



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report 313041-22

### Development

Part 2-storey, part single-storey extension to front, widening of existing dormer window to rear, domestic wind turbine on side wall & all associated site works.

### Location

73 Grange Abbey Drive,  
Donaghmede, Dublin 13.

### Planning Authority

Dublin City Council

### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB5209/21

### Applicant(s)

Claudia & Gerard Corcoran

### Type of Application

Permission

### Planning Authority Decision

Split Decision

### Type of Appeal

First Party v. Condition

### Appellant(s)

Claudia & Gerard Corcoran

### Observer(s)

John & May Woodlock

### Date of Site Inspection

24<sup>th</sup> April 2022

### Inspector

Louise Treacy

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The subject site has a stated area of 187 m<sup>2</sup> and is located at No. 73 Grange Abbey Drive, Donaghmede, Dublin 13. The site is located on the northern side of Grange Abbey Drive and accommodates a 2-storey, semi-detached dwelling with off-street car parking to the front. The dwelling has 2 no. rooflights to the front roof slope and a dormer extension to the rear. A pedestrian laneway is located to the west of the subject site adjacent to the neighbouring property at No. 71 Grange Abbey Drive.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of the construction of a part 2-storey, part single-storey extension to the front of the property, widening of the existing dormer window in the main roof to the rear of the property as well as the erection of a small domestic wind turbine on the side wall of the house and all associated site works.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

- 3.1.1. A split decision was issued by Dublin City Council on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2022 whereby planning permission was granted for the front ground floor extension subject to 8 no. conditions and planning permission was refused for the front 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension, the widening of the existing rear dormer and the wind turbine.
- 3.1.2. Condition no. 2 omits the 1<sup>st</sup> floor front extension, the widening of the existing rear dormer and the wind turbine.
- 3.1.3. Condition no. 3 requires the ground floor front extension to have a reduced external depth of no greater than 1.8 m.
- 3.1.4. All other conditions are generally standard in nature.
- 3.1.5. Planning permission was refused for the 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension, rear dormer extension and wind turbine for 3 no. reasons as follows.

(1) The scale, depth and appearance of the 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension would be visually incongruous and obtrusive on the streetscape and would, in itself, and by the

precedent established for such incongruous structures, cause serious injury to the visual and residential amenities of the area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the policies and objectives of the current Dublin City Development Plan, in particular Section 16.10.12 and Appendix 17 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- (2) The increase in the width of the existing rear dormer would result in a structure which would be over-scaled and visually dominant on the rear roof plane and would, in itself, and by the precedent established for such over-scaled dormers, cause serious injury to the residential amenities of the area. Furthermore, the increase in width would contravene condition no. 2 of An Bord Pleanála permission under ABP301118-18. The proposed widening of the dormer would be contrary to the policies and objectives of the current Dublin City Development Plan, in particular Section 16.10.12 and Appendix 17 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- (3) The proposed wind turbine, to be attached to the gable wall of the dwelling, in its height, scale, proximity to the adjacent dwelling and visual prominence, would cause serious injury to the visual and residential amenities of the area and would be contrary to the zoning objective for the area which seeks “to protect, provide and improve residential amenities” and so would be contrary to the current Dublin City Development Plan and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

- 3.2.2. Dublin City Council’s Planning Officer considered that a single-storey extension to the front of the dwelling was reasonable but that the depth of the development (2.815 m) was “grossly excessive” and significantly larger than would be considered acceptable. The 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension was also considered to be “substantial in depth” and would represent a dominating and visually obtrusive appearance on the streetscape. As such, it was recommended that the ground floor extension be no more than 1.8 m in depth externally and that the 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension be omitted.

- 3.2.3. In recommending that planning permission be refused for the dormer extension, the Planning Officer considered that no rationale had been provided for the proposed development, which would be visually dominant, excessive, and inconsistent with development plan policy and the amended condition no. 2 of Planning Reg. Ref. 4447/17; ABP Ref. 301118-18.
- 3.2.4. In recommending that planning permission be refused for the proposed wind turbine, the Planning Officer considered it would have little separation from neighbouring properties and its height and appearance would be highly obtrusive and incongruous and would impact on residential amenities. The noise impact of the turbine was also considered to be unclear.
- 3.2.5. **Other Technical Reports**
- 3.2.6. **Engineering Department - Drainage Division:** No objection to the proposed development subject to conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.4. **Irish Water:** None received.

