



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-309826-21

Development	Construction of extension and attic conversion.
Location	98, Ardmore Drive, Beaumont, Dublin 5.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council North
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1020/21
Applicant(s)	Justin Nolan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant with conditions
Type of Appeal	First Party vs Condition
Appellant(s)	Justin Nolan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	08 th of May 2021
Inspector	Adrian Ormsby

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located c. 5 km to the north east of Dublin City centre at 98, Ardmore Drive, Beaumont, Dublin 5. The site has a stated area of 203 sq.m.
- 1.2. The site is located on the southern side of Ardmore Drive and c. 60 m east of Ardmore Park. The site is located in an established residential area and is occupied by a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. No. 98 adjoins the house to its west No. 100 Ardmore Drive.
- 1.3. The house is a semi-detached two storey house with a hipped roof. The front of the house is open to the public path save for two piers. The driveway is finished with cobble lock style paving providing car parking within the front of site boundary. Side boundaries to the front of the house include low level brick walls with railings and capped pillars.
- 1.4. There is a laneway adjoining the eastern boundary of the site providing access to the rear of the site and to the rear of No. 96 Ardmore Drive. The house benefits from an existing single storey rear return and rear private amenity space with garage enclosed by boundary walls of c. 2m height.
- 1.5. The rear boundary of the site adjoins an area of public open space known as Beauvale Park.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises-
 - 30.2 sq.m of extension including-
 - Attic conversion and dormer window extension to the rear
 - Single story extension to front
 - Attic conversion for storage purposes.
 - Revision of roof profile from hipped roof to 'dutch' hip style

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The Planning Authority decided to grant permission on the 10/03/21, subject to conditions of a standard nature, but also including the following Condition No. 9-

C.3- The development hereby approved shall incorporate the following amendments:

a) The proposed half hip roof shall be omitted and replaced by a pitched roof side dormer. The ridge and side roof planes of the dormer shall sit fully below the existing main roof ridge and inside the existing side ridges

b) The proposed attic gable window shall be amended to a window in the side dormer

c) The rear dormer shall be reduced in width and shall not exceed an external width of three metres with the roof of the dormer not exceeding the height of the main ridge line and shall not be higher than the side dormer

d) The new side dormer shall be clad in vertically hung slate/tiles to match the existing roof Development shall not commence until revised plans, drawings and particulars showing the above amendments have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority, and such works shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the buildings:-

Reason: In the interests of orderly development and visual amenity and to comply with the policies and objectives of the current Dublin City Development Plan.

4.0 Planning Authority Reports

4.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planning Officer (09/03/21) generally reflects the decision of the Planning Authority. (I note a date of 09-Apr-2021 is indicated on the Planning report but this is considered a clerical error). The following is noted from the report:

- The proposed attic conversion would involve the alteration of the existing hipped roof to a “half-hip” more accurately a vestigial hip, being of minimal size relative to the roof plane.
- There are limited examples of roof alterations along the street with No’s 254, 258 and 264A being the only houses where this has been done.
- The overall scale and changes to the appearance of the roof would not be consistent with the streetscape or the requirements of the Development Plan.
- It is considered reasonable to require the half hip roof profile to be omitted and replaced by a side dormer with pitched roof sitting inside the plane of the side roof with a dormer to the rear not exceeding an external width of three metres.
- Reducing the external depth of the front extension to 1.5m would improve the balance of the extension to the main dwelling and would still be generous overall.
- 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.
- The proposed development is considered consistent with the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 and with the proper planning and development of the area. It is recommended that permission be granted.

4.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division- No objection subject to condition

4.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

4.4. Third Party Observations

- None

5.0 Planning History

- There does not appear to be any planning history pertaining to the appeal site.

