



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-308472-20

Development	Construction of part-single storey, part-2 storey extension to the side, single storey extension to front in line with porch and attic conversion
Location	36A, Edenmore Crescent, Raheny, Dublin 5, D05 X438
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1509/20
Applicant(s)	Cathal & Cara Ryan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	First Party vs. condition
Appellant(s)	Cathal & Cara Ryan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	24 th November 2020
Inspector	Stephen Ward

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located approximately 500 metres northwest of Raheny village centre, within a small cul-de-sac housing development located directly south of Edenmore Park. The site contains an existing two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling and an associated shed to the rear. It is of an irregular shape and contains three divided external spaces. There is a small gated yard to the rear, as well as spaces to the front and side of the house which are separated by a high block wall and gate.
- 1.2. The Edenmore Crescent estate is characterised by similar development. The adjoining property to the south (No. 38) is of a similar corner-site configuration.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. In summary, the development comprises the construction of the following:
 - Part single storey, part two-storey extension to the side to provide a workshop space, utility room, WC, and new bedroom (c. 97 sq.m.)
 - Single storey extension to the front (c. 6 sq.m.) in line with existing front porch to provide enlarged living room
 - Attic conversion to provide a store area (27 sq.m.)
- 2.2. The associated works include the demolition of the existing shed to the rear yard; alterations to the side garden to facilitate double-door gated access; and alterations to the existing drainage arrangements.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated 24th September 2020, Dublin City Council (DCC) issued notification of the decision to grant permission. The only notable condition of the decision was condition no. 2, which is summarised as follows:

- a) The extension to the side shall have a maximum width of 3.6 metres (thereby omitting the single storey element which has a width of c. 6.9 metres)

- b) The first-floor rear elevation window shall be sized as per the floor-plan drawing and fitted with opaque glazing
- c) The rooflight within the front roof plane shall be omitted.

Reason: In the interests of the visual and residential amenity of the area

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The planner's report can be summarised as follows:

- The development is acceptable in principle
- 84.45 sq.m. of private amenity space will be retained to the rear and side. This is deemed satisfactory, but concerns are raised about the amenity level of these spaces due to irregular layout
- The single storey element of the side extension will have an obtrusive impact due to its projection beyond the established building line to the south
- From the front (north) of the site, the scale of the extension will be excessive and will not harmonise with the existing and neighbouring dwellings
- A grant of permission is recommended, subject to the amendments as outlined in condition no. 2 of the notification of decision.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division: No objections subject to standard conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

P.A. Ref. 1672/01: Permission granted by DCC for a two-storey detached house

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The operative Development Plan for the area is the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022. The site is zoned as 'Z1', the objective for which is '*To protect, provide and improve residential amenities*'.

5.1.2 Section 16.2.2.3 of the Plan is part of the general design standards and principles. It deals with 'Alterations and Extensions', which should be designed to respect the existing building, its context and the amenity of adjoining occupiers. Of relevance to the current application, it is stated that development should:

- Respect street uniformity, patterns and rhythms
- Retain a significant portion of garden / yard / enclosure
- Not detract from the architectural quality of the existing building
- Be confined to the rear in most cases
- Be clearly subordinate to the existing building in scale and design

5.1.3 Section 16.10.12 deals more specifically with 'Alterations and Extensions to Dwellings'. In summary, it is recommended that proposals should respect the visual amenity / character of the area and should protect the residential amenity of adjoining properties. Appendix 17 'Guidelines for Residential Extensions' sets out more detailed advice and principles in this regard.

5.2 Natural Heritage Designations

There are no designations of relevance to the proposed development.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 This first party appeal relates solely to Condition no. 2(a), which states that the proposed development shall be amended as follows:

'The extension to the side of the dwelling shall have a maximum width of 3.6m from the existing side gable wall'.

6.1.2 The grounds of the appeal can be summarised as follows:

- It is queried whether the intention of the extension was simply to clarify the width of the two-storey element, rather than reduce the single storey portion
- The need for the workshop space for amateur woodworking is set out
- Alternatively, a detached garage could be built as 'exempted development'
- The proposed extension is in keeping with the house and its environs, and the restriction imposed on the ground floor width is unreasonable.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

None.

