



Board Direction

Ref: 29S.246088

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 12th, May 2016.

The Board decided to refuse permission generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

In not accepting the Planning Inspector's recommendation to grant planning permission for the proposed rear extension, the Board agreed with the Planning Inspector's conclusion that a suitably designed extension to the rear of the dwelling would be acceptable in principle, but considered that any such extension should not project beyond the established side building lines of the existing building.

Reasons and Considerations

Under the Dublin City Development Plan 2011 – 2017, the former social hall on the site and the accompanying dwelling houses to the south and west on Pembroke Gardens are identified as protected structures within a Z2 conservation area – residential neighbourhood. The architectural style of this hall and these dwelling houses reflects the Arts and Crafts Movement. The hall is sited on a corner between the southerly and westerly rows of dwelling houses and it provides a focal point for the same. It has a gambrel roof, which is of particular interest as it is a rare example in Dublin of this unusual roof type.

Policies FC27 and FC53 of the City Development Plan, the planning authority undertakes to preserve the built heritage of the city that makes a positive contribution to the character, appearance and quality of local streetscapes and to protect traditional pitch-roof forms in historic streetscapes. It is considered that the entire proposal including the insertion of four dormer windows the said gambrel roof and the rear

extension projecting beyond the established side building line of the existing dwelling would be out of character with the established character of development including this roof and with the wider roofscape context of the associated dwelling houses and would obscure the legibility of the existing dwelling including this shapely roof when viewed from surrounding public vantage points. Accordingly, to accede to them would contravene the aforementioned Policies and it would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Board Member: _____ Date: 12th, May 2016
Paddy Keogh