3.5. **Irish Rail:** None received.

3.6. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.6.1. One third party observation was received from May & John Woodlock, 75 Grange Abbey Drive, Donaghmede, Dublin 13. The issues which are raised can be summarised as follows: (1) reduced light and quality of life, (2) excessive scale of development, (3) reduced property value.

## 4.0 **Planning History**

- 4.1. **Planning Authority Reg. Ref. 4447/17; ABP Ref. 301118-18:** Planning permission granted for dormer window to the rear and 2 no. rooflights to the front.
- 4.2. Condition no. 2 of this permission, as amended by An Bord Pleanála, states the following:

“The proposed development shall be amended as follows:

(a) The roof dormer shall be at least 990 millimetres from the external face of the east gable wall at attic level.

(b) Access to the attic level shall be provided within the envelope of the existing roof and/or the proposed dormer structure.

(c) No window or other opening, other than a roof light matching the proposed front roof lights in dimension, shall be provided to the attic landing on the rear roof slope.

Reason: To clarify the nature and extent of the permission granted and in the interest of visual amenity.

## **5.0 Policy and Context**

### **5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022**

### **5.2. Land Use Zoning**

- 5.2.1. The site is subject to land use zoning “Z1” (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods) which has the objective “to protect, provide and improve residential amenities”.

### **5.3. Alterations and Extensions**

- 5.3.1. The policy regarding extensions and alterations to dwellings is set out in Sections 16.2.2.3 and 16.10.12 and Appendix 17 of the development plan. In general, applications for planning permission to extend dwellings will only be granted where the planning authority is satisfied the proposal will: (1) not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the dwelling, and (2) not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy and access to daylight and sunlight.
- 5.3.2. Further guidance in relation to dormer extensions is set out in Section 17.11 of Appendix 17. When extending the roof, the following principles should be applied:
- 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 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.

#### **5.4. Natural Heritage Designations**

5.4.1. None.

### **6.0 The Appeal**

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

6.1.1. A first party appeal against condition no. 2 has been lodged by MFA Architects on behalf of the applicants. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension is required as the existing bedroom is too small for family requirements. A reduced extension depth of 1.3 m is proposed for the consideration of An Bord Pleanála.
- A precedent for an extension of this size exists at No. 14 Grange Abbey Drive (Planning Authority Reg. Ref. 2489/10).
- The dormer extension to the rear is required to enable the applicant to work from home. The dormer is, and will remain, relatively concealed away from the boundary, with no objections in relation to same raised by the neighbours.

#### **6.2. Planning Authority Response**

6.2.1. None received.

#### **6.3. Observations**

6.3.1. An observation on the appeal was received from John & May Woodlock, 75 Grange Abbey Drive, Donaghmede, Dublin 13. The observers submit that reduced light to the front of their dwelling on foot of the proposed extensions will impact on their ability to manoeuvre around their home (the details of the observer's medical condition as provided to the Board have been noted).

## 7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. Dublin City Council issued a split decision in relation to this application on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2022, whereby planning permission was granted for the proposed ground floor extension subject to 8 no. conditions and planning permission was refused for the proposed 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension, the widening of the existing rear dormer and the wind turbine.
- 7.2. A first-party appeal has been lodged by MFA Architects on behalf of the applicants. The appeal relates to the omission of the 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension and the widening of the existing rear dormer only, as required under condition no. 2 of the Planning Authority's decision. The applicants have not sought to appeal the omission of the proposed domestic wind turbine.
- 7.3. In my opinion, it would be appropriate to assess this application de novo having regard to the nature of the proposed development, the extent of the alterations which are required to same under the Planning Authority's decision and the nature of the split decision which has been issued in this instance.

