



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-310248-21

Development

Retention permission for removal of rear single storey conservatory. Construction of a 2-storey extension to rear, new attic dormer extension to rear & new front porch extension, new window openings to side elevation and all associated site works to provide for a 4 bedroom 2-storey dwelling.

Location

No. 50 Carlton Court, Swords, Co Dublin.

Planning Authority

Fingal County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

F21B/0057

Applicant(s)

Jeni & Constanin Salop.

Type of Application

Retention Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Split Decision.

Type of Appeal

First Party.

Appellants

Jeni & Constanin Salop.

Observer(s)

None.

Date of Site Inspection

15th day of July, 2021.

Inspector

Patricia-Marie Young.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Relevant Planning History	6
5.0 Policy & Context	6
5.1. Local Planning Provisions	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	7
6.0 The Appeal	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
6.3. Planning Authority Response	7
6.4. Observations	8
7.0 Assessment	8
8.0 Recommendation.....	16
Reasons and Considerations	Error! Bookmark not defined.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. No. 50 Carlton Court, the appeal site has a stated site area of 0.02159ha. It contains a much modified and extended semi-detached dwelling that forms part of a larger residential development scheme of 2-storey semi-detached dwellings. The site itself is located on the southern side of Carlton Court, c145m to the east of its junction with the Dublin Road and c700m to the south of Main Street, the historic heart of the Dublin city suburb of Swords, in County Dublin.
- 1.2. The side and rear boundaries of this appeal site adjoin No. 48 Carlton Court to the west, No.s 44 and No. 130 Carlton Court to the south, and No. 52 Carlton Court to the east. These properties all form part of semi-detached pairs with No.s 44 Carlton Court plot orientated in a west to east direction whereas the other aforementioned adjoining properties, including the subject property are orientated in a north to south direction.
- 1.3. Directly opposite the site is a mature pocket of communal open space.
- 1.4. The immediate surrounding setting has an established residential in its character.
- 1.5. Photographs taken during my inspection of the site and its setting are attached.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Retention permission is sought for removal of rear single storey conservatory and the construction of a 2-storey extension to rear, new attic dormer extension to rear & new front porch extension, new window openings to side elevation and all associated site works to provide for a 4 bedroom 2-storey dwelling.
- 2.2. According to the documentation on file the existing dwelling had a stated 118.3m² gross floor space; the demolished rear single storey conservatory had a stated 18.8m² gross floor space; and the works to be retained have a stated 39.05m².

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. In a **split decision** the Planning Authority **granted** permission for the retention of the front porch and the part single, part two-storey rear extension with windows on the

side elevation of the dwelling subject to 8 no mainly standard conditions. Of relevance to this particular appeal case is Condition No. 3 which essentially requires the removal of the dormer extension, the reinstatement of the roof structure and associated works within a specified time frame.

In addition, retention permission was **refused** for the dormer extension on the rear roof slope for the following stated reasons:

“1. The dormer window on the rear roof slope is overly dominant, out of character and seriously injures the visual amenity of the area and adjoining property by reason of its scale and excessive width. The scale of the dormer is excessive and overbearing. The rear dormer for retention is, therefore, contrary to the DMS41 and the zoning objective of the area to protect and improve residential amenity and is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The scale of the dormer window on the rear roof slope sets an undesirable precedent for other similar developments, which would in themselves and cumulatively seriously injure the visual and residential amenities of the area and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planning Officer’s report dated the 16th day of April, 2021, is the basis of the Planning Authority’s decision in this case. It sets out a number of concerns in relation to the dormer component of the development sought. It refers to Objective DMS41 of the Development Plan. It considers that the dormer extension in terms of its overall built form to be excessive, overly dominant and if permitted it would set an undesirable precedent.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. The Planning Authority received a submission from a 3rd party raising the following concerns:

- Adverse impact of the development on their residential amenity. With particular concern raised that the development diminishes the levels of privacy and light.
- The height of the dormer is at odds with a setting characterised by 2-storey built forms.
- If permitted, it would establish an undesirable precedent for other similar developments which would in turn result in cumulative adverse diminishment of residential amenity for properties in this area.
- Structural soundness of this development's construction is questioned.
- A number of civil matters are raised.

