



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP301323-18

Development	Permission for attic conversion consisting of raising of gable end, dormer window projection to rear with bathroom and all associated site
Location	213 Tyrconnell Road, Dublin 8.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2080-18.
Applicant(s)	Colin Price
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission.
Type of Appeal	1 st Party versus refusal.
Appellant(s)	Colin Price.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	11 th June 2018
Inspector	Brid Maxwell.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal is located within a well-established residential area at Tyrconnell Road, Inchicore. Dublin 8. The site has a stated area of 189m. sq. comprising an established semi-detached two storey dwelling, with two storey flat roofed rear return. The dwelling forms part of a terrace of two storey two bay dwellinghouses. The dwellings are finished in brick at ground floor level and plaster and decorative dash to bay window. The dwellings have small front gardens used mainly for parking enclosed by boundary walls and gardens to rear. The area is mixed use in character with the petrol forecourt on the opposite side of Tyrconnell Road a launderette at 203 Tyreconnell Road to the north east and The Black Horse Inn, 231 Tyrconnell Road to the southwest. The Grand Canal is located a short distance to the south of the site at the busy intersection formed by the junction of Tyrconnell Road, Naas Road, Davitt Road and The Luas.
- 1.2. Photographs appended to this report taken on the date of my site visit demonstrate the character of the area.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal provides for the attic conversion consisting of the raising of the gable end, provision for dormer window projection to rear roofplane providing for attic space 23sq.m including bathroom and all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated 12 March 2018. Dublin City Council decided refuse permission for the following reason:

“The proposed development, involving the alteration of the existing roof profile from fully hipped to gable ended and the provision of a dormer that is not visually

subordinate to the roof slope, would seriously impact the scale and character of the existing house and the form of the terrace, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and render the house the subject of this application contrary to the established character of houses in the vicinity,

Having regard to Section 16.2.2.3 and Appendix 17 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, and the planning history of the area, the proposed development in itself, or by the precedent a decision to grant permission would give for similar undesirable development, would be seriously injurious to amenities and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

3.2 Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1 Planning Reports

Planner's report concludes that the proposed alteration in the roof profile from a fully hipped roof to gable ended roof fundamentally alters the character and appearance of the existing house and would set an undesirable precedent for uncoordinated and piecemeal development in the vicinity.

3.2.2 Other Technical Reports:

Engineering Department Drainage Division report indicates no objection subject to conditions.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 No apparent history on the appeal site. I note the following recent decisions in the vicinity:

2744/17 Split decision in relation to site at 221 Tyrconnell Road. Application sought permission for entrance gates and driveway to provide off street parking to front. Change of roof profile from hip roof to gable roof with a flat roof dormer extension to rear for the conversion of attic space to home office, the replacement of an existing lean-to sunroom to rear with flat roofed extension to accommodate kitchen / dining. External insulation to side and rear of dwelling along with sundry alterations throughout. The decision of Dublin City Council was to refuse permission for change

of roof profile on grounds that the development would be out of character with established pattern of development.

PL29S248830 (PA ref 1203/17) 98 Emmet Road. The Board upheld decision of City Council to refuse permission for attic conversion including alteration to the roof to change existing hip to a gable wall with new dormer window to front elevation. Grounds for refusal were as follows:

“Having regard to the overall scale and mass of the proposed extension, the significant interventions proposed at roof level, incorporating a dormer extension in the front elevation and changes in the existing roof profile, and the inappropriate scale, design and finish of the proposed rear roof extension, it is considered that the proposed development would seriously impact the scale and character of the existing house and the form of the terrace, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would be contrary to the provisions of the current Dublin City Development Plan. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The site is subject to Z1 Zoning - “To protect provide and improve residential amenities,” within the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022.

