



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-310006-21

---

<b>Development</b>	Alterations and extensions to house
<b>Location</b>	8 Merlyn Road, Dublin 4
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	3153/21
<b>Applicants</b>	Declan and Tara Merry.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party vs. condition
<b>Appellants</b>	Declan and Tara Merry
<b>Observer</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	29 <sup>th</sup> May 2021
<b>Inspector</b>	Stephen J. O'Sullivan

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is in a suburban part of Dublin c4km southeast of the city centre. The area is characterised by semi-detached houses from the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. The site has a stated area of 474m<sup>2</sup>. It consists of the curtilage of a two-storey semi-detached house with a stated floor area of 191m<sup>2</sup>.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to provide habitable accommodation at attic level. Dormer windows would be provided on the rear and side slopes of the roof. They would not exceed the existing ridge height of the roof. The development would provide an additional stated floor area of 20m<sup>2</sup>.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to grant permission subject to 6 conditions. Condition 2 revised the proposed development and reads as follows-

*The rear dormer extension shall be reduced in width to a maximum width of 4m.*

**Reason:** *In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

### 3.2. Planning Report

The rear dormer will be only slightly down from the ridge of the roof. The width at 5m is considered to be excessive and overly dominant on the roof. This can be reduced to 4m by way of a condition. A grant of permission was recommended.

### 3.3. Third Party Observations

None

## 4.0 Planning History

Reg. Ref. 3242/14 – the council granted permission for a single storey extension to the side of the house and a widening of the access.

Nearby sites –

PL29S. 247675, Reg. Ref. 3696/16 – the board granted permission 18<sup>th</sup> April 2017 for an extension to the house at No. 10 Merlyn Road immediately to the north-east of the current appeal site.

ABP-307706, Reg. Ref. 1139/20 – the board granted permission on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2020 for an extension to the house at No 12 Merlyn Park, to the east and rear of the current appeal site. The board's decision included a condition reducing the width of a rear dormer to 4m that reflected a condition on the council's decision that had been accepted by the applicant. The board granted another permission for an extension on this site on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2021 under ABP-308452-20, Reg. Ref. 1519/20.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

The Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 applies. The site is zoned under objective Z1 to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. Section 16.10.12 of the plan says that residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining property and the form of the existing building should be followed as closely as possible, and that development should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar finishes and windows. Appendix 17 provides further guidance on extensions to houses. Dormer windows should be visually subordinate to the roof slope, allowing a large proportion of the original roof to remain visible. Dormer windows should be set back from the eaves to minimise their visual impact and reduce the potential for overlooking of adjoining properties.

### 5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

None

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appeal is stated to be against condition 2 of the council's decision.

- The reduction from 5m to 4m in the width of the dormer would require the omission of the proposed shower room and toilet.
- The dormer complies with the requirement of appendix 17.11 to the development plan. It would be set back 1.35m from the eaves and would be subordinate to the roof over Nos 6 and 8. The shape of the window reflects those on the existing house and the proposed zinc finish is visually and functionally appropriate.
- The proposed rear dormer would not affect the streetscape. It would be 42m from the houses that it would face on Merlyn Park, so overlooking would not be an issue.

### 6.2. Planning Authority Response

None received

### 6.3. Observations

None

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1. The proposed development is relatively limited in scale. No third party submissions were made to the council on the application. It is recommended that the board treat the appeal as one against conditions only under section 139 of the planning act.

7.2. The proposed rear dormer would not affect the streetscape or the character of the area in general. It would be set back from the eaves of the house and would not exceed the height of the existing roof. It would not unduly overlook or overbear other residential properties. As such it would generally comply with the provisions of the development plan, including those set out in appendix 17. A reduction in its width

from 5m to 4m would not be required by the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. It is therefore recommended that condition 2 of the council's decision should be omitted.

## **8.0 Recommendation**

- 8.1. I recommend that the planning authority be directed to omit condition 2 of its decision and to renumber the conditions accordingly.

## **9.0 Reasons and Considerations**

The proposed dormer window on the rear slope of the roof over the house on the site would not injure the character of the area or amenities of property in the vicinity, and would generally comply with the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, including the zoning of the area under objective Z1 to protect, provide and improve residential amenity and the guidance on residential extensions set out at Appendix 17 to the plan. A reduction in the width of the proposed dormer window would not be required by the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, therefore.

---

Stephen J. O'Sullivan  
Planning Inspector

30<sup>th</sup> May 2021