4.0 Relevant Planning History

4.1. None.

5.0 Policy & Context

5.1. Local Planning Provisions

5.1.1. The policies and provisions of the Fingal Development Plan, 2017-2023, apply. The site lies within an area zoned 'RS' which has an aim to: *"provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity"*.

5.1.2. Chapter 12 of the Development Plan states that: *"dormer extensions to roofs will be considered with regard to impacts on existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. The design, dimensions, and bulk of any roof proposal relative to the overall size of the dwelling and gardens will be the overriding considerations. Dormer extensions (whether for functional roof space or light access) shall generally not form a dominant part of a roof. Consideration may be given to dormer extensions proposed up to the ridge level of a house, but in all cases no dormer extension shall be higher than the existing ridge height of the house. The proposed quality of*

materials/finishes for dormers will be considered carefully as this can greatly improve their appearance. The level and type of glazing within a dormer structure should have regard to existing window treatments and fenestration of the dwelling.”

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The site does not form part of or is it in the immediate vicinity of any European site with the nearest such sites, which are Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004025) and Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code: 000205) located c1.8km to the north west at their nearest lateral separation distance.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.2. The First Party’s grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- This appeal relates to the requirements of Condition No. 3.
- The Board is requested to consider the modification of the dormer extension as provided in this appeal submission. Two options are put forward.
- The refusal of the dormer was unnecessary, and the Planning Authority could have requested its scale and bulk to be reduced.
- A reduction in window size would negate having to remove the dormer extension that is now *in situ*.
- The reinstatement of the roof structure as requested is an extremely onerous undertaking and would require significant structural modifications. It is contended that the appellants cannot afford this undertaking.
- This proposal is consistent with an established precedent for this type of development.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- 6.3.1. The Planning Authority’s response can be summarised as follows:

- Should the Board be minded to grant permission it is requested that a maximum width of 3.5m be set down from the ridge line and set up from the eaves line as well as that one window would suffice and as the internal attic room is only 2m in its height it should therefore only be used for storage purposes.
- Any grant of permission should include a Section 48 contribution condition.

6.4. Observations

6.4.1. None.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. Firstly, I note that the description of the development sought under this application together with the accompanying documentation in my view do not set out the actual development sought under this application. In particular in terms of the quantum of development for which retention is proposed. This was clear during my inspection of the site where I observed that all components of the development both proposed and for retention are fully completed. I therefore do not consider that the public notices or indeed the documentation submitted with this application which sets out the development accurately reflect the development sought. It is in my opinion problematic procedurally to accept the description provided on the public notices which imply that retrospective permission is sought for the removal of the rear single storey extension and planning permission for the construction of rear ground floor, first floor and attic alterations and additions alongside a front porch extension in order to provide a 4-bedroom dwelling with an increase in floor area from 118.3m² to 157.35m².
- 7.2. On this matter I note that the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2007, make it clear that, in dealing with applications for retention, they must be considered “*as with any other application*”. This is in accordance with planning law and with proper planning practice, in that all applications for retention should be assessed on the same basis as would apply if the development in question were proposed. Therefore, no account can, or should, be taken of the fact that the development has already taken place.

