



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP 311300-21.

---

<b>Development</b>	Reconstruction of rear dormer roof structure to form wider dormer structure at top floor, to that previously permitted under P. A. Reg. Ref. WEB1432/21.
<b>Location</b>	2 Arranmore Road, Donnybrook, Dublin 4.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council
<b>P. A. Reg. Ref.</b>	WEB1700/21
<b>Applicant</b>	Joanne Kelly and Declan Fitzgerald.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Decision</b>	Grant Permission.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party X Condition No 3
<b>Appellant</b>	Joanne Kelly and Declan Fitzgerald.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	23 <sup>rd</sup> December, 2021
<b>Inspector</b>	Jane Dennehy

## Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0 Proposed Development .....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	3
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy Context.....	4
5.1. Development Plan.....	4
6.0 The Appeal .....	5
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	5
6.2. Planning Authority Response .....	6
7.0 Assessment .....	7
8.0 Recommendation.....	8

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1.1. The application site has a stated area of 478 square metres and is that of an early twentieth century two-storey semi-detached dwelling with front and rear gardens on the northeast side of Arranmore Road linking Herbert Park and Brendan Road and, parallel to Argyle Road and Morehampton Road. The original features common to the houses include a modest sized dormer window in the rear roof slope.
- 1.1.2. Several of the properties in the area have been upgraded and/or extended including the adjoining property at No 4 Arranmore Road for which permission was granted for demolition of a garage and part of the two storey return and for construction of a two-storey side and rear extension and single storey extension to the rear and dormer windows.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1.1. The application lodged with the planning authority indicates proposals for modifications to the rear dormer roof structure to form a wider dormer structure, than that which was previously permitted under P. A. Reg. Ref. WEB1432/21 details of which are in para 4.1 below. The previously permitted width is 1.7 metres whereas the proposed modified dormer width is 4.2 metres.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

- 3.1.1. By order dated, 23rd August, 2021, the planning authority decided to grant permission subject to conditions which include the appealed condition, No. 3 according to which the width of the dormer is to be reduced to a maximum of 3.2 metres.
- 3.1.2. This condition was included because, according to the planning officer report, the reduction in width, from the proposed width of 4.2 metres is excessive.

## 4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. **P. A. Reg. Ref. WEB1432/21:** Permission was granted for demolition of the existing singlestorey returns at the rear and side, construction of a single storey flat roof extensions along the side and the rear with a stated area of forty-five square metres the extension of the porch roof over a new side passage entrance, installation of a conservation style roof light to the front roof, replacement of the existing (rear) dormer and a new vehicular entrance to the front. At the time of inspection, hoarding had been erected around the property.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The operative development plan is the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022 according to which the site location is within an area subject to the zoning objective Z1: *to protect, provide and improve residential amenities*". Relevant development management standards are in chapter 16 with supplementary guidance in the accompanying Appendix 17.

- 5.1.2. According to Section 16.10.12 of the Written Statement:

*"The design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenity of adjoining properties and in particular the need for light and privacy. In addition, the form of the existing building should be followed as closely as possible, and the development should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar finishes and windows. Extensions should be subordinate in terms of scale to the main unit."*

- 5.1.3. According to section 17.11 in Appendix 17.

*"The roofline of a building is one of its most dominant features and it is important that any proposal to change the shape, pitch, cladding or ornament of a roof is carefully considered. If not treated sympathetically, dormer extensions can cause problems for immediate neighbours and in the way a street is viewed as a whole.*

*When extending in the roof, the following principles should be observed:*

*The design of the dormer should reflect the character of the area, the surrounding buildings and the age and appearance of the existing building*

*Dormer windows should be visually subordinate to the roof slope, enabling a large proportion of the original roof to remain visible*

*Any new window should relate to the shape, size, position and design of the existing doors and windows on the lower floors*

*Roof materials should be covered in materials that match or complement the main building*

*Dormer windows should be set back from the eaves level to minimise their visual impact and reduce the potential for overlooking of adjoining properties.”*

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

6.1.1. An appeal dated 3<sup>rd</sup> September, 2021 against Condition No 3 attached to the decision to grant permission was lodged by Colgan O'Reilly on behalf of the applicant and it includes some illustrations and 'Google' images. According to the appeal, the required reduction in width from the proposed width of 4.2 metres to a maximum of 3.2 metres is unacceptable. The dormer as proposed is to allow for an increase in attic level space and to provide for increased attic level space and improved second floor accommodation comprising bathroom en-suites and a ceiling height of 2.4 metres. According to the appeal:

- The planning officer's assessment includes references to section 16.10.12 of the CDP and to 16.38.9 the latter of which is irrelevant as it relates to off street parking.
- The planner in his report does not refer to section 17.11 – Roof Extensions in his report. The proposed development complies with Section 17.11 (See Para 5.1 above)

