



An
Bord
Pleanála

inspector's Report ABP-303103-18

Development	Permission for zinc clad projecting dormer windows and velux rooflights.
Location	49, Strand Road (corner of and siding onto Gilford Ave.), Sandymount, Dublin 4
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	3909/18
Applicant(s)	Angela Douglas
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Split
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Angela Douglas
Date of Site Inspection	09 th February 2019
Inspector	Colin McBride

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.00278 hectares, is located at the junction of Strand Road and Gilford Avenue in Sandymount, Dublin 4. The site is occupied by a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. To the north of the site is no. 47, which is a two-storey terraced dwelling. To the west is no. 32 Gilford Avenue, which is a two-storey dwelling fronting onto Gilford Avenue and is part of a terrace of dwellings to the west.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought for zinc clad projecting dormer windows, one to the front and one to the rear and rooflight windows in the roof profile, one to the front and one to the rear.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was granted for the projecting dormer window and rooflight on the rear roof profile subject to 9 conditions.

Permission was refused for the projecting dormer window and rooflight on front roof profile. Permission was refused based on one reason...

1. The site is zoned Z2 in the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 which seeks, 'To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas'. The proposed front dormer extension by reason of its design, bulk and scale would represent an incongruous insertion to the roof of the terrace, which would be out of character with the established pattern of development in the vicinity. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the Z2 zoning objective for the area, would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Planning Report (01/11/18):

The design and scale of the front dormer extension was considered excessive in scale and would be prominent feature out of character relative to the terrace it is part of. A split decision was recommended with a grant of permission for the dormer window and rooflight on the rear roof profile but refusal of the dormer window and rooflight proposed on the front roof profile.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division (02/10/18): No objection subject to condition.

3.3. Third Party Observations

No observations.

4.0 Planning History

No planning history on the appeal site.

Adjoining sites

3080/09: Permission granted for new roof window to front, two-storey extension and single-storey extension with roof patio to rear at no. 47 Strand Road, Sandymount, Dublin 1.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The relevant Development Plan is the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022. The site is zone Z2 with a stated objective 'to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas'.

Policy CHC4

"Development within or affecting a conservation area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness, and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible".

Section 16.10.12 Extension and Alterations to Dwellings

The design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular the need for light and privacy. In addition, the form of the existing building should be followed as closely as possible, and the development should integrate with the existing building through use of similar finishes and windows. Extensions should be subordinate in terms of scale to the main unit.

Appendix 17. 11 Rood 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 lower floors.
- Roof materials should be covered in materials that match and complement the main building.

- Dormer windows should be set back from the eaves level to minimise their visual impact and reduce potential for overlooking or adjoining properties.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) located to the west on the opposite side of Strand Road.

South Dublin Bay and Tolka River SPA (Site Code 004024) located to the west on the opposite side of Strand Road.

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

A first party appeal has been lodged by Delahunty & Harley Architects Designers on behalf of Angela Douglas, 49 Strand Road, Sandymount, Dublin 4. The grounds of appeal are as follows...

- The appeal is against the decision to refuse permission for the dormer window and rooflight on the front roof profile.
- It is noted that the house is not a protected structure but is located within an ACA. It is noted that dwelling is at the end of the terrace and is forward of the building line and distinct in character relative to the other houses in the terrace. It is also noted there is a significant mix of dwellings along Strand Road.
- In response to the issues raised on the Planners report and the decision, the appellant has proposed revised plans in which the dormer window is reduced in width to 3.1m and centred on the lower floor window.
- It is noted the front dormer is designed to be a subordinate feature taking up 32% of the front roof profile and leaving a significant amount of the roof profile visible (68%). It is noted recently permitted rooflights in no. 47 are identical in proportion to what is proposed. The roof line, shape and pitch will be unchanged and the existing roof finish will remain. The window sits well below

the ridgeline and is well separated from the edges of the roof. The proposal for zinc cladding is high quality material.

- The proposal will improve the function of bedroom it serves.
- The proposal is consistent with the Z2 zoning objective in that it will improve residential amenity.
- In terms of Development Plan policy and Appendix 17 in regards to extensions it is noted the proposal would be acceptable as it would have no adverse impact on visual character and no adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining properties. In terms of roof extension the dormer windows are designed to be subordinate to the roof profile.
- The appellant notes numerous examples of the mix of dwellings in the area including various rooflights and roof extensions. The appellant has noted a number of planning precedents including no. 47 Stand Road.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

No response

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having inspected the site and associated documents, the main issues can be assessed under the following headings.

Design, scale, visual amenity

Appropriate Assessment

7.2 Design, scale, visual amenity:

7.2.1 The proposal consists of the provision of a dormer window and rooflight in the front roof profile and a dormer window and rooflight in the rear roof profile. The dormer and rooflight on the rear roof profile was permitted while the dormer window and rooflight on the front roof profile was refused. The dormer window and rooflight to the

rear are satisfactory in terms of overall design and scale and would be acceptable in the context of visual and adjoining amenity. The refusal was on the basis of the site being located in a conservation area with the front dormer extension by reason of its design, bulk and scale deemed to represent an incongruous insertion to the roof of the terrace, which would be out of character with the established pattern of development in the vicinity. The proposed development was therefore deemed be contrary to the Z2 zoning objective for the area, would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7.2.2 The proposal is for a dormer window and rooflight on the front roof profile to serve an existing bedroom. There is currently two rooflights on the front roof profile and the neighbouring dwelling has a large rooflight on its front roof profile. There is a significant variation in dwelling types at this location with the area not characterised by a rigid or repetitive form of development. There are examples of dwellings with dormer windows in the front roof profile located further north. The dormer window proposed on the front does conform to the requirements of Development Plan policy in regards to roofline extensions. The overall scale of the dormer window is subordinate to the roof profile within which it is located, with a significant amount of the roof profile still visible. The window is setback from the ridge and eaves level as well as the sides of the roof and is 3.7m wide and 2.8m high with a zinc clad finish. It is notable that the appellants have submitted a revised proposal with the dormer window reduced in width to 3.152m to address any concerns regarding visual impact.

7.2.3 I would consider that the revised option submitted by the appellant (drawings date 28th November 2018) provide for an acceptable standard of development. The proposal provides a dormer window that is in keeping with Development Plan policy in regards to roofline extensions and works well with the existing character of the house (fenestration) as well being a neater design than that originally proposed with only provision of a dormer window that lines up with the windows on the lower floors. I am satisfied that the proposal would be satisfactory in the context of the visual

amenities of the area, the status of the area as a conservation area and would not have a significant or adverse impact on adjoining amenities. I consider it an improved design over that originally proposed and should be permitted in this case.

7.3 Appropriate Assessment:

7.3.1 Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and its 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.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend a grant of permission subject to the following conditions.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the design and scale of the proposed development and subject to compliance with conditions, the proposed development would be satisfactory in the context of the visual amenities of the area and its status as a designated conservation area. The proposal would also be acceptable in the context of adjoining and amenities and would, therefore, be satisfactory in the context of 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 and as amended by the revised plans submitted to An Bord Pleanála on the 28th day of November 2018, 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 between the hours of 0800 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

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

Colin McBride
Planning Inspector

10th February 2019