



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-301510-18

Development	Conversion of attic to storage, including changing the existing hipped end roof to a gable end roof, a dormer window to the rear and two velux rooflights to the front all at roof level.
Location	5 Mount Prospect Grove, Clontarf, Dublin 3
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1051/18
Applicant(s)	Jason Walsh
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Jason Walsh
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	12/09/18
Inspector	John Desmond

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
5.1. Development Plan.....	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	7
6.0 The Appeal	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
6.2. Planning Authority Response	9
6.3. Observations	9
7.0 Assessment.....	10
7.2. Design and visual impact	10
7.3. Environmental Impact Assessment Screening	12
7.4. Appropriate Assessment Screening	12
8.0 Recommendation.....	13
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	13

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in the mature suburban area of Clontarf, c.5.5km east-northeast of the centre of Dublin and 600m from the coast at Bull Island. The application relates to a 2-storey, end-of-terrace dwelling within an estate of similar dwellings, which date probably from the late interwar period. The site area is stated as 254-sq.m and the existing floor area as 105-sq.m.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to convert the attic to storage use, change the existing hipped roof to gable end roof, install dormer window to the rear and 2no. velux rooflights to the front at roof level.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

To **GRANT** permission subject to 9no. conditions. Conditions of relevance to this appeal may be summarised as follow:

No.2 -

The development hereby approved shall incorporate the following amendment:

- (a) The proposed gable roof profile shall be omitted and replaced by a hipped roof and side dormer. This dormer shall be full hipped to match the existing roof profile and shall have its ridge line set down below that of the main roof by at least 200mm and drawing up from the existing eaves line so that the side dormer shall sit fully within the plane of the main side hip roof as a subordinate feature.*
- (b) The front and side walls of the side dormer hereby approved shall be clade in slate/tiles to match the existing roof.*
- (c) Any window on the side dormer shall have a vertical emphasis.*

The applicant is directed to the example of no.22 Mount Prospect Drive (WEB1219/15) as a design precedent.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, consistency in the roofscape and to comply with current Dublin City Development Plan policy, in particular Appendix 17.11.

No.3 -

The proposed rear dormer shall be amended as follows:

The dormer shall be reduced in width and amended to a pitched roof gable fronted structures such that the entirety of the former structure is contained within the rear roof plane of the existing house.

The applicant is directed to the example of no.22 Mount Prospect Drive (WEB1219/15) as a design precedent

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity, consistency in the roofscape and to comply with current Dublin City Development Plan policy, in particular Appendix 17.11.

No.4 -

The 2no. front rooflights shall be omitted.

REASON: In the interest of visual amenity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the planning officer (29/03/18) is consistent with the decision of the planning authority and the conditions attaching thereto.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division (12/03/18) raises no objection subject to standard conditions.

3.3. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

On Site – No relevant history.

In vicinity -

PL29N.245746 / Reg.Ref.3549/15 – Permission **GRANTED** by the Board (08/02/16), overturning refusal by the planning authority, for attic conversion, including side and rear roof dormers and front rooflight at no.9 Mount Prospect Grove, Clontarf subject to a condition (no.2) omitting proposed side gable and providing a part hip / part gable roof dormer similar to that installed at adjacent property to the north (no.8).

Reg.Ref.WEB1219/15 – Permission **GRANTED** for, inter alia, attic conversion with dormers to rear and side of no.22 Mount Prospect Drive, subject to conditions amending the design of the dormers and omitting front rooflight.

Reg.Ref.5311/08 – Permission **GRANTED** for, inter alia, replacement of hipped roof with gable-end roof structure no.18 Mount Prospect Grove.

Reg.Ref.5311/06 – Permission **GRANTED** for, inter alia, attic conversion with replacement of hipped roof with gable-end roof structure no.40 Mount Prospect Grove.

Reg.Ref.0595/02 – Permission **GRANTED** by the planning authority for attic conversion with dormer window to the side, in addition to kitchen extension at ground, at no.8 Mount Prospect Grove.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Land use zoning objective Z1 '*To protect, provide and improve residential amenities*'.

Section 16.10.12 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings: [...] *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.*

Applications for planning permission to extend dwellings will only be granted where the planning authority is satisfied that the proposal will: Not have an adverse impact

on the scale and character of the dwelling; Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, access to daylight and sunlight.

Appendix 17 Guidance for Residential Extensions: S.17.11 Roof Extensions:

When extending in the roof, the following principles should be observed:

- The design of the dormer should reflect the character of the area, the surrounding buildings and the age and appearance of the existing building*
- Dormer windows should be visually subordinate to the roof slope, enabling a large proportion of the original roof to remain visible*
- Any new window should relate to the shape, size, position and design of the existing doors and windows on the lower floors*
- Roof materials should be covered in materials that match or complement the main building*
- Dormer windows should be set back from the eaves level to minimise their visual impact and reduce the potential for overlooking of adjoining properties.*

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

North Dublin Bay SAC 000206 (c.0.6km to the east).

