



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-304983

Development	Extend the existing attic storage room area with revised roof profile.
Location	81 Mount Prospect Avenue, Clontarf, Dublin 3
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council North
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2948/19
Applicant(s)	Michael and Patricia Heffernan.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Michael and Patricia Heffernan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	27 th October 2019.
Inspector	Suzanne Kehely

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The site is that of a large semi-detached house with spacious front and back gardens on the southern side of Mount Prospect Avenue – a mature residential road in Clontarf. The houses on this side of the road are two storey dormers built in c.1930s in a decorative Arts and Crafts style. They feature elaborate roofs with expansive deep slopes and multipaned dormer windows. The houses have been extended in various formats to the side and rear. The subject site has already been extended.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. It is proposed to revise the roof profile and extend an existing attic store further to approved plans under planning authority reference 3070/18. The main elements are highlighted in yellow in the submitted plans. The proposed roof to the side rear rises about one metre above the main ridge over the original two storey house.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The planning authority issued a decision to Refuse for the stated reason that: The proposed extension of the attic with revised roof profile would create an effective third storey to the dwelling with this element being contained fully within the secondary rear portion of the dwelling and would in its position, height and appearance , dominate the scale of the dwelling, be significantly visually obtrusive and incongruous and would in itself and by the precedent established for over scaled roof forms, seriously injure the residential amenities of the area and the visual amenity of the streetscape. The proposed development is contrary to the policies and objectives of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, in particular section 16.10.12 and Appendix 17.11 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report: This refers to:

- Similarity to floor layout as previously permitted and the inclusion of a flat roof section and roof tile cladding to the walls.
- The significantly higher level of proposed roof as compared to original main roof together with changes in profile.
- Inherent conflict of a third-floor level in a supposedly subordinate extension.
- Absence of justification for proposal.
- Planning authority remains of view that the roof will be visually incongruous and obtrusive despite cladding and sloping. It would set an unacceptable precedent.
- Section 16.10.2 of plan re adverse impact on scale and character of the dwelling
- Appendix 17.11 requires developemtn to be reflective of character and subordinate of main roof.

3.3. **Third Party Observations**

- None received within statutory period.

4.0 **Planning History**

- 4.1. Planning authority ref: 3070/18: Grant of permission for a two-storey extension and single storey extension with altered roof profile over previously approved bedroom and ensuite. This was subject to eh omission of the new attic level storey.
- 4.2. An Bord Pleanala ref. PL29N.242714: Grant of permission on appeal for the raising the ridge line of the existing two-storey extension, altering attic and new windows.
- 4.3. Planning authority ref: 4386/09: Grant of permission for demolition and construction of a two-storey extension to side and rear with rooflights and dormer windows.

5.0 **Policy and Context**

5.1. **Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022**

- 5.1.1. In a 'Z1 - Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' area with a stated objective 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.
- 5.1.2. Section 16.10.12: Permission to extend dwellings will only be granted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposal would not have an adverse impact

on the scale and character of the dwelling and have no unacceptable effect on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings. Section 16.2.2.3 refers to alterations and extensions.

- 5.1.3. Appendix 17 (Volume 2) of the Development Plan provides guidance specifically relating to residential extensions. Subsection 17.8 advocates the Subordinate Approach such that the extension plays more of a 'supporting role' to the original dwelling. In general, the extension should be no larger or higher than the existing. Section 17.11 of this appendix outlines the principles that should be observed when extending the roof.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. Having regard to the existing development on site, the nature and scale of the proposed development and the location of the site, 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 and a screening determination is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 7.1.1. The grounds of appeal, have been submitted by the agent and refer to:
- The storage area was already granted permission 3187/13 but is now being refused. Cannot understand why the planning authority continues to seek omission of attic in this context.
 - The storage area is existing and is being requested to be removed
 - The pitched roof will match other houses.
 - Houses to the side have similar extensions.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- 7.2.1. No further comment.

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. In this case permission was granted on appeal in 2013 for a large extension to the side and rear in addition to a previous extension to the side. In that case, refusal of permission was recommended on grounds of incongruity of the roof design which was proposed to be a higher level than the original main roof, however, the Board considered the set back to provide some latitude in permitting this deviance. The applicant subsequently sought permission for a revised two-storey and attic extension which effectively widened the extension thereby further increasing the height and mass of the roof. While permitting this, the planning authority omitted the roof level. The applicant now seeks to effectively reinstate this attic by what is described as an extension to the existing. While the case is made that it is similar to what was previously permitted, on examination of the previous case before the Board and that currently proposed, the roof profile will be quite considerably altered.
- 8.2. I note the style of the house is of a characteristic 1930s style influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement which featured crafted details and celebrated the simple vernacular and hence the modest cottage scaling with a deep eaves and use of dormers emphasising the ground level. In this case the proportions and scaling of the principal roof with the ridge width of 5.5m and height of 7.85m contrasting with the 10.5m width of the house as measured at eaves level of 2.38m is one of the most defining characteristics in the street elevation. The 2009 extension to the side, while breaching this, remains subordinate in a number of respects to the principal facade. However in this latest version of the proposed extension, the new roof would result in a roof rising to 9m which is 1.15m above the original principal ridge. The new roof would also extend considerably wider than the original. Further to this it incorporates a different pitch and hip profile and design approach to the original. For these reasons the overall massing would be a dominant and incongruous feature.
- 8.3. I consider the alterations at roof level would be incongruous with a semi-detached house of a distinctive style that contributes the character of the streetscape. It would be of excessive scale relative to the original profile of the house which is not mitigated by the recess in this case.
- 8.4. While the development plan permits a contemporary approach, the scale and design are not in compliance with the design approach set out in section 16.2.2.3 or

Appendix 17(sections 17.8 and 17.11 of the development plan which seek to ensure that extensions and alterations are subordinate in scale and design and also respect existing uniformity of the street and architectural features that contribute to the character of the building and street. Furthermore the altered roof would also be highly dominant as viewed from the surrounding houses and would be seriously injurious to the amenities of the area. Permission for the roof development proposed in this case would be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.

9.0 **Appropriate Assessment**

9.1. Having regard to the minor nature of the proposed development and to the location of the site in a serviced urban area and the separation distance to the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

10.0 **Recommendation**

10.1. Having read all the reports on the file and inspected the subject site, I recommend that permission be refused for the proposed development for the following reason:

11.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

1. The proposed attic extension and roof profile by reason of its scale, massing, height and design would constitute an incongruous roof profile that would be out of character with the pair of the semi-detached houses of which it forms a part and would therefore detract from the streetscape. The proposed development therefore fails to adequately comply with the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-22 as contained in section 16.2.2.3 and Appendix 17 in relation to roof extensions and alterations. The proposed development would accordingly seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would set an undesirable precedent for similar development and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Suzanne Kehely
Senior Planning Inspector

29 October 2019