



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspectors Report ABP - 302335 - 18.

---

<b>Development</b>	Attic conversion with dormer window; change of roof profile; new gable wall; and, all associated works.
<b>Location</b>	No. 61 Lanesborough View, Dublin 11.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Fingal County Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	F18B/0134.
<b>Applicants</b>	Darren Ray & Martina Roe.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Planning Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refusal.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party – v – Refusal.
<b>Appellants</b>	Darren Ray & Martina Roe.
<b>Observers</b>	None.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	9 <sup>th</sup> October 2018.
<b>Inspector</b>	Patricia-Marie Young.

# Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0 Proposed Development .....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	3
3.1. Decision .....	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....	3
3.3. Prescribed Bodies .....	4
3.4. Third Party Observations .....	4
4.0 Planning History.....	4
4.2. Development Plan.....	4
4.3. Natural Heritage Designations .....	5
5.0 The Appeal .....	5
5.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	5
5.2. Planning Authority Response .....	5
5.3. Observations .....	5
6.0 Assessment .....	5
7.0 Recommendation.....	8
8.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	8

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. No. 61 Lanesborough View is located in the 'Lanesborough' housing development, in the suburb of Ballymum, to the north west of Dublin's city centre. The site contains a 2-storey end-of-terrace part brick and part dashed dwelling house that is setback from the public road by a predominantly paved front garden area. The surrounding area consists of well-established groups of 2-storey terraces and 3-storey duplexes.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Planning permission is sought for: -

- Conversion of the existing attic space (c24m<sup>2</sup> floor area);
- Insertion of a dormer window into the rear roof structure (3.625m by 2.23m);
- Construction of side gable wall with a change of roof profile from hipped to full gable end; and,
- All associated site development works.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Fingal County Council decided to **refuse** permission for the following stated reason: -  
*"It is considered that the proposed development by virtue of its design and alteration to the roof profile and the dormer window by reason of its size, scale, bulk, together would have a negative impact on the visual amenity and character of the area, would be visually obtrusive and seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with Objective DMS41 of the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 and would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area."*

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's Report is the basis for the Planning Authority's decision.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. None.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. None.

## 4.0 Planning History

4.1.1. I note the following Board decision in the vicinity of the appeal site: -

**ABP Ref. PL06F.222004:** Permission was **granted** on appeal for a development that included the removal of a hipped end roof and the construction of an apex roof, with dormer window and velux windows at 25 Lanesborough Grove. Of note Condition No. 1 required the development to be revised to provide a half-hipped roof in place of the proposed apex roof. It also restricted the increased height of the gable wall. The stated reason for this condition included in the interest of residential and visual amenity.

### 4.2. Development Plan

4.2.1. The policies and provisions of the Fingal Development Plan, 2017-2023, apply. The site lies within an area zoned 'RS' which has an aim to: "*provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity*".

4.2.2. Objective DMS41 is relevant. It states: "*dormer extensions to roofs will only be considered where there is no negative impact on the existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. Dormer extensions shall not form a dominant part of a roof. Consideration may be given to dormer extensions proposed up to the ridge level of a house and shall not be higher than the existing ridge height of the house.*"

### 4.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

4.3.1. None relevant.

## 5.0 **The Appeal**

### 5.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

5.1.1. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows: -

- Many similar developments have been granted throughout Dublin.
- This proposal is compliant with Development Plan.
- It would not give rise to any adverse amenity impact.
- The design is complimentary to the exiting dwelling and its situation.
- The Board is requested to overturn the Planning Authority's decision.

### 5.2. **Planning Authority Response**

5.2.1. In the event of a grant of permission it is requested that a Section 48 contribution condition be included.

### 5.3. **Observations**

5.3.1. None.

## 6.0 **Assessment**

### 6.1. **Overview:**

6.1.1. The substantive issues in this appeal case are: -

- Visual Amenity
- Residential Amenity
- Appropriate Assessment

I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise; notwithstanding, the issue of appropriate assessment needs to be addressed.

