



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-301690-18

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Development | Permission for a detached 2-bedroom dormer bungalow to the side of existing dwelling. Widening of existing driveway and dishing of footpath locally to provide combined vehicular access and all other ancillary site works. |
| Location | 58 Glin Road, Coolock, Dublin 17 |
| Planning Authority | Dublin City Council North |
| Planning Authority Reg. Ref. | 2433/18 |
| Applicant(s) | Tina Donohoe |
| Type of Application | Permission |
| Planning Authority Decision | Refuse permission |
| Type of Appeal | First Party |
| Appellant(s) | Tina Donohoe |
| Date of Site Inspection | 16 th August 2018 |
| Inspector | Donal Donnelly |

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located on Glin Road between Coolock and Darndale approximately 6.5km north-east of Dublin city centre. The area surrounding the site to the west of Malahide Road Industrial Park and between the River Santry to the south and Priorswood Road to the north is mainly characterised by 2-storey pitched roof housing in terraces of mostly 6 dwellings.
- 1.2. No. 58 Glin Road is an end of terrace dwelling located on a corner site to the north of a “T” junction. The dwelling faces west and overlooks a large open green space located to the north of a community centre. The stated area of the dwelling is 103 sq.m. and the site has a given area of 381 sq.m.
- 1.3. There is a single parking space to the front and a low boundary wall curves around the front/ side garden of the site. The width from the gable to the side boundary wall is approximately 6m. The rear garden measures approximately 190 sq.m. The southern gable of the terrace is approximately 1m forward of the front building line of the perpendicular terrace to the rear (east).

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for the following:
 - Subdivision of 381 sq.m site;
 - Construction of a detached 2-bedroom 74 sq.m. bungalow with dormer to front and rooflights to rear;
 - Widening of existing driveway and dishing of footpath to provide combined ancillary vehicular access;
 - All other ancillary works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Dublin City Council issued notification of decision to refuse permission for the following reason:

“The proposed development, by reason of its form and appearance, the prominent dormer and reduced ridge height would be visually incongruous and would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development is, therefore, contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, in particular Section 16.10.9, 16.10.10 and QH22, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

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 were raised under the assessment of the application:

- Development of housing in residentially zoned area is acceptable in principle.
- Small unit would add to the variety of housing available in the area.
- Porch projecting forward of the building line would provide greater garden depth.
- Particularly high standard of amenity is required due to prominence of site visually.
- Design with much lower ridge line, dormer and gabled porch does not reflect the character of housing in the area.
- Garden area is at the lower end of what is acceptable, particularly given its irregular shape.
- Impact on private space for existing dwelling would not be unacceptable given limited height of proposed dwelling.
- Design falls short of what is required for a prominent corner with long views from the surrounding area.
- Roads and Traffic Planning Division recommend that there shall be only one vehicular access to the front of no. 58, with maximum width of 3.6m to serve both dwellings.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. No planning history on the appeal site. The following cases are noted in the Planner's Report:

- 5782/05 – permission granted for 2-storey end of terrace house to side of No. 6 Glin Park, including new vehicular access for off street parking;
- 1072/05 – permission on foot of outline permission granted at No. 21A Glin Grove for 2-storey dwelling and vehicular entrance to side of No. 21.
- 3958/99 – Permission granted at the side and rear of No. 79 Ferrycarrig Drive for erection of a granny flat.

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 corner/ side garden sites and infill housing are set out in Sections 16.10.9 and 16.10.10.
- 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:
- Glin Road has many different house styles, from old Dublin Corporation pebble dash to more recent half brickwork and dashed styles.

- There are numerous one-off construction houses and Glin Court and flats back onto Glin Road.
- There is a house on the corner of Glin Road/ Ferrycarrig Drive that is single storey with multiple hipped roof profile – proposed ridge height would be similar.
- Dormer window will be in symmetry with the 1st floor windows of existing houses.
- Materials/ finishes will match surrounding dwellings and would be aesthetically pleasing to the visual landscape.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1. No response.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. In my opinion, the main issues to be addressed in this appeal are as follows:

- Development principle;
- Visual impact; and
- Impact on residential amenity.

