



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-311734-21

Development

Retention and permission for the development will consist of retention planning for a dormer roof to the rear of the existing house roof. Planning permission will consist of demolishing an existing shed to the rear of the existing site and replacing it with a proposed ground and first floor extension to the rear of the existing house and a proposed new bay window at the front of the existing house and all ancillary works.

Location

4 Glin Road, Dublin 17, D17 YE29

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council North

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

3332/21

Applicant(s)

Robert & Lisa Cullen

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Robert & Lisa Cullen

Date of Site Inspection

19th December 2021

Inspector

Colin McBride

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.027 hectares, is located on the western side of Glin Road and to the north of Artane. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey terraced dwelling. To the north is no. 6 and to the south is no. 2, which are similar dwellings. To the west is no. 5 Macroom Avenue, which is a two-storey terraced dwelling that backs onto the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought for retention of a dormer window on the rear of an existing dwelling and permission for demolition of a shed to the rear of the site and construction of a ground and first floor extension to the rear of the existing house and a new bay window extension on the front elevation.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission granted subject to 10 conditions. Of note is the following condition...

5. (a) The dormer window is to be reduced in width to maximum of 3.4m, there shall be one window on the dormer extension and the window shall be fitted with obscure glazing to the height of 1.8m

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Planning Report (04/10/21): The design and scale of the proposed development was considered acceptable subject to amendments to the dormer window including a reduced width and obscure glazing. The front extension was noted as having been constructed and inaccurately described in the notices (no mention of retention). A grant of permission was recommended subject to the conditions outlined above.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division (01/09/21): No objection.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

No planning history on the appeal site.

3730/99: Permission granted for retention of attic conversion and kitchen porch to the rear of no. 6 Glin Road.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The relevant Development Plan is the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022.

The appeal site is zoned Z1 with a stated objective 'to protect, provide and improved residential amenities'.

16.2.2.3 Extension and Alterations to Dwellings

In particular, alterations and extensions should:

- Respect any existing uniformity of the street, together with significant patterns, rhythms or groupings of buildings.

- Retain a significant proportion of the garden space, yard or other enclosure Not result in the loss of, obscure, or otherwise detract from, architectural features which contribute to the quality of the existing building.
- Retain characteristic townscape spaces or gaps between buildings Not involve the infilling, enclosure or harmful alteration of front lightwells.

Furthermore, extensions should:

- Be confined to the rear in most cases.
- Be clearly subordinate to the existing building in scale and design.
- Incorporate a high standard of thermal performance and appropriate sustainable design features.

In addition to the above, alterations and extensions at roof level, including roof terraces, are to respect the scale, elevational proportions and architectural form of the building, and will:

- Respect the uniformity of terraces or groups of buildings with a consistent roofline and will not adversely affect the character of terraces with an attractive varied roofline.
- Not result in the loss of roof forms, roof coverings or roof features (such as chimney stacks) where these are of historic interest or contribute to local character and distinctiveness.

16.10.12 Extensions

The design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities 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. Applications for planning permission to extend dwellings will only be granted where the planning authority is satisfied that the proposal will:

- Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the dwelling.

- Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, access to daylight and sunlight.

Section 17.11 Roof Extensions

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.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

None within the zone of influence of the project.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 A first party appeal has been lodged by Robert & Lisa Cullen, 4 Glin Road, Dublin 17, D17 YE29. The grounds of appeal are as follows...

- The appeal is against the terms of condition no. 5(a) reducing the width of the dormer window to 3.4m. The appellant notes that there are numerous dormer windows in the Dublin 17 and Dublin 5 areas that exceeds 50% (presumably width of the roof is being referred to).
- The appellants note there were no objections to the proposal and that there are full width dormers at two locations identified by the applicant in the local area.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

No response.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. At the outset, I wish to point out that following consideration of the documentation on the appeal file and the site location and context, I am satisfied consideration of the proposal on a de novo basis, (that is as if the application had been made to the Board in the first instance), is unwarranted and that it is appropriate to determine the appeal in accordance with the provisions of Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended. Having inspected the site and examined the associated documentation, the following are the relevant issues in this appeal.

7.2. Condition 5(a):

7.2.1 The appeal concerns the application of condition 5(a) only with the condition specifying that the dormer window on the rear elevation for which retention has been sought be reduced in width to 3.4m. The dormer window subject to retention has a width of 4.5m. I am satisfied that the overall scale of the dormer is reasonable in proportion to the rear roof plane of the existing dwelling. The dormer window is sufficiently set back from both eaves level and each side of the roof. The dormer is also marginally lower than the ridge height. I am satisfied that the proposal complies with Section 17.11 in relation roof extensions and is satisfactory in terms of overall scale and design. The proposal dormer will not be highly visible in the surrounding

area due to its location on the rear roof plane as well as being of an acceptable scale in the context of the existing dwellings and its roof profile. I would recommend that condition no. 5(a) be omitted and that a reduction in width is not be merited.

7.2.2 I would point out that although the appellants' only refer to part of condition no. 5 (5(a)), the condition includes other revisions to the dormer window that lead on from the reduction in width. I would be of the view that the entire condition should be omitted with the dormer extension, satisfactory in scale, the level of windows on such being acceptable and orientation of such in keeping with the pattern of development. I would recommend that the entire condition no. 5 be omitted.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

8.1 Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and its proximity 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.

9.0 Recommendation

9.1. I recommend that condition no. 5 be omitted.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature of the conditions 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 REMOVE Condition No. 5, and the reasons therefor.

(a) Having regard to overall design and scale of the dormer extension for which retention is sought, which has adequate regard to Development Plan policy for roof extensions and is acceptable in terms of its scale being in reasonable proportion to the existing dwelling/roof profile, it is considered that the imposition of a condition reducing the width of the dormer extension would be unduly onerous and unnecessary.

Colin McBride

Senior Planning Inspector

20th December 2021