



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-301691-18

### Development

Planning Permission for 1) an attic conversion with a raised ridge to the front and a dormer window to the rear, 2) 1 no velux roof window to the front at attic/roof level, 3) a single storey extension to the front.

### Location

63 All Saints Road, Dublin 5

### Planning Authority

Dublin City Council North

### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2481/18

### Applicant(s)

Brian and Vanda Cummins

### Type of Application

Permission

### Planning Authority Decision

### Type of Appeal

First Party

### Appellant(s)

Brian and Vanda Cummins

### Observer(s)

None

### Date of Site Inspection

21/08/18

### 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.....	5
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 .....	8
7.0 Assessment.....	8
7.1. Design and visual impact .....	8
7.9. Appropriate assessment .....	9
8.0 Recommendation.....	10
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	10
10.0 Conditions .....	10

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application relates to a 2-storey mid-terrace dwelling within a mature suburban area characterised by similar dwellings in Clontarf / Raheeny, northeast Dublin City, c.5.5km from the city centre, c.700m south of Raheeny DART station and c.700m northeast of the coast at James Larkin Road. The site fronts onto All Saints Road, facing onto St Anne's Park beyond.
- 1.2. The site area is stated as 210-sq.m and the existing floor area as 113-sq.m. The dwelling has been extended at ground floor level to the rear. There is a detached structure to the rear, the nature of use of which is not clear. Approximately 20-sq.m private open space remains to the rear between the extended dwelling and the detached structure, excluding the side passage leading to the front of the property. The property has a front garden with off-street parking for 2no. cars.
- 1.3. The neighbouring property to the west (no.62) has a rear box dormer, with raised roof ridge. Similar development has been undertaken at nos.72 and 74 to the east (within 80m of the site).

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to (i) convert the existing attic space with a box-dormer to the rear, with raised roof ridge height, and 1no. velux rooflight to the front; (ii) and single storey extension to the front, with 2no. rooflights.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority issued a SPLIT decision:

- to GRANT permission for the front extension subject to 5no. standard-type conditions;
- to REFUSE permission for the attic conversion with raised ridge, rear box dormer and 1no. rooflight to front on grounds of incongruous and uncoordinated development that would undermine the character and visual

amenities of the area, that would contravene the provisions of the Development Plan (having regard to s.16.10.12 and Appendix 17) and, by itself and the precedent it would set, would be contrary to the sustainable development of the area.

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planning Officer (01/05/18) is consistent with the decision of the Planning Authority to issue a split decision and to the details thereof.

#### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division (09/04/18) – No objection subject to conditions.

### 3.3. Third Party Observations

None.

## 4.0 Planning History

**PL29N.242073 / Reg.Ref.2355/13** – Permission **GRANTED** by the Planning Authority for conversion of attic to bedroom, with box dormer to rear and increased roof ridge height, at no.74 All Saints Road, subject to a condition (no.2(a)) reducing the width of the dormer and (no.2(b)) associated increased ridge height to 3.5m and (no.2(c)) omission of the front roof lights. On 3<sup>rd</sup> party appeal against condition no.2, the Board (10/09/13) omitted the alterations required under part 2(a) and 2(b), but attached condition 2(c) omitting the front roof lights.

**Reg.ref.3201/08** – Permission **GRANTED** by the Planning Authority (FG 05/09/08) for conversion of attic, with rear box dormer structure, increased roof ridge height and roof lights to the front, and a single-storey extension to the front, subject to standard-type conditions, at no.62 All Saints Road.

**Reg.Ref.5973/05** – Permission **GRANTED** by the Planning Authority (FG 21/03/18) for conversion of attic with addition of box dormer to rear and raised ridge height and rooflights to the front, in addition to single-storey front and rear extensions, at no.72 All Saints. Condition no.3 required the width of the dormer to be reduced by at least

1 m and the depth reduced by 300mm through setback from the back wall of the house, in addition to stipulating a finish of slates, tiles or shingle of colour to match existing roof.

## 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.0.7km to the east).

North Bull Island SPA 004006 (c.0.7km to east).

South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA 004024 (c.1.6km to south).

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The main grounds of this first party appeal against decision to refuse permission for part of the development, submitted c/o Paul Sheehy Architectural and Project Management Services, may be summarised as follow:

- The appellant is appealing the decision to refuse permission for attic conversion with raised roof ridge, box dormer and roof window.
- Acknowledges that the proposed development is in breach of the design principles under the Development Plan, which are reasonable, but are only are guiding principles allowing discretion.
- 2D drawings (e.g. Drawing no.PP-05) are misleading by their nature and offer a poor representation of the actual streetscape.
- 5no. photos of existing streetscape attached showing the subject dwelling (proposed development site) with similar permitted development which has been carried out on the adjacent property (no.62), which, it is submitted, demonstrate that the proposed development would be barely visible when viewed from any point on the streetscape.
- An additional photo taken from St Anne's Park is submitted to support the appellants' view that the development would not visually intrude on the park due to the presence of screen planting.
- Accordingly, the appellants request that permission be granted.
- In the event the Board decides to uphold the decision, it is requested that permission be granted for the rear dormer below the ridge line to obviate the need for them to go through the planning process again.