- **Ground Floor Extension**

- 7.4. The proposed ground floor extension has a stated floor area of 12.2 m<sup>2</sup> and will enlarge the existing hall and sitting room to the front of the house. The extension projects 2.815 m beyond the existing front building line. Dublin City Council's Planning Officer considered this element of the proposed development to be "grossly excessive" and "significantly larger than would be considered acceptable". As such, it was recommended that the ground floor extension be reduced to a maximum external depth of 1.8 m (condition no.3 refers). In my opinion, a valid planning argument has not been presented to justify the requirement for this modification and that an extension of 12.2 m<sup>2</sup> cannot reasonably be described as grossly excessive. In my opinion, the proposed ground floor extension would be acceptable on the subject site having regard to the semi-detached nature of the dwelling and size of the front garden area.
- 7.5. The proposed ground floor extension has a pitched roof profile which projects beyond the building footprint to the side of the dwelling. I note a discrepancy in the overall width of the roof as illustrated on the proposed floor plan drawings, which is

shown as c. 6.4 m on the proposed 1<sup>st</sup> floor plan and c. 5.8 m on the proposed attic plan (Drawing No. 21-039-PL-2.02 refers). For the avoidance of doubt, I consider that the width of the roof over the ground floor extension should match the existing roof profile to the gable elevation of the dwelling, resulting in a more uniform building profile at this location. This matter can be addressed by way of condition should the Board decide to grant planning permission for the proposed development.

- 7.6. I also note that the roof above the ground floor extension directly abuts the shared boundary with No. 71 Grange Abbey Drive. In my opinion, it would also be appropriate to attach a planning condition which requires that surface water drainage from the roof is resolved within the site boundary and does not impact on the neighbouring property.

- **1<sup>st</sup> Floor Extension**

- 7.7. The proposed 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension has a stated area of 5.2 m<sup>2</sup> and projects forward of the existing front building line by 2.14 m. In recommending that this element of the proposed development be omitted, Dublin City Council's Planning Officer considered that the extension was substantial in depth and would represent a dominating and visually obtrusive appearance on the streetscape.
- 7.8. The proposed 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension will increase the floor area of the existing single bedroom from 7.1 m<sup>2</sup> to 10.9 m<sup>2</sup> as illustrated on the existing and proposed floor plan drawings. In my opinion, the proposed floor area increase is modest, and would serve to improve the standard of residential accommodation as identified in the applicants' appeal submission. While I acknowledge that the extension will project forward of the established building line, I note that the building is not a Protected Structure and is not located in an Architectural Conservation Area or Residential Conservation Area. Thus, in my opinion, it would be unreasonable to refuse planning permission for this element of the proposed development.
- 7.9. In responding to the Planning Authority's decision to refuse planning permission for the proposed 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension, the applicants propose to reduce its depth from 2.14 m to 1.3 m. A drawing to illustrate the proposed amendment has not been included with the appeal submission. However, in my opinion, this amendment is unnecessary, and I am satisfied that the extension as originally proposed can be accommodated on the subject site, with no undue visual or residential amenity



impacts arising to the existing or neighbouring properties or the streetscape at this location. Should the Board disagree with my assessment, I note that this amendment could be addressed by way of planning condition.

7.10. I have considered the observation on the appeal from the owners of the adjacent property at No. 75 Grange Abbey Drive. Concerns have been raised regarding the potential loss of light to the front of the observers' property on foot of the proposed ground and 1<sup>st</sup> floor extensions. However, I note that the observers' property is located to the east of the site and is not attached to the subject dwelling. As such, I consider that the front of the observers' property will continue to receive direct sunlight during the day, and that any reduction in light which may occur in the late evening would likely be very minor. As such, I am satisfied that the proposed ground and 1<sup>st</sup> floor extensions would have no significant negative impact on the residential amenity of the observers' property or any other neighbouring property.

- **Dormer Extension**

7.11. In recommending that the proposed extension of the rear dormer structure not be permitted, Dublin City Council's Planning Officer considered that no rationale in support of the proposed development had been provided. The Planning Officer also considered that the dormer extension would be visually dominant, excessive, inconsistent with development plan policy and the amended condition no. 2 of Planning Authority Reg. Ref. 4447/17; ABP Ref. 301118-18.

7.12. I have reviewed the Board's assessment of the appeal which was lodged against condition no. 2 of the parent permission in this instance, which required the dormer structure to be centrally located on the rear roof plane, with a maximum external width of 3.5 m. In assessing the appeal, the Board's Planning Inspector did not consider that the amendments required by the Planning Authority in its imposition of condition no. 2 were necessary in the interests of orderly development and visual amenity. In recommending that the dormer be set back by 990 mm from the external face of the east gable wall at attic level, the Planning Inspector noted a discrepancy in the submitted planning application drawings, with a set-back of 990 mm shown on the plan drawing and of 1122 mm shown on the elevation drawing. As such, it was recommended that this matter be clarified by way of condition.