- 7.3. Further, the current Development Plan indicates where a development is neither listed as being '*permitted in principle*' or '*not permitted*' it should be assessed in terms of its contribution towards the achievement of the applicable zoning objective, the vision for the zoning objective and its compliance as well as consistency with the policies and objectives it contains. The only benefit *per se* is that one can actually observe on the ground the visual and residential impact of the development in this case on its setting.
- 7.4. Based on this concern the Board may consider it prudent to request new public notices prior to any determination by them of this case.
- 7.5. In addition to the accuracy of the public notices and that the documentation provided also does not accurately set out what is proposed and what is for retrospection permission I have further accuracy concerns in relation to the suite of drawings accompanying this application. Which I note also follows through into drawings with two options submitted by the appellant as part of this appeal seeking to overcome the Planning Authority's concerns in relation to the attic dormer extension which was omitted from the grant of permission.
- 7.6. Having inspected the site and its setting I raise particular concerns that the roof structure and overall built structure of the host dwelling and the semi-detached pair it forms part of appear to have been misrepresented in order to indicate that it had a greater volume through to not as low of a pitch. This is most apparent in relation to how the two-storey projection shared with its matching semi-detached pair is depicted with the drawings showing that this element sits much lower than the actual ridge height of this semi-detached pair itself.
- 7.7. I therefore raise a significant concern that the suite of drawings provided with this application and with this appeal submission can not be fully relied upon in the determination of the merits of the development sought.
- 7.8. I consider that my assessment of this appeal case can be limited to the issues that arise in relation to the dormer component of the development sought, in particular the requirements of Condition No. 3 of the Planning Authority's decision notification. With this condition seeking the removal of the dormer extension and all modifications made to the roof structure in its entirety. Alongside requiring that the roof be reinstated. Having read the reasons given by the Planning Authority for this decision I consider

that they are substantially founded on residential amenity impact, visual amenity impact through to compliance with local planning provisions concerns.

7.9. Outside of these particular matters which in totality relate to the dormer extension component of the development sought under this application I am of the view that the remainder of the development is consistent with the type of development that is permissible on land zoned 'RS' under the applicable Development Plan, subject to standard residential, visual and other standard safeguards set out in the Planning Authority's decision notification to grant the remainder of the development sought. I also consider given the juxtaposition of the components permitted to properties outside of the applicant's legal interest the advisory notes also included by the Planning Authority as part of their decision notification are also reasonable as well as appropriate. Further the advisory note in relation to Building Regulations highlights that there is a direct onus on the applicants to be compliant with this separate code.

7.10. **Attic Dormer Extension**

7.10.1. By way of this application a number of alterations and additions are sought to the rear and principal façade of the subject dwelling, No. 50 Carlton Court. The subject dwelling forms part of a semi-detached pair that forms part of a group of originally matching and highly coherent in their built form, appearance, palette of material through to building to space relationship semi-detached pair that formed part of a group of matching semi-detached pairs within a residential scheme that included some variation in order to break up the homogeneity of the semi-detached pairs particularly by way of certain changes to the principal façade treatment.

7.10.2. The semi-detached pair that the subject dwelling forms part of semi-detached pair with includes No. 52 Carlton Court which adjoins and attaches to it on its eastern side.

7.10.3. To the immediate west of it is another originally matching semi-detached pair that shares the principal façade detailing, treatments and built form to that of the subject semi-detached pair. This adjoining semi-detached pair marks the eastern side of one Carlton Courts estate access roads with an originally matching semi-detached pair on the opposite side of the aforementioned access road. This in close proximity access road to the site is of note not only due to its proximity to the appeal site but due to its north south direction and alignment. It can be described as a modest in length cul-de-sac group of semi-detached dwellings that carry through this residential scheme's

similarity of 2-storey semi-detached pairs as well as their building to space relationship but with this being applied to rectangular plots that in contrast to the subject site and its streetscape setting have an east to west orientation.

