



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-302871-18

---

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Development</b>                  | Conversion of roof structure to bedroom, construction of a flat roof dormer extension to rear and dormer roof structure to gable end |
| <b>Location</b>                     | 20, Old County Road, Crumlin, Dublin 12  |
| <b>Planning Authority</b>           | Dublin City Council South  |
| <b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b> | 3738/18  |
| <b>Applicant(s)</b>                 | Brendan and Catherine Rooney   |
| <b>Type of Application</b>          | Appeal   |
| <b>Planning Authority Decision</b>  | Refuse   |
| <b>Type of Appeal</b>               | First Party  |
| <b>Appellant(s)</b>                 | Brendan and Catherine Rooney   |
| <b>Observer(s)</b>                  | None   |
| <b>Date of Site Inspection</b>      | 01/12/2018   |
| <b>Inspector</b>                    | Lorraine Dockery   |

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

1.1. The subject site is located within the mature area of Crumlin, Dublin 12. Old County Road is predominantly residential in nature, but does contain a mix of mixes. The subject property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, with off-street parking to front.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

2.1. The proposal as per the submitted public notices comprises the conversion of an existing roof/attic space to new habitable bedroom and storage to an existing semi-detached dwelling to include alterations to the existing roof structure, construction of a flat roof dormer extension to rear elevation and dormer roof structure to gable end/side elevation with pitched roof over, new windows to rear and side elevations and all associated minor internal alterations at 20 Old County Road, Crumlin, Dublin 12.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. Permission REFUSED for one reason as follows:

1. Having regard to the overall design and massing of the proposed development, the pattern of development in the area, the stated objectives and policies provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 for such developments, it is considered that the proposed development would, if permitted, adversely impact upon the visual and residential amenities and character of the area. The proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for other such similar developments, contravene stated objectives and policies as set out in the City Development Plan 2016-2022, and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.



- Developments recently permitted on Old County Road could be considered not to have regard to existing character of the street, in terms of building heights, lines, proportions, materials. Example of development at 103 Old County Road cited.
- Precedent for provision of dormer structures in the area
- Differing patterns of building on the roadway
- Would agree to alterations to rear dormer if considered appropriate by ABP to ensure design was subordinate to main dwelling and/or alterations to cladding
- Considers that proposal would not have adverse impact on scale and character of dwelling and would not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, access to daylight/sunlight
- Design reflects character of area; side dormer will be visually subordinate; rear dormer could be reduced in scale; windows/cladding could be revised; no alterations proposed to established building line
- Proposal would provide additional floorspace for their growing family

## 6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

None received to date

## 6.3. **Observations**

None

## 6.4. **Further Responses**

None

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1.1. I have examined all the documentation before me, including the Planner's Report of the Planning Authority, the appeal submission and I have visited the site and its environs. I have decided to assess this application de novo, as if it had been received by the Board in the first instance. In my mind, the main issues relating to this appeal are

- Principle of proposed development
- Impacts on amenity of area
- Other issues

### 7.2. Principle of proposed development

7.2.1. The subject site is located within 'Zone 1' of the operative City Development Plan, which seeks to 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities'. This objective is considered reasonable. The proposed development provides for the construction of dormer extensions and alterations to an existing dwelling. I consider that the alteration and extension to an existing dwelling house to be acceptable in principle. I shall assess the individual merits of this case below.

### 7.3. Impacts on amenity

7.3.1. This is the main issue of concern, namely the impacts of the proposed works on the amenity of the area. I note that the property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached properties at Old County Road, Crumlin, Dublin 12 and that both properties have hipped roofs at the present time. The proposal includes for the provision of two dormer structures, one on the side roofslope and one on the rear roofslope. The proposed dormer on the rear roofslope is flat roofed while that on the side roofslope has a pitched roof. The proposed works also involve minor alterations the existing dwelling. The proposed works would accommodate a new habitable bedroom, storage and staircase and have a stated floor area of approximately 15.7 square metres. It is stated that the additional floorspace is required to accommodate a growing family.

7.3.2. Having examined all the information before me and having visited the site and its environs, I would concur with the opinion of the planning authority in this instance.

Both proposed dormers are substantial in nature. I consider that the size, scale, bulk and design of the proposed works to the roofslope are such that they are excessive in their current form, would be unduly visible when viewed from street and would detract from the visual amenities of the area. The location of the site is such that the proposed works, in particular the proposed dormer to side, would be visible from Crumlin Road, together with Old County Road and would be visually incongruous at this location. Reducing the size of the proposed dormer to side may render it unusable internally in terms of providing access to the attic level. Reducing its size would also result in the proposed substantial dormer to rear becoming more visible on the streetscape. I refer to Section 16.10.12 and Appendix 17 of the City Development Plan in this instance and consider that the proposal is not in keeping with the principles set out therein.

- 7.3.3. I draw the attention of the Board to the character of Old County Road. While two-storey, semi-detached properties dominate, I acknowledge that there are properties of varying styles along the roadway, both commercial and residential in nature. A dormer type dwelling exists on the opposite side of Old County Road but this is a completely different style of property to that the subject of this current appeal. I note that none of the properties of similar style to this current property have dormers to the side roofslope, visible from the roadway. Therefore, I do not concur with the appellants when they state that there is a precedent for dormers in the area. There are dormer type extensions in the wider area but none in the immediate vicinity of the site on dwellings of similar style to that the subject of this current appeal. The proposal, therefore, if permitted may set a precedent for similar type developments in the vicinity.
- 7.3.4. I note the details contained within the appeal submission with regards to a growing family wishing to create additional floorspace within the footprint of their property. I acknowledge the desire of the applicants to provide additional accommodation while at the same time, I am conscious of the importance of protecting existing residential and visual amenities. A scaled down version of the proposal may be an option, however in doing this, the proposal may then become unusable in terms of compliance with Building Regulations and achieving adequate head height in order to provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation at attic level. I consider that an

extension to side/rear may be a more appropriate option in this instance, subject to a grant of planning permission.

## **8.0 Appropriate Assessment**

8.1. The subject site is located in an established residential area and is not located adjacent to nor in close proximity to any European sites, as defined in Section 177R of the Habitats Directive. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and/or the nature of the receiving environment and/or proximity to the nearest European site, 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.

## **9.0 Recommendation**

9.1. Having regard to all of the above, I recommend that permission be refused for the reason outlined below.

## **10.0 Reasons and Considerations**

1. Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 and to the nature, scale, location and design of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed dormer extensions would appear visually dominant and incongruous on the streetscape at this location; would seriously injure the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

Lorraine Dockery  
Senior Planning Inspector

02<sup>nd</sup> December 2018