



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-313451-22

### Development

Removal of existing single storey pitched roofed rear extension, construction of new single storey flat roof rear extension, attic conversion to include 3 no. dormer windows to front, side, and rear, widening of existing vehicular entrance, removal and replacement of front boundary wall and gates, and minor elevational alterations and associated works to facilitate the development.

### Location

45 Vernon Park, Clontarf, Dublin 3

### Planning Authority

Dublin City Council

### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

3226/22

### Applicant(s)

Brian & Susan O'Callaghan

### Type of Application

Permission

### Planning Authority Decision

Grant, subject to 9 conditions

### Type of Appeal

First Party -v- Condition

### Appellant(s)

Brian & Susan O'Callaghan

**Observer(s)**

Sean & Sinead Crudden

Jim & Chew Pieng Ryan

**Date of Site Inspection**

6<sup>th</sup> October 2022

**Inspector**

Hugh D. Morrison

# Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	4
2.0 Proposed Development .....	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	5
3.1. Decision .....	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....	7
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy and Context.....	7
5.1. Development Plan.....	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations .....	8
5.3. EIA Screening .....	8
6.0 The Appeal .....	9
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	9
6.2. Planning Authority Response .....	10
6.3. Observations .....	10
6.4. Further Responses.....	12
7.0 Assessment.....	13
8.0 Recommendation.....	19
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	21

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located at the north-eastern end of Vernon Park, which is a modern housing estate that has been developed on backlands to the east of Vernon Avenue (R808) from which it is accessed. This estate is laid out as a cul-de-sac, and it is composed of two-storey semi-detached dwelling houses. The estate is built on land that rises at gentle gradients from the south to the north.
- 1.2. The site itself is one of two housing plots that adjoin the inner south-eastern corner of the cul-de-sac's "T" shaped head. This site approximates to a parallelogram in shape, which tapers towards its south-eastern corner. It extends over an area of 349 sqm. The site presently accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwelling house, which has a two-storey side extension with a single storey lean-to side extension beyond and a centrally sited single storey rear extension. This dwelling house is orientated on a north-west/south-east axis, and it is served by a front garden with a vehicular entrance and drive-in from the adjoining cul-de-sac and a rear garden with an upper patio and a lower landscaped area.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal would comprise the following elements:
  - (i) The removal of the existing centrally sited pitched roofed single storey rear extension,
  - (ii) The construction of a new single storey flat roofed rear extension across the greater portion of the rear extension of the dwelling house beginning at the site's south-western boundary with No. 46,
  - (iii) An attic conversion, which would be served by the addition of 3 no. dormer windows to the front, side, and rear of the main roof,
  - (iv) The widening of the existing vehicular entrance by 0.9m from 3.1 to 4m,
  - (v) The removal and the replacement of the front boundary wall and gates, and
  - (vi) Minor alterations to all elevations, rooflights, landscaping and all associated works to facilitate the development.

- 2.2. Under the proposal, 138.8 sqm would be retained and 57.54 sqm would be added to give a total floorspace of 196.34 sqm.
- 2.3. At the appeal stage, the applicants have submitted revised plans of their proposal, which are summarised below under the heading "Grounds of appeal".

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Permission was granted, subject to 9 conditions, the following 2 of which are the subject of this appeal:

*2. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:*

*(a) The proposed dormer to the front shall be omitted.*

*(b) The proposed side dormer shall be amended as follows:*

*(i) The side dormer shall be fully hipped to match the existing roof and shall have its ridge line set down below that of the main roof by at least 200mm so that the side dormer shall sit fully within the plane of the main side hip roof as a separate floating subordinate feature with the existing roof tiles to the hipped roof being retained.*

*(ii) The window to the side dormer shall be centrally placed and shall be reduced in width to have a more vertical emphasis.*

*(c) The proposed rear dormer shall be amended as follows:*

*(i) The rear dormer shall be reduced in width by 1m with no part of the dormer projecting above the side roof plane and shall be fully disaggregated from the proposed side dormer.*

