



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-301706-18

### Development

The development will consist of (i) building up of existing side wall to form new gable wall with new obscure glazed window to side elevation at attic level and associated alterations to existing hipped roof (ii) attic conversion with new dormer window to rear elevation and 2 no. rooflight windows to front elevation (iii) and all associated site development works.

### Location

31 Ardmore Cres, Artane, Dublin 5

### Planning Authority

Dublin City Council North

### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2455/18

### Applicant(s)

Ciaran & Denise Murphy

### Type of Application

Permission

### Planning Authority Decision

Grant permission

### Type of Appeal

First Party

### Appellant(s)

Ciaran & Denise Murphy

### Date of Site Inspection

16<sup>th</sup> August 2018

### Inspector

Donal Donnelly

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located on Ardmore Crescent in Artane approximately 5km north-east of Dublin city centre. The site is within an extensive suburban area located to the east of Swords Road (N1) and west of Malahide Road (R107) and incorporating Beaumont and Kilmore and parts of Coolock and Artane.
- 1.2. Ardmore Crescent comprises a cul de sac of approximately 50 no. 1950's style semi-detached 2-storey dwellings. Most dwellings retain their original hipped roof design with pebble and brick finishes. Some dwellings, however, have been altered to include new fenestration, rear dormers, porches and replacement gable ends.
- 1.3. No. 31 Ardmore Crescent is situated on the northern side approximately midway along the street. The dwelling has a stated area of 126 sq.m. and the site area is given as 220 sq.m. There is an existing single storey extension and outbuilding to the rear of the property.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for the following:
  - Building up of existing side wall to form a new gable wall with obscure glazed window to side elevation at attic level and associated alterations to existing hipped roof;
  - Attic conversion with new dormer window to rear elevation and 2 no. rooflights to front elevation;
  - All associated site development works.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Dublin City Council issued notification of decision to grant permission subject to seven conditions. Condition 3, the subject of this appeal, states as follows:

*“The dormer shall be amended as follows:*

- *The dormer shall not constitute more than 50% of the width of roof plane and shall be centred as much as possible on the roof plane.*
- *The external walls of the dormer shall be of a similar colour (or tiles/slates) to the existing roof finish.*
- *All fascia/soffits; rainwater goods, window frames glazing bars shall be finished in a dark colour so as to blend with the existing roof.*

*Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.”*

3.1.2. Condition 2 also required the omission of the rooflights on the front roof slope; however, this condition was not appealed.

### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. The recommendation to grant permission in the Planner’s Report reflects the decision of the Planning Authority.

3.2.2. The following points were raised under the appraisal of the application:

- Gabling of hipped roofs not generally considered acceptable – however, a number of dwellings, including adjoining no. 33, have gabled roofs.
- Rooflights on the front roof plane are not generally acceptable, as they can have a negative impact on the character of the dwelling and street.
- Not considered that the dormer would unduly overlook adjoining property given the setback from eaves.
- There are concerns regarding the scale of the rear dormer which is considered excessive.

### **4.0 Planning History**

Dublin City Council Reg. Ref: 4625/06

4.1. Planning permission granted at No. 33 Ardmore Crescent for conversion of attic to include removal of hipped end of roof and the construction of an apex roof with dormer windows to the rear of roof and window to gable.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022

- 5.1.1. The appeal site is zoned Z1, where the objective is *“to protect, provide and improve residential amenity.”*
- 5.1.2. It is stated under Section 16.10.12 that 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.
- 5.1.3. Guidelines for residential extensions are included in Appendix 17. It is recognised in Section 17.11 that the roofline of the building is one of its most dominant features and any proposal to change the shape, pitch, cladding or ornament of a roof should be carefully considered.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. A first party appeal has been submitted against Condition 3 of the Council’s decision. The grounds of appeal and main points raised in this submission can be summarised as follows:
- Appellant has no objection to 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> points of Condition 3 but wishes to appeal the 1<sup>st</sup> point relating to the width of the proposed dormer.
  - Dormer of this proportion is necessary to facilitate the additional head height and natural light necessary to make the attic a safe and usable space.
  - Attic space will be used for additional storage and permission is not sought for an en-suite.
  - Size of dormer is in line with the rear extensions already in-situ within the Ardmore Estate.

- Proposed dormer reflects the adjoining dormer at no. 33 in terms of proportion and is therefore in keeping with its surroundings.
- Roof extension of the proposed width is not visible from the front of the house and therefore there will be no impact on the aesthetics of Ardmore Crescent.
- There does not appear to be a sound rationale for imposing a condition that the dormer should not constitute more than 50% of the roof plane.

