



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL29S.247536

---

<b>Development</b>	Part change of use of parochial house and erection of extension to provide a new Parish Pastoral Centre and demolition of offices (schoolhouse)
<b>Location</b>	Grounds of Church of the Sacred Heart, Donnybrook, Dublin 4 (PS)
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	3612/16
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	MGR Lorcan O'Brien
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Philip O'Reilly Shrewsbury Property Services
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> February 2017
<b>Inspector</b>	Karla Mc Bride

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

The appeal site is located in Donnybrook on the south side of Dublin and the surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. The site is located on the corner of Anglesea Road, Ailesbury Road and Stillorgan Road. It is occupied by the Church of the Sacred Heart which is a Protected Structure, two 2-storey over basement semi-detached, red brick Parochial Houses, and a single storey former national school building which is used as parish offices. The site boundaries are defined by walls and trees and vehicular access is off Stillorgan Road to the SW and Ailesbury Road/Close to the NE. The site is bound to the SE by the 3-storey Belville apartment development and Donnybrook Bus Garage is located to the SW on the opposite side of the Stillorgan Road. Photographs and maps in Appendix 1 describe this relationship in more detail.

Permission is being sought for a new Parish Pastoral Centre which would comprise:

- Change of use of the basements in the 2 semi-detached Parochial Houses.
- Retention of residential use at ground and upper floor levels
- Construction of a 2-storey extension to the rear of one of the houses.
- Demolition of the former school building.
- Extension of car park to provide 63 spaces.
- New vehicular entrance off Ailesbury Close & alteration of existing entrance.

The application was accompanied by the following documents:

- Conservation report
- Structural Report
- Drainage Report
- Flood Risk Assessment Report

## 2.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

### 2.1. **Decision**

The PA decided to grant planning permission subject to 8 standard conditions.

### 2.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

Planning Officer: Recommended grant of permission.

Drainage Division: No objection subject to conditions.

Roads and Traffic: No objection subject to conditions.

Conservation Officer: No report.

### 2.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Application circulated to the DAU, Heritage Council and An Taisce with no submissions received.

### 2.4. **Third Party Observations**

Three objections raised concerns in relation to protected structures & conservation, inappropriate design, excessive glazing & loss of privacy, adverse impact on adjoining car park, adverse impact on streetscape, unnecessary demolition of Victorian school house which should be converted to a community centre.

### 2.5. **Planning History**

None.

## 3.0 Policy Context

### 3.1. Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines for PAs, DoEH&LG 2004

Part 1 of this document provides advice and guidelines for the protection of structures, or parts of structures, and the preservation of the character of architectural conservation areas. Chapter 5 contains specific guidelines for places of public worship. Part 2 provides detailed guidance in relation to particular features and Chapter 13 deals with curtilage and attendant grounds.

Section 13.1.5 states that in making a decision as to the extent of the **curtilage** of a protected structure and the other structures within the curtilage, the planning authority should consider:

- (a) Is, or was, there a functional connection between the structures?
- (b) Was there a historical relationship between the main structure and the structure(s) within the curtilage which may no longer be obvious?
- (c) Are the structures in the same ownership? Were they previously in the same ownership at the time of construction of one or other of the structures?

Section 13.2.1 states that the **attendant grounds** of a structure are lands outside the curtilage of the structure but which are associated with the structure and are intrinsic to its function, setting and/or appreciation.

### 3.2. Dublin City Council Development Plan 2016 to 2022

**Zoning objective:** The proposed development would be located within an area covered by the Z2 zoning objective in the Development Plan which seeks to “To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.” Cultural/recreational building and uses are open for consideration.

**Protected Structures:** The Church of the Sacred Heart is a Protected Structure

**Conservation Areas:** The NW corner of the site lies within the River Dodder CA.

**Residential Conservation Areas:** The site is located within a Zone 2 RCA.

**Policy CHC1** seeks the preservation of the built heritage of the city that makes a positive contribution to the character, appearance and quality of local streetscapes and the sustainable development of the city.

