022	4
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	4
6.0 The Appeal	4
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	4
6.2. Planning Authority Response	5
6.3. Observations	5
6.4. Further Responses.....	5
7.0 Assessment.....	5
8.0 Recommendation.....	8
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	8
10.0 Conditions	8

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on the western side of Hollybrook Grove, which is accessed by way of a left turn onto Strandville Avenue East, off the Clontarf Road. The site is located along a residential street, in proximity to the seafront, northeast of Dublin City Centre.
- 1.2. The site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling, which has been recently extended to the side and rear.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the following:
 - Dormer extension to the rear to serve storage room.
 - Side dormer extension to accommodate a stairwell to the attic space.
 - Two front rooflights.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

GRANTED, subject to 7 conditions, including the following:

C2: Attic shall be used for storage only.

C3: Omission of side dormer; amendment of design of rear dormer; omission of front rooflights.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planning Officer's report generally reflects the decision of the Planning Authority.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division: No objection subject to condition.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None.

4.0 **Planning History**

3194/12: Permission GRANTED for a two storey extension to the side and rear.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022**

- Zoning objective Z1, the objective for which is ‘to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.’
- Section 16.10.12: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings
- Appendix 17, Section 17.11: Guidance for Roof Extensions

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The site is not located within or adjacent to any designated Natura 2000 site. The nearest Natura 2000 site is the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (0040240) 210m to the south of the subject site. The North Bull Island SPA and North Dublin Bay SAC are to the southeast of the site.

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The first party appeal is against Condition 3 and is summarised as follows:

- There are numerous side dormers in the area and precedent has been established in this regard.

- The restriction of width of the rear dormer is considered excessive and unreasonable. There is precedent in the area, where widths of 3.9m have been granted.
- The front rooflights are necessary to provide light as the rear dormer would not be sufficient. There is precedent for front rooflights in the area.
- Precedent exists on The Stiles Road, Kincora Avenue, Kincora Grove and Clontarf Road and photographs of these precedents are included in the appeal submission.
- Proposed dormers match other types of development locally in terms of design, material, texture, colour and finish. The proposed development is similar in size, appearance and character to the established residences in the area.
- The Board is asked, in accordance with Section 139, to remove or amend condition 3(a), (b)i and (c).

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

None.

6.3. **Observations**

None.

6.4. **Further Responses**

None.

7.0 **Assessment**

- 7.1. This is a first party appeal against planning condition 3(a), (b)i and (c) of the Planning Authority which states:

The development shall be revised as follows:

- a) The proposed side dormer shall be omitted, which may be placed by rooflight as required.

b) The proposed rear dormer shall be amended as follows:

- i. The proposed rear dormer shall have a maximum width of 2.60m and shall be placed as centrally as possible upon the primary rear plane and be disaggregated as much as possible from the 1st floor rear return and the shared chimney.
- ii. The proposed rear dormers ope(s) shall be no higher or wider than the existing largest existing rear 1st floor opes below, and the rear dormer's southerly side ope shall be omitted.
- iii. Shall be set back at least 500mm from the party boundary with No. 6 Hollybrook Grove.
- iv. All the rear dormer's elevations; fascia/soffits; rainwater goods, window frames, glazing bars shall be finished in a dark colour so as to blend with the existing roof. No white uPVC shall be used
- v. The rear dormer shall not accommodate any solar panels whether or not they would be exempted development under the Planning & Development Act 2000(as amended)

c) The front rooflights shall be omitted.

Development shall not commence until revised plans, drawings and particulars showing the above amendments have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority, and such works shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the buildings.

Reason: In the interests of orderly development and visual amenity.

- 7.2. Having regard to the nature of the development proposed and the condition subject of this appeal, I consider a de novo consideration of the proposal is not warranted and I recommend the Board should use its discretionary powers under Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), and restrict its consideration to the terms of condition no. 3.
- 7.3. The main issue of the appeal relates to design and visual Impact.
- 7.4. The applicant argues there are numerous side dormers in the area and precedent has been established in this regard. With regard to the rear dormer, the restriction of

width is considered excessive and precedent in the area is quoted where widths of 3.9m have been granted. The appellant considers the front rooflights necessary to provide light as the rear dormer would not be sufficient and precedent in the area is quoted. The Board is asked, in accordance with Section 139, to remove or amend condition 3(a), (b)i and (c).

- 7.5. The proposed side dormer window is shown on the floor plans to accommodate a stairs to the attic level store room. The side dormer measures approx. 3.7m wide, is set 200mm below the ridgeline and is approx. 500mm back from the eaves of the roof. I note side dormers have been permitted previously in the wider area, although none exist on this street. In my view, the more visually unobtrusive side dormers are those which are set down from the ridgeline, set back from the eaves and generally reflect the roof profile of the existing dwelling. Given the positioning of the side dormer within the roofslope of the dwelling subject of this appeal, I consider the side dormer will not be visually incongruous within the streetscape. However, I consider the side dormer would integrate more satisfactorily with the existing dwelling if the roof was hipped, in line with the design of the existing roofslope. Condition 3 could be amended to address this issue.
- 7.6. The proposed rear dormer, is positioned between the rear roofslope of the first floor extension and the existing rear roofslope. The dormer is stated to serve a store room, is 4m wide, is set back from the eaves, sits approx. 200mm below the ridgeline and is finished with a flat roof. This attic area is indicated to have an internal floor to ceiling height of 1.49m. There are no dwellings directly to the rear of the property, with the rear boundary being to a laneway to the rear of the property, adjoining which is a large triangular backland site in commercial use. I consider that while the scale of the dormer at a width of 4m is wide, the proposal is not visible from the streetscape and given separation distances to any residential properties to the rear, does not impact on the residential amenities of properties to the rear. The proposal is set 300/400mm from the shared boundary with the adjoining dwelling, with a rear and side window. The side window would result in overlooking of the neighbouring property and should be omitted, however I am satisfied that the positioning of the dormer will not negatively impact on the amenity of the adjoining property. The dormer as proposed is not visible from the front elevation and will not in my view be injurious to the visual amenities of the area.

- 7.7. The two proposed front rooflights (approx. 800mm x 700mm) are small in scale and satisfactorily positioned within the roofscape as to not impact visually on the streetscape.
- 7.8. Having considered the existing context of the site, the design and positioning of the proposed dormer elements and scale of the front rooflights, I am of the view that the proposal in this specific instance, will not be injurious to amenity of adjoining properties. Should the Board be minded to grant permission, Condition 3 of the Planning Authority should be amended.

Appropriate Assessment

- 7.9. Having regard to the minor nature of the development, its location in a serviced urban area, and the separation distance to any 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. It is recommended that condition 3 be amended, as set out hereunder.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 9.1. Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, the existing pattern of development in the area, and the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed dormer extensions and rooflights would not detract from the character of the area or seriously injure the amenities of property in the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and condition 3 should be amended.

10.0 Conditions

- 3 The proposed development shall be amended as follows:
- a) The proposed side dormer shall be hipped.

b) The proposed rear dormer's southerly side ope shall be omitted.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

Una O'Neill
Senior Planning Inspector

11th May 2018