



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP318417-23

### Development

Two- storey flat roof extension (to include a porch and hallway extension on the ground floor and a bedroom extension on the first floor) and alterations to the existing windows, all to the front.

### Location

19 Meadow View, Churchtown, Dublin  
14

### Planning Authority

Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County  
Council.

### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D23B/0394.

### Applicant(s)

Mariya Marinova.

### Type of Application

Permission.

### Planning Authority Decision

Refuse permission.

### Type of Appeal

First Party

### Appellant(s)

Mariya Marinova.

### Observer(s)

None.

**Date of Site Inspection**

23/12/23.

**Inspector**

Anthony Abbott King

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site comprises no.19 Meadow View a two-storey 2-bay semi-detached house on the west side of the street. Meadow View is a suburban residential avenue within a network of residential streets to the east of Nutgrove Shopping Centre;
- 1.2. No.19 Meadow View abuts no. 17 Meadow View to the south and is separated from no. 21 Meadow View by a side passage.
- 1.3. Meadow View comprises a streetscape of two-storey semi detached houses with front and back gardens. No. 19 Meadow View has in-curtilage vehicular parking to the front.
- 1.4. The streetscape on both sides of Meadow View is generally uniform. However, the front building line in instance is broken by porch extensions at ground floor level;
- 1.5. The site area is given as 0.022 hectares (220 sqm.).

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Two-storey flat roof extension (to include a porch and hallway extension on the ground floor and a bedroom extension on the first floor) and alterations to the existing windows, all to the front of the subject property at Meadow View.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Refuse permission for the following reason:

*(1) The proposed extension is out of character and would not integrate with the existing house and neighbouring properties and would be visually obtrusive on the streetscape. As such, the proposed development would impact negatively upon the amenities of the area and would depreciate the value of property in the vicinity. It is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to Section 12.3.7.1 (i) of the County Development Plan 2022-2028 ('Extensions to Dwellings – Extensions to the Front'), by virtue of its negative visual impact and the reduction of the length of the subject site's driveway*

*below the 6m length requirement. The development, if permitted, would set an undesirable precedent for similar types of development on similarly constrained sites. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the zoning objective of the area, which is 'A' to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities and would be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

## **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

The decision of the CEO of Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown reflects the recommendation of the planning case officer.

### **3.2.2. Other Technical Reports**

No objection subject to condition.

## **4.0 Planning History**

None recorded subject site.

## **5.0 Policy and Context**

### **5.1. Development Plan**

The Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the local planning policy document. The following policy objectives are relevant:

- Chapter 13 (Land Use Zoning Objectives) Table 13.1.1 (Development Plan Zoning Objectives) and Zoning Map 1 is relevant.

The area zoning objective is "A": *To provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.*

- Chapter 12 (Development Management) Section 12.3.7.1 (Extensions to Dwellings) provides guidance with respect to porches, front extensions, side

extensions, rear extensions, roof alterations, attic conversions and dormer extension.

- Section 12.3.7.1 (i) (Extensions to the Front) is relevant and states:

*Porch extensions, other than those deemed to be exempted development, should be of appropriate design and scale relative to the design of the original house. The scale, height, and projection from the front building line of the dwelling should not be excessive so as to dominate the front elevation of the dwelling. The porch should complement the existing dwelling, and a more contemporary design approach can be considered.*

*Front extensions, at both ground and first level will be considered acceptable in principle subject to scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. A break in the front building line will be acceptable, over two floors to the front elevation, subject to scale and design however a significant break in the building line should be resisted unless the design can demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the proposal will not impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings. Excessive scale should be avoided. Front extensions, particularly at first floor level, should reflect the roof shape and slope of the main dwelling. A minimum driveway length of 6 metres should be maintained.*

## 5.2. EIA Screening

5.3. The proposed development is not within a class where EIA would apply.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of this first-party appeal, prepared by Enda Fanning Architect on behalf of the appellant, are summarised below. The appeal statement is accompanied by a suite of drawings.

