



An
Bord
Pleanála

**Board Direction
PL06F.247943**

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on the 5th July 2017.

The Board decided to treat this case under section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000. The Board decided, generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, and for the Reasons and Considerations set out below that the planning authority be directed, as follows:

Attach condition number 4(b), and the reason therefor

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the pattern of development in the area, which is defined by dwellings with fully hipped roof profiles at each end, it is considered that the proposed Dutch hip roof would not complement the character of adjoining dwellings, would appear visually incongruous within the streetscape and would create a visually discordant intervention that would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. Accordingly, it is considered that the imposition of this condition by the planning authority was reasonable and appropriate.

The Board also decided, for the Reasons and Considerations set out below, that the planning authority be directed as follows:

Amend condition number 4(a) as that it is as follows:

“The dormer extension to rear to be omitted and may be replaced by no more than four no. rooflights”

In not accepting the recommendation of the Inspector that the planning authority be directed to attach condition 4 (a), the Board was of opinion that the proposed dormer extension, even as modified by condition 4 (a) as imposed by the planning authority, would create a visually discordant intervention that would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area, and therefore was of the view that it should be omitted, and could be replaced by rooflights.

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the pattern of development in the area and the location of the subject property, the rear elevation of which is visible from adjoining public open space, it is considered that the proposed dormer window extension, even as modified by condition 4 (a) as imposed by the planning authority, would create a visually discordant intervention that would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. It is therefore considered that condition 4 (a) should be amended to exclude the dormer extension in its entirety.

Board Member:

Philip Jones

Date: