



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-317740-23

Development	Attic conversion into non-habitable storage space with dormer to rear to accommodate stairs.		
Location	25 Carleton Road, Marino, Dublin 3		
Planning Authority Ref.	3783/23		
Applicant(s)	Damian Kelly		
Type of Application	Permission	PA Decision	Grant w Conds.
Type of Appeal	First party v Cond.	Appellant	Damian Kelly
Observer(s)	None		
Date of Site Inspection	12/12/2023	Inspector	D. Aspell

Context

1. Site Location/ and Description

The site comprises a mid-terrace, 2-storey dwelling with parking to front and garden to rear. The dwelling has a dormer-style roof to the front and pitched roof to the rear. The front dormer is off-centre.

Carleton Road and the areas to the west around the Marino and Croydon parks comprise a planned suburban development. The dwellings in the area are predominantly 2-storey and terraced, with significant variation in their design, including in terms of roof style and materials. Some of the dwellings have typical A-frame hipped roofs whilst others such as the subject site are part-dormer. Some of the roofs are finished in black slate whilst others are finished in a red roof tile.

2. Description of development

The proposal is for:

- An attic conversion into non-habitable storage space;
- Dormer roof to rear to accommodate stairs and associated ancillary works.

3. Planning History

Subject site:

None recorded.

Nearby sites:

- Ref. WEB1317/22: Planning permission granted by the planning authority in 2022 at No. 31 Carleton Road for a single-storey extension to rear of existing property, and construction of a dormer extension to rear at attic level.
- Ref. 3371/11: Planning permission granted by the planning authority in 2012 at 53 Carleton Road for a 4.5m wide flat roof below ridge level dormer with window to rear. A condition was attached to this permission requiring the width of the dormer to be reduced so as not to exceed 3.5m.

4. Planning Policy

I note the following provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028:

- The land use zoning objective for the area is 'Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas)' – "*To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas*".
- Policy SC19 High Quality Architecture
- Policy QHSN6 Urban Consolidation
- Chapter 11 Built Heritage and Culture including Policy BHA9 Conservation Areas
- Chapter 15 Development Standards
- Section 15.9.18 Overlooking and Overbearance
- Section 15.11 House Developments

Appendix 18 Residential Extension including Sections 1.1 General Design Principles, 4.0 Alterations at Roof Level / Attics / Dormers / Additional Floors, and 5.0 Attic Conversions / Dormer Windows.

5. Natural Heritage designations

None relevant.

Decision and Grounds of Appeal

6. Planning Authority decision

The planning authority issued a notification of decision to grant on 7th July 2023 with 8 no. conditions attached. I note the following:

- Condition 2 part (a) states the dormer structure shall have a maximum external width of 3.5m and shall be centred as much as possible on the roof plane. It also states that the glazing panels to the window openings of the amended dormer structure shall retain a vertical emphasis and shall be no taller or wider than the largest first floor rear elevation window below.
- Condition 2 part (b) requires that the 2 no. roof windows on the front roof plane shall be omitted.

7. Appeal

The first party appeal is against part of Condition 2(a) specifically. The appeal is prepared by the appellant's architect and is summarised as follows:

- Contests the first element of Condition 2 part (a) that requires the dormer be reduced to a maximum of 3.5m and centred as much as possible on the roof;
- Seeks to maintain dormer width of 3.9m internally. This will keep dormer width to 63% of the width of the roof and not be overbearing;
- In the reduced and centred dormer the stairs will encroach into the storage space and limit its use. An existing chimney breast will further reduce the area;
- The dormer will have no visual bearing on the streetscape;
- There is an existing dormer measuring 4m on a mid-terrace house at No. 53 Carleton Road which is not centred on the roof;
- There are a number of off-centre dormers in the area and which exceed 3.5m width (eg. 53 Carleton Road, 18 St Aidan's Park and 52 St. Declan's Road);
- There are a number of dormers extending the full width of the roof within 1km (eg. 221 Philipsburgh Avenue, 215 Philipsburgh Avenue, 221 Philipsburgh

<p>Avenue, 58 and 59 Grace Park Terrace, and 62, 74 and 78 Annadale Crescent). Some of these exceed 4.5m width and are in mid-terrace houses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not contest the second element of Condition 2 part (a) that requires the dormer window opening glazing panels to have vertical emphasis and be no taller or wider than the largest first floor rear window below; • Does not contest Condition 2 part (b). States the front windows will be omitted; <p>Appeal includes a list of dwellings in the area with dormers, photographs of dormers in the area, and planning application reference numbers.</p>
<p>8. Planning authority response</p> <p>None received.</p>