**Policy CHC2** seeks to ensure that the special interest of protected structures is protected. Development will conserve and enhance Protected Structures and their curtilage and will (amongst other requirements) not cause harm to the curtilage of the structure. The design, form, scale, height, proportions, siting and materials of new development should relate to and complement the special character of the protected structure.

**Policy CHC4** seeks to protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas (11.1.5.4). Development within or affecting all conservation areas will contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness; and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.

#### **Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings (Section 16.10.12 & Appendix 17):**

The design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular the need for light and privacy and the development should integrate with the existing building.

#### **Sub-division of Dwellings (Section 16.10.13):**

The sub-division of large dwelling houses may be permitted in highly accessible areas to provide for the demographic changes in the city, subject to the residential amenity standards set out in Chapter 16 including minimum floor space etc...Where sub-division is being considered, factors such as the extent of open space within the site boundaries, landscaping schemes including the retention and planting of trees, the provision of on-site parking, the retention of existing railings and gates, and screened refuse storage areas will be evaluated as part of the assessment.

## **Car parking standards – Area 3 (Map J & Table 16.1):**

Other Cultural, Recreational & Leisure Uses:                      Dependent on nature, location & use

### **3.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

The following NPWS designated areas are located within a 5km radius of the site:

- South Dublin Bay SAC (Site code: 000210)
- South Dublin Bay & River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site code: 004024)
- South Dublin Bay pNHA (Site code: 000210)

## **4.0 The Appeal**

### **4.1. Grounds of first Third Party Appeal**

The concerns raised by Philip O'Reilly are summarised below.

- Insufficient weight given to the protected structure status of the buildings and the Z2 residential conservation area zoning for the site; the two houses and the former schoolhouse lie within the curtilage of the protected structure and are therefore part of this designation.
- All the buildings have significant architectural merit; the proposed extension would destroy their character; the schoolhouse, which has been adversely affected by recent interventions, would be lost; and a positive and constructive conservation approach is required.
- The Development Plan advocates the preservation and refurbishment of existing building stock over demolition and replacement.
- The schoolhouse and the two houses should be restored and refurbished; the existing extension to the schoolhouses should be removed; the

buildings would benefit from new sensitively designed extensions; for use as a community centre.

- The schoolhouse building is similar in design and character to the Rathgar School which is a PS, however the schoolhouse is even more unique because of the large amount of cut granite.
- The proposed works and extensive car parking would have an adverse impact on the character and setting of the two houses and the Church.

## 4.2. Grounds of second Third Party Appeal

The concerns raised by Shrewsbury Property Services Ltd. are summarised below.

- The period structures on the site form a notable ensemble that contributes to the heritage and prestige of Donnybrook and the proposal would bring far reaching changes to the property including the loss of the gardens.
- Adverse impact on the character and setting of the protected structure as a result of the proposed extension to the rear of the two houses, demolition of schoolhouse, excessive car parking, and new road layout.
- Adverse impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring apartments at Beleville as a result of excessive glazing, loss of perimeter trees and loss of privacy.
- The bulky 2-storey extension would have an adverse impact on the two houses and result in the loss of essential period features and the loss of the garden to car parking would destroy an essential feature within the of the curtilage of the protected structure.
- The schoolhouse should be retained as most of its defining features are well preserved, it merits inclusion in the RPS.
- The overall site contains heritage items of street furniture, including iron manhole covers, which should be protected.
- The height, bulk and external finishes render the proposal incompatible with the Z2 zoning objective for the site and the works, including the loss of the garden, would have a detrimental effect on the curtilage of the PS.
- Unsatisfactory assessment carried out by the planning authority.
- Adverse impact on amenities of nearby apartments at Beleville as a result of the extensive glazing and proximity of the first floor meetings rooms;



inadequate separation distances and overbearance; and day time solar glare and night time artificial lighting; all of which would be incompatible with the Z2 zoning objective which seeks to protect residential amenity.