- 7.10.4. As a result of this layout and together with the side and rear boundaries that appear to be c2m in height as well as the lack of any substantial above ground floor additions to the west of the subject property, its rear elevation particularly above ground floor level is highly visible within this context. Including it is highly visible when viewed from the public domain of the aforementioned cul-de-sac.
- 7.10.5. In terms of public domain impact, it's in this context that the modifications made to the original rear structure above first floor level are most evident. With its overall width, height, depth, palette of materials through to the extensive level of mainly transparent glazing this dormer extension being a highly dominant new insertion that is in complete contrast with the roof structures of adjoining and neighbouring properties as well as this highly unified in built form 2-storey residential setting. When viewed from the nearby cul-de-sac the dormer extension to the subject dwelling is clearly a dominant new insertion that is legible due to its overall built form dimensions as a distinct 3rd floor level. This is at odds and out of character not only with the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair it forms part of but the overall pattern of development in this suburban context where there are no similar additions at roof level with the roof structures through to roof skyline being highly consistent in their built forms and appearance to one another. Thus, being one of the characteristic features of this residential areas design.
- 7.10.6. According to the submitted plans the dormer extension sits below the stated ridge height (Note: 8.326m) of the subject dwelling, it extends in a southerly direction c4.3m, has a width that measures c5.3m and a palette of materials that is inconsistent with the colour, materials and textures of the roof structure but being consistent with the external rear alterations of the extended ground and first floor below. In addition to this the drawings suggest a window of c1.2m by 2.9m on the southern elevation of the dormer structure. This is significantly larger in dimensions for the original transparent glazed window openings that characterised the original rear elevation but similarly is significantly larger than the window openings of the first-floor level rear extension in situ.

- 7.10.7. Of concern none of the windows present in the rear elevation of are consistent with what is in situ in terms of window dimensions, window fenestration through to number of windows present with the dormer extension including an additional window to that illustrated. In addition, the height of the dormer structure whilst placed below the ridge height is represented as having a slightly larger gap between it and the maximum height of the dormer structure through to the overall roof structures built form as presented in the drawings appear to vary with what actually exists.
- 7.10.8. These issues in my view are carried through in the two options proposed by the appellant to overcome the Planning Authority's reasons for refusing the dormer extension as part of the appeal submission and of further concern the drawings submitted with the appeal still do not overcome the inaccuracies between what is essentially sought and what has been actually constructed to the rear. Alongside the conflicting information in relation to the use of the attic as an attic room with WC and the schedule of floor areas which set out use for the attic as being for use as dwelling floor area is still present.
- 7.10.9. In relation to the options proposed by way of the appeal submission these include reducing the width of the dormer extension by 1200 away from the centre line with its adjoining semi-detached pair and the provision of two window openings.
- 7.10.10. I consider that the drawings do not make it clear what glazing is proposed for these two window openings and from my site inspection it would appear that the smallest window that serves a WC is fitted with opaque glass whereas the other window that is present which is much larger than that indicated in the options provided I observed is transparent. The larger window in the option provided has a measured width of c2.m and height of c1.3m. Its fenestration detailing is consistent with the windows on the rear of first floor extension.
- 7.10.11. I also consider that the dimensions of the amended window opening are still out of character with that present to the amended rear elevation and the windows that characterise the rear elevation of the semi-detached pairs in this residential scheme.
- 7.10.12. As such I consider the suggested amendments do not significantly overcome the diminishment of privacy and the perception of overlooking that would arise.
- 7.10.13. In addition, I note that the modified width of the revised option measures c4.6m and the overall width of the ridge of this dwelling house measures c6.2m. This is a

significantly dominant feature within the roof structure of the host dwelling and the semi-detached pair it forms part of. In this context the dormer extension could not be considered as subordinate or a built insertion that is not a dominant part of a roof structure.