*(ii) The rear elevation to the rear dormer shall be set back by a minimum of 500mm from the rear wall of the original dwelling measuring horizontally.*

*(iii) The rear dormer shall sit fully within the plane of the rear roof as a separate floating subordinate feature with the existing ridge tiles to the hipped roof being retained.*

*(iv) Individual window opens to the rear dormer shall be no larger than the largest existing windows at first floor level below.*

*(v) The windows to the rear dormer shall be permanently fitted with opaque glazing to a minimum height of 1.8m above floor level.*

*(d) All the rear and side dormer's elevations, fascia/soffits, rainwater goods, window frames, glazing bars shall be finished in a dark colour so as to blend with the existing roof finish. White uPVC shall not be used.*

*(e) The rear or side dormer shall not accommodate any solar panels whether or not they would be exempted development under the Planning and Development Act (as amended).*

*(f) The proposed rear single storey extension shall be amended as follows:*

*(i) The rear single storey extension shall be set back by a minimum of 1m from the boundary with No. 46 Vernon Park.*

*(ii) The applicant/developer may re-position the rear extension to the north-east ensuring that it will have the same floor area, depth from the rear wall and height as proposed.*

*(g) The grant of planning permission does not include the shed and storage structures within the front garden indicated on the proposed site plan (drawing no. 21-702-P-08).*

*Development shall not commence until revised plans, drawings and particulars showing the above amendments have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority, and such works shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the buildings.*

*Reason: In the interests of orderly development and visual amenity.*

*4. The following requirements of the Transportation Planning Division of Dublin City Council shall be complied with:*

*(a) The widening of the vehicular entrance shall be omitted.*

*(b) All costs incurred by Dublin City Council, including any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development shall be at the expense of the developer.*

*(c) The developer shall be obliged to comply with the requirements set out in the Code of Practice.*

*Reason: to ensure a satisfactory standard of development.*

## 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

See above cited conditions.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Dublin City Council:
  - Drainage: No objection, standard drainage advice given.
  - Transportation Planning: Objects to the widening of the existing vehicular entrance to the site from 3.1m to 4m, as exceptional circumstances do not exist.

## 4.0 Planning History

- 2477/01: Demolish garage and construct two storey side extension and single storey rear extension: Permitted.
- WEB 1361/15: Demolish single storey rear extension and construct new single storey rear extension and shed/bin store to the side of the dwelling house: Permitted.
- WEB 1461/16: Construct single storey side extension with a bin store enclosure to the front and a canopy over the front door: Permitted.

## 5.0 Policy and Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

Under the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 – 2022 (CDP), the site is shown as lying within an area that is zoned Z1, wherein the objective is “To protect, provide and improve residential amenities.”

Section 16.10.12 of the CDP addresses extensions and alterations to dwellings as follows:

*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 of the CDP sets out “Guidelines for Residential Extensions”. Section 17.11 addresses roof extensions as follows:

*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**

Portions of Dublin Bay are the subject of European designations.

## **5.3. EIA Screening**

The proposal is for domestic extensions, which are not a class of development for the purpose of EIA.



## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The applicants appeal Conditions Nos. 2 & 4 attached to the Planning Authority's permission. They request that the Board consider in the first instance their original proposal. They also request that the Board considers their revised proposal, which has been informed by the concerns underlying the aforementioned conditions. The revisions thus made are summarised as follows:

- *The proposed ground floor rear extension has been hipped on the south-western section which reduces the height of this elevation from 3.4m to 2.65m.*
- *The proposed rear dormer has been reduced and repositioned to the south-west so that it sits within the roof plane. The extent of glazing has been reduced.*
- *The proposed side dormer has been reduced in size and hipped. The extent of glazing has also been reduced.*
- *The proposed front dormer has been replaced with a rooflight.*
- *The proposed vehicular entrance has been reduced from 4m to 3.5m.*

The applicants provide a commentary on the proposed revision to the ground floor extension. They state that they do not want to reposition it to the north-east as that portion of their rear garden is of amenity value. They draw attention to the use of the front/side garden to the west of the dwelling house at No. 46 as a patio area. Nevertheless, the reduction in the height of their extension would ease any overbearing or overshadowing concerns.

