



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-315064-22

#### Development

Permission is sought to extend living room and entrance hall with pitched roof, demolish existing east facing gable shed and replace with a single story ground floor extension with flat roof.

#### Location

No. 70 Castletimon Road, Dublin 5.

#### Planning Authority

Dublin City Council.

#### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

4754/22.

#### Applicant(s)

Zilah Santos Carvalho & Bojan Starcevic.

#### Type of Application

Planning Permission.

#### Planning Authority Decision

Grant.

#### Type of Appeal

First Party – V – Condition No. 3(c).

#### Appellant(s)

Zilah Santos Carvalho & Bojan Starcevic.

#### Observer(s)

None.

#### Date of Site Inspection

16<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2023.

#### Inspector

Patricia-Marie Young.

# Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0 Proposed Development .....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	3
3.1. Decision .....	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....	4
3.4. Prescribed Bodies & Third Party Observations .....	4
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy Context.....	4
5.1. Development Plan.....	4
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations .....	5
5.3. EIAR Screening.....	5
6.0 The Appeal .....	5
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	5
6.2. Planning Authority Response .....	5
6.3. Observations .....	5
7.0 Assessment.....	6
8.0 Recommendation.....	10
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	10

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. No. 70 Castletimon Road, is an irregular triangular shaped residential plot with a stated 468m<sup>2</sup> area. It is located on the northern side of Castletimon Road at a point that this road contains a small pocket of green space that lies on the northern side of its junction with Castletimon Park. At this point the site is setback c43m to the north of the main stretch of Castletimon Road. The site itself is also situated c118m to the south of R104, as the bird would fly, and c600m, by road from the R104, via Dundaniel Road. The site comprises of a 2-storey end-of-terrace dwelling with an attached mono-pitched shed structure which appeared to be in a poor structural state. The subject dwelling is setback from the public domain by a mainly grassed front garden area that also accommodates an area of hard surface that could be used to park a standard car. The site forms part of the larger Castletimon residential scheme which is situated in the north Dublin city suburb of Kilmore.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Planning permission is sought for the following:

- Extension of the living room and entrance hall with pitched roof.
- Demolition of existing east facing gable shed and in its place the construction of a single-story ground floor extension with flat roof over.
- All associated site works and services.

2.2. According to the Planning Application Form the floor area of the buildings to be retained on site is 90m<sup>2</sup>; the floor area to be demolished is 26m<sup>2</sup>; the proposed new floor area is 35m<sup>2</sup>; and the total new as well as retained floor area would be 125m<sup>2</sup>.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

3.1.1. On the 21<sup>st</sup> day of October, 2022, the Planning Authority decided to **grant** permission for the proposed development subject to eight mainly standard in nature conditions.

Of relevance is the requirements of sub-condition 3(c) which was imposed for the stated reason of “*protection of residential amenity*”. It reads:

“3. *The development hereby approved shall be modified as follows: ...*

*c. The proposed front extension shall be finished in rough cast render similar to the existing finish of the front of the house.”*

## **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

The Planning Officer’s report is the basis of the Planning Authority’s decision.

## **3.3. Other Technical Reports**

3.3.1. **Drainage:** No objection, subject to safeguards.

## **3.4. Prescribed Bodies & Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. None.

## **4.0 Planning History**

### **4.1. Site & Setting**

4.1.1. None.

## **5.0 Policy Context**

### **5.1. Development Plan**

5.1.1. The Dublin City Development Plan, 2022-2028, came into effect on the 14th day of December, 2022, under which the site is zoned ‘Z1 – *Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods*’. Section 14.7.1 of the Development Plan in relation to ‘Z1’ zoned land states that the land use objective is: “*to protect, provide and improve residential amenities*”. Section 15.11 and Appendix 18 of the Development Plan deals with the matter of extensions to existing dwellings.

## **5.2. Natural Heritage Designations**

- 5.2.1. The nearest Natura 2000 site is the South Dublin Bay & River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024) is located c3.8km to the south of the site, as the bird would fly.

