



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL09.247219

Development	Changes to Dwelling Internally and Externally, Two Storey Extension to Side of Dwelling and Shed, new vehicle entrance to rear at 205 Glendale, Leixlip, Co. Kildare
Planning Authority	Kildare Co. Co.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	16/627
Applicant(s)	Des and Elisha Connolly
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant with Conditions
Appellant(s)	Des and Elisha Connolly
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	28/11/2016
Inspector	Caryn Coogan

1.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 1.1 No. 205 Glendale is located within a suburban residential housing estate called Glendale to the north-east of Leixlip. It is 0.0445Ha and includes a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a conservatory to the rear.

2.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 2.1 The proposed development will consist of changes to the existing dwelling on both floor levels, internally to the layout and externally to the relocation of existing windows and hall door. There is also a two storey extension to the side of the dwelling, a bay across the front of the dwelling on the ground floor and a single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling.

3.0 PLANNING AUTHORITY DECISION

3.1 DECISION

Kildare Co. Co. had a split decision relating to the proposed development. The planning authority granted the alterations and extension to the existing dwelling subject to 11No. conditions. The most relevant is Condition No. 2:

Prior to the commencement of any development on foot of this permission that applicant shall submit revised details for the proposed front elevation removing the bay style entrance windows and porch area in order to reduce length and break up the visual dominance of this section of the development for the written agreement of the planning authority.

The proposed vehicular entrance was refused due to the undesirable precedent and it would conflict with section 15.2.7 of the development plan.

3.2 TECHNICAL REPORTS

Area Engineer: No objections

Water Services: No objections

Transportation : No objection but 2nd entrance should be refused.

Planning Report: The proposed extension and reconfiguration of the dwelling is acceptable, in terms of overlooking, plot ratio, site coverage, etc. The front bay is considered to be excessive, and should be redesigned. The new entrance would have to traverse a grass verge and footpath, and it will reduce the capacity and safety of the road. The new

access conflicts with the policy 15.2.7 which discourages the proliferation of access points onto public roads.

3.3 THIRD PARTY SUBMISSIONS

There were none received.

4.0 PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 A number of permissions granted to neighbouring properties for extensions to side of dwellings and attic spaces, 05/585 and 00/755.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

5.1 Development Plan

Leixlip LAP 2010/ Kildare County Development Plan 2011-2017

The subject site is zoned to protect and improve residential amenity, to provide for appropriate infill residential development and to provide for new and improved ancillary services.

6.0 THE APPEALS

6.1 The applicants have appealed two elements of the planning authority's decision namely Condition No. 2 and the decision to refuse the new vehicular entrance.

6.2 Condition No. 2

The applicant's wish to extend their TV room and hallway which creates the single storey bay affect. It only projects 1.3metres from the front building line of the dwelling. It will have a lean to roof, and pitch that matches the main roof of the dwelling. It is unclear from the planning report on file and the decision, how the front extension was viewed to be excessive. There are a number of similar front extensions throughout the Glendale estate. The Board is referred to No. 194 Glendale in the same cul-de-sac as the subject site which was permitted under reference 2010/0006. Another example is No. 136 Glendale a single storey bay window/ porch extension was granted.

Glendale is not an architectural conservation area. There is no justification for Condition no. 2.

6.3 Vehicular Entrance

Mr. Connolly is engaged in the construction industry and wishes to park his small van within secure boundaries on his own property for security reasons. The Council's decision limits him to parking his van to the front

of the dwelling. The proposal will not set a precedent as there are few if any similar houses in Glendale estate, the precedent argument has no credibility there are no similar cul-de sacs throughout the estate. The public carriageway is 5.5metres wide. There are 6No. dwellings served by it. There will be no increase in traffic generated by the proposed entrance therefore, there will be no material impact.

Under PL 09.215529 The Board granted an additional entrance to serve a new dwelling, and the proposed entrance was deemed to be reasonable at the exact same location as the proposed entrance.