The applicants' grounds of appeal are as follows:

- The proposal would accord with the Z1 zoning objective, i.e., it would not adversely impact upon residential amenity.
- Reducing the size of the proposed dormer windows would undermine their visual interest and the visual amenity that they would afford.
- The specification of 1.8m high opaque glazing is arbitrary and it would reduce the amenity value of the converted attic.

- The widening of the vehicular entrance to the site is deemed to be necessary to facilitate the access/egress of 2 cars.

The applicants cite 1361/15, under which a single storey rear extension was permitted without any requirement that it be set back from the boundary with No. 46 or repositioned on the site. The applicants also cite precedents for aspects of their proposal from the following permitted applications on Vernon Park:

- In relation to Condition 2(c):

At No. 3, 3300/18, at No. 8, 2222/20, at No. 33, 2703/09, and at No. 54, 4570/19: examples of rear dormers, which did not necessarily abide by the parameters set for the applicants' rear dormer, i.e., encroach on the side roof plane, sit as a separate floating feature, and display opaque glazing.

- In relation to Condition 2(f):

At No. 35, WEB1500/20, single storey rear extension that abuts a common boundary.

- In relation to Condition 4(a):

At 37, 2498/20, the widening of a vehicular entrance to 3.2m.

The applicants cite policies from the CDP, along with Sections 16.2.2.3 & 16.10.12 and Appendix 17.

## 6.2. Planning Authority Response

None

## 6.3. Observations

(a) Sean & Sinead Crudden of 47 Vernon Park

- The observers draw attention to the juxtaposition of the application site to their residential property, i.e., the rear elevation of the applicants' dwelling house overlooks the northern side boundary to their rear garden. Consequently, they objected to the originally proposed rear dormer, as it would afford views into their rear garden, which would result in overlooking and a loss of privacy.

- The observers welcomed the provisions of Condition No. 2 as they would address their concerns. They consider that any revised proposal should equally address them. Insofar as this proposal would continue to specify glazing that would be larger than at first floor level and clear rather than opaque, it would fail to address these concerns. While they draw attention to the use of the converted attic as a bedroom, they also draw attention to its originally proposed use as a tv room and seated area. They question whether in practise it would be used as a bedroom rather than a tv room and seated area.
- The observers question the comparability of the majority of the precedents cited by the applicants, insofar as they are not examples of dwelling houses that have been the subject of two storey side extensions that cause the front elevation of the original dwelling house to become “double-fronted”. The exception is No. 8. However, this dwelling house was the subject of two modest rear dormers that differ in size and design from the one that the applicants propose.
- While the applicants cite Section 16.10.12, the observers do not consider that their proposal would comply with its provisions. They are concerned that it would establish an adverse precedent.

(b) Jim & Chew Pieng Ryan of 46 Vernon Park

- Exception is taken to the applicants’ assessment of the observers’ outdoor space. Thus, the side/front garden to the west of their dwelling house affords limited privacy, due to its street-side location and overlooking from surrounding dwelling houses. Consequently, it is their rear garden that affords privacy and yet that would be undermined by the applicants’ proposed single storey rear extension and rear dormer window.
- The observers critique the applicants’ precedents, as follows:
  - With respect to 1361/15 at No. 45 itself, they were previously unaware of this permitted application, which has now lapsed. They note that the proposed rear extension would have been considerably lower than the one proposed.

