



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-301598-18

Development

1) Two-storey extension to side and rear of house, incorporating already approved plans ref.: 3426/17. 2) Subdivision of extended semi detached house into two separate dwellings. 3) Relocation of existing vehicular entrance including a new pedestrian entrance, also all associated site works.

Location

36 Inishmaan Road, Gaeltacht Park, Whitehall, Dublin 9

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council North

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2344/18

Applicant(s)

Alan Harrison

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse permission

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Alan Harrison

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

16th August 2018

Inspector

Donal Donnelly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located on Inishmaan Road in Whitehall approximately 3.7km north of Dublin City Centre. Inishmann Road is within a 1930's housing estate (Gaeltacht Park) situated to the south of Collins Avenue West (R103) and west of Swords Road (N1). The estate has a regular layout with roads radiating from a central green area. Inishmaan Road comprises the north-eastern radial road between the inner and outer circle roads.
- 1.2. Houses within the overall estate are semi-detached or terraced units with similar design comprising hip-ends, double height bay windows, brick finish at ground level and dashed upper level. Some dwellings have been altered over time to include side extensions and dormers.
- 1.3. No. 36 Inishmaan Road is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling located at the western corner of the 'T' junction with Iveragh Road. The dwelling and its semi-detached neighbour face north-east to address the corner. The dwelling has double height bay windows either side of a central doorway and a single storey garage to the side. The floor area of the existing dwelling appears to be 159.33 sq.m. and the site area is given as 368.5 sq.m.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for the following:
 - 2-storey extension to the side and rear of house incorporating already approved Reg. Ref: 3426/17;
 - Subdivision of extended semi-detached house into two separate dwellings comprising 1 no. 2-bed house (87 sq.m.) and 1 no. 3-bed house (137 sq.m.);
 - Relocation of existing vehicular entrance to serve proposed dwelling including a new pedestrian entrance; and
 - All associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Dublin City Council issued notification of decision to refuse permission for reasons relating to the setting of an undesirable precedent that would be incompatible with the established pattern of development and character of the area, and the inadequate quality and quantity of private open space, providing unsatisfactory standard of residential amenity for future occupants.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. The recommendation to refuse permission in the Planner's Report reflects the decision of the Planning Authority. The following points set out in the Planner's Report are of note:
- Both dwellings reach and exceed the minimum standards and room sizes set out in the Development Plan and Quality Housing Guidelines.
 - Proposed development will create a terrace of 3 houses and the estate contains some terraced housing.
 - Proposed development would be incompatible with the established pattern of development and would have a negative impact on the residential and visual amenities of the area.
 - 49 sq.m. proposed to rear of 2-bed house and 40 sq.m./ 35 sq.m. to rear/ side of 3-bed dwelling (40 sq.m. and 50 sq.m. of private open space required). Private open space to rear of 3-bed house appears to be over-estimated.
 - Unsatisfactory quantity and location of private open space adjacent to front garden of no. 35.
- 3.2.2. The Roads and Traffic Planning Section noted that the impact of the relocated access on the existing tree on the grass verge is not clear from application drawings.

4.0 Planning History

Dublin City Council Reg. Ref: 3426/17

- 4.1. Permission granted in October 2017 for construction of a proposed double storey extension to gable end and rear of house incorporating existing garage, and all associated site works, including re-positioning of pedestrian gate entrance at front of site.

Dublin City Council Reg. Ref: 3365/99

- 4.2. Permission granted in October 1999 for a 2-storey extension with garage to side.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The appeal site is zoned "Z1" where the objective is *"to protect, provide and improve residential amenities."*
- 5.1.2. Development standards for extensions and alterations to dwellings and sub-division of dwellings are set out in Sections 16.10.12 and 16.10.13.
- 5.1.3. Policy QH22 seeks *"to ensure that new housing development close to existing houses has regard to the character and scale of the existing houses unless there are strong design reasons for doing otherwise."*

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. A first party appeal against the Council's decision was submitted by the applicant. The grounds of appeal and main points raised in this submission are summarised as follows:
- Planning permission has been granted for a third house at existing semi-detached corner site at no's. 502 & 502A Collins Avenue.
 - Appeal site is quite unique in its surroundings and Dublin City Council may relax normal planning standards to allow for infill development.

- Regional Planning Guidelines have strategies to increase densities so that consolidation will facilitate efficient use of public transport.
- Side gardens have been used as private space at no's. 33 Inishmaan Road, 137 Iveragh Road and 1 Inishmaan Road.
- Issues regarding effects on open space and standard of amenity were not raised in the previous planning application.
- Development Plan recommends a mix of accommodation – proposal sees the creation of a 2-bed unit.
- Development does not adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring properties.
- Measurements of garden size are correct.
- Detailed drawings will be submitted and full liaison will occur with the Parks Development with regards to the young trees near the proposed access.
- Nearest bus stop is 160m from the site.
- Very limited overshadowing will occur.
- Estimate that more than half the housing stock in the area is terraced.

