



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP – 310388 – 21.

Development	Construct ground floor extension to front and associated site works.
Location	48 St Pappin Road, Glasnevin, Dublin 11.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	1289/21.
Applicant	Carolann Conway and Joseph Weafer.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission.
Type of Appeal	First Party v Condition
Appellant	Carolann Conway and Joseph Weafer.
Observer	None.
Date of Site Inspection	16 July 2021.
Inspector	Mairead Kenny.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in the north suburban area of Glasnevin in Dublin city in a residential estate west of the Ballymun Road and north of Griffith Avenue. St Pappins Road runs in an east- west direction in the heart of this 20th-century residential area. The subject site number 48 St Pappins Road is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses at a corner close to the junction with Dean Swift Road.
- 1.2. Photographs which were taken by me at the time of my inspection are attached.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for:
 - a ground floor front extension of stated area of 22.05 m²
 - ancillary works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to grant subject to conditions.

Condition 2 requires the following amendment:

- The depth of the front extension shall be a maximum of 3 m as measured externally. It shall be set in from the west corner of the house by a minimum of 500 mm and have a maximum width of 6m.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The comments in the planner's report include:

- It is preferable for extensions to be located to the rear or side in accordance with development plan guidance.
- In this instance having regard to the wedge-shaped site creating an ample front garden space and a more limited rear garden space and an irregular space to the site, an extension to the front can be considered. The orientation of the house is also a factor which creates better conditions for front extension.
- The scale and size of the proposed extension is not subordinate to the existing building in scale and design. The combined impact of the location, width and depth in the way it wraps around the corner with no setback, would result in adverse impact on the scale and character of the dwelling, would dominate the building and not comply with the development plan guidance.
- The proposal would also likely affect the daylight to the front window further impacting the character of the property.
- The precedents referenced by the applicant are described in the planning history section of this report. None of those developments have a depth, width or scale which is comparable. The front extension of 3.9 m depth would break the building line by 2.6 m and risk a visually obtrusive appearance.
- There are large front porches in the area including at 54 and 58 Saint Pappin Rd which have a depth of 1.8 m.
- Would not have undue impacts on neighbouring properties by way of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing.
- A reduction in depth to 3 m and a set in from the side wall would create an extension in line with development plan standards. If a larger room is required a rear extension might be more appropriate.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division report indicates no objections subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No reports.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None received.

4.0 **Planning History**

There is no relevant planning history relating to this site.

At 22 St Pappin Green under Reg ref 3751/18 permission was granted for modifications and extensions to include a single-storey extension to the front, which is described in the planner's report as being approximately 5.3 m in width by 3 m in depth with a hipped roof and a maximum height of approximately 3.7 m.

At 85 Dean Swift Rd under Reg ref 1438/20 permission was granted for a single-storey extension to the front of an existing dwelling house which is described in the planner's report as being 3 m deep.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Development Plan**

Under the provisions of the **Dublin City Development Plan** policy the site is in an area zoned Z1 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities'.

The policy relating to extensions to residential development include section 16.2.2.3 which requires that extensions be integrated with the surrounding area, be sensitively designed and respect the character of the existing building. Other criteria are set out.

Section 16. 10.12 requires that the amenities of adjoining properties be protected.

Appendix 17 sets out detailed provisions in relation to the approach to design and consideration of the impact on the amenities of the area.

There are no conservation objectives related to the site or the immediate surroundings.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appeal is against condition 2.

The main points of the appeal are:

- We report our communications with the planning authority subsequent to the decision.
- Although modern in design the extension is sympathetic and complements the existing building and at 22.5 m² represents 22.8% of the existing floor area.
- The depth of the extension is incorrectly reported in the planner's report and is 3.8 m and it does not breach the building line. There are numerous examples in the area, which are described and which are depicted in attached photographs.
- Other enclosures referenced refer to the small size of the rear garden and the requirements to provide to work from home study spaces. The amended design imposed by the condition of the planning authority would not allow for this requirement and once we retire would not have any function.
- Enclosed site layout drawing shows the 1.8 m breach in building line which would result from the proposed development.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority has not offered a substantive response.

6.3. Observations

None.