## 6.2. Visual Amenity

- 6.2.1. In terms of the visual impact of the proposed development I have considered the examples of similar types of development within the Lanesborough housing development including those outlined in the Planning Officer's report and by the appellant in their grounds of appeal. I have also carried out an inspection of the site and its environs. On the matter of planning precedent for or against such developments it is appropriate that each application should be considered on its individual merits. Since the Boards consideration of appeal case ABP Ref. No. PL06F222004 the local planning context has changed. The proposed development is subject to demonstrating compliance with the standards and objectives set out in the Fingal County Development Plan, 2017-2023, and not the previous plan. This includes Objective DMS41 which only deems dormer extensions acceptable where there is no negative impact on the existing character and form of the existing dwelling.
- 6.2.2. In terms of visual impact, I consider that the proposed development would negatively impact the existing character and form of No. 61 Lanesborough View. This consideration is based on this property forming part of a group of formally designed, highly homogenous and coherent 2-storey hipped roof terrace properties. This context can be described in part as consisting of the eastern side of Lanesborough View which is characterised by terrace groups with hipped roofs over. Along this streetscape there are no precedents for significant modifications to their hipped roof structures. I observed that the hipped roof design element is also evident on the groups of 3-storey duplexes that characterise the western side of Lanesborough View. Their visual character and integrity has also not been diminished by any cumulative changes or insertions above eaves level as appreciated from the public domain. As such the built integrity of the original design of Lanesborough View in terms of roof structures as appreciated within the streetscape scene is highly intact.
- 6.2.3. In relation to the property itself, No. 61 Lanesborough View, is an end-of-terrace property whose roof structure consists of a sloped roof profile which extends downwards to the wall plane of its eastern, western and northern elevations. The roof structure over has a ridge height of a stated 8.1m. The roof ridge extends c1.2m over the stated 5.25m in width front and rear elevations as well as the stated 9.72m in length side elevation. As such the ridge height of 8.1m is limited over this

property. Having regard to these existing dimensions the proposed extension of the ridge height over the entire width of the property would be a very visible change to its built form. It would visually unbalance the symmetry that currently exists in the shape of the hipped roof structure of this terrace group. It would also result in this terrace group being visually at odds with the other matching terrace groups that address the eastern side of Lanesborough View. For these reasons it would diminish the integrity of their original design in an *ad hoc* manner.

6.2.4. The visual incongruity of the provision of a gable ended roof over No. 61 Lanesborough View would be further added too by the insertion of a dormer window 150mm directly below the ridge height in the slope of the rear roof. The proposed dormer would have a stated width of 3.96m; height of 2.64m; width of 3.45m; and, c3.7m at its maximum projection from the slope of the rear roof. Moreover, the internal volume of the roof structure is limited due to the angle of its slope and with its maximum height of 2.415m directly below the roof ridge. Having regard to the stated ridge height and the external wall plate footprint which is comparable to the eaves dimensions already stated the dormer window would be a significant insertion to the roof structure of this property. In addition, as the property is an end-of-terrace with a gap of 2m between it and the neighbouring end-of-terrace property the dormer insertion would be visible from the public domain. Thus, further adding to the visual incongruity of the alterations proposed to the property in its streetscape context. I also consider that it would be highly visible from the public open space that bounds the southern side of the terrace group No. 61 Lanesborough View forms part of.

6.2.5. I note to the Board that the drawings accompanying this application indicate the potential for a similar dormer window at the adjoining property. There is no planning history for such an insertion nor did I observe the presence of any such insertion during my inspection of the site and its setting.

6.2.6. In conclusion, based on the visual amenity concerns raised above I consider that the proposed development would be contrary to Objective DMS41 of the County Development Plan.

### 6.3. **Residential Amenity**

6.4. I agree with the appellants in that the proposed development would result in improved residential amenity for occupants of No. 61 Lanesborough View and that it

would not result in any serious injury to the established amenity of properties in its vicinity.

## 6.5. **Appropriate Assessment**

- 6.5.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and to the nature of the receiving environment, namely an urban and fully serviced 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.

## 7.0 **Recommendation**

- 7.1. I recommend that permission be **refused** for the following stated reasons and considerations.

## 8.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

- 8.1. Having regard to the end-of-terrace location of the proposed development in a residential streetscape characterised with hipped roof structures, it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its form, massing and design, would result in a built form which would fail to respect its context, it would be visually obtrusive in its setting and it would establish an undesirable precedent for similar development in its vicinity. This would be contrary to Objective DSM41 of the Fingal County Development Plan, 2017-2023, which only permits such interventions where no negative impact arises on the existing character and form of the property. The proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

Patricia-Marie Young  
Planning Inspector

10th October 2018



