



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP 312937-22

Development	Single storey extension to front of dwelling.
Location	8 Grangemore Drive, Donaghmede, Dublin 13.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB5076/21
Applicant	Alan Kirwan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant subject to conditions
Type of Appeal	1 st Party v. condition
Appellant	Alan Kirwan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	14/04/22
Inspector	Pauline Fitzpatrick

1.0 Site Location and Description

Grangemore is a mature residential estate accessed from Grange Road (R809) in Donaghmede Dublin 13. Many of the properties in the vicinity have been altered and/or extended including extensions to front elevations.

No.8 Grangemore Drive is an end of terrace, two storey dwelling with side access to its rear garden.

2.0 Proposed Development

As amended by way of further information the proposal entails a single storey, hipped roof extension to the front of the dwelling to extend across the full site frontage with access to be retained to the side access. The extension is have a depth of 1.8 metres.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Grant permission for the above described development subject to 6 conditions. Of note:

Condition 5: False elevation section along the side of the front elevation to be omitted.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The 1st Planner's report recommends further information on impact of proposal on neighbouring property in terms of obstruction of sunlight and amendments reducing the scale of the extension including the false elevation section

The 2nd report following further information notes:

- The roof design has been amended from a lean-to roof to a hipped roof as an alternative to removing the apex porch. This is considered to be an acceptable alteration.

- The false elevation section to extend along the side of the front elevation would result in an undesirable precedent. It would result in the loss of features which contribute to the quality of the existing building and the surrounding streetscape contrary to section 16.2.2.3 of the development plan.

A grant of permission subject to conditions recommended.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

An objection to the proposal received by the planning authority is on file for the Board's information. The issues raised relate to impact on amenities of adjoining property by reason of overshadowing and overbearance with the proposal considered to be out of character with the pattern of development in the area.

4.0 Planning History

I am not aware of any previous planning applications on the site.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Dublin City Development Plan 2016

The site is within an area zoned Z1 the objective for which is to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.

Chapter 16 sets out the development management requirements.

Section 16.10.12 Alterations and Extensions to Dwellings

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.

Appendix 17 sets out the Guidelines for Residential Extensions

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

None in the vicinity

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The 1st Party appeal against condition 5 can be summarised as follows:

- Houses have extended to the front and vary in appearance. There is no pattern or uniformity.
- Precedent has been set in the area for comparable false elevation sections to the front of dwellings. Photographs of examples provided.
- There is an inconsistency in planning authority decisions.
- The proposal would improve the appearance of his dwelling.
- The adjoining neighbours have no objection.
- He wishes to construct the feature for security reasons. The existing low level side entrance gate and wall is insufficient and allows access to the rear of his property.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

None received.

6.3. **Observations**

None.

7.0 **Assessment**

I am satisfied, having examined the details of the application and having visited the site, that the determination of the application by the Board, as if it has been made to it in the first instance, would not be warranted. Accordingly, I consider that it is appropriate to use the provisions of Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and to consider the issues arising out of the disputed condition only.

Condition 5 requires the omission of the false elevation section of the extension to the side of the front elevation.

The dwellings within the Grangemore estate are of a standard two storey semi-detached and terraced design and do not have any unique features or architectural detailing. As noted by the applicant in his appeal submission and observed on day of inspection many dwellings have been extended to the front with varying designs evident including examples of false elevations.

I submit that the proposed extension incorporating the false elevation section to the side is respectful of the parent dwelling and is of a limited size and scale. It would not constitute a discordant feature and would integrate with the existing building through the use of similar finishes and windows. It would not harm the character or visual amenity of the dwelling or the dwellings in Grangemore Drive and I consider that it complies with the requirements for extensions and alterations to dwellings as set out in Section 16.10.12 of the city development plan. On this basis I recommend that condition 5 be omitted.

Appropriate Assessment – Screening

Having regard to the location of the site and the nature and scale of the proposed development it is concluded no appropriate assessment issues arise as 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

Having regard to the documentation on file, the grounds of appeal, my site inspection, and the assessment above I recommend that the planning authority be directed to **OMIT** condition 5 for the following reasons and considerations.

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the existing pattern of development in the vicinity of the appeal site, to the limited scale of the proposed development and to the precedent in the immediate vicinity of the site for front extensions of a similar style and scale to that of the proposed development, it is considered that the development, as proposed in the plans and particulars lodged with the planning authority would be compatible with the established streetscape character at this location, 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. It is considered, therefore, that the modifications to the design of the proposed extension as required by condition number 5 would be unwarranted.

Pauline Fitzpatrick
Senior Planning Inspector

April, 2022