



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

**Inspector's Report**  
**301203-18**

---

<b>Development</b>	First floor extension to side of dwelling.
<b>Location</b>	17 Baymount Park, Clontarf, Dublin 3
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	1630/17
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Roisin Williams
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party v Conditions
<b>Appellants</b>	Roisin Williams
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	6 <sup>th</sup> July 2018
<b>Inspector</b>	Suzanne Kehely

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings and one of a row of 10 dwellings on the east side of the road and located just before a point in the road where it turns sharply alongside parkland. It is a mature road characterised by mature gardens and individualisation of an ordered building style.
- 1.2. The houses are typically two bay semis with side garages to the side and up to the boundary. Finishes include a mix of brick and render, many of the houses on the same side of the road have constructed extensions over the garage and up to the boundary. The adjoining semi has altered the original house quite extensively; it has converted the garage and extended to the side at first floor and continued the roof ridge and hip profile over this. It has repeated the use of bay windows rendered over the brick façade, presenting a completely symmetrical façade.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development involves
  - First floor extension to side with flat roof.
  - Remodelling the ground floor elevation.
  - Structurally, it is proposed to construct steel support inside the site boundary to avoid bearing on the party wall.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Grant permission subject to 6 conditions.

Condition 1 relates to compliance with drawings.

Condition 2 states:

The development hereby approved shall incorporate the following amendments: -

The side extension including the front façade of the existing garage conversion shall be set back behind the primary front building by at least 0.5metres.

Reason: To minimise the visual impact and protect residential amenity.

Conditions 3, 4 and 6 relate to construction stage.

Condition 5 relates to drainage.

### 3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. The planning reports to policies and guidance on extensions and alterations as contained in the current Development Plan. The report notes the height of the extension which breaches the eaves in the context and raises concerns about the dominance of the extension and considers a stepping back is important to preserve the proportions of the existing dwelling and acknowledges that this will require internal adjustment. The proposal is otherwise acceptable in terms of privacy and daylight and sunlight.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage: no objection subject to conditions

### 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Irish Water: No report

## 4.0 **Planning History**

Planning authority ref.1644/01 refers to permission for demolition of garage and extension at rear, widening of existing gate, two storey extension to side and single storey to rear, attic conversion with roof lights and new entrance.

## 5.0 **Development Plan**

5.1.1. The site is zoned to protect and improve residential amenity.

5.1.2. Section 16.2.2.3 refers to extensions and alterations. It applies the principle of subordination with the overall aim of integration such that it will not adversely impact the scale and character of the dwelling nor the amenities of adjacent properties in respect of privacy and access to light.

## 6.0 Grounds of Appeal

6.1. The agent has submitted an appeal against condition 2 only. The requirement to step back 500mm is excessive having regard to:

- Precedent for two stories to the side that have not had to step back.  
(Photographs attached of nos 19 adjoining, 13, 11 and 14 Ballymount Park)
- A previous permission for two storey extension to the side on the site did not have this requirement.
- The high-quality design and finish is subordinate and the contemporary approach sets off the original house. It will not negatively impact on residential or visual amenities.
- The required 500mm set back is substantial and will require demolition and revision to the internal layout and impact on the utility of the living spaces as
- designed.
- The small scale of proposed development and its visual setting in a secluded area.
- It will enhance the streetscape.
- Normal practice: Typically, a front building line could not be breached although each case being assessed on its own merits but this a much more onerous approach.
- The site or building is not subject of any building conservation designations.

## 7.0 Responses

### 7.1. Planning Authority Response

None

## 8.0 Assessment

### 8.1. Issues

8.1.1. This appeal is against condition number 2 of a decision to grant permission for a first-floor extension to the side of the house. Having reviewed the file and inspected site and having regard to the nature of the condition, I am satisfied that the Board

can confine its consideration to issues within said condition and that a determination by the Board of the application as if it had been made in the first instance would not be warranted.

8.1.2. The issues in this context are

- Visual amenity and orderly development

8.1.3. The planning authority considers the proposal to be generally acceptable subject to recessing the existing building line to achieve a 500mm setback. This would involve demolishing and losing existing habitable space. This is imposed, by reference to the Development Plan policy, to achieve visual subordination having regard to the proposed height which breaches the eaves height. The applicant however makes the case that the requirement is excessive on many fronts and that the design does comply with the Development Plan design criteria and does achieve visual integration.

8.1.4. I note the proposed extension is over the existing converted garage and retains the original building line structurally, but by the addition of external insulation, the render finish will align the surface with the brick façade on the original house. The existing 20-30mm recess will therefore be lost. However, this be offset by the insertion of a tall window opening visually bridging ground and first floor with an extended tapered reveal commencing about 500mm from the redbrick which is a subtle form of recess. The design achieves a simple sleek rendered column in contrast to the original brick façade and in my judgement, articulates the original house rather than dominates it. The materials and design are I consider successfully rationalised to integrate the contemporary approach (which is advocated in the development plan guidance). At the same time, the massing and scale balances the semi-detached house with the adjoining extended house (no.19) which incorporates an extended roof ridge and hip – for this reason the slight breach of the eaves make visual sense.

8.1.5. For these reasons I consider the proposed development un-amended would successfully integrate with the existing pair of semi-detached houses and the streetscape generally.

8.1.6. While I consider the setback unwarranted in this case, the subtle tapered recess could be highlighted by further recessing the window glazing. If the Board was of mind to require recessing then this I consider would be a more reasonable approach.

- 8.1.7. While if this were an entirely new build, a subtle recess would be preferable, however, I consider the design successfully retains the original character of the house. Furthermore, I do not consider the proposed extension will adversely affect the amenities of the adjacent residents or wider streetscape.
- 8.1.8. On balance I consider the proposed extension to be acceptable and in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 9.0 **Appropriate Assessment**

- 9.1. In view of the nature of the proposed development within the footprint of a dwelling in an urban area I do not consider the issue of appropriate assessment arises.

## 10.0 **Recommendation**

- 10.1. Within the provisions of section 139, I recommend that the planning authority be directed to **remove** condition no. 2.

## 11.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the existing building line and pattern of development and the proposed design and façade treatment, it is considered that, the proposed development would comply with development plan policy with respect to the integration of the proposed extension and would be acceptable in terms of residential and visual amenities of the area and would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

Suzanne Kehely

Senior Planning Inspector

9<sup>th</sup> July 2018