- 7.13. Having undertaken an inspection of the subject site, I do not consider that the proposed dormer extension would be visually dominant at this location. While the existing dormer is visible from the pedestrian laneway to the west of the site, I note that the site does not directly adjoin this laneway. In addition, the dormer is proposed to be extended in an easterly direction across the roof plane, and as such, will only be readily visible from the opposing dwellings to the rear/north of the site. The applicants' agent submits that the proposed extension will enable the applicants to work more comfortably from home, which I consider to be a reasonable justification in support of the proposed development.
- 7.14. In my opinion, the proposed dormer extension would not have any adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling, any neighbouring dwelling or the streetscape and would not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy or access to daylight and sunlight. As such, I am satisfied that the proposed extension of the existing dormer structure would not be contrary to development plan policy. The dormer structure sits above eaves level and the original rear roof profile will remain legible in public views of the site from the laneway to the west.
- 7.15. Furthermore, I do not consider that the granting of planning permission for the dormer extension would be contrary to condition no. 2 of ABP Ref. 301118-18, given that planning permission is now sought to amend this element of the permitted development and having regard to the applicants' rationale in support of same.

- **Domestic Wind Turbine**

- 7.16. Planning permission is also sought for a domestic wind turbine which is proposed to be attached to the rear / gable elevation of the subject dwelling. The structure is positioned approx. 5.8 m above ground level, with an overall height of c. 3.5 m and projecting 1.8 m above roof apex level. Dublin City Council's Planning Officer considered that the wind turbine would have little separation from neighbouring properties, that its height and appearance would be highly obtrusive and incongruous and would impact on residential amenities. The noise impact of the turbine was also considered to be unclear. As such, it was recommended that planning permission be refused for the proposed wind turbine.

7.17. I note that the technical information in relation to the wind turbine as submitted with the planning application states that the structure does not produce any noise. I also note that the noise concerns of Dublin City Council's Planning Officer have not been addressed in the appeal submission, with the applicants deciding not to appeal this element of the Planning Authority's decision.

7.18. While I consider that renewable energy structures such as this should generally be encouraged, I am not satisfied that sufficient technical information has been provided to demonstrate that no impacts would arise on foot of same to the neighbouring property at No. 75 Grange Abbey Drive. In this regard I note that the structure is adjacent to the gable elevation and 1<sup>st</sup> floor living accommodation of this neighbouring property and has the potential to have a significant negative impact on the residential amenity of this dwelling. Thus, in the absence of further supporting information to address the potential for residential amenity impacts to arise, I consider that this element of the proposed development should be omitted. This matter can be addressed by planning condition.

#### 7.19. **Conclusion**

7.19.1. In conclusion, I consider that the proposed ground and 1<sup>st</sup> floor extensions to the front of the dwelling and the proposed dormer extension to the rear, would be acceptable on this residentially zoned site, and would serve to improve the existing standard of residential accommodation. I also consider that the proposed development would have no significant negative impact on the residential amenities of any neighbouring property and would not have any significant visual impact on the streetscape of this Z1 land use zone. Thus, I am satisfied that the proposed development, with the omission of the proposed domestic wind turbine, would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

#### 7.20. **Appropriate Assessment**

7.20.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and its location relative to Natura 2000 sites, no appropriate assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on a European site.

## 8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend that planning permission be granted for the proposed development.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

9.1. Having regard to the residential land use zoning of the site, and the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity. 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.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed development hereby permitted shall be amended as follows:</p> <p>(a) The proposed domestic wind turbine shall be omitted in its entirety.</p> <p>(b) The width of the roof over the ground floor extension shall match that of the existing roof to the gable elevation of the dwelling.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity and in the interest of visual amenity.</p>
3.	<p>The external finishes of the proposed extensions hereby permitted shall be the same as those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p>

	<b>Reason:</b> In the interest of public health.
5.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, 0800 to 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>

---

Louise Treacy  
Planning Inspector

27<sup>th</sup> April 2022