6.0 Policy Context

6.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022

- 6.1.1. The appeal site has a zoning objective 'Z1 - Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' within the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, with a stated objective *'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities'*.
- 6.1.2. Relevant planning policies and objectives for residential development are set out under Section 5 (Quality Housing) and Section 16 (Development Standards) within Volume 1 of the Development Plan. Appendix 17 of Volume 2 of the Development Plan provides guidance specifically relating to residential extensions.
- 6.1.3. The following Sections are of particular relevance:
- Section 16.10.12 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings:
'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 Guidance for Residential Extensions
 - Section 17.3 Residential Amenity Issues
 - Section 17.4 Privacy
 - Section 17.5 Relationship Between Dwellings and Extensions
 - Section 17.6 Daylight and Sunlight
 - Section 17.7 Appearance
 - Section 17.8 Subordinate Approach

- Section 17.10 Contemporary Extensions
- Section 17.11 Roof Extensions: *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.*

6.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- None relevant

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first-party appeal has been lodged '*specifically*' against condition no. 9, which was attached to the Planning Authority's notification of a decision to grant planning permission. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows-

- There are 15 documented precedents similar to the subject application in the Ardmore/Montrose housing estate in which the application site is situated.
- A list of these precedents including photographs, planning details were available and final grant date is provided within the appeal
- A map of the precedents subject to the application site is provided.

- The recommendation of a pitched side dormer to sit fully below the existing main ridge, does not fit within the streetscape/visual amenity of the surrounds given no other attic extension within the estate has this type of side dormer.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- No response received to the grounds of appeal.

7.3. Observations

- None

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Introduction

- 8.1.1. This is a first-party appeal '*specifically*' against Condition No. 9 attached to the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the content of condition no. 9, it is considered 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. Therefore, the Board should determine the matters raised in the appeal only, in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

8.2. Condition 9

- 8.2.1. The Planning Authority appear to consider the proposed half hip roof profile to be contrary to the visual amenity of the streetscape. They have permitted the development with a condition requiring the provision of a '*pitched roof side dormer*' which shall sit below the existing main roof ridge and inside the existing side ridges. The Planning Authority also appear to consider the rear dormer roof extension to be excessive in scale and would dominate the extended rear roof plane. They have reduced its external width to 3m. The reason given for condition 9 is '*in the interests of orderly development and visual amenity and to comply with the policies and objectives of the current Dublin City Development Plan.*'

- 8.2.2. The application involves an attic conversion including amendments to the roof profile from a hipped roof to an almost standard pitch roof save for a small 'dutch hip' style feature to the east side of the roof profile.
- 8.2.3. The proposed development requires changes to the existing hipped roof profile that characterises the existing and adjoining house and other properties on Ardmore Drive. I appreciate that semi-detached houses are generally designed as pairs and this is reflected in the general streetscape of the area. However I do not consider the proposed roof profile will have a negative visual impact on the adjoining house or on the streetscape or the area as a whole. In this regard I do not consider the provision of a '*pitched roof side dormer*' to be warranted and accordingly conditions 9 a), b) and d) should be removed.
- 8.2.4. The application also proposes a 4.2m wide dormer roof extension to the rear elevation of the house. The drawings show this extension will be to the rear, below the main ridge height of the house and setback sufficiently from the eaves. It is very unlikely to be visible from Ardmore Drive. In my opinion the dormer extension as proposed would be subordinate to the revised roof profile and a sufficiently large proportion of the main roof would remain visible and as such is in accordance with Section 17.11 of the City Development Plan.
- 8.2.5. The proposed roof extension would be c.14.5 m from the sites rear boundary which adjoins an area of public open space known as Beauvale Park. It would not lead to undue overlooking and in my opinion would not seriously detract from the visual amenity of the area when viewed from the park. Furthermore it is considered that a reduction in the dormer extension width by 1.2m would have minimal benefit from a visual impact perspective. In this regard I do not consider condition 9 c) is warranted and should be removed.

8.3. **Appropriate Assessment**

- 8.3.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the distance from 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. Having inspected the site and reviewed the drawings and documents on file, I am satisfied that the determination by the Board of this application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted. Accordingly, I consider that it would be appropriate to use the provisions of Section 139 of the 2000 Act, as amended. I recommend that Condition 9 should be REMOVED.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the residential Z1 'Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' zoning for the site, the pattern of development in the area and the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, it is considered that, the proposed amendments to the roof and its dormer roof style extension to the rear would not seriously injure the residential and visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Adrian Ormsby
Planning Inspector

08th May 2021