



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-304465-19

Development	Two-storey house extension to the side & rear.
Location	24, Drumfinn Avenue, Ballyfermot, Dublin, D10 YT57
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1102/19
Applicant(s)	Krzystof Sieczkowski
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Lilly Moran
Date of Site Inspection	23 rd July 2019
Inspector	Colin McBride

1.0 **Site Location and Description**

1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.0264 hectares, is located approximately 8km to the west of Dublin City Centre. The appeal site is occupied by no. 24 Drumfinn Avenue, which is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. Immediately to the east is no. 22, which is the other dwelling making up the pair of semi-detached dwellings and to the west is no. 24. The dwellings at this location are characterised by a single-storey portion to the side. To the north of the site is the rear garden belonging to dwelling fronting Gurteen Avenue to the north east of the site.

2.0 **Proposed Development**

2.1. Permission is sought for a two-storey extension to the side and rear of an end terraced dwelling and dormer extension at second floor level on the rear roof profile. The space at second floor level is to be attic storage.

3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. **Decision**

Grant subject to 6 conditions. Of note is the following condition...

Condition no. 2: The rear dormer is to be set down from the ridge, reduced in width and setback from the eaves by a maximum of 200mm. the width of the dormer may be extended to a maximum of 4m externally to enable a sufficient portion of the roof to remain visible to the side and top of the roof.

Reason In the interests of orderly development and protection of residential amenity.

3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. **Planning Reports**

The proposal was considered to be acceptable subject to a reduction in the size of the dormer extension. A grant of permission was recommended subject to the conditions outlined above.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Drainage Division (28/03/19): No objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Third Party Observations

3.3.1 Submission by Lilly Moran, 26 Drumfinn Avenue, Ballyfermot, Dublin 10.

- The issues raised are the excessive scale of the extension and its impact in terms of loss of light. The submission also questions the need for the level of development proposed.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 No planning history.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The relevant Development plan is the Dublin County development plan 2016-2022. The site is zoned Z1 with a stated objective 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities'.

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 the use of similar finishes and windows. Extensions should be subordinate in terms of scale to the main unit.

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.

Appendix 17

17.11 Roof Extensions:

The roofline of a building is one of its most dominant features and it is important that any proposal to change the shape, pitch, cladding or ornament of a roof is carefully considered. If not treated sympathetically, dormer extensions can cause problems for immediate neighbours and in the way a street is viewed as a whole.

When extending in the roof, the following principles should be observed:

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.

Roof materials should be covered in materials that match or complement the main building.

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

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1 None in the vicinity.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 A third party appeal has been lodged by Lilly Moran, 26 Drumfinn Avenue, Ballyfermot, Dublin 10. The grounds of appeal are as follows...

- The proposal if constructed as per the plans lodged would have an adverse impact on the appellant's residential amenities with the proposal reducing privacy, daylight/sunlight and devaluing her property.
- A shadow analysis should have been requested by the Planning Authority.

- The proposal to extend the house to the side and increase the floor area at ground floor level including moving the front door level with the building line with the rest of the dwelling would have an adverse visual impact.
- The provision of the front door and double doors to the rear closer to the appellant's property would impact on her amenities and the altered building line of the section to the side would reduce line of sight and passive security from the front door of the appellant's property.
- The proposal would reduce the development potential of the appellant's property and set a precedent for adjacent properties.
- The proposal would be contrary Development Plan policy regarding extensions (Section 16.10.12), infill development (Section 16.2.2.2 and Alterations and Extensions (Section 16.2.2.3).

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1 A response has been submitted by Joe Bonner, Town Planning Consultant on behalf of the applicant, Krzysztof Sieczkowski.

- The applicant has prepared revised drawing shaving regard to condition no. 2 of the grant of permission with alterations to the extension to the rear and the roof profile with the main change a reduction in the size of the dormer window serving the second floor level.
- The applicant has prepared a shadow analysis with it considered that the proposal would have no significant impact in regards to overshadowing of adjoining properties and in particular the appellant's property.
- The alterations to the entrance door would reduce the existing number of doors to access the property and would be a visual improvement and would have no adverse impact on adjoining properties. It is noted that the visual appearance of the dwelling will be improved and not diminished as suggested by the appellant.
- It is noted that existing vegetation and boundary treatment on the applicant's property and an existing boundary wall restricts visibility from the appellant's front door and the front of the applicant property. It is noted that the proposal would have no impact in regards to views from the appellant's property.