5.1.2 Section 16.10 Standards for Residential Accommodation.

Section 16.10.12 Standards for Extensions and Alterations. Appendix 17 – Guidelines for Residential Extensions.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1 The nearest Natura 2000 sites are the Dublin Bay SAC and the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 The first party appeal grounds are submitted by H2B Architects. Grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- Additional space is vital and applicant wishes to remain in the locality. The family has resided at this house since the house was built in 1936.
- Applicant is fully committed to supporting the architectural integrity of the house as well as supporting the regeneration of the area.
- Alternative dutch hipped roof as opposed to full gable would be acceptable. Note, however, that there is a mix of heights and roof changes along the road frontage and consider that proposal is modest compared to some other interventions.
- The requested changes are sympathetic to the building and the area blending form and function.
- There is no real pattern of buildings in the vicinity as the area is extremely varied with contrasting style, type, age and function.
- Photographic survey appended to the appeal demonstrates mixed character of the area.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1 The Planning Authority did not respond to the grounds of appeal.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. The issues arising in this appeal relate to the principle and acceptability of the proposed development in this location particularly in light of the visual impact and impact on the character of the dwelling and the immediate area. Given the established residential use and zoning objective of the site, the principle of development of the attic space, which I note is indicated for storage / room use, to enhance and improve the level of residential accommodation on the site is acceptable in principle.
- 7.2. The key issue is therefore to consider whether the intervention is acceptable in terms of its impact on residential amenity, its visual impact and impact on the character of the dwelling and the area.
- 7.3 I note the main requirements for extensions and alterations to dwellings as set out within the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 S16.10.12 and Appendix 17, namely that the design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and, the need for light and privacy. In addition, the form of the existing building should be followed as closely as possible and the development should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar finishes and windows. Extensions should be subordinate in terms of scale to the main unit.
- 7.4 On the issue of impact on adjacent residential amenity, the proposal provides for a window to the side elevation at attic level and an additional dormer window to the rear roof plane. Whilst the additions would give rise to an increased level and sense of overlooking of the adjacent dwelling and private garden, it is not to such an extent in my view as to warrant a refusal of permission on grounds of detriment to established residential amenity.
- 7.5 The grounds for refusal by Dublin City Council was on the basis that the *“development would seriously impact the scale and character of the existing house and the form of the terrace, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and render the house the subject of this application contrary to the established character of houses in the vicinity”*. As regards the visual impact, the proposal involves significant alterations to the roof profile. I would tend to concur with the

local authority that such alterations would be unsatisfactory, would be out of character and detrimental to the existing dwelling and to the pattern and form of the terrace of dwellings in the vicinity. Within the grounds of appeal, the agent for the applicant suggests a dutch hipped gable alternative, if the Board were to consider a full gable end to be too intrusive in the streetscape. In my view however such alteration would not render the proposal acceptable.

7.6 The first party claims that there is precedent for such alterations in the vicinity of the site and provides a photographic review to elucidate arguments made. However as noted within the Planner's report the examples highlighted relate, in the main, to properties on the north side of Tyrconnell road which is characterised by gable ended terraced structures and a more eclectic mix of uses, therefore present an entirely different context to the appeal site. Other examples noted within the appeal relate to commercial properties in the main. Therefore, I would concur that there is no established precedent for such a permission. In fact, Dublin City Council has refused permission for a similar alteration at 221 Tyrconnell Road in its decision 2744/17. The decision of the Board PL29S248830 (1203/17) to refuse permission for a comparable proposal is also of note. On the basis of the foregoing I recommend that the Council's decision to refuse be upheld.

7.7 Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the nature of the receiving environment, and proximity to the nearest European site, no appropriate assessment issues arise and it is considered that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on a European site.

8 Recommendation

8.7 Having regard to the foregoing, I recommend that the decision of the Planning Authority be upheld and permission refused for the following reason:

8.2 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the zoning objective, Z1; “to protect provide for and improve residential amenities” according to the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, to the character of the existing dwelling and to the established pattern, scale and architectural character of the area, it is considered that the proposed extension by reason of its alteration of roof profile would constitute an inappropriate intervention, would seriously impact on the character of the existing house and the pattern of the terrace of which it forms part. The proposed development would be contrary to the provisions of the current Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, and would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Bríd Maxwell
Planning Inspector

19th June 2018