6.3. Observations

None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Nature of the appeal

7.1.1 The submitted appeal relates to condition no. 2(a) only, which effectively requires the omission of the single storey element to the side of the proposed two-storey element. I am satisfied that the development is otherwise in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, and that the determination by the Board of the application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted. My assessment will therefore be limited to the matters raised in

relation to the terms of the condition, pursuant to the provisions of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

7.1.2 Responding to the grounds of appeal, I consider it clear from the planner's report that the intention of the condition is indeed to reduce the width of the single storey element, and not simply to clarify the width of the two-storey element.

7.1.3 The stated reason for the application of condition no. 2(a) was '*In the interests of the visual and residential amenity of the area*'. Having inspected the site and reviewed the drawings and documentation on file, I would concur that these are the only issues relevant to the condition.

7.2 Visual amenity

7.2.1 The concerns raised by the planning authority in relation to the scale of the extension and the implications of the proposed building line are noted. However, having regard to its size and corner location, I consider that the site has the potential for increased scale and flexibility in terms of the building line.

7.2.2 When viewed from the south of the site (within Edenmore Crescent), I note that the single storey element of the extension will be screened by the existing boundary wall to a height of c. 1.8 metres. The single storey eaves level extends to c. 2.6 metres and therefore just c. 800mm of the single storey walls will be visible above the level of the existing boundary wall. The roof of the single storey element extends to c. 3.6 metres and is hipped on all sides, thereby minimising its visual impact. Overall, I consider that the single storey projection will have limited visual impact above the existing boundary wall which would enclose the extension to the south and east. It will be significantly distanced from the adjoining property to the south (No. 38) and I consider that corner sites like this are less sensitive in relation to building lines.

7.2.3 Similarly, when viewed from the front of the site I consider that the single storey element to the side would have a relatively limited visual impact when seen in the context of the existing house and the proposed two-storey extension. It should also be noted that there is significant hedge screening along the corner of the site, which helps to screen the proposed extension. It is considered that corner sites like this have the capacity to absorb extensions of larger scale and that the inclusion of the single storey element would not seriously detract from the character of the existing house and surrounding development.

7.3 Residential Amenity

7.3.1 Regarding the subject property itself, the application proposes to retain a private open space area of c. 85 sq.m. Development Plan standards state that a minimum of 10 sq.m. per bedspace will be required (resulting in a requirement for 60 sq.m. in this case), and that up to 60-75 sq.m. is sufficient for houses in the city. While it is acknowledged that the proposed area is divided into separate rear and side gardens, it should be noted that this is the case already. I consider that the quantity and quality of retained space is acceptable, particularly given the recreational nature of the proposed workshop space; the generous front garden area; and the proposal to demolish the existing shed to the rear of the site.

7.3.2 In terms of surrounding properties, I consider the single storey element to be omitted by condition would be of limited height and scale and would be largely enclosed by the existing perimeter walls. I do not consider that it would adversely impact on the amenities of adjoining properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing or otherwise.

7.4 Conclusion

In conclusion, I am satisfied that Condition No. 2(a), requiring a reduction in the width of the extension through the omission of the single storey element to the side, would not be warranted as its inclusion would not impact on residential amenity or seriously detract from the visual amenities of the area.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

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.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that the Planning Authority be directed to REMOVE Condition 2(a) for the reasons and considerations set out hereunder.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential land use zoning for the site, and to the pattern and character of development in the area, it is considered that the proposed extension, by reason of its scale, nature and design, and its location with respect to adjoining properties, would not detract from the character of the existing dwelling or the visual amenities of the area, and would not detract from the residential amenity of the existing dwelling or adjoining properties. Therefore, the planning authority's Condition No. 2(a), requiring a reduction in the width of the extension, is not warranted.

Stephen Ward
Senior Planning Inspector

30th November 2020