## 6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1. No response.

## 7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. This is a first party appeal against the first point of Condition 3 only attached to Dublin City Council's decision to grant permission to build up the side wall of a dwelling to form a new gable with obscure glazed window in the side elevation at attic level, together with associated alterations to existing hipped roof and conversion of attic to include new dormer window to rear elevation.
- 7.2. Under the first point of Condition 3, it is stated that the dormer shall not constitute more than 50% of the width of the roof plane and shall be centred as much as possible. The appellant has no objection to the second and third points of Condition 3, which relate to external finishes of dormer walls, roof, fascia/ soffits, rainwater goods, window frames and glazing bars.
- 7.3. I concur with the Planning Authority that the principle of extending the dwelling into the attic by replacing the existing hipped roof end with a gabled roof is acceptable having regard to the fact that the neighbouring semi-detached dwelling and other dwellings in the area have been similarly altered. I would be satisfied that the proposal will not have any adverse visual impacts on the semi-detached pair or the streetscape, and that adjoining residential amenities will not be adversely affected. Furthermore, I agree that any dormer should be finished in dark coloured materials, as required under the second and third points of Condition 3.
- 7.4. Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that an assessment of the case *de novo* would not be warranted, and that the Board should determine the matters raised in

the appeal only, in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended).

- 7.5. It is recognised in Appendix 17 of the Development Plan (Guidelines for Residential Extensions) that the roofline of a building is one of its most dominant features and any proposal to change its shape, pitch, cladding or ornament should be carefully considered. The following principles are set out for roof extensions:
- 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.
- 7.6. It was noted by the Planning Authority that the proposed dormer extends out from the ridge line of the existing roof and back from the eaves by approximately 1m. There will be a gap of c. 800mm between the adjoining boundary of no. 29. Having regard to the principles for roof extensions, the Planning Authority considers that the scale of the proposed dormer is excessive.
- 7.7. The appellant submits that the proposed dormer reflects the adjoining dormer at no. 33 and will not be visible from the front of the dwelling. It is also noted that a dormer of this proportion is necessary to facilitate the additional head height and natural light necessary to make the attic a safe and usable space.
- 7.8. The neighbouring dormer was granted permission on 20<sup>th</sup> November 2006 during the tenure of Dublin City Development Plan 2005-2011. There may have been less stringent guidelines for residential extensions in place at that time and it can be seen from the surrounding area that a number of dormers of similar scale have been constructed in the past. Dormers have also been permitted in the side plane of dwellings in the area, including No. 13 Ardmore Crescent.
- 7.9. I would generally be in agreement with the Council that dormers should be visually subordinate in the roof slope. In this case, however, I consider that it is reasonable to take guidance from the existing dormer to the neighbouring property. As noted above, the design of a dormer should reflect the character of the area and the

surrounding buildings, and in my view a similarly scaled and designed dormer to that at No. 33 would have a more balanced and consistent appearance. It is noteworthy that the existing dormer to No. 33 is virtually invisible from the street to the front, with a glimpse view only available between two semi-detached dwellings to the north on Ardmore Drive.

- 7.10. I note from the proposed rear contextual elevation (Drg. no: S812-A-907) that the dormer to the rear of No. 33 appears larger and closer to the eaves than the proposed dormer. Upon inspection of the site and according to the drawings submitted with the planning application for the dormer at No. 33, the distance from eaves is actually greater than that proposed. The depth of the adjoining dormer is shown at 2.655m and the proposed dormer has a depth of c. 3.65m. The width of the adjoining dormer is given as 4.878m and the proposed dormer is c. 5.3m wide.
- 7.11. Having regard to the above, I consider that the proposed dormer should be reduced in scale to reflect that of the adjoining dormer. It appears that this dormer occupies approximately 50% of the amended roof plane. I would also be of the opinion that the proposed dormer should be fitted with similar windows that mirror those of the adjoining dormer and relate to the positioning of windows at first floor level.

#### Appropriate Assessment

- 7.12. 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. Having regard to the nature of Condition 3 the subject of the appeal, the Board is satisfied that the determination by the Board of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) to AMEND Condition 3 for the reasons and considerations hereunder.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the established precedent in the area for rear facing dormer extensions, in particular, the neighbouring dormer which occupies approximately half of the amended roof plane and relates to the positioning of existing windows at first floor level, it is considered that the first point of Condition 3 should be amended as follows to reflect the character of the area and surrounding buildings, and to present a more balanced appearance within the roofscape.

## 10.0 Condition

3. The dormer shall be amended as follows:

- The width, depth and height of the proposed dormer, its positioning on the roof plane and fenestration shall mirror those of the neighbouring dormer at No. 33 Ardmore Crescent.
- The external walls of the dormer shall be of a similar colour (or tiles/slates) to the existing roof finish.
- All fascia/soffits; rainwater goods, window frames glazing bars shall be finished in a dark colour so as to blend with the existing roof.

**Reason:** In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

---

Donal Donnelly  
Planning Inspector

16<sup>th</sup> August 2018