## **5.3. EIAR Screening**

- 5.3.1. Having regard to the existing development on site, the limited nature, scale, and extent of the development sought under this application, the site's location within an urban serviced landscape setting and the absence of any connectivity to any sensitive location, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

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

- 6.1.1. The First Party grounds of appeal seek that the Board omit sub-condition 3(c) from the Planning Authority's notification to grant permission for the development sought under P.A. Ref. No. 4754/22 only. This requires a rough cast render to be used on the exterior of the new building to match the existing finish of the host dwelling. It is requested that a modern sand and cement render finish be instead imposed by way of condition. There are similar developments on Castletimon Road where sand and render has been used. There are also examples of brick used as an external finish.

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

- 6.2.1. None.

### **6.3. Observations**

- 6.3.1. None.

## 7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. This is a First-Party appeal only against sub condition No. 3(c) attached to the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission for the development sought under planning application P.A. Ref. No. 4754/22. Condition No. 3(c) requires the development approved to be modified by way of the proposed front extension being finished in rough cast render similar to the existing finish of the front of the house as opposed to the brick finish indicated in the drawings submitted with this application.
- 7.2. The Planning Authority's Planning Officer considered that the proposed use of brick to the front extension was out of character with the palette of external finishes and treatments of the terrace group and its streetscape setting. This is the basis for the requirements of the sub-condition of concern which the First Party seeks the Board to omit. Instead the appellant seeks that the Board permit a smooth sand and cement render which they contend is in similarity with other developments in Castletimon Road.
- 7.3. The Board did not receive a response to the grounds of appeal and there are no Third-Party observations or indeed any submitted to the Planning Authority during its determination of the planning application.
- 7.4. I note in the streetscape scene of No. 70 Castletimon, that there is precedence for the use of other external finishes as opposed to rough cast render. No. 92 Castletimon Road is an example of a single storey front projecting extension finished in smooth sand and cement render that has been painted to match the colour of its first-floor front elevation. Whereas the 2-storey dwelling with single storey front porch on what was part of the original curtilage of No. 92 Castletimon Road is finished in rough cast render (Note: 92A Castletimon Road).
- 7.5. The latter is the case with the majority of the additions to dwellings where the extensions to them are forward of their front building line within the streetscape view of No. 70 Castletimon Road.
- 7.6. For example, No. 74 Castletimon Road which forms part of the subject terrace group No. 70 Castletimon Road forms part of. As well as the adjoining two terrace properties of No.s 60, 66 and 68 Castletimon Road on the adjoining terrace group to the east.

- 7.7. Further, examples include but are not limited to No.s 52, 54 and 56 Castletimon Road on the neighbouring terrace group to the east. From my observations, the examples of smooth render within the immediate context on the northern side of Castletimon Road and indeed the example of a brick finished single storey front extension are limited.
- 7.8. With this also being the case in terms of the planning history in the area which does not have a recent precedent for variance from the host external finish in relation to extensions to the side and forward of the front building line as appreciated from the public domain.
- 7.9. Moreover, the local planning provisions have become more robust and detailed in terms of the residential extensions since the recent adoption of the new City Development Plan.
- 7.10. Of relevance Section 1.1 of Volume 2, Appendix 18 of the Development Plan in terms of the design of residential extensions sets out that these should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar or contrasting materials and finishes. It states that: “*applications for extensions to existing residential units should: not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling*”; and, that front extensions should achieve a high quality of design as well as make a positive contribution to the streetscape. It further sets out that there is a general presumption against front extensions that significantly break the building line unless they can be justified in design terms and demonstrate that they would have no adverse impact on the character of the area or the visual amenities.
- 7.11. Of further note Section 1.7 of Volume 2, Appendix 18 of the Development Plan, on the matter of materials it sets out that these: “*should complement those used on the existing building; features such as windows and doors on the new extension should relate to those on the original building in terms of proportion and use of materials*”.
- 7.12. When regard is had to the above, the pattern of development, the design of the proposed extension that would be forward to the building line and to the side of the host dwelling the design is not one that could be considered to be innovative or of any particular high quality. However, its window portions and fenestration detailing are respective of the host dwelling and the terrace group it forms part of. In addition, there

are within the wider setting examples of similar front extensions that are of varying quality.