Section 15.2.7 does not relate to new entrances onto public roads. The relevant sections are 19.6.3 and 19.6.4 and these relate mainly to the development of houses in rural areas and are not applicable to the current scenario

6.12 RESPONSES

Planning Authority: There was no further comment from the planning authority.

7.0 ASSESSMENT

- 7.1 The site is a corner site within a large residential development in Leixlip. The site has two road frontages and includes a semi-detached dwelling. The house is currently a three bedroomed unit, unoccupied and this will increase to the four-bedroom unit under the current proposals, with a large open plan area on the ground floor, and two family rooms. The most notable features of the proposed development is a two storey extension to the side of the house, a single storey extension to the rear, a front elevation bay projection and a side vehicular entrance to the rear of the dwelling.
- 7.2 The Board previously granted planning permission for the subdivision of the site and the provision of a new dwelling within the existing curtilages under appeal reference PL09.215529. The dwelling permitted was to the side of No. 205 Glendale. This permitted development was not carried out on the site.
- 7.3 The planning authority granted the proposed extension. There were no third party submissions from the neighbours. However, the planning authority considered the double bay window projection to the front elevation of the extended dwelling to be excessive. A condition was attached, namely Condition No. 2 omitting the bay projection. The front bay projection along the front elevation is merely a decorative feature. It is to provide balance to the new television room which projects 1metres from the front building line, and the overall design has been mirrored on the layout of the existing front room and hallway. The house has little or no

architectural merit and the estate is a typical suburban residential estate. The footprint and layout of the large residential curtilage enables the applicant to erect a sizeable extension to the dwelling without undermining the visual or streetscape qualities of the immediate area. This is an end/corner dwelling. The bay window projection on the ground floor will not impact on the neighbours and because it is only 1m in depth, I do not consider it to be excessive. The horizontal emphasis of front elevation design may have been better broken up by the provision of two separate front bay windows, however this would not have provided an extension to the internal hallway. Overall the proposal is acceptable in the context of the wider streetscape, and is not considered to be excessive. I noted and photographed a dwelling within the same cul de sac as the subject site, 194 Glendale has a broadly similar front elevation and projecting bay windows at ground floor level across the entire width of the extended dwelling. Therefore, I recommend the Board remove condition No. 2.

7.4 The planning authority made a split decision and refused the additional vehicular entrance to the rear of the dwelling. The applicant is a builder, and he intends erecting a shed on site, and wishes to park his car to the rear of the property for extra security of his van. The proposed access is positioned alongside No. 206 Glendale, along the northern site boundary. The existing vehicular entrance and parking is the front of the dwelling is along the western site boundary. The Board should note the new proposed entrance is accessed from a short cul de sac, and it will not result in any material impact on the adjoining estate road network.

7.5 I consider the proposed new entrance is reasonable and is incidental to the enjoyment of the existing dwelling on site. It will not impact negatively on neighbouring properties or the road safety of the estate. The Board should note there is an existing similar entrance en route to the subject site within Glendale at No. 84 Glendale, photographs included. In the case of No. 84 Glendale the second access is off the main service road into the large estate, unlike the subject site, which has the access onto the short cul de sac serving 6No. dwellings. The Board should overturn the decision to refuse the second entrance to the rear of the dwelling as there is a significant road frontage to the individual curtilage, and the new access is unlikely to materially impact on the wider estate or the adjoining properties.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

Overall, the development is acceptable in principle on the subject site, and the planning authority's decision to refuse planning permission for the second rear vehicular entrance should be overturned by the Board, and the proposed front elevation treatment is acceptable having regard to similar type development within close proximity to 205 Glendale, Leixlip.

REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Having regard to the zoning objectives for the area and to the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety, public health and convenience. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

CONDITIONS

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 and 1900 from Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between the hours of 0800 and 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

3. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure a proper standard of development.

4. All necessary measures shall be taken by the contractor to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay rubble or other debris on adjoining roads during the course of the works.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

5. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

Caryn Coogan

Planning Inspector

01/12/2016

