



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP313015-22

---

<b>Development</b>	A dormer window to the rear roof area at attic level to provide additional headroom in the existing converted attic.
<b>Location</b>	47 Roselawn Road, Castleknock, Dublin 15, D15K5NW.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Fingal County Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	FW21B/0180.
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Owen Dunne.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party.
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Owen Dunne.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	N/A.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	24.05.2022.
<b>Inspector</b>	Mary Mac Mahon.

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on the southern side of Roselawn Road in Castleknock and backs onto the Royal Canal. The site is not visible from the road, but is visible from the Royal Canal. The adjoining dwellings, No. 49 and No. 45, have both been extended to the rear.
- 1.2. The dwelling house has been extended previously. It is a four bedroom dwelling house, of a stated 274 square metres. The site area is stated as 0.0517 ha. The rear garden depth is circa 29.5 metres.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is to provide for headroom to an existing attic space. A window on the rear elevation is proposed. The additional gross floor space is 5.7 square metres.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Refuse:

*“Having regard to the design, scale and position of the proposed dormer on the rear roof slope of the existing dwelling, the proposed development would be visually dominant on the roof slope, would be contrary to Objective DMS41 of the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 and set a poor precedent for other similar development. The proposed development, would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”*

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The planner’s report notes that planning permission has been granted for dormer windows in the rear in the Roselawn Road area. There is an attic window which does not appear to have the benefit of permission.

The proposed dormer is considered visually dominant on the roof due to its scale, design and position, would negatively impact on the streetscape and set an undesirable precedent.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None.

## 4.0 Planning History

On site:

FW09B/0015 – planning permission granted for bay window to front elevation and 1 and two storey rear extension, 22.09.2009.

No. 49 Roselawn Road:

FW09B/0045 – planning permission granted on appeal for bay window to front elevation and 1 and two storey rear extension, incorporating a granny flat extension, 29.01.2010.

No. 45 Roselawn Road:

FW10B/0105 – planning permission granted for bay window to front elevation and 1 and two storey rear extension, 11.01.2022

## 5.0 Policy and Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

The *Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023* applies. The site is zoned which 'RS' seeks to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity. The need to alter existing dwellings is acknowledged in the plan. In relation to changes to roof profiles, the plan states on page 425:

*'Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles, for example, changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/'A' frame end or 'half-hip', will be assessed against a number of criteria including:*

- *Consideration and 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 (whether for functional roof space or light access) shall generally not form a dominant part of a roof. Consideration may be given to dormer extensions proposed up to the ridge level of a house, but in all cases no dormer extension shall be higher than the existing ridge height of the house. 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.*

*Objective DMS41 Dormer extensions to roofs will only be considered where there is no negative impact on the existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. Dormer extensions shall not form a dominant part of a roof. Consideration may be given to dormer extensions proposed up to the ridge level of a house and shall not be higher than the existing ridge height of the house’.*

*Objective CH43 Protect and enhance the built and natural heritage of the Royal Canal and ensure that development within its vicinity is sensitively designed and does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the Canal, its built elements and its natural heritage values and that it adheres to the Waterways Irelands Heritage Plan 2016-2020.*

## **5.2. Natural Heritage Designations**

The site abounds the Royal Canal, a proposed Natural Heritage Area 002103. The entire canal is so designated and has a ‘B’ rating of national importance, due to the diversity of species along its linear route. The proposed development, an alteration to

the proposed roof, is minor in scale, notwithstanding its proximity to the proposed Natural Heritage Area. The foreseeable emissions from the proposed development are such 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.

### **5.3. EIA Screening**

The proposed development does not come within a class of development that is subject to Environmental Impact Assessment.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

6.1. The First Party's agent, Stephen Molloy Architects, submitted the appeal, the grounds of which are summarised below.

### **6.2. Grounds of Appeal**

- The attic is in regular use as an office, due to working from home arrangements;
- The head height is not suitable on a continuous use basis;
- The window will improve the level of daylighting enjoyed in the room;
- The approach minimises impacts on the adjoining properties;
- The dormer will not be visible from the street;
- Alternative materials are proposed, if considered an improvement;
- It is not obvious how the proposed development fails to comply with Objective DMS41;
- Precedent permissions are cited, where dormers extend beyond the roof profile. In this case, they remain within the roof profile.

### **6.3. Planning Authority Response**

The Planning Authority responded as follows:

- The proposed dormer is not in compliance with Objective DMS41, as it would visually dominant on the roof due to its scale, design and position

## 7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. The alteration to the roof profile is limited in scale, however it would add appreciatively to the extent of floor space that is not compromised by the roof profile. The proposed development would not be visible from Roselawn Road and does not infringe on the public domain from this location. It sits below the roof ridge of the house and is not visible on the streetscape, in accordance with development plan policy.
- 7.2. The dormer element is not large in itself and I do not consider that it would significantly increase the degree of overlooking of the adjoining property at No. 45, Roselawn Road, particularly given the extent of the extension on that property.
- 7.3. The proposed window in the dormer is disproportionately large in relation to the solid to void ratio, resulting in an unbalanced roofscape. This could be dealt with by way of condition, to limit the size of the window.
- 7.4. The development plan draws attention to the distance/contrast/visibility of the proposed roof end and prominence of the structure. In most circumstances, in a back-to-back suburban estate, the proposed development would not be very prominent. In this instance, the location is more visible due to views to the site from the Royal Canal. No. 47 is already quite prominent in this vista. The use of plaster on the dormer as a finish would draw attention to the imbalance of the main roof behind the hipped roof.
- 7.5. I would suggest that the re-use of the existing tiles to cover the wall of the proposed dormer would aid in the assimilation of the dormer in the roof, or the use of roof tiles of a similar colour, should the originals not be re-usable. This, combined with the reduction in area of the window, similar to the size of the roof light that on the roof at present, would provide for the appellant's needs and meet the requirements of the development plan, by ensuring that the dormer element of the roof profile is not prominent, particularly when seen from the Royal Canal.

## 8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend a grant of permission, subject to condition.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the policies set out the *Fingal County Development Plan, 2017-2023*, the limited scale of development and subject to the conditions set out below, it is considered that the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential and visual amenities of the area. The proposed development, would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed development shall be amended as follows:</p> <p>(a) The window in the dormer shall be similar in size to the existing rooflight.</p> <p>(b) The existing roof tiles shall be retained and re-used (or similar in colour, if not re-usable) to cover the front wall of the dormer.</p>

	<p>Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of visual amenity.</p>
--	--

---

Mary Mac Mahon  
Planning Inspector

14 June 2022