- There were no third-party objections to the planning application. The decision to refuse permission was the decision of Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council's planning officer;
- The proposed extension extended a distance of 2.35m from the existing front wall with a width of 3.4m. The incorporation of a canopy to the front to create an open porch extended the distance from the front wall by a further 1.7m;
- The front driveway depth is well over the maximum 6m required across most of the house frontage and off-street parking can still be accommodated. There are also numerous off-street car parking spaces on Meadow View;
- The proposal at No. 19 Meadow View is not unusual in terms of its design within the County of Dun Laoghaire Rathdown citing an example at no. 111 Braemor Road, Churchtown, Dublin 14;
- No. 79 Barton Road East is cited by the appellant as an example of an approved (Reg. Ref: 20B/0089) similar scale first floor front extension, which is located 750m from no. 19 Meadow View;
- The appellant challenges the assertion of the planning authority that the proposed development would impact negatively upon the amenities of the area and would depreciate the value of property in the vicinity. The appellant asks the Board to exclude such an assertion as it is not a planning matter and a planning officer would have no experience in assessing local property values.

## 6.2. Planning Authority Response

The Board is referred to the previous planners report. It is considered that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the planning authority, would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

## 6.3. Observations

None

## 7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. The following assessment covers the points made in the appeal submission and is my *de novo* consideration of the application. The appeal statement is accompanied by a suite of drawings (08 November, 2023). I advise the Board that I do not consider that the drawings submitted with the appeal statement represent a material change in the application as advertised. It is noted there are no new substantive matters for consideration.
- 7.2. The applicant proposes to build a two- storey flat roof extension to the front of no. 19 Meadow View a two-storey two-bay semi-detached house in a streetscape of similar suburban houses. No. 19 Meadow View has an existing floor area of 106 sqm. The two-storey front extension would accommodate a porch at ground floor level (5.4 sqm.), as a hallway extension, and would accommodate a bedroom extension at first floor (5.4 sqm.). The two-storey extension would have an internal floor area of approximately 11 sqm.
- 7.3. The construction of the extension on the front façade at ground and first floor level would require alteration of the existing front elevation fenestration including the introduction of a 'glazed screen fixed to sill' at first floor level. The existing horizontal window openings to the ground floor reception room and the larger first floor bedroom would be reduced in width with a compensatory increase in their verticality. The fenestration of the new bedroom extension above the porch would match the vertical emphasis of the altered fenestration of the front façade of the house. The proposed fenestration of no. 19 Meadow View would be distinct, including the introduction of first-floor glazed screens to the bedroom windows, given the dominant horizontal emphasis of the streetscape fenestration on Meadow View.
- 7.4. The extension would have an external footprint of approximately 8 sqm. and would project 2350mm beyond the front building line at first floor level. The two-storey extension externally would have a plaster finish. The ground floor level would be accessed by external steps from the front driveway. The rise of the steps would be located under an open canopy screened to the north, which would extend the north facing elevation of the front extension at ground floor level. The canopy would have a zinc roof and at the side of the entry the screen wall would be clad in timber. The

projection of the extension at ground floor level inclusive of the canopy screen would measure 4050mm beyond the front building line.

- 7.5. The planning authority refused permission for the proposed development. The substantive reason for refusal is that the proposed extension would be out of character, would not integrate with the existing house and neighbouring properties and, would be visually obtrusive on the streetscape. The planning case officer concluded that the proposed development would have a negative visual impact on the streetscape at this location by virtue of its domineering appearance, and its lack of compliance with the requirements set out in Section 12.3.7.1 (i) of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 ('Extensions to Dwellings-Extensions to the Front') and if permitted would set an undesirable precedent for similar development. The appellant notes that there were no third party objections to the planning application. The appellant challenges the assertion of the planning authority that the proposed development would impact negatively upon the amenities of the area and in particular that it would depreciate the value of property in the vicinity.
- 7.6. The zoning is objective "A": *To provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.* The extension of an existing dwelling house is permissible subject to compliance with the overall policy objectives for the zone, would not have undesirable effects and, would otherwise be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The relevant Section 12.3.7.1 (i) ('Extensions to Dwellings-Extensions to the Front') of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 *inter alia* states:

*Front extensions, at both ground and first level will be considered acceptable in principle subject to scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. A break in the front building line will be acceptable, over two floors to the front elevation, subject to scale and design however a significant break in the building line should be resisted unless the design can demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the proposal will not impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings. Excessive scale should be avoided.*