North Bull Island SPA 004006 (c.0.6km to east).

South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA 004024 (c.0.8km to south).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The main grounds of this third part appeal against the attaching of conditions nos.2(a), 3 and 4 of the decision (see s.3.1, above), submitted c/o DRB Design, may be summarised as follow:

- The dwellings in the area are similar, creating a sense of place, but not identical.

- The dwelling at the southern end of the terrace (no.8) has a side dormer, as does nos.9 and 21; two dwellings are gable-ended (nos.18 and 40); four dwellings have flat-roof rear dormers; three dwellings have front rooflights (nos.9, 21 and 46).
- The proposed development has been designed in accordance with the principles under the Plan (s.16.10.12 and Appendix 17 referred to).
- No unacceptable amenity impacts – side gable fenestration to be of opaque glazing, with modest rear windows; and negligible overshadowing.
- Use of gable conversion is a more balanced and considered approach in lieu of side dormer.
- All materials will match existing.
- Gable design is subordinate, being not larger or higher than existing. A side dormer design is not appropriate (can appear ill-considered) given the current building form and precedent within the estate – no.9 Mount Prospect Grove (PL29N.245746), no.18 (reg.ref.5311/08) and no.40 (Reg.Ref.5311/06).
- Rear dormer is subordinate at 50% of the width of rear roof plane and of modest height similar to others in the estate.
- The Development Plan does not preclude the use of gable alterations once it complies with the overriding guidance given in s.16.10.12 and Appendix 17 of the Plan.
- Permission granted for hipped end to gable-end conversions permitted by Dublin City Council in 2017 and 2018 include – WEB1242/17 (Montrose Drive, Artane), WEB1150/17 (Shaowen Road, Santry), Reg.Ref.4557/17 (Woodland Drive, Santry), Reg.Ref.4467/16 (Ashington Court, Navan Road), Reg.Ref.4315/16 (Cranfield Place, Sandymount), Reg.Ref.4034/17 (Willow Park Crescent, D11), Reg.Ref.3549/17 (Crenmore Heights, Glasnevin).
- The Planning Inspector to PL29.245746 (no.9 Mount Prospect Grove) considered the proposed gable roof to be more sympathetic to the original roof profile and to have less of an impact than the other examples of dormer gable extensions in the area. The Board's decision to require the gable be

replaced with part hip / part gable roof, recognised the deficient nature of the side dormers within the estate (it was built as non-hipped dormer window).

- WEB1219/15, referred to in the conditions, is non-typical, with very modest side and rear dormers and would provide substandard access and very limited space. No.9 Mount Prospect is more relevant.
- Only one property has a side dormer that steps down – no.21 Mount Prospect Grove.
- Re condition no.3 (concerning alteration of rear dormer), there is no policy specifically requiring pitched roofs to rear dormers and it is not a common condition and it is possible that it was the intention of the Planning Authority to ensure the rear dormer would fit into the rear roof plane created by the use of a dropped side dormer, otherwise the proposed design is compliant. Similar permitted at No. 9 and 40 Mount Prospect Grove and at nos.10, 22, 35, 38, 50, 65, 71 and 75 Mount Prospect Drive.
- Re condition no.4 (concerning omission of front rooflights), the Board permitted same at no.9 Mount Prospect Grove, the reporting Inspector considered the visual impact would be negligible, there is further precedence for permission in the area (Reg.Ref.6187/07 and Reg.Ref.0095/00) and the rooflights are important for views, lights, ventilation and fire escape/rescue.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

None received.

6.3. **Observations**

None received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

- 7.1.1. This First Party appeal is against the attaching of conditions 2(a), 3 and 4 to the grant of permission, respectively: amending proposed gable-end replacement roof design with a hipped side-dormer; amending the width and roof design of proposed rear dormer; and omitting front rooflights.
- 7.1.2. Having regard to the provisions under section 139(1) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, the Board has the discretion to limit its considerations to the conditions concerned. I am of the opinion that, having regard to nature of the conditions, determination of the application by the Board, de novo, would not be warranted in this instance.
- 7.1.3. This is a single-issue case relating to design and visual impact.