Environmental screening

<p>9. Environmental Impact Assessment screening</p> <p>The proposed development is not within a class where EIA applies, and therefore is not subject to requirements for preliminary examination of EIA (Refer to pre-screening Form 1, Appendix 1 of this report).</p> <p>10. Appropriate Assessment screening</p> <p>Having regard to the proposed alterations and the location in an urban area connection to existing services, and absence of connectivity to European sites, I conclude that 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 any European site.</p>

11.0 Assessment

- 11.1. Having regard to the foregoing; having examined the application details; having inspected the site; and having regard to relevant policies and objectives, I consider the main issues are those related directly to the appeal, that is, Condition 2 part (a). Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the nature of Condition 2 part (a), I consider that a *de novo* assessment is not warranted. I am satisfied the proposed development is otherwise in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. I recommend the Board

determines the matters raised in the appeal only in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

Condition 2 part (a)

- 11.2. The dormer would have limited if any visibility from Carleton Road. It would be visible from the rear of some dwellings to the east. It would have only incidental visibility from Malahide Road.
- 11.3. The dormer would not extend above the ridge height of the dwelling and would be set back from the eaves. It would not extend the full width of the roof, and a large proportion of the roof would remain visible. I consider the dormer to be reasonably typical in size, scale and design, and would relate well to the form, position and design of the dwelling. I consider the dormer would be visually subordinate, would have minimal visual impact, would not be overly dominant, and would be sympathetic to the proportions of the building.
- 11.4. In relation to the alignment of the dormer on the roof plane, I note the design of the existing dwelling is not symmetrical, including in relation to the alignment of the front dormer. Other dwellings in the area also have designs that are not symmetrical.
- 11.5. The dormer is proposed to be clad in metal. I am satisfied that the finishes and materials as required by Condition 3 of the planning authority decision are appropriate.
- 11.6. I note that the zoning objective for the area is Z2 which seeks to protect the special interest and character of the area. The development plan requires that development contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness of the area and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area. The area has a distinct character derived from its planned nature, narrow streets and the regimented form, height and design of the numerous terraces. I note again the significant design variation within and between the dwellings in the area. The proposal would have minimal impact on the streetscape, and given its position, scale and design I do not consider it would conflict significantly with the elements that underpin the character of the area. The proposal also provides for ancillary residential development in line with the land use zoning objective, and I consider it would make an overall positive contribution to the area.

- 11.7. For completeness I note that in relation to overlooking and overbearance, the dwellings to the east are over c.27m away and as such I do not consider there would be significant issues in this regard.
- 11.8. I consider that the proposal in the absence of the first element of Condition 2 part (a) is acceptable and would not be unsuitable or have a significant detrimental impact on the residential and visual amenity of the area, or the architectural quality of the area, subject to further conditions as set out above and below. As noted the appeal does not extend to the second element of Condition 2 part (a) or to part (b) of Condition 2.

12.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the nature of Condition No. 2(a), which is the subject of the appeal, the Board is satisfied that the determination by the Board of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and, based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to AMEND Condition No. 2 part (a), to read as follows:

Amended Condition 2:

2.	<p>The development shall be revised as follows:</p> <p>a) The glazing panels to the window openings of the dormer shall retain a vertical emphasis and shall be no taller or wider than the largest first floor rear elevation window below;</p> <p>b) The 2 no. rooflights on the front roof plane shall be omitted.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of residential and visual amenity.</p>
----	--

13.0 Reasons & Considerations

Having regard to the 'Z2' land use zoning for the area, and to the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the proposed extension and alterations, by reason of their limited scale, nature and design, and their location with respect to adjoining properties, would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities, or the conservation value of the area, subject to condition.

-I confirm this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.-

Dan Aspell

Inspector

3rd January 2024

APPENDIX 1

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	317740-23		
Proposed Development Summary	Attic conversion into non-habitable storage space with dormer to rear to accommodate stairs		
Development Address	25 Carleton Road, Marino, Dublin 3		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	No further action required
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) or does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes		Class.....	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
No	X	N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Class/Threshold.....	Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	X	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ Date: 14/12/23