



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

The Board decided to treat this case under section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000. The Board also decided that the planning authority be directed to amend condition no. 2, so that it reads as follows, for the reasons and considerations set out following.

Condition No.2

2. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:-
 - (a) The front ridge height of the proposed extension shall be reduced by c.900mm.
 - (b) The roof of the proposed side extension shall match the main roof in terms of angle and pitch and material use.
 - (c) The reduction in height of the ridge would determine a recession of the front building line to be c.one metre behind the main building line of the dwelling.
 - (d) The triangular pitched roofs to the dormers shall be omitted and replaced / maintained with flat roofs.
 - (e) The proposed porch shall be omitted and replaced with a revised porch or canopy comprising a simple form design response that would not compete or be incongruous with the existing house.

- (f) The two windows serving the bedroom at first floor level on the east elevation shall be omitted and replaced with two windows of similar dimensions to the narrow width windows to the existing front gable feature. The lower panes of glass in the windows shall be obscured. These windows shall be appropriately positioned on the elevation following the amendments required to the height and setback.

Reason: To respond sensitively to the architectural character of the original house and to safeguard the visual amenities of the area.

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the policies and objectives of the current Development Plan for the area, the pattern of existing development in the area, and the character and form of the original house, it is considered that an amendment to condition number 2, including 2(e), which requires a redesigned porch which would be a simple form or alternatively an open canopy design, would be reasonable and appropriate to ensure that the design responds sensitively to the architectural character of the original house and to safeguard the visual amenities of the area. With the overall amended condition number 2, it is considered that the development, as proposed, would not seriously injure the character of the original house or of the visual amenities of the area, and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Board Member

Date: 6th December 2017

Philip Jones