## 6.2. Planning Authority Response

None.

## 7.0 Assessment

The main issues arising in this case may be addressed under the following headings:

7.1 Design and visual impact

7.2 Appropriate Assessment

### 7.1. Design and visual impact

- 7.2. The principle of the proposed development with the Z1 land use zone is not in question. The main issue arising in this case is the potential for adverse impact on the character of the existing dwelling and the visual amenities of the area from the proposed rear box dormer, the associated proposed raised roof ridge height and the roof light.
- 7.3. Proposals for residential extensions are assessed against the Council's development management standards, s.16.10.12 *Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings*, and guidance under Appendix 17 *Guidance for Residential Extensions*, and which the appellant acknowledges as reasonable.
- 7.4. Having inspected the site and viewed the streetscape and surrounding built context, including similar development permitted at the adjacent property to the west (no.62), and neighbouring property to the east (no.72 and 74), I am satisfied that the proposed attic level development, including increased roof ridge height and 1no. roof light would have minimal impact on the character of the dwelling and an almost imperceptible visual impact on the streetscape. The proposed development would therefore not be contrary to the provisions of s.16.10.12.
- 7.5. The guidelines under Appendix 17 specifically address roof extensions under s.17.11, providing clear guidance on the design, scale and finish considered appropriate for dormer structures. I am satisfied that the proposed roof dormer would not be disproportionate in scale given its location on the rear roof slope. The



dormer structure would be appropriately setback from the eaves and from the party line between neighbouring dwellings.

7.6. The proposed attic conversion and dormer structure necessitates the raising of the roof ridge line by c.500mm (it would still only achieve a floor to ceiling height of 2.2m). This raises reasonable concern about potential adverse visual impact on the streetscape, particularly as the dwelling is located within a terrace of similar dwellings. As noted above, there is precedent for similar development at the adjacent property to the west and elsewhere in the vicinity. The photographs submitted with the appeal, in addition to a site inspection of the area, has demonstrated to me that the proposed raise roof ridge height and rear box dormer would have negligible visual impact on the streetscape.

7.7. Regarding the decision to refuse permission for the 1no. rooflight at attic level, I note there is precedent for granting permission for rooflights on this street (at no.72 under Reg.Ref.5973/05) but also for omitting same from similar developments granted permission (PL29N.242073). I could find no relevant policy or design guidance under the Development Plan concerning rooflights. The Council permitted 2no. rooflights on the ground floor front extension as part of its split decision. I see no issue with the proposed rooflight on the front roof slope in terms of visual impact on the streetscape. Such fenestration is common place on residential structures through suburban and rural areas such as to be unremarkable in most settings and I am satisfied that a front rooflight would not be obtrusive on this street. In addition, rooflights have the benefit of increasing access to light (and sunlight on a south-facing roof slope in this instance), thereby reducing dependency on artificial light in line with sustainable development.

7.8. The appellants request, in the event that the Board decides to uphold the decision of the Planning Authority to refuse permission for the proposed dormer, increase in roof ridge height and roof light, that the Board grant permission for a rear dormer not to exceed existing roof ridge height.

#### 7.9. **Appropriate assessment**

7.9.1. 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. I recommend that permission be **GRANTED** for the proposed development subject to the conditions under section 10.0, below.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

It is considered that the proposed development would be consistent with the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, section 16.10.12, concerning Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings, and the design standards for such development under Appendix 17; that the proposed development would not be visually obtrusive within the streetscape, would not be 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.

## 10.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.  
  
Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the

planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health

3. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.

Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of property in the vicinity

4. During the construction and demolition phases, the proposed development shall comply with the British Standard 5228 "Noise Control on Construction and Open Sites Part 1: Code of practice for basic information and procedures for noise control".

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development, in the interests of residential amenity.

5. The site development works and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the adjoining street(s) are kept clear of debris, soil and other material and if the need arises for cleaning works to be carried out on the adjoining public roads, the said cleaning works shall be carried out at the developers' expense.

Reason: To ensure that the adjoining roadways are kept in a clean and safe condition during construction works in the interest of orderly development.

---

John Desmond  
Senior Planning Inspector

27<sup>th</sup> August 2018