- 7.10.14. Objective DMS41 of the Development Plan objective indicates that the Planning Authority in relation to dormer extensions to roofs will only considered them to be acceptable *“where there is no negative impact on the existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. Dormer extensions shall not form a dominant part of a roof. Consideration may be given to dormer extensions proposed up to the ridge level of a house and shall not be higher than the existing ridge height of the house.”*
- 7.10.15. The visual dominance and overtness of the dormer roof structure is also highly legible from the semi-private and private domain of adjoining and neighbouring residential properties to the west, east and south of the site.
- 7.10.16. If permitted in the form set out in this application or as amended in the options put forward with this appeal it would give rise to a level of overlooking and visual overbearance that is out of character with its setting that in my view would be beyond that which exists in this suburban context. I consider it would be such that it would give rise to additional overlooking and the perception of being overlooked over and above that which forms an inherent part of this formally designed and laid out residential scheme.
- 7.10.17. Due to the orientation of the host dwelling and its building to space relationship with adjoining as well as neighbouring properties I do not consider the dormer extension would give rise to significant overshadowing and diminishment of daylighting, particularly to adjoining properties.
- 7.10.18. Overall, due to the material diminishment of privacy that would arise to properties in the vicinity of the development alongside the dormers visual overtness as well as dominance within roof skyline to permit this component of the development sought under this application would be contrary to the ‘RS’ zoning objective of the site and its setting. This land use objective seeks to provide a measure of protection to residential amenities whilst balancing residential improvements that may be sought within this parcel of zoned land.

- 7.10.19. In relation to the residential amenities for occupants of the subject property if it is the case that the dormer extension is to purely function as additional storage then the necessity for the dormers overall built form, design, the level of glazing for light and ventilation through to the need of a WC within this space appears to be at odds with its purported function. If it is for storage this provides greater latitude for mitigation design improvements to ensure that the residential amenity impacts for properties in the vicinity are negated.
- 7.10.20. It is also questionable why such level of additional storage is required given the sizeable single storey structure present in the rear garden area which has significantly diminished the remaining private open space amenities.
- 7.10.21. In this instance case I concur with the Planning Authority that to permit the dormer extension would be contrary to Development Plan objective DMS41 and the options put forward by way of the appellants appeals submission do not substantively overcome this concern, particularly in terms of residential and visual amenity impact.
- 7.10.22. I also concur with the Planning Authority in that to permit a dormer of the scale proposed, even setting aside all the discrepancies that appears to be presented in the submitted plans and documentation, would in itself and cumulative set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments that would adversely and materially diminish the visual amenities and residential amenities of this established residential suburban setting. A setting whose built characteristics is informed by its 2-storey character through to the level of visual and built consistency in its residential built forms. With this dormer being highly visible in the public realm.
- 7.10.23. Whilst I acknowledge that the provision of additional floor area would provide improved facilities for occupants of the subject property and would not give rise to any serious injury for them or future occupants this does not override in my view the visual and residential amenity concerns that arises from the dormer extensions design. As well as its lack of consistency with local planning guidance relevant to such types of developments. In particular Development Plan Objective DMS41.
- 7.10.24. Based on the considerations above I therefore concur with the Planning Authority's decision to omit the dormer structure in the interests of safeguarding and protecting residential as well as visual amenities of the area.

7.11. Other Matters Arising

7.11.1. **Compliance with Building Regulations:** Setting aside what appears to be inconsistencies in the drawings presented in relation to the development sought and the actual host dwelling itself, I note that the submitted drawings suggest a floor to ceiling building height of 2m in the attic dormer extension. Accordingly, it does not have the height to qualify as a 'habitable room' under current Building Regulations. The Planning Authority in their response to the grounds of appeal request the Board to attach a condition limiting the use of the attic dormer to storage only in the event of a grant of permission.

I note that the Development Management Guidelines makes the point that conditions attached to a planning permission should not require matters that are covered by a separate code which imposes responsibilities on applicants for permission. In the present case the applicant has responsibility to meet the building regulations in relation to habitable room standards in relation to the development in its entirety.

7.11.2. **Revised Drawings:** Given the discrepancies present in the submitted drawings and what has been constructed on site it would be advisable that any grant of permission include a condition to require an accurate suite of drawings that also sets out matters for which conditions set out certain requirements upon the applicant to have carried out as part of the overall compliance. The Board may consider this a new issue.

7.11.3. **Section 48:** Having regard to the applicable development contribution scheme should the Board be minded to grant permission for the development sought in its entirety a Section 48 contribution condition should be imposed.

