



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-302097-18

Development	Construction of a bedroom at attic level, involving reconstruction of rear half of existing roof to a new profile, with new windows facing to rear.
Location	32 Marian Crescent, Ballyboden, Dublin 14.
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD18B/0193
Applicant(s)	Keith Barker & Emma Byrne
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Keith Barker & Emma Byrne
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	21 st September 2018
Inspector	Michael Dillon

1.0 Site Location and Description

The site, with a stated area of 0.0514ha, is located on the west side of Marian Crescent – a street in suburban Ballyboden, Dublin 14. The two-storey house on the site has already been extended to the rear and side at ground and first floor levels, with flat roofs. There is no side passage. The front elevation comprises brick and wet-dash, whilst the more modern extension to the side is plastered and painted. The roof is a brown-tile, A-frame construction. The house forms one of a pair of semi-detached units with no. 34 to the south. No. 34 has a two-storey, part flat-roofed and part tiled roof extension to the side and rear. There are 2-3 on-site parking spaces within the front garden curtilage. There is a long rear garden.

2.0 Proposed Development

Permission sought on 3rd May 2018, to extend a two-storey, semi-detached house, by way of attic conversion and extension of 30.5m². The proposal will involve raising the height of the ridge-line of the existing roof. The extension, which will project out to the rear, will be finished with timber/zinc cladding and 'Trocal' roof membrane.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

By Order dated 22nd June 2018, South Dublin County Council issued a Notification of decision to refuse planning permission for 2 reasons, which can be summarised as follows-

1. Development would be incongruous in relation to existing roof profile of the property and would have a negative impact on visual and residential amenity.
2. Development would set an undesirable precedent.

4.0 Planning History

SD11B/0102: Permission granted to extend this house to side and rear at ground and first floor level. Development was carried out.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The relevant document is the South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2016-2022. The site is zoned 'RES' – To protect and/or provide for residential amenity. Section 2.4.1 of the Plan deals with residential extensions. Section 11.3.3(i) further deals with residential extensions.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

There are no natural heritage designations in the immediate vicinity.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. The appeal from Paul O'Callaghan Architects, agent on behalf of the applicants, received by An Bord Pleanála on 18th July 2018, can be summarised in bullet point format as follows-

- Design submitted was not incongruous or overbearing.
- The increase in height of the ridgeline would have been barely perceptible from the road.
- The house only has three bedrooms at present.
- Three-storey houses are now becoming the norm.

6.1.2. The appeal is accompanied by a set of revised drawings which show a lowered roof profile and a setback of the extension further from the back wall of the two-storey extension to the rear of the house, for the consideration of the Board.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

7.0 Assessment

The principal issue of this appeal relates to visual impact and residential amenity.

7.1. Development Plan Considerations

Section 2.4.1 of the Development Plan deals with residential extensions. H18 Objective 1 states- "To favourably consider proposals to extend existing dwellings subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities and compliance with the standards set out in Chapter 11 Implementation and the guidance set out in the South Dublin County Council House Extension Design Guide, 2010 (or any superseding guidelines). Chapter 11 reiterates the necessity to comply with the Extension Design Guide, 2010. The Guide relates to design, overshadowing, overlooking in relation to impact on adjoining properties, and considers the various possible extensions to houses – front, side and rear. In relation to attic conversions and dormer windows, the recommendation is that the main ridge and eaves are not obscured, and that a ridgeline higher than the existing one is not created. Flat roofs are discouraged, but this would appear to relate to the front roof profile rather than to the rear. The Guide recommends against visually dominant and overly-large rear extensions, where they are visible from public view.

7.2. Layout and Design

- 7.2.1. The original proposal submitted to SDCC was for an attic extension of 30.5m². In order to obtain necessary floor-to-ceiling heights, the proposal involved raising the ridgeline height of the roof on a setback line – providing the front profile of the roof with two different planes. This house is one of a pair of semi-detached units, and the proposed alteration of the roof profile would appear incongruous – particularly when viewed from the street. I would agree with the assessment of the PA which concluded that permission should be refused. Permission has already been granted to extend this house to the side and rear – at both ground and first floor levels. These extensions involved flat-roofed structures.
- 7.2.2. Revised drawings have been submitted for consideration of the Board – by way of 1st Party appeal submission. The revised drawings provide for a flat roof to the attic extension – one which would not impinge on the existing ridgeline height. The

extension has also been pulled back by approximately 1.25m at the rear – reducing the floor area by approximately 3m². The gable wall of the house is to be altered at roof level – partly concrete block and plaster and partly zinc/timber cladding. Both the original and revised attic extensions would be visible from the street – in the gap wide between no.s 30 & 32. The revised proposal is an improvement on the original.

7.2.3. The site is a large one. The extended house is stated to be 148m². There is ample room within the site to extend at ground floor level, and possibly at first floor level. The applicants have expressed a desire to create a fourth bedroom. The site is not within an Architectural Conservation Area. The existing extension to the side of this house already sets it apart from its neighbours. The adjoining house (no. 34) has been extended to the side and rear. There is no design standard for extensions to houses on this street. However, I would consider that the proposed revisions to the gable elevation would appear bulky and out-of-character with the roof profile of houses in the area. Permission should be refused for this reason.

7.3. **Other Issues**

7.3.1. Development Contribution

Extensions to houses within the SDCC administrative area do not attract a requirement to pay a development contribution where they are less than 40m². This house has already been extended by more than 40m². There would be a requirement to pay a development contribution (calculated on a sq.m basis) in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme 2016-2020. The 1st Party appeal suggested an alternative reduced floor area development for the consideration of the Board. If the Board is minded to grant permission (either for the original proposal or as amended by way of 1st Party appeal submission), then a condition should be attached requiring payment of a development contribution in accordance with the Scheme currently in place.

7.3.2. Appropriate Assessment

The site is neither within nor abutting any European site. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development and the suburban location, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development

would be likely to have a significant effect, individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

7.3.3. Environmental Impact Assessment

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

7.3.4. Hours of Construction

Should the Board be minded to grant permission, it would be appropriate to attach a condition to any grant of permission, restricting construction hours – in the interest of protecting the residential amenities of adjoining property.

7.3.5. Precedent

The second reason for refusal of permission related to the creation of an undesirable precedent. I would consider that each case should be considered on its merits.

8.0 **Recommendation**

I recommend that permission be refused for the Reasons and Considerations set out below.

9.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

1. The proposed attic extension would be visible from the public road, and would appear unduly bulky and overbearing. The proposed development would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity.

**Michael Dillon,
Planning Inspectorate.**

4th October 2018.