7.2. Design and visual impact

- 7.2.1. The Plan (s.16.10.12) provides that extensions and alterations to dwellings will only be granted where the planning authority is satisfied that the proposed will not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the dwelling and will not adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring property in terms of access to daylight and sunlight. Appendix 17 of the Plan (Vol.2) contains design guidance on residential extensions, including roof extensions, specifically (s.17.11 - see section 5.1, above).
- 7.2.2. The application relates to an end-of-terrace dwelling forming part of a larger development of similar 2-storey suburban dwellings surrounding a central rectangular open space. There is a certain consistency in the style and arrangement of the dwellings, as originally built, but it is far from uniform in design. There is variation in the original roof styles (gable ended or hipped) but all are of a fairly consistent height and are finished in dun brown tiles, creating a sense of consistency.
- 7.2.3. Many of the dwellings have subsequently been amended at roof level. For example, the dwelling at the opposite end (south) of this short terrace, no.8, has erected a side gable-ended dormer (Reg.Ref.0595/02) as has the neighbouring end-of-terrace

dwelling, no.9 (PL29N.245746 amended by condition from proposed gable-end replacement roof design which had been refused by the planning authority). The ridge height of both said dormers are level with that of the main roof ridge.

- 7.2.4. To the south, no.18, and on the opposite side of the green, no.40 have both amended the original hipped roofs to full gable-end design (Reg.Ref.5311/08 and Reg.Ref.5311/06, respectively), and the latter property also erected a rear box dormer. Also, to the south, no.21 has erected a hipped-roofed side dormer with ridge height set below that of the main roof, as was proposed in the application (Reg.Ref.6187/07). A similar side dormer was erected at no.22 Mount Prospect Drive (Reg.Ref.WEB1219/15), except that the latter dormer was amended from gable-ended dormer to hipped-dormer by condition. The permitted development at no.22 is cited in conditions nos.2 and 3 (subject of this appeal) as the design precedent for the development to follow.
- 7.2.5. I do not consider the proposal to be contrary to the guidance on roof extensions under Appendix 17 of the Plan within its context. Where existing roofs in the vicinity have been altered to gable-ended in lieu of the original hipped design, this is not obvious to the casual observer. On inspecting the site context, the side dormers appeared relatively more visually prominent or obtrusive interventions to me, but neither design feature detracted from the visual amenities of the area to any significant degree. Whilst I am cognisant of the Board's decision PL29N.245746 / Reg.Ref.3549/15, referred to above, for no.9 Mount Prospect Grove, which is the most relevant to the case on hand, in my professional opinion the proposed change to gable-ended roof is acceptable within the context. I therefore consider condition no.2(a) to be unwarranted (and parts (b) and (c) of the condition would be irrelevant in the absence of (a)) and that condition 2 should be omitted in its entirety.
- 7.2.6. Regarding condition no.3, there is ample precedent for rear box dormers, including to the rear of the adjacent dwelling no.6. The rear dormer is in scale with the roof, is set back from the eaves, the gable and the party boundary and it would not exceed the height of the existing roof ridge and would therefore not be visible from the front. In the absence of condition no.2 there is no need to amend the proposed rear box dormer or amend its roof structure to a pitched roof gable. Should the Board attach condition no.2, the rear dormer would have to be set down from the roof ridge to match that of the side dormer, but otherwise could be accommodated in terms of its

proposed width, subject to appropriate redesign to integrate with the side dormer roof structure, which could be agreed with the planning authority by way of condition.

- 7.2.7. Regarding condition no.4, I consider the requirement to omit the proposed front rooflights to be unjustified and I could find nothing in the Development Plan that prohibits such fenestration. The visual impact of same will be negligible on the public streetscape. There is precedent for same at no.9, as permitted by the Board. The provision of rooflights is a sustainable approach to provide daylight to internal spaces in lieu of artificial lighting.

7.3. **Environmental Impact Assessment Screening**

- 7.3.1. Having regard to the small-scale and nature of the proposed development and the nature of the receiving environment, there is no real likelihood of significant impacts on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can therefore be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

7.4. **Appropriate Assessment Screening**

- 7.4.1. Having regard to the small-scale nature of the development proposed within an existing built-up area, it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect, directly or indirectly, individually or in combination with other plans or projects on any European site. I consider no Appropriate Assessment issues to arise.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. The Board is satisfied, having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and to the nature of the conditions subject of this First Party appeal, the determination of the application as if it had been made to the Board in the first instance is not warranted and the Board directs Dublin City planning authority to **OMIT** conditions nos.2, 3 and 4.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

It is considered that having regard to the site context, including the existing pattern of development including alterations to neighbouring dwellings at roof level, the design of the proposed development would generally accord with the design standards for such development under Appendix 17, Vol.2 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 and would not be unduly out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity, would not seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity, would be consistent with the zoning objective pertaining to the site, Z1 '*To protect, provide for an improve residential amenities*', and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

John Desmond
Senior Planning Inspector

12th September 2018