



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-310236-21

Development	Construction of first floor extension to front, over single storey extension, which has previously been granted planning permission under Reg Ref: 3766/19.
Location	32 Shanvarna Road, Santry, Dublin 9.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council North
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2267/21
Applicant(s)	Eileen Gregory & Eamon Gray
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Eileen Gregory & Eamon Gray.
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	25 th of June 2021.
Inspector	Karen Hamilton

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	3
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	4
3.4. Third Party Observations	4
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy Context.....	5
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	6
5.3. EIA Screening	6
6.0 The Appeal	6
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	6
6.2. Applicant Response	7
6.3. Planning Authority Response	7
6.4. Observations	7
7.0 Assessment	7
8.0 Recommendation.....	9
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	10

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site consists of a two-storey end of terrace dwelling along Shanvarna Road, Santry, Dublin 9. The site is triangular and is set forward slightly from the adjoining terrace to the north. The surrounding area consists of similar type of dwellings. The property has been previously extended to the site and many of the dwellings in the vicinity have been altered externally. The site has vehicular parking off the street and front and rear gardens.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of a first-floor extension above a single storey extension to the front of the dwelling which was previously conditioned for removal (condition no. 2) as part of a previous grant of permission (Reg Ref. 3766/19).

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Decision to refuse for the following reason:

1. The proposed first floor extension would be an incongruous and visually obtrusive addition to the terrace of houses and the streetscape and would, in itself and by the precedent established for such structures, cause serious injury to the residential amenities of the area and would, therefore be contrary to both the policies and objectives of the current Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the area planner reflects the decision to refuse permission and notes the following:

- The development plan policy in relation to domestic extensions is set out in Section 16.10.12 and Appendix 17.
- The proposed structure is identical to the first-floor works conditioned for removal under Reg Ref 3766/19 apart for the alteration of the roof from a gable front to a hip.
- It is noted that the agent states the design is like No. 4A Shanvarna Road (Reg. Ref 0997/03) although this is an infill detached dwelling and not considered relevant.
- The creation of the first-floor extension on a flat fronted terrace of houses would be visually incongruous and out of place.
- There is no change in policy to alter the opinion of the planning authority since the previous decision.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division: No objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None submitted.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None submitted.

4.0 Planning History

Reg Ref 3766/19

Permission granted for alterations to the existing dwelling for the construction of a part single, part two storey extension to the front of the existing dwelling with a pitched & hipped roof profile, associated internal modifications and all ancillary works.

Condition No. 2 required the removal of the first-floor extension as stated below:

C. 2. The development hereby approved shall incorporate the following amendments:

a) The proposed first floor level extension and associated pitched roof to the front of the dwelling shall be omitted in its entirety.

Revised plans shall be submitted for the written approval of the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development and in the interests of visual amenity.

Reg. Ref 2544/98

Permission granted for a two-storey extension at the side of the dwelling.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022

The site is located on lands zoned as Z1 *“To protect, provide and improve residential amenities.”*

Extensions to dwellings.

Section 16.2.2.3: Alterations and extensions (general)

Extensions will be sympathetic to the existing building and adjoining occupiers, Alterations and extensions to roof will respect the scale, elevation proportion and architectural form of the building.

Section 16.10.12: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings

- Development does not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the area and will not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by occupants of adjacent buildings.

Appendix 17 of the Plan sets out design guidance with regard to residential extensions

17.3: Residential amenity: Extensions should not unacceptably affect the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

17.4 Privacy: Extensions should not result in any significant loss of privacy to the residents of adjoining properties.

17.6 Daylight and Sunlight: Care should be given to the extensions and the impact on the adjoining properties.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

None of relevance

5.3. **EIA Screening**

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The grounds of appeal are submitted from the applicant in relation to the PA reason for refusal and may be summarised as follows:

- The property has a large double fronted dwelling and the proposed first floor extension is very modest in size.
- The proposal is subordinate in scale and design to the existing dwelling.
- The proposed first floor extension will enhance the current streetscape and the design is sensitive to the existing buildings along Shanvarna Road.
- The original make up of Shanvarna Road consists of detached, semi-detached, terraced and maisonette dwellings.
- Photographs are submitted of other houses in the area which are not in line with the original streetscape.
- The granting of permission will not set a precedent as the current dwelling is unique in that it is double fronted and at the start of the streetscape.