- As illustrated in the images provided, the dormer is largely screened from public view at the front and neighbouring properties (Nos 16 and 20 Herbert Park).
- There are several similar dwellings with attic extensions, at No 5 Arranmore Road and No 8 Argyle Road and at properties at Herbert Park, Morehampton Road, Auburn Avenue, Nutley Avenue, Anglesea Road. (Planning Register details are provided.) There is well established precedent for larger dormers, and they are becoming a common feature.
- The proposed design is justified based on the ratio of dormer to the main ridge, The area of the dormer is equivalent to 43% of the roof slope and this is in line with the permitted developments which provide precedent. The window is aligned with those of the existing dwelling in height and width.
- The retention of the rear chimney and rear return roof which obscures the view of the dormer from the north and northeast gardens at Herbert Park properties, precedent set in the local area in terms of size and, lack of third-party objections and agreement with the owner of the property at No 4. Arranmore Road.
- The adjoining property owner has agreed that the proposed obscure glazing for the outer panels reduces overlooking.
- There is precedent for the proposed zinc finish for the dormer in the area proposed zinc finish is common in the area and is sustainable. (The originals were in lead).
- The dormer is setback from the eaves and consistent with Fire Regulations

## 6.2. Planning Authority Response

There is no submission from the planning authority on file.

## 7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. The subject proposal is confined to the proposed modification to the previously permitted dormer structure, provided for in the prior grant of permission, (under P. A. Reg. Ref. WEB1432/21) for partial demolition, extensions and a vehicular entrance at this early twentieth century property. The properties on Arranmore Road form a block of similar dwellings with deep rear gardens along with Herbert Park, Argyle Road, Brendan Road and one of the common features of these houses are small box dormers in the rear roof slopes.
- 7.2. The appeal is solely against Condition No 3 attached to the decision to grant of permission whereby the width of the dormer element to be reconstructed is to be reduced from 4.2 metres to 3.2 metres. It is agreed that the reasoning provided at application stage in the assessment and in the assessment and for the condition lacks some clarity and further consideration is warranted. Further to review of the application, it is considered that *de novo* consideration is unwarranted and that determination of the appeal with the provisions of section 139 of the Act is appropriate.
- 7.3. The original dormers in the rear roof slopes of the application site property and surrounding properties are a common positive feature in the composition of these early twentieth century houses and contribute to the visual amenities from within the surrounding properties. Various Interventions and enlargements and replacements undoubtedly would result in a reduction in the integrity and architectural character of these dwellings. However, as pointed out in the appeal, these rear roof slopes are not in view from the public realm. In addition, it is reasonable for given to the scope for enhancement of the quality of internal accommodation to be taken into consideration.

The position above the eaves and below the ridge of the dormer element as proposed along with length of the glazing is similar in form to the original dormers although the width of the dormer is considerable. Nevertheless, as pointed out in the appeal, the ratio of the dormer feature to relative to the original roof slope's surface is reasonable at forty three percent and there is sufficient separation at each side from the edge of the roof.

Further to review of the examples for the permitted developments at Herbert Park, (No 6) Argyle Road and Arranmore Road provided in the appeal to support the case for precedent, it is noted that the permitted developments are not totally comparable, and that modifications were required by condition for the development at No 6 Herbert Park. However, these permitted developments do indicate that significant modifications to the rear roof slopes and dormer structures have been permitted, although not necessarily supported by the conservation officer.

Given the size, width and depth of the rear gardens of the properties, the setbacks from party boundaries and the proposed use of opaque glazing for the outer panels, it is considered that the proposed four metres' width for the dormer can be accepted and that the condition can be omitted.

#### **7.4. Environmental Impact Assessment – Screening.**

- 7.4.1. Having regard to the minor nature of the proposed development and its location in a serviced inner suburban area, removed from any sensitive locations or features, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

#### **7.5. Appropriate Assessment.**

- 7.5.1. Having regard to the scale and nature of the proposed development and to the serviced inner suburban location, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise. The proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

### **8.0 Recommendation**

It is recommended that the appeal be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended in that de novo consideration is unwarranted and that the planning authority should be directed to delete Condition No 3 based on the reasons and considerations set out below:



## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the scale, size of the existing roof slope relative to the form of the proposed box dormer and its position above the eaves, below the ridge and from the edge of the roof slope, and, to the separation distances from adjoining properties, it is considered that the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual amenities and architectural character of the streetscape or the residential amenities of properties in the vicinity. As a result, the proposed development would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

**Jane Dennehy**  
Senior Planning Inspector  
28<sup>th</sup> December, 2021.