7.11.4. **Unauthorised Development:** I concur with the Planning Authority's Planning Officer findings that it is evident that there are other works that have been recently carried out on this appeal site that fall outside of the development sought as well as fall outside of the scope of what is exempted development. I consider that enforcement matters fall outside of the scope of the Boards remit in their consideration of this particular case and are a matter for the applicants to rectify and/or the Planning Authority to deal with under the enforcement powers as they see fit.

7.11.5. **Environmental Impact Assessment:** Having regard to the nature, size and location 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.

- 7.11.6. **Appropriate Assessment:** Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development within a serviced urban area and separation distance to 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.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend a **split decision** whereby permission is granted for the retention of the removal of a rear single storey conservatory, construction of a two storey extension to the rear and an extension to the front porch for the reasons and considerations set out under Schedule 1 below alongside the conditions set out thereunder; and permission is refused for the retention of the dormer attic extension to the rear and its associated modifications to the roof structure for the reasons and considerations set out under Schedule 2 below.

Schedule 1

Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development is in an area zoned 'RS' under the Fingal Development Plan, 2017 to 2023, which has a stated zoning objective to: "*provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity*" and with a vision of ensuring that any new development enhance existing residential amenity. Having regard to the pattern of development in the area, the nature, scale and overall built form of the alterations to the ground and first floor rear elevation alongside that of the modified and extended single storey front porch, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, that the retention of this development will not seriously injure the visual or residential amenity of the area, will accord with the zoning objective for the area and will, otherwise, accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. (a) The landing and bathroom windows on the side elevation shall be permanently fitted with obscure glazing, within 6 months of the grant of retention permission.

(b) External finished shall harmonise in colour and texture with the existing dwelling on site.

Reason: In the interest of privacy and visual amenity.

3. The dormer feature shall be removed, and the roof slope shall be reinstated and tiled within 6 months of the grant of permission for retention. Revised drawings setting out the details in writing with the Planning Authority shall be submitted to the Planning Authority clearly setting out the removal of the dormer feature and accurately setting out the scale of works including their external expressions accurately within this timeframe.

Reason: To ensure clarity and to ensure that the development as retained complies with the requirements of the permission as granted.

4. The extension shall be provided with noise insulation to an appropriate standard, having regard to the location of the site within Dublin Airport Noise Zone D.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and sustainable development and residential amenity.

5. The entire premises shall be used as a single dwelling unit apart from such use as may be exempted development for the purposes of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended.

Reason: In the interests of clarity and to ensure proper planning and sustainable development.

6. Water supply and drainage requirements, including surface water collection and disposal, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure a proper standard of development.

7. (a) All necessary measures shall be taken by the contractor to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble, or other debris on adjoining roads during the course of the works. In the event of any such spillage or deposit, immediate steps shall be taken to remove the material from the road surface at the applicant/developers own expense.

(b) The applicant/developer shall be responsible for the full cost of repair in respect of any damage caused to the adjoining public road arising from the construction work and shall either make good any damage to the satisfaction of Fingal County Council or pay the Council the cost of making good any such damage upon issue of such requirement by the Council/.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.

8. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

Schedule 2

Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the 'RS' zoning provisions of the Fingal County Development Plan, 2017 to 2023, which seeks to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity with a vision to also ensure that any new developments in existing areas have minimal impact on existing residential amenity, it is considered that by reason of the overall design, its scale, width, depth, height and level of glazing of the dormer extension, would seriously injure the residential and visual amenities of the area alongside would contravene Objective DMS41 of the Fingal Development Plan with regard to the design of dormer extensions. It is also considered that the dormer if permitted in the manner proposed would establish an undesirable precedent which would diminish the character and intrinsic attributes of its 2-storey highly coherent suburban setting. The development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Patricia-Marie Young
Planning Inspector

19th day of July, 2021.