



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-311098-21

Development	Two Dormer extensions – 26sqm each side of an existing dwelling to provide additional bedroom accommodation, new windows and ancillary works.
Location	56 Avondale Road, Killiney, Co.Dublin
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D21B/0260
Applicant(s)	Barry and Adele Murphy
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Barry and Adele Murphy
Observer(s)	No
Date of Site Inspection	22 nd November 2021
Inspector	Suzanne Kehely

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The appeal site relates to a mature detached dormer dwelling on the northern side of Avondale Road and almost directly facing a junction with Cluny Manor housing development. It is one of an extensive row of the same dwellings which are characterised by a gable front in a simple unadorned modern style. The houses are typically 8.8-9.5m from the road and the roofs with their low eaves and expansive slopes are quite distinctive and prominent as viewed along Avondale Road. Most houses either incorporate rooflights or modestly scale dormer windows. A few in the vicinity have larger dormers but they are recessed and generally not visually apparent in approaching street views. I note one house with a wide dormer to the side but its recess from the facade permits only glimpsed views.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1.1. The proposed development comprises the following:

- Construction of two dormer extensions – One each side of the roof - providing an extension of 52sq.m. at first floor level. This is to provide additional bedroom space. It is proposed to project 4785mm from a point just below the ridge and extend 11356mm on each side. The dormer on the eastern side incorporates 3 rooflights. Zinc cladding is proposed. (The depth of existing roof is 11.8m wide
- The window first floor gable window in the façade is proposed to be replaced with a wider tripartite window.
- Other works relate to new ground flood windows.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The Planning Authority decided to refuse permission for the stated reason:

- The proposed development by reason of the substantial scale, massing and bulk of the proposed dormer extension and in the context of the existing dwelling on site would be visually dominant and unappealing when viewed from Avondale Road and would therefore be injurious to the visual amenities of the area and would depreciate the value of property in the vicinity. The proposed development

would not be in compliance with the provision of section 8.2.3.4(i) Extensions to Dwellings in the Dun-Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022 and would if permitted be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

- The report refers to section 8.2.3.4 of the Development plan
- Given the scale and massing and visual dominance of the proposed dormer extension on each side the visual impact is an issue.
- Having regard to the existing dormer overlooking is not an issue.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division - Engineering Department - no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- No reports

4.0 Planning History

No.60 Avondale PA ref. D16A/0826 refers to permission for a c. 50sq.m. extension to the rear and side and ancillary works.

5.0 Policy & Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. The objective for the site is 'To protect and/or improve residential amenities.' (Zone A)

5.1.2. Chapter 8 sets out housing standards. Section 8.2.3.4 (i) refers to extensions.

(i) Extensions to Dwellings First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can often have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding

residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:

- Overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking - along with proximity, height and length along mutual boundaries.
- Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability.
- Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.
- External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.

Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles -

changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/ 'A' frame end or 'half-hip' for example – will be assessed against a number of criteria including:

- Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
- Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
- Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
- Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures and prominence.

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 shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries.

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. Particular care will be taken in evaluating large, visually dominant dormer window structures, with a balance sought between quality residential amenity and the privacy of adjacent properties. Excessive overlooking of adjacent properties should be avoided unless support by the neighbours affected can be demonstrated. More innovative design responses will be encouraged, particularly within sites where there may be difficulty adhering to the above guidance and where objectives of habitability and energy conservation are at stake.

5.2. Environmental Impact Assessment - Preliminary Examination

- 5.2.1. Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development and the absence of any connectivity to any sensitive location, 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

- 6.1.1. A first-party appeal has been lodged by the applicant. The grounds of objection are based on:
- The need for additional family space for a growing family who have occupied the house since 2014.
 - The dormers are lower in ridge height from the main roof, set back from the facade and maintain the gable elevation so as to retain the streetscape.
 - The use of materials such a smooth render matches existing materials in the house, while the zinc ties in with the first floor dormer boxes in Cluny Manor opposite the site and the design in this context is consistent with the existing neighbouring buildings.
 - The proposal otherwise meets with the development plan criteria in respect of overlooking and overbearing as neither impact will be material in the context of the existing development.
 - It is disputed that the development would depreciate the value of property when in fact it could be argued that the upgraded works could increase the value .
 - No third party objections.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- No further comments.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. This appeal relates to a proposal for two large dormer extensions among other minor alterations. There is no issue in terms of overlooking and alterations to the existing

fenestration. The only issue under dispute relates to visual amenity due to the scale and massing of the proposed dormers and impact on the façade and wider streetscape. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposal I consider the scope of consideration can be confined to this issue.

- 7.2. The proposed dormer extensions being just below the ridge height (250mm from the scaled drawings 1:100) and projecting close to the existing eaves on each side essentially squares of a very strongly triangular gable façade and is what I consider top heavy. Accordingly the design completely alters the proportions, style and character of the house as viewed in the street elevation. The visual incongruity and prominence of this is further highlighted by the width of the dormer extending close the façade.
- 7.3. I do not consider that the change in the roof profile can be absorbed having regard to the very ordered streetscape of the same dwelling types which have more subordinate intervention in their respective roof profiles. The house is even more prominent as viewed from the opposing junction in addition to the approach street view on each side. I consider permission in this instance would set an undesirable precedent in the area.
- 7.4. I accept that the conversion of the roof space is more efficient and potentially less injurious to directly adjacent neighbouring housing as compared to first floor extensions to the rear in terms of overlooking and overshadowing. However I do not consider the extent of impact on the streetscape is warranted in this case. Having regard to the visual prominence of the house frontage, any dormer extension should I consider be set back by a few metres at least from the gable façade so as to better assimilate and retain the street profile and character in the interest of orderly development. I do not consider this can be addressed by condition.
- 7.5. In light of the above I concur with the conclusion of the planning authority in that the proposed development would be visually dominant and injurious to residential amenities and fails to meet the criteria of the development plan which I consider reasonable. I do however accept that it is difficult to ascertain the likely extent of property value depreciation and would omit this as part of the reason. The proposed development would on balance be inconsistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

- 8.1.1. Having regard to the minor nature of the proposed development, the location of the site in a serviced urban area and the separation distance to the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise. It is not therefore 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. I recommend that planning permission for the proposed development be refused based on the following reasons and considerations.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown Development Plan 2016-2022, the existing pattern of development in the area, and the nature and extent of the proposed dormer extensions, it is considered that, the proposed development would be visually incongruous and out of character with the pattern of development in this urban area. Having regard to its prominent location the proposal would constitute a disorderly form of development which would detract from the streetscape and visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would therefore seriously injure the residential amenities of the area and permission for such would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Suzanne Kehely

Senior Planning Inspector

24th November 2021