7.0 Assessment

I consider that the substantive issues in this case relate visual amenities and compliance with the development plan policies. The appeal is solely against

condition 2. In my assessment below I consider whether *de novo* consideration in this case is warranted and separately I deal with the grounds of appeal.

7.1. ***De novo* consideration**

It is open to the Board to consider the case *de novo* and to reverse the decision to grant permission. I provide some comments below on this matter.

The original dwellinghouses and the layout of the area create an attractive residential district but the actual architectural merits of the individual dwellinghouses is limited. As such, the subject area is not governed by any conservation objectives. The development plan policy objectives relating to extensions includes that they respect the existing uniformity of the street together with significant patterns, be confined to the rear in most cases and be clearly subordinate to the existing building in scale and design. In principle there is no objection in the development plan on the basis of conservation objectives or with respect to a front extension which would warrant a refusal of permission.

No objections have been received from third parties and many of the dwellinghouses are significantly modified including by way of front extensions.

Taking into account all of these factors, I consider that *de novo* consideration is not warranted in this case and I restrict my assessment to the condition subject of the appeal.

7.2. **Grounds of appeal**

While the appellant has raised particular issues relating to the requirements for two study spaces and other matters, I consider that the development plan policy emphasis is on streetscape and design considerations. I address the grounds of appeal in this context.

There is a requirement for sensitive design and detail to respect the character of the existing building and not to unduly dominate that building in the context of the streetscape. The appellant has raised issues with regard to matters in the planner's report and states that there are inaccuracies in the manner in which the breach of

building line was measured. The application drawings submitted with the application do not provide a dimension in this respect are my own estimation is that it is 1.9 m.

The drawings show a discrepancy between the proposed site plan, which shows an external dimension of the extension depth as 3.5 m and drawing DAB – 1001 – 02 which shows that the internal measurement between the original front façade and the interior of the wall of the new living room is 3500 mm.

At the time of inspection, I placed my measuring tape on the ground to layout the position of the front extension and in doing so I took into account the 3.5 m external measurement, which would favour the applicant's case. The estimate of the position of the front extension on the ground is necessarily a rough exercise but nevertheless a useful aid. .

Regarding the design of the extension and whether it would dominate the ground floor of the dwelling house I consider that by reason of its height of 3250 and flat roof it would read clearly as a contemporary intervention. The success of integrating the structure would require careful selection of materials and these are not specified in the application drawings. Detailed agreement with the planning authority would be appropriate.

I consider that the scale of the ground floor front extension comprising a room of 22.5 m² with a width of 6.8 m is significant. The projection to the side further emphasises the structure to the front and makes it more dominant in the context of the original dwellinghouse. The condition of the planning authority requires that the extension be set in from the west corner of the house by a minimum of 500 mm and have a maximum width of 6m. I consider that this is generous in the context of the development plan policy. Furthermore, I share the opinion of the planning authority that a maximum 3 m depth projection from the front wall of the original house would be appropriate.

In granting permission for the subject development the planning authority has taken into account other front extension developments in the area and in my opinion has not been unduly restrictive in the approach to the application. A grant of permission for an extension to the front is in itself a significant decision on the part of the planning authority. None of the permitted extensions in the area appear to be of similar floor area, design and height proposed in this application. In addition, the site

is very exposed and the development would be highly visible in the streetscape. I therefore consider that the proposed development would be overly dominant and would not be in keeping with the development plan policies for the area. The decision of the planning authority sufficiently reduces the scale of the extension and mitigates the resulting impact on visual amenities of the area.

In conclusion, I consider that the decision of the planning authority constitutes an appropriate balance between the applicant's requirements and the visual amenities of the area and that it reasonably interprets the adopted development plan policy. I do not recommend any alteration to the wording of condition 2.

7.3. Appropriate Assessment

Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, which comprises modifications to a suburban dwellinghouse on serviced lands I am satisfied that 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

I recommend a draft order as follows:

ORDER

Having regard to the nature of the condition the subject of the appeal, the Board is satisfied that the determination by the Board of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and, based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to ATTACH condition number 2 and the reason therefor.

REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that the proposed development subject to the amendments set out in condition 2 would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Mairead Kenny
Senior Planning Inspector

18 July 2021