



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-001433
PL-501693-WW-26

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 16th October 2026.

The Commission decided to refuse permission generally in accordance with the following reasons and considerations.

Planning Commissioner:

Emer Maughan

Date:

21st day of October 2026

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the relevant policies of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 including CPO. 8.18 (Built Heritage) and CPO 8.20 (Protection of the County's Architectural Heritage) and Appendix 2 of Volume 3 in relation to extensions to single rural dwellings which states inter alia that extensions should be sympathetic to the existing house and that good extensions are usually

subservient to the main building, and CPO 6.43 which requires in cases of reinstatement of residential buildings that a structural survey is carried out and that works should be carried out in a sensitive manner, it is considered that the proposed extension and alterations, by reason of the form, massing and scale of the first floor extension and the two storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling, would seriously injure and visually detract from the single storey cottage and would not be sympathetic to the traditional form of the existing building. It is considered that the proposed alterations and extension, by virtue of the overall design approach, subsumes the existing dwelling form, is excessive in height, and would not respect the proportions of the existing dwelling. The proposed development would result in the unacceptable erosion of the character of the cottage, which despite not having a formal recognition as a Protected Structure, is a vernacular structure of historic interest. The proposed development fails to accord with policy objectives CPO 8.18 and CPO 8.20 of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028, which seek to conserve traditional dwellings and features. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development would injure the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note:

1. The Commission, having reviewed the totality of documentation on file, decided not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission as the Commission determined that the proposed development, by virtue of its design distorts the plan form, massing, and overall composition of the existing structure and, therefore, fails to respect the character, scale and proportions of the existing vernacular cottage. The Commission considered that the proposed development

would enclose the plan form and roofscape of the original cottage to the extent that it would be indistinguishable from the proposed extension and therefore the Commission did not agree with the Inspector's assessment that the proposed extension is subservient to the height of the existing dwelling or to the floorspace of the existing dwelling, particularly given the excessive floor to ceiling height of the proposed first floor in relation to the existing floor to ceiling height in the cottage. The Commission noted the absence of a structural survey and the lack of certainty whether the existing walls would have sufficient bearing capacity to support an additional floor. The Commission considered that the proposed plan form detracts from the narrow plan form of the existing cottage, and therefore would significantly diminish the architectural integrity of the cottage.

2. The Commission had concerns with the accuracy of the survey drawings, in particular in relation to the height of the eaves of the existing cottage, the proportions of the window and door opens relative to the existing eaves height and the slope of the roof as presented for the existing extension.