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 proposal to subdivide a corner site and construct a new dwelling would therefore be acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the proposal under other relevant Development Plan criteria, most notably Section 16.10.9 relating to development in corner/ side garden sites.

7.3. Visual Impact

7.3.1. The Planning Authority has stated in its reason for refusal that the form and appearance of the proposed dwelling, including prominent dormer and reduced ridge

height, would be visually incongruous and would seriously injure the amenities of the area. Reference is made in the reason for refusal to Policy QH22 which 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.”*

7.3.2. Section 16.10.9 of the Development Plan recognises that the development of a dwelling in a side garden of an existing house is a means of making the most efficient use of serviced residential lands. In terms of visual impact, the following criteria shall be considered when assessing proposals for development of corner/ garden sites:

- The character of the street;
- Compatibility of design and scale with adjoining dwellings, paying attention to the established building line, proportion, heights, parapet levels and materials of adjoining buildings;
- The provision of landscaping and boundary treatments which are in keeping with other properties in the area;
- The maintenance of the front and side building lines, where appropriate.

7.3.3. The proposed dwelling is a single storey dormer style structure with deep plan layout comprising a main side elevation of approximately 10m in length with a 4m rear return. The pitch of the roof will be similar to the existing dwelling on site; however, the roof slope will be more dominant when viewed from the front and this will be exacerbated by the presence of the proposed frontal dormer. The ridge height will sit approximately 1736mm below the existing ridge and unlike other side garden developments in the immediate vicinity, a separation is proposed between the flank walls of existing and proposed dwellings. The eaves of the proposed dwelling will sit behind and below that of the terrace and a proposed porch will continue the established building line. The new gable will sit further forward of the perpendicular terrace to the east, similar to a number of nearby side garden developments that continue out to the side boundary.

7.3.4. Having regard to the above, I would be in agreement that the proposed dwelling will have adverse visual impacts on the character of the street, particularly in view of its

prominent corner location. The design and scale of the structure is incompatible with the established pattern of development, with little attention paid to proportions, heights and parapet levels of the adjoining terrace. In my opinion, this site would be better developed as a continuation of the existing terrace to form a new dwelling or an extension to the existing dwelling.

- 7.3.5. The first party appellant refers to the dwelling at the corner of Glin Road/ Ferrycarrig Drive that is single storey with multiple hipped roof profile height. It should be noted, however, that this unit was permitted as ancillary family accommodation and it would generally be the case that this type of unit is integral with the original family house.

7.4. Impact on residential amenity

- 7.4.1. It is also stated under Section 16.10.9 that proposals for corner/ side garden sites shall have regard to the impact on the residential amenities of adjoining sites; open space standards and refuse standards for both existing and proposed dwellings; and the provision of appropriate car parking facilities, and a safe means of access to and egress from the site.
- 7.4.2. The proposed dwelling will sit to the south of the existing dwelling and will project beyond the established rear building line. The proposal will give rise to some overshadowing of the rear garden of the existing dwelling; however, the rear of the proposed dwelling will be single storey in nature and set back from the party boundary. The existing dwelling will be left with approximately 98 sq.m. of rear garden area and the proposed dwelling will have c. 45 sq.m. I would consider the proposed open space provision for existing and proposed dwellings to be acceptable.
- 7.4.3. Car parking is proposed to the front of the new dwelling with access alongside the existing driveway. It is recommended by the Roads Department that the driveway should be shared and be no wider than 3.6m. This can be addressed by way of condition should the Board be minded to grant permission for the proposal.
- 7.4.4. Overall, I would have no objection to the proposal from the point of view of residential amenity and the provision of a satisfactory standard of accommodation for existing and proposed dwellings. It would also appear that the internal dimensions

and room sizes are acceptable and in compliance standards set out in the Development Plan/ relevant Guidelines.

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 prevailing pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the proposed detached dwelling, by reason of its scale and design, including reduced ridge and eaves heights and frontal dormer window, would be out of character and out of place at this prominent corner location, and would be visually incongruous in the streetscape. The proposed development would, therefore, seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Donal Donnelly
Planning Inspector

20th September 2018