6.1.2. The applicant's consultant also lodged correspondence with the submission stating that precedent for this type of development is well established. The applicant and agent were hopeful that private open space standards could be relaxed somewhat in the interests of adding to the depleted housing stock.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. I consider that the key issues in determining this appeal are as follows:

- Development principle;
- Development pattern and visual impact;
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Appropriate Assessment.

7.2. Development Principle

- 7.2.1. The appeal site is zoned Z1 where the objective is *“to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.”* The extension and sub-division of a dwelling into two dwellings would therefore be acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the amenities of existing and future residents and compliance with other relevant Development Plan policies and objectives.

7.3. Development Pattern and Visual Impact

- 7.3.1. It is stated under the reason for refusal that the proposed development would be incompatible with the established pattern of development in the area and would set an undesirable precedent for similar type development. Reference is made in the Planner’s Report to the proposed creation of a terrace of three houses and to the distinctive architectural character of the area.
- 7.3.2. From the outset, it should be noted that the dwelling on site was originally extended by 64 sq.m. over 2-storeys to the side following a permission in 1999. There is also a live permission granted in October 2017 for a double storey extension to the side of the already extended dwelling. The permitted extension adds another 58.6 sq.m. to the dwelling. The current proposal sees the dwelling sub-divided into an 86.6 sq.m. dwelling, comprising mostly of the original 2-storey semi-detached house, together with a 136.73 sq.m. dwelling made up of the original extension and a new extension thereto.
- 7.3.3. It should be noted that the extension permitted under Reg. Ref: 3426/17 is to be set back from the front building line and below the ridge level of the main dwelling so as to appear sub-servient to the host dwelling. The setback building line also allows the entire structure to fit the dimensions of the site. A 1m separation between the extended dwelling and the site boundary fronting Inishmaan Road is facilitated under this permission.
- 7.3.4. The extension proposed under the current application will continue the front building line to establish a terrace of three dwellings. The south-eastern corner of the extension will be chamfered to facilitate a 1m set back from the site boundary. However, the hipped roof will continue over this chamfer. I would have concerns regarding the appearance of this roof overhang.

- 7.3.5. I have no objections per se to the insertion of a third dwelling into a corner site subject to space considerations and a degree of visual symmetry. In this case, the proposed new dwelling would off-set the terrace to one side of the entire prominent corner location. One end of the terrace would appear tightly against the side boundary and the other end will have a spacious setting. I would be of the opinion that this will give rise to an asymmetric appearance that will adversely impact on the visual amenities of the streetscape.
- 7.3.6. Having regard to the above, I agree that the proposed extension and subdivision, by reason of its scale and proximity to boundaries, and off-set terracing effect would form an obtrusive feature that would be contrary to the established pattern of development in the area. I consider that this housing estate has managed to retain its architectural character, with alterations mostly carried out sensitively.

7.4. Impact on residential amenity

- 7.4.1. The proposed subdivision will create an 86.6 sq.m. 2-bedroom dwelling and a 136.73 sq.m. 3-bedroom dwelling. These figures exceed the target gross floor areas for dwellings on this size set out in the Quality Housing Guidelines.
- 7.4.2. It is stated under Section 16.10.2 of the Development Plan that a minimum of 10 sq.m. of private open space per bedspace will normally be applied. The 2-bed dwelling will have a 48.8 sq.m. rear garden and the 3-bed dwelling will have a combined rear and side garden area of c. 75 sq.m. I would have no objection to the proposed private open spaces and consider that, subject to appropriate screening, they will offer a reasonable standard of amenity for future residents of the development.
- 7.4.3. There will be no significant impacts on surrounding residential amenity from the proposed development. The extended dwelling will be angled towards the side elevation of the existing dwelling to the south-west and there will be adequate separation.
- 7.4.4. The Roads and Traffic Section recommend that further information be sought from the applicant to clarify the impact of the proposed vehicular access on the existing tree on the grass verge. Should the Board be minded to grant permission for the proposed development, I recommend that a landscaping scheme should be

submitted to the Planning Authority before commencement of development to include proposals for tree removal, planting and boundary treatment.

7.5. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.5.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development proposed and to the nature of the receiving environment, namely a suburban and fully serviced location, no appropriate assessment issues arise.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that planning permission should be refused for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the scale and positioning of the proposed development and to the established pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the extension and sub-division of the dwelling into 2 no. dwellings, by reason of proximity to site boundaries, off-set appearance and creation of a terrace, would seriously injure the visual amenities at this prominent corner location and would be incompatible with the architectural character of the area. The proposed development would set and undesirable precedent for similar type developments and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Donal Donnelly
Planning Inspector

19th October 2018