- 7.7. I consider that the proposed development would in floor area represent a reasonable upgrade of the existing accommodation on site (106 sqm.) providing a modest increase in living space (approximately 11 sqm.). However, the location of the extension to the front of the house and the two-storey massing projecting 2350mm at first floor level beyond the front building line is problematic. I would concur with the planning case officer that the proposal would have an adverse visual impact. I consider that the two-storey massing of the front extension would have a significant adverse visual impact on no.19 Meadow View and the Meadow View streetscape given the uniformity of the existing housing stock on Meadow View above ground floor level.
- 7.8. It is considered that the proposed front extension would be out of character, would not integrate with the existing house and neighbouring properties in Meadow View and, would be visually obtrusive on the streetscape by reason of its scale, two-storey massing and form projecting 2350mm beyond the established front building line at first floor level and 4050mm beyond the front building line at ground floor level. Therefore, the proposal would be inconsistent with Section 12.3.7.1 (i) ('Extensions to Dwellings-Extensions to the Front') by reason of excessive scale and design providing for a significant break in the established building line, which would have an adverse impact on visual and residential amenities.
- 7.9. I note on the day of my site visit that there are single-storey projections in instances providing for enclosed porches in Meadow View including at no. 15 Meadow View proximate to the subject dwelling house. However, there are no first floor extensions in the streetscape. I also note on my site visit following walking the network of suburban streets in the area (not exhaustive) including Meadow Park that there are no front first floor extensions in the streetscapes in the vicinity.
- 7.10. It is further noted that in instances along the extensive linear streetscape on Barton Road East in the vicinity of the subject site that there are very limited examples of first-floor front extension, including at no. 79 Barton Road East cited by the appellant. The projection of the first-floor extensions on Barton Road East are shallow, representing a modest step forward of the building line, emphasising the end bay of the front elevation. These shallow projections are in proportion to the associated front façades. I consider that the subject proposal would set an undesirable precedent in terms of excessive scale for front two-storey extension of dwelling

houses given the modest width of the front facade of no. 19 Meadow View and the significant projection of the first floor of the proposed extension by 2350mm beyond the front building line.

7.11. The planning case officer observes the reduction of the driveway to circa. 4.7m, arising from the dept of the steps leading to the ground floor entrance resulting from the site gradient. Section 12.3.7.1 (i) ('Extensions to Dwellings-Extensions to the Front') of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 requires that *a minimum driveway length of 6 metres should be maintained*. I would concur with the planning case officer, as I measure the dept of the driveway from the front boundary to the proposed entrance steps at an approximate 5m (measured off the revised drawings dated August 2023 submitted with the appeal).

7.12. In conclusion, the proposed front extension by reason of its scale, two-storey massing and building form, projecting 2350mm beyond the established front building line at first floor level and 4050mm beyond the front building line at ground floor level, would be out of character, would not integrate with the existing house and neighbouring properties and, would be visually obtrusive on the streetscape, which would set an undesirable precedent for similar two-storey front extensions of excessive scale and, as such, the proposal would be inconsistent with Section 12.3.7.1 (i) ('Extensions to Dwellings-Extensions to the Front') of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 and with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

#### 7.13. **Appropriate Assessment Screening**

The proposed development comprises a domestic front two-storey extension in an established urban area.

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development it is possible to screen out the requirement for the submission of an NIS.

## 8.0 **Recommendation**

8.1. I recommend a refusal of planning permission having regard to the reasons and considerations below.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the grounds of appeal, the reason for refusal, the residential zoning objective 'A', which seeks to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities and, the policy framework provided by Section 12.3.7.1 (i) ('Extensions to Dwellings-Extensions to the Front') of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, it is considered that the proposed development comprising a two-storey front extension, by reason of its scale, two-storey massing and building form, projecting 2350mm beyond the established front building line at first floor level and 4050mm beyond the front building line at ground floor level, would adversely impact on the residential and visual amenities of the area given the uniformity of the streetscape on Meadow View above ground floor level, would set an undesirable precedent for similar first floor front extension of excessive scale and, as such, would be inconsistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 10.0 Reason for Refusal

1.	The proposed extension is out of character and would not integrate with the existing house and neighbouring properties and would be visually obtrusive on the streetscape. As such, the proposed development would impact negatively upon the visual and residential amenities of the area. It is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to Section 12.3.7.1 (i) of the County Development Plan 2022-2028 ('Extensions to Dwellings – Extensions to the Front'), by virtue of its negative visual impact and the reduction of the length of the subject site's driveway below the 6m length requirement. The development, if permitted, would set an undesirable precedent for similar types of development on similarly constrained sites. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the zoning objective of the area, which is Objective 'A' to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
----	---

“I confirm that 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”.

---

Anthony Abbott King  
Planning Inspector

29 December 2023