



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-308887-20

Development	Amendments to previously granted Planning Permission Reg Ref: 2079/20. Extending the main ridge line of the roof of the dwelling, the addition of 3 rooflights and widening of front door ope.
Location	50 Hollybrook Grove, Clontarf, Dublin 3
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	3523/20
Applicant(s)	Simon Callanan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	First Party vs. condition
Appellant(s)	Simon Callanan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	3 rd February 2021
Inspector	Stephen Ward

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located within a residential area to the north of Clontarf Road, approximately 400 metres northeast of Fairview Park. Hollybrook Grove is one of several small residential estates within this area and is characterised by a strong linear pattern of semi-detached and terraced housing along both sides of the road.
- 1.2. The subject site is typical of plots within the estate and comprises the existing 2-storey semi-detached dwelling. A single storey garage to the side of the house adjoins a similar garage serving the neighbouring property to the northeast. There is a vehicular entrance and off-street parking to the front of the site. A large garden to the rear extends to the boundary of the DART rail line.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Under the previous application on the site (P.A. Ref. 2079/20) permission was granted for part single, part two-storey extension to the front, side and rear elevations including feature canopy to front; rooflights; and alterations to all elevations. The current application proposes amendments to this permission as follows:
 - To raise the ridge height of the permitted extension by c. 670mm to match the main roof ridge line of the dwelling,
 - To add 3 rooflights to the northeast side elevation to serve a bathroom, wardrobe and ensuite bathroom,
 - To widen the front door opening to accommodate the repositioning of the door and the addition of side lights.
- 2.2. The proposed amendments do not involve any additional floor area. No alterations are proposed to the permitted access and servicing arrangements.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated 27th November 2020, Dublin City Council (DCC) issued notification of the decision to grant permission, subject to conditions. Condition no. 2 of the decision states as follows:

The proposed development shall be amended as follows:

The proposed roofline above side first floor level extension to match the ridge of the main dwelling shall be omitted. The roofline shall be constructed as permitted under Reg. Ref. 2079/20.

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

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The planner's report can be summarised as follows:

- Other than the amendments proposed, the proposal incorporates the other amendments required under condition no. 3 of P.A. Ref. 2079/20.
- The lower ridgeline previously permitted would be more appropriate to preserve the proportions and rhythm of the streetscape and the proposed increase should be omitted.
- The proposed rooflights will not result in overlooking.
- There is no objection to the other proposed alterations.
- 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. 2079/20: Permission granted (1st July 2020) by DCC for the construction of a part single, part two-storey extension to the front, side and rear elevations including feature canopy to front; rooflights; and alterations to all elevations. Other works as part of the development include landscaping; and all associated works to facilitate the development. The conditions required several amendments to the proposed design, which have been incorporated into the current application.

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
- 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

The South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special protection Area (SPA) is located approximately 300 metres south of the site.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 This first party appeal relates solely to Condition no. 2 of the DCC decision, which requires a reduction in the roof ridgeline as outlined in section 3.1 of this report.

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

- There is precedent in the immediate locality (No. 71 Hollybrook Grove) for a permission granted by DCC (P.A. Ref. 3063/04) for an almost identical roof form to that proposed. There are other similar examples in the estate at No. 52 (P.A. Ref. 4387/05) and at No.'s 9, 42 & 54.
- The proposed development does not involve an increase in floor area and would not result in the formation of a terrace should the adjoining property propose a similar development.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

None.

6.3. Observations

None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. The appeal relates to condition no. 2 only, which effectively requires the omission of the increased ridge level to the extension. 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).

- 7.2. The stated reason for the application of condition no. 2 is '*In the interests of the visual amenity of the area*'. Having inspected the site and reviewed the drawings and documentation on file, I would concur that this is the only issue relevant to the condition and, accordingly, my assessment will be limited to this issue.
- 7.3. I have had regard to the appellant's references to precedent and I would concur that there are several similar examples of similar roof forms in the estate. I do not consider that these varying roof forms have detracted from the character of the estate in any significant manner. However, irrespective of precedent, I consider that the proposed increase in ridge height of c.670mm over a length of c. 2.5m would have only a minimal visual impact in this case and would successfully assimilate with the existing property and surrounding development.
- 7.4. In conclusion, I am satisfied that Condition No. 2, requiring the omission of the proposed increase in ridge height of the extension, would be wholly unwarranted as its inclusion would not significantly impact on 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 No. 2 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 height, scale, and design, would not detract from the character of the existing dwelling or the visual amenities of the area. Therefore, the planning authority's Condition No. 2, requiring a reduction in the ridge height of the extension, is not warranted.

Stephen Ward
Senior Planning Inspector

1st March 2021