- With respect to 3300/18, unlike the current proposal, the glazing in the rear dormer would approximate in size to the first floor window beneath.
- With respect to 2222/20, unlike the current proposal, the two rear dormers are of modest size.
- With respect to 2703/09, unlike the current proposal, the glazing in the rear dormer would approximate in size to the first floor window beneath.
- With respect to 4570/19, unlike the current proposal, the rear extension is set back from the adjacent common boundary, and the glazing in the rear dormer would approximate in size to the first floor window beneath.
- With respect to WEB1500/20, the rear extension is lower than the one proposed by the applicants.
- The observers question the need to widen the vehicular entrance to the site, i.e., 2 cars are presently parked in front of the applicants' dwelling house.
- The observers comment on the revised design of the single storey rear extension to the effect that they consider that it should still be set back by 1m from the common boundary.
- The observers express concern that the existing and proposed plans show roof levels of 14.4m ASL and yet the relationship of the existing and proposed roofs to first floor window cills differs. They express the further concern that this discrepancy could result in the proposed roof level being higher than that which is depicted.
- The observers state that the drainage of the roof to the proposed single storey extension would need to be self-contained within the applicants' site.
- The observers consider that the revised rear dormer window would still contain overly large glazing, which should be reduced in size to match the first floor window beneath. In any event, the need for such a large window to serve what is now identified as a bedroom is questioned.

#### 6.4. Further Responses

None

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1. The applicants have appealed Conditions 2 & 4 attached to the permission granted by the Planning Authority. Under Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 – 2022, the Board has the discretion to determine this appeal without undertaking a *de novo* assessment of the proposal. I have reviewed the proposal in the light of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 – 2022 (CDP), relevant planning history, the submissions of the parties and the observers, and my own site visit. Accordingly, I consider that the Board should exercise the aforementioned discretion in this case. I also consider that the appealed conditions should be assessed under the following headings:

- (i) Visual and residential amenity,
- (ii) Access, and
- (iii) Appropriate Assessment.

### **(i) Visual and residential amenity**

7.2. Under Condition 2 attached to the permission granted to 3226/22, the Planning Authority requires that the proposal be extensively reworked in the interests of orderly development and visual amenity. The applicants have appealed this Condition and they request that the need for it be considered by the Board. They have also submitted a revised proposal that reflects some of the requirements of Condition 2 as their response to the Planning Authority's critique of their original proposal. They request that the Board considers this proposal, too.

7.3. Under the CDP, domestic extensions and alterations are addressed generally in Section 16.10.12 and dormer extensions are addressed specifically in Section 11 of Appendix 17. I will refer to these provisions of the CDP in conjunction with my assessment of each element of Condition 2.

*(a) The proposed dormer to the front shall be omitted.*

7.4. As originally submitted, a dormer window with a pitched roof and a straight gable would have been added to the front roof plane between the two existing straight gables, which rise above the eaves line and "top-off" the two-storey bay windows on the front elevation. While this dormer window would correspond with the pitched roof

canopy below above the front door, it would compete with the gables on either side. Its presence would make for a visually overly busy roofscape and so I concur with its omission.

- 7.5. As revised, a rooflight would be installed instead of the front dormer window. While I understand the applicants' substitutionary intent in this respect, a front rooflight is not cited in the description of the proposal and so its inclusion now is outside the scope of this description.

*(b) The proposed side dormer shall be amended as follows:*

*(i) The side dormer shall be fully hipped to match the existing roof and shall have its ridge line set down below that of the main roof by at least 200mm so that the side dormer shall sit fully within the plane of the main side hip roof as a separate floating subordinate feature with the existing roof tiles to the hipped roof being retained.*

*(ii) The window to the side dormer shall be centrally placed and shall be reduced in width to have a more vertical emphasis.*

- 7.6. As originally submitted, the greater portion of the fully hipped north-eastern roof plane would be extended by means of a metal clad side dormer. The sloping sides to this dormer would be continuous with the front and rear roof planes to the existing dwelling house. Its window would be composed of 3 no. lights that would extend over the greater portion of its face.

- 7.7. The applicants' existing dwelling house has been extended by means of a two-storey side extension with two-storey bay windows at the front, which match the two-storey bay windows of the original dwelling house. The adjoining dwelling house at No. 46 has added a side dormer over its fully hipped roof end, which extends the front and rear roof planes. These extensions mean that the symmetry that originally existed across the pair of semi-detached dwelling houses at Nos. 45 & 46 has been diluted. The proposed dormer would extend the existing roofline still further and it would introduce a new finishing material, which would be novel within its streetscape context. Relevant CDP provisions emphasise the importance of dormers being subordinate to their host roofs and reflective of their contexts. This dormer would fail to exhibit these characteristics.