- 7.13. The use of brick finish for the extension forward of the building line would accentuate this insertion in a manner that I would concur with the Planning Authority's Planning Officer is out of character with the host dwelling and with the overall pattern of development for this type of intervention.
- 7.14. Whilst I acknowledge that the streetscape scene that No. 70 Castletimon forms part of has been diluted by alterations and additions over the years the design, particular as a result of the external finishing, brick finishes in later additions and alterations is one of the limited changes that has added to the visual diminishment of this streetscape scene.
- 7.15. In terms of the use of a smooth render finish this external finish despite being one that is less visually at odds with the character of the host dwelling and other properties within its streetscape scene would like in the case of the limited examples within this streetscape setting also be visually at odds when viewed against the predominant painted rough cast render.
- 7.16. This is more obvious when one has regard to the southerly aspect of the subject terrace groups No. 70 Castletimon Road forms part of as this finish is in examples present painted the same colour as the upper floor level. This smoothness of finish on a built insertion that does not seek to differentiate itself as being reflective of the time in which it was constructed but rather seeks to respond to the more traditional estate aesthetics of Castletimon Road adds to this structure lack of harmony with the palette of materials, finishes and treatments. The other limited examples of front additions with smooth painted render are at odds with the upper floor level finish.
- 7.17. The design put forward in terms of its overall built form, solid to void dimensions and the like is not one that seeks to be legible as a quality new addition of its time that also has the ability to respect and harmonious with the host dwelling and its setting.
- 7.18. On the other hand, it is one that seeks to be more traditional in its approach with its window and door openings respecting that of the host dwelling. Alongside its replacement side and rear extension being indicated as being finished in rough cast render finish.



7.19. Against this context the use of smooth render would in my view give rise to a disjointed visual appearance of the proposed extensions when viewed in the round and from the public domain. Thus, in terms of the public domain adding to examples of such extensions whose use of materials result in them being visually overtly dominant and at odds with the character of this once highly homogenous in appearance residential scheme.

7.20. Moreover, the use of rough cast render that is painted over is the uniform and coordinated approach within this residential scheme for additions where the designs are not contemporary in their overall design approach.

7.21. Conclusion

7.21.1. In conclusion, whilst the host dwelling of No. 70 Castletimon Road and its streetscape scene is not afforded any specific protection for the considerations set out above I consider the requirements of Condition No. 3(c) accord with the provisions set out in the Development Plan for extensions and alteration to an existing dwelling. I therefore do not recommend that the Board omit or amend its requirements in the interest of protecting the visual amenities of the host dwelling and the area, alongside this being in the interest of proper planning and sustainable development of the area. This is on the basis that to permit an *ad hoc* approach to external finishes in this once highly coherent residential scheme, in a streetscape scene where its integrity has been diminished by additions whose external palette of materials are out of character with and fail to harmonise in a respectful manner with the coherent use of painted rough cast render would not only result in further diminishment of the settings visual amenities but also would result in a precedent for similar design approaches. Whereas the use of harmonious and respectful external palette of materials and finishes, which are respectful of their host dwelling, other buildings in their setting through to are reflective of the design approach chosen would result in this streetscape scene successfully accommodating residential improvements in a more successful coordinated manner that results in these additions being successfully absorbed without giving rise to streetscape scene visual amenity diminishment. Thus, resulting in less cumulative erosion of this coherently designed and laid out residential scheme.

## **7.22. Appropriate Assessment**

- 7.22.1. Having regard to the minor nature of the proposed development and to the location of the site in a serviced urban area and the separation distance to the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the development would 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. Having regard to the nature of the condition 3 sub-condition (c) the subject of this appeal case, it is considered that the determination of the relevant application as if it had been made to the Board in the first instance would not be warranted and it is recommended that based on the reasons and considerations set out below, that the Planning Authority are directed under subsection (1) of Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, to MAINTAIN condition number 3 sub-condition (c) in its entirety for the reasons and considerations hereunder.

## **9.0 Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that the modifications to the proposed development, as required by the planning authority in its imposition of condition number 3 sub-condition (c), are warranted, and that the proposed development, subject to this being maintained would be in accordance with the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be acceptable in terms of the visual amenities of the area, would not set an unacceptable precedent in the area and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

Patricia-Marie Young

Planning Inspector – 6<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2023.