- The applicant does not agree with the appellant's views that development potential would be reduced and notes that this view has not been demonstrated.
- The proposal would not impact on the value of the appellant's property.
- The applicant has listed a number of examples of precedents for similar developments.

6.3. 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 and residential amenity

7.2 Design, scale, visual and residential amenity:

7.2.1 Permission was sought for a two-storey extension to the side and rear of an end of terrace dwelling and dormer extension at second floor level on the rear roof profile. Permission was granted with condition no. 2 requiring revision to the rear dormer (second floor level) which is to be set down from the ridge, reduced in width and setback from the eaves by a maximum of 200mm. the width of the dormer may be extended to a maximum of 4m externally to enable a sufficient portion of the roof to remain visible to the side and top of the roof.

7.2.2 The proposal is for a two-storey extension to the side and rear of an existing semi-detached dwelling. The dwelling already has a single-storey portion to the side, which is to be demolished for a full height extension to the side tying into the existing roof profile. The extension to the rear extension projects 3.2m beyond the rear building line of the existing dwellings and its first floor level is a dormer style window that is set back from the edge of the roof and eaves level. Above this is a dormer extension at second floor level to serve attic storage.

7.2.3 The scale of the design and scale of the extension to the side is satisfactory in that it respects the scale and design of the existing dwelling and ties in with the existing roof profile. The two-storey extension to the rear would also be satisfactory in scale in that it does not project a significant distance beyond the rear building line. In addition, where it adjoins the appellant's property to the west there was already a single-storey element that projects beyond the rear building line (to be demolished). I am satisfied that the overall design and scale of the proposed two-storey extension to the side and rear is satisfactory in the context of the visual amenities of the area and the amenities of adjoining properties.

7.2.4 The proposal also included a dormer extension at second floor level to serve attic storage. I would concur with the Planning Authority's assessment that such is too large in scale and should be reduced in width and height. As noted above condition no. 2 was applied. The applicant in responding to the third party appeal noted that they were amenable to the condition (no first party appeal) and have submitted plans revising the proposal having regard to the condition. Having inspected the revised plans, I would note that such are satisfactory and deal with the issue of the visual impact of the second floor window.

7.2.5 The third party appeal raises concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the visual amenities of the area and her residential amenity. As noted above the visual impact of the proposal would be satisfactory and the revised plans submitted deal with issues concerning the scale of the second floor dormer extension. In relation to the extension to the side, it replaces a single-storey extension and ties in well with the existing front building line and roof profile of the existing dwelling. I would note that alterations to the position of the front door of the dwelling would have no significant impact due to existing boundary treatment between the appeal site and the appellant's property, which is high block wall.

7.2.6 As noted above the extension to the rear projects 3.2m at ground floor level and a little less at first floor level (dormer extension). I am satisfied that the level of projection and scale of the extension would not be excessive relative to adjoining properties including the appellant's property at no. 26 and the dwelling adjoining to

the east, no. 22. The applicant has submitted a shadow analysis (March 21st, June 21st and September 21st) with the existing and proposed development shown. I am satisfied that this demonstrates that the impact of the proposal over and above the existing arrangement on site would not be significant to the degree it would be detrimental to the residential amenities of existing properties including the appellant's.

7.2.7 In regards to privacy I am satisfied that the orientation of windows is in keeping with the pattern of development at this location. I do not concur with the appellant's view that the proposal would impact on development potential of their property. The proposed extension entails the provision of no windows on the western elevation and the pattern and scale of development proposed on the appeal site could be replicated on the appellant's site and adjoining sites.

7.2.8 I am satisfied subject to the revisions proposed in the plans submitted by the applicant, that the proposed development would be satisfactory in the context of the visual amenities of the area and the residential amenities of adjoining properties. I am also satisfied that the proposal is consistent with the Development Plan policy in regards to residential extensions.

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, it is considered that the proposed development, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would not seriously injure the amenities of adjoining property. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with 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 by the applicant to An Bord Pleanála on the 17th day of June 2019, 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. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

4. 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

24th July 2019