7.8. As revised, the proposed side dormer would meet the requirements of (b) except for the need to specify a fully hipped roof end. Instead, a half-hipped roof end is specified, presumably to facilitate more useable space within the bathroom that would be accommodated within the dormer. I consider that these requirements map out an appropriate approach to the redesign of the side dormer. I note that a fully hipped roof would ensure that the side dormer maintains a more discrete streetscape presence than would arise under the proposed half hipped treatment. Given the scale of the already extended dwelling house, I consider that this objective should be met. I note, too, that the floorspace of the bathroom would be generous and so the effect of a fully hipped treatment would not negate its provision.

*(c) The proposed rear dormer shall be amended as follows:*

*(i) The rear dormer shall be reduced in width by 1m with no part of the dormer projecting above the side roof plane and shall be fully disaggregated from the proposed side dormer.*

*(ii) The rear elevation to the rear dormer shall be set back by a minimum of 500mm from the rear wall of the original dwelling measuring horizontally.*

*(iii) The rear dormer shall sit fully within the plane of the rear roof as a separate floating subordinate feature with the existing ridge tiles to the hipped roof being retained.*

*(iv) Individual window opens to the rear dormer shall be no larger than the largest existing windows at first floor level below.*

*(v) The windows to the rear dormer shall be permanently fitted with opaque glazing to a minimum height of 1.8m above floor level.*

7.9. As originally submitted, the proposed metal clad rear dormer would be effectively the full height of the rear roof plane and it would extend 4.5m across the greater portion of this plane to extend, over its top right hand side corner, beyond the fully hipped roof end. This dormer would have an expansive 2 no. light window that would cover virtually its entire face. Relevant CDP provisions emphasise the importance of dormers being subordinate to their host roofs. Clearly, the proposed dormer would fail to exhibit this characteristic. Furthermore, the “picture” window specified would be ungainly in appearance and it would be unneighbourly in terms of its sheer

physical presence and the excessive scope that it would afford for overlooking and loss of privacy.

7.10. As revised, the rear dormer would meet the requirements of (c) except for items (iv) and (v). I consider that items (i), (ii), and (iii) map out a reasonable approach to the redesign of the rear dormer. I consider that the wording of (iv) is ambiguous as the word “opes” normally refers to the literal opening for a window and yet the reference to “individual window opes” suggests that individual lights are in view. Observer (b) questions why this window continues to be so high when it would serve a bedroom. I consider that it should be no higher than the first floor bedroom windows, i.e., 1.2m. I consider, too, that its width should be retained as, to the narrow this window would cause it to appear out of proportion with the dimensions of the dormer’s face. Item (v) refers to the specification of opaque glazing to a minimum height of 1.8m above floor level. The applicants consider that this is an arbitrary requirement which would detract from the amenity of the proposed bedroom. I take the view that, in principle, habitable rooms should be served by clear glazed windows. Given that the reduction in the windows height would secure a cill height of 1.1m, I consider that the window now envisaged would be visually appropriate and it would not lead to any excessive opportunity for overlooking.

7.11. The applicants propose a rooflight in the rear roof plane to illuminate the landing to the staircase. I note that an existing smaller rooflight is situated on the rear roof plane in the vicinity of where the proposed one would be sited. I note, too, that the description of the proposal refers to alterations to rooflights. I, therefore, consider that the proposed rear rooflight can be entertained under this description. Its size should, however, be reduced to complement the revised size of window in the dormer’s face to 0.9m. Its dimensions would thereby match those exhibited by the rear rooflight to the dwelling house at No. 46.