- The use of materials is intended to be sympathetic to the original dwelling and streetscape.

6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant is the appellant.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

None received.

6.4. Observations

None received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. The main issues of the appeal can be dealt with under the following headings:

- Planning History
- Design of the Proposed Development and Impact on Visual Amenity
- Appropriate Assessment

Planning History

7.2. The site has a current planning permission (Reg Ref 3766/19) for the construction of a part single, part two storey extension to the front of the existing dwelling with a pitched & hipped roof profile, associated internal modifications and all ancillary works. This grant of permission is subject to the removal of the first-floor element of the extension along the front of the dwelling and Condition No. 2 states that:

“The development hereby approved shall incorporate the following amendments:

a) The proposed first floor level extension and associated pitched roof to the front of the dwelling shall be omitted in its entirety.

Revised plans shall be submitted for the written approval of the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.”

7.3. The design of the proposal as submitted is essentially the same as the previous first floor extension and therefore the proposal requires the removal of Condition No. 2 of the current permission. The applicant did not appeal the decision of the PA in the first instance; therefore, I consider the principle of development acceptable subject to the planning assessment below.

Design of the Proposed Development and Impact on the Visual Amenity.

- 7.4. The single storey element to the overall proposal includes a ground floor extension along most of the ground floor on the dwelling and an additional first floor element which extends above the entrance of the dwelling and includes a vertical window extending from the ground floor level to the first floor with a pitched roof . The eaves of the first-floor element will meet the eaves of the current dwelling and the external materials will match the existing dwelling.
- 7.5. The report of the area planner notes the previous decision and the impact of the first-floor design element. The planner's report notes that no policy changes have occurred since the previous decision and it was considered the proposal would be visually incongruous and out of place and the proposal remained unacceptable.
- 7.6. The grounds of appeal submit that there is no defined character in the area as there are a range of house types and external finishes. A sample of 5 different house types have been submitted as evidence to support this statement. The grounds of appeal further submit that the overall design of the first floor element is in keeping with the dwelling having regard to its location at the end of the terrace and the proposal would not be out of character to the surrounding area.
- 7.7. That policy guidance in the development plan which relates to alterations and extensions to dwellings is contained within Section 16.2.2.3 and Section 16.10.12 of the development plan. The guidance requires any proposals for alterations to respect the scale, elevation proportion and architectural form of the building. In addition, the development must not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the area or adversely affect the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings.
- 7.8. The proposal as granted is for a ground floor front extension similar in style to the adjoining dwelling to the north and other dwellings in the vicinity. I note the variety of materials and external finishes of those dwellings in the vicinity of the site although

upon site inspection there was no evidence of any dwellings with first floor front extensions. Many front external alterations in the vicinity include ground floor extensions which I consider are in keeping with the character of those dwellings and the surrounding area. I note the grounds of appeal have submitted one example of a similar style of proposal with a first-floor design element although this related to a semi-detached dwelling not located within the vicinity of the site. Other examples of house types submitted with the grounds of appeal relate to infill developments and I do not consider these are relevant to this proposal.

- 7.9. The additional first floor element, whilst minor in nature, extends the full height of the dwelling and would in my opinion alter the appearance of the dwelling to an extent that it would be out of character within the dwelling immediately to the north. This type of first floor extension is not usual and would, in my opinion, negatively alter the symmetrical nature of the façade. The Board will note the policy guidance in the development plan which relates to extensions and the requirement to respect the scale, elevation proportion and architectural form of the building. Therefore, it is considered the first-floor extension would not be in keeping with the scale, elevation proportion and architectural form of the building and would be contrary to the policies and objectives of the development plan. In this regard, I consider the proposed development would be incongruous to the dwelling, would be out of character to the surrounding area and would have a significant negative impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

Appropriate Assessment

- 7.10. Having regard to the distance of the site from European Sites, to the small scale of the proposed development and to the absence of any direct pathway from the site to the designated sites I consider that the proposed development individually, or in combination with any other plans or projects, would not be likely to have any significant effect on any European Site.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that planning permission should be **refused** for the reason and consideration set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed first floor extension would be an incongruous and visually obtrusive addition to the terrace of houses and the streetscape and would, in itself and by the precedent established for such structures, cause serious injury to the residential and visual amenities of the area and would, therefore be contrary to both the policies and objectives of the current Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Karen Hamilton
Senior Planning Inspector

28th of June 2021