



An
Bord
Pleanála

Board Direction
PL29N.248875

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on October 19th 2017.

The Board decided to treat this case under section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000. The Board also decided, generally as recommended by the Inspector, and for the Reasons and Considerations set out below, that the planning authority be directed to amend condition number 3 so that it reads as follows:-

3. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:-
 - (a) The ground floor and first floor of the proposed extension shall be set back to match the existing front building line of the house.
 - (b) The first floor rear balcony shall be omitted from the development and the proposed double doors at this location shall be replaced by a window having the same dimensions, and at the same cill height, as the existing rear window serving bedroom number 2.
 - (c) The extension shall be modified, either by setting it back from the side boundary or by an alteration to the roof design, so as to ensure that no part of the development, including gutters and rainwater goods, would oversail the adjoining property to the west.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the residential amenities of neighbouring property.

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 – 2022, and to the existing pattern of development in the area, it is considered that, by reason of its scale, form and design and its location at the end of a terrace of dwellings, the proposed development, as modified by the amended condition 3 set out in this order, would not seriously injure the residential amenities of adjoining property and would be acceptable in terms of the visual amenities of the area. It is considered that the setting back of the first floor of the proposed extension by one metre from the existing building line, as required by the terms of condition 3(b) imposed by the planning authority, was not warranted, but it is also considered that the imposition of a condition requiring the development not to oversail adjoining property is necessary in order to protect the amenities of that property.

Board Member

Date: 19th October 2017

Philip Jones