*(d) All the rear and side dormer’s elevations, fascia/soffits, rainwater goods, window frames, glazing bars shall be finished in a dark colour so as to blend with the existing roof finish. White uPVC shall not be used.*

7.12. This element is non-contentious between the parties.



*(e) The rear or side dormer shall not accommodate any solar panels whether or not they would be exempted development under the Planning and Development Act (as amended).*

7.13. This element is non-contentious between the parties.

*(f) The proposed rear single storey extension shall be amended as follows:*

*(i) The rear single storey extension shall be set back by a minimum of 1m from the boundary with No. 46 Vernon Park.*

*(ii) The applicant/developer may re-position the rear extension to the north-east ensuring that it will have the same floor area, depth from the rear wall and height as proposed.*

7.14. As originally submitted, a flat roofed single storey rear extension would be sited in a position immediately adjacent to the common boundary between Nos. 45 & 46. This extension would extend to a depth of 3.6m along this boundary and to a height of 3.4m. Observer (b) expresses concern that the plans may not depict the full height of the extension. They draw attention to the stated common height of 14.40m ASL of the ridge to the existing rear extension and that of the proposed flat roofed replacement extension. The plans of the existing and proposed rear extensions show this height as being either 0.25 or 0.35m below the underside of the first floor window cill level and yet "on the ground" the flashing of the existing extension abuts this level. The proposed rear extension may therefore be higher in practice than that which is depicted.

7.15. During my site visit, I observed that the common boundary between Nos. 45 & 46 is denoted by means of a 1.5m high wall with an c. 0.8m high timber slatted privacy screen above it. This boundary encloses the north-eastern side of the rear garden to No. 46. The rear elevation of the dwelling house at No. 46 contains a pair of glazed doors adjacent to this boundary. A slight increase in early morning overshadowing of these doors and a slight loss of outlook from them would arise from the originally proposed rear extension. Provided the aforementioned screening is retained any overlooking of the rear garden from the glazed openings in the rear elevation of this extension would be satisfactorily mitigated.

7.16. The Planning Authority seeks to address the dis-amenity to No. 46 of the proposed rear extension by setting it back 1m from the common boundary. The applicants'

revised proposal depicts an alternative response, i.e., the introduction of a slope to the south western portion of the flat roof, with a new eaves line of 2.65m. This line would be only marginally above the height of the existing common boundary treatment. Observer (b) expresses the concern that any rainwater goods should be capable of being contained wholly within the applicants' site. *Prima facie* there would be scope to achieve this objective. In these circumstances, I consider that this response would satisfactorily address the dis-amenity identified by the Planning Authority.

*(g) The grant of planning permission does not include the shed and storage structures within the front garden indicated on the proposed site plan (drawing no. 21-702-P-08).*

7.17. This element speaks for itself.

7.18. I conclude that the following elements of Condition No. 2 should be retained as drafted by the Planning Authority: (a), (b) (i) & (ii), (c) (i), (ii) & (iii), (d), (e), and (g). I also conclude that the following elements should be redrafted to reflect my assessment (c) (iv) & (v), and (f) (i) & (ii).

#### **(ii) Access**

7.19. The vehicular entrance to the site is presently 3.1m wide. Under the original and revised proposals, the applicants seek to increase its width to 4m or 3.5m. Under Condition 4 attached to the permission granted to 3226/22, no increase in this vehicular entrance's width is allowed. This Condition was prompted by the advice of the consultee, Transportation Planning, which cited the Planning Authority's leaflet "Parking cars in front gardens". Under the heading of "Basic dimensions" this leaflet states the following:

*Generally, the vehicular opening proposed shall be at least 2.5 metres or at most 3.6 metres in width and shall not have outward opening gates. Narrower widths are generally more desirable and maximum widths will generally only be acceptable where exceptional site conditions exist.*

The consultee advises that, as no exceptional conditions exist, the width of the vehicular entrance should remain as it is.

7.20. The applicants state that the increased width is needed to facilitate the access/egress of 2 cars to the gravelled parking area in front of their dwelling house. Observer (b) states that 2 cars can already park in this area. During my site visit, I

observed that 2 cars were indeed parked in it and so I understand the applicants' position to be that they want to achieve greater ease of access/egress, e.g., independent manoeuvring of cars to and from Vernon Park. During my site visit, I also observed that the alignment of Vernon Park forward of the site is straight with attendant reasonable visibility. Manoeuvres to and from the site are therefore not especially challenging and so I do not consider that "exceptional site conditions exist" to warrant an increase in the width of the vehicular entrance.

7.21. I conclude that Condition 4 be confirmed.

### **(iii) Appropriate Assessment**

7.22. The site is not in or beside any European site. It is a fully serviced suburban site. Under the proposal, the dwelling house on this site would be extended. No Appropriate Assessment issues would arise.

7.23. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the proposal, and proximity to the nearest European site, it is concluded that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise as the proposal 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**

8.1. That the Planning Authority be directed to confirm Condition 4 attached to the permission granted to 3226/22.

8.2. That the Planning Authority be directed to alter the wording of Condition 4 attached to the permission granted to 3226/22 to read as follows:

2. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:

(a) The proposed dormer to the front shall be omitted.

(b) The proposed side dormer shall be amended as follows:

(i) The side dormer shall be fully hipped to match the existing roof and shall have its ridge line set down below that of the main roof by at least 200mm so that the side dormer shall sit fully within the plane of the main side hip roof as a separate floating subordinate feature with the existing roof tiles to the hipped roof being retained.

- (ii) The window to the side dormer shall be centrally placed and shall be reduced in width to have a more vertical emphasis.
- (c) The proposed rear dormer shall be amended as follows:
- (i) The rear dormer shall be reduced in width by 1m with no part of the dormer projecting above the side roof plane and shall be fully disaggregated from the proposed side dormer.
  - (ii) The rear elevation to the rear dormer shall be set back by a minimum of 500mm from the rear wall of the original dwelling measuring horizontally.
  - (iii) The rear dormer shall sit fully within the plane of the rear roof as a separate floating subordinate feature with the existing ridge tiles to the hipped roof being retained.
  - (iv) The window in the face of the dormer shall comprise 3 no. lights. It shall have a width of 2m and a height of 1.2m and it shall be centrally sited within the face of the dormer. This window shall have a cill height of 1.1m and it shall be clear glazed.
  - (v) The proposed rear rooflight shown on drawing no. 21-702-P-12 dated April 2022 and submitted to the Board on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2022 shall be reduced in height to 0.9m.
- (d) All the rear and side dormer's elevations, fascia/soffits, rainwater goods, window frames, glazing bars shall be finished in a dark colour so as to blend with the existing roof finish. White uPVC shall not be used.
- (e) The rear or side dormer shall not accommodate any solar panels whether or not they would be exempted development under the Planning and Development Act (as amended).
- (f) The proposed rear single storey extension shall accord with that which is shown on drawings nos. 21-702-P-12 & 13 dated April 2022 and submitted to the Board on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2022, provided all rainwater goods are capable of being provided wholly within the site.
- (g) The grant of planning permission does not include the shed and storage structures within the front garden indicated on the proposed site plan (drawing no. 21-702-P-08).

Development shall not commence until revised plans, drawings and particulars showing the above amendments have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority, and such works shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the buildings.

Reason: In the interests of orderly development and visual amenity.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the following provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 – 2022:

- Section 16.10.12 and Appendix 17.11, which, variously, address extensions and alterations, and dormer extensions,

It is considered that Condition No. 2 attached by the Planning Authority to the permission it granted to application 3226/22 would, subject to revised wording, ensure that the proposed side and rear dormers and the proposed single storey rear extension complies with the above cited provisions of the Development Plan. This extension would thus be compatible with the visual and residential amenities of the area, and it would accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Having regard to the advice set out in the Planning Authority's leaflet entitled "Parking cars in front gardens", it is considered that Condition No. 4 attached by the Planning Authority to the permission it granted to application 3226/22 would be appropriate on road safety grounds and so it would accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

Hugh D. Morrison  
Planning Inspector

20<sup>th</sup> October 2022