



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-307671-20

Development	Extension to ground floor and attic conversion.
Location	58 Northbrook Avenue, Ranelagh, Dublin 6
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2537/20
Applicant(s)	Tracy Armstrong
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Michael Kennedy & Dubhfeasa Slattery
Date of Site Inspection	20 th October 2020
Inspector	Colin McBride

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.0175 hectares, is located at 58 Northbrook Avenue to the north east of Ranelagh. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey terraced dwelling. The dwelling is part of a terrace of similar dwelling on the eastern side of Northbrook Avenue. No. 59 immediately to the south is the appellants' property. No. 57 to north has different front and rear building line with it and no. 56 stepped forward of the building line of no.s 58 and 59. To the east of the site is an apartment development.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought for development consisting of a rear extension at ground floor (12sqm) and first floor level (12sqm), and attic conversion with dormer window to the rear and insertion of 2 no. roof lights.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission granted subject to 6 conditions. Of note is the following condition...

Condition no. 2

Depth of first floor extension to be reduced to 3.5m and the new roof structure shall not exceed the ridge height of existing roof plane.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Planning report (24/06/20): The depth of extension at first floor level was considered excessive. The proposal was considered satisfactory in design and adjoining amenity subject to a reduction in the depth of the first floor extension to 3.5m. A grant of permission was recommended based on the conditions set out above.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division (23/04/20): No objection subject to conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1 Two third party submission were received from...

Michael Kennedy, 20 Belgrave Road, Rathmines, Dublin 6.

Dubhfeasa Slattery, 20 Belgrave Road, Rathmines, Dublin 6.

The two submission are identical in content and can be summarised as follows...

- Both are owners of no. 59. Loss of natural light, overlooking, reduced privacy, devaluation of property, overdevelopment of the site, health impact of reduced natural light.

4.0 **Planning History**

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 Michael Kennedy & Dubhfeasa Slattery, 20 Belgrave Road, Rathmines, Dublin 6.

- The appellants are co-owners of no. 59 Northbrook Avenue located adjacent the appeal site.
- Reduction in natural light to kitchen two bedrooms and small back garden.
- The proposal will overlook private amenity space.
- The proposal would reduce privacy both inside the house and the private amenity space.
- Reduced amenity would impact future ability to work from home.
- The proposal would devalue the appellants' property and is an overdevelopment of the site.
- Overshadowing would impact plant growth in the appellants' garden.
- The height and scale of the proposal may impact on the foundations of the house and shared boundary wall.
- Reduced light levels would have an adverse health impact.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1 Response by the applicant Tracy Armstrong.

- The applicant notes a number of permissions granted in the area relevant to the appeal site including a two-storey extension granted by the Board at no. 31 Chelmsford Avenue (305122).
- The proposal will have no impact on the visual amenity of the area as it is to the rear of the existing dwelling.

- It is noted that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of light or overshadowing and the first floor portion would come under the exempted development threshold if sought in isolation of other alterations sought.
- The proposal would not reduce privacy at the appellants' property and within their garden with the orientation of windows consistent with the pattern of development.
- The proposal is not overdevelopment of the site with the plot ratio and site coverage falling within the permit limits under the City Development Plan.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1 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 rear of a two-storey terraced dwelling. The dwelling was previously extended at ground floor level to the rear under the provision of exempted development. It is proposed to extend at ground floor to rear by a further 2.5m. It is proposed to construct an extension to the rear at first floor level and such extends beyond the rear of the dwelling by 4.4m. It is also proposed to convert the attic with the provision of dormer window on the rear roof plane and 2 no. rooflights on the front roof plane. Permission was granted however the depth of the first floor extension was considered to excessive and reduced to 3.5m in depth by way of condition.

7.2.2 The appellant property is at no. 59 Northbrook Avenue located immediately to the south of the appeal site. The issues raised relate to the design and scale of the extension in the context of its impact on natural light and privacy within the

appellant's house and garden. The ground floor extension would have no significant impact and is extending the previously constructed ground floor extension by 2.5m. The first floor extension projects 4.4m from the rear elevation and is stepped back from the southern boundary and the appellants' property to the south. The extension has a flat roof and ridge height much lower than the ridge of the existing dwelling. The depth of this extension was reduced to 3.5m as it was considered to project an excessive amount. I note that this may be in relation to the dwelling at no. 57 to the north, which has different building line with the dwelling at no. 58 and 59 (58 and 59 have building line is further to the east).

7.2.3 I would consider that the overall design and scale of the permitted development relative to no. 59 is satisfactory. The scale of the extension at first floor level would not be excessive in depth or height and is stepped back from the boundary of the appellants' property to the south. In addition I would note that the permitted development is reduced in scale due to condition no. 2. I would consider that the design and scale of the extension would not be excessive relation to the appellants' property and would not result in a significant or detrimental loss of light. In addition I would note that the extension is located directly north of the appellants' property and does not impact on light generated from a southerly aspect. In relation to privacy I would note that all windows proposed are orientated to the east in keeping with the prevailing pattern of development and in no way would result in a reduction in privacy at the appellants' property or other adjoining dwellings. I would consider that condition no. 2 is an appropriate condition given the difference in the rear building line of the dwelling on the appeal site and the dwelling to north at no. 57. I would consider subject to a similar condition being imposed, the proposed development has adequate regard to visual amenities of the area and the residential amenities of adjoining properties, and would be in compliance with development plan policy.

8.0 **Appropriate Assessment**

8.1 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.

9.0 Recommendation

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

10.0 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.

11.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:

(a) The first floor extension shall be reduced in depth to 3.5m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of [visual] [and residential] amenity.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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

20th October 2020