- The excessive level of car parking would result in the loss on the entire rear garden of house no.2; the excessive car parking and new road layout would impact on the character and setting of the Church along Stillorgan Road; and it would prevent the planting of replacement trees.
- The new roadway would affect residential amenity at Beleville by way of noise, disturbance, glare, emissions and structural stability which would be incompatible with the Z2 zoning objective although land along the Anglesea Road frontage could be used for car parking as an alternative.
- The Beleville apartments were built on the former church car park in the mid-1980s and the applicant now seeks to overdevelop the site in order to compensate for previous mistakes.
- The Stillorgan Road entrance works well whilst the new entrance would force vehicles to use Ailesbury Road/Close in close proximity to Beleville; the new entrance should be located to the front of the Church (southern end) and further away from the traffic lights; the proposal would rely on a single entrance for the entire church parking; and there is overspill car parking on local roads during church and other events.
- The anticipated loss of trees to accommodate the proposal would have an adverse impact on the visual and residential amenities of the area, and the absence of a Tree Survey is noted.
- Request the Board to refuse permission for 3 reasons related to built heritage, visual and residential amenity and excessive car parking.

#### 4.3. Applicant's response to first Third Party Appeal

- The rationale for the proposed parish centre was set out in the cover letter.
- The footprint of the new extension would follow the line of the existing side wall of the parochial garden, the materials would reflect the finishes of the church but with a modern design.
- The existing car parking arrangements are inadequate as the church has a high attendance rate, the two existing car parks are entered from the rear of Ailesbury Road and directly from the Stillorgan Road
- The proposal will provide an access link between the front and rear at Ailesbury Road and the other directly off Stillorgan Road and access at the front of the church would be restricted to weddings and funerals only.
- Not all of the buildings on the site are protected structures and the removal of the schoolhouse would not have an impact on the PS or its setting.
- Most of the original architectural character of the schoolhouse was lost due to alterations and the building has no conservation merit and its restoration would not serve current needs.
- The semi-detached houses would be mainly retained in residential use and the basements would form part of the parish centre for pastoral care.
- The proposal will ensure that the church and parish continue to be viable for modern parish activities into the future.

#### 4.4. Applicant's response to second Third Party Appeal

- The schoolhouse does not form part of the PS or contribute to its setting, the extension to the semi-detached houses and part change of use to parish centre is acceptable and as are the access arrangements.
- The scheme has been designed by a Grade 1 Conservation Architect and an adequate assessment was carried out by the PA.
- The rear gardens are no longer necessary, the proposed extension will provide for a more appropriate community based use and the design and finishes would complement the Church which is a PS.
- The proposal would reduce on street car parking in the neighbourhood and the car park would be well landscaped.
- The refurbishment of the schoolhouse is not a viable option, it does not form part of the PS and its demolition is justifiable.
- Removal of the schoolhouse and rear gardens will provide for improved car parking, circulation & landscaping, compatible with the Z2 zone.
- The heritage features/ironworks on site are not of any particular merit although they could be retained by way of a planning condition.
- No alterations to the Stillorgan Road access which would be retained and the public notices contain an adequate description of the works.
- The Planner's report contains a detailed assessment of the application.

- The houses and schoolhouse were always ancillary to the church; the parish centre is acceptable within the Z2 zone; the height of the extension is lower than the houses; and the design and materials are high quality.
- Substantial separation distance between the glazed element and Belville and the trees along the boundary provide screening with no overlooking.
- Proposal does not constitute overdevelopment of the site; the removal of the schoolhouse and consolidation of the existing buildings through reuse and extension is an efficient use of the land; the site coverage is low.
- Proposal will have no impact on trees given the separation distances; the trees and boundary wall will be retained; and new trees will be planted.
- The PA had no concerns about the level of car parking; there is an existing car park with no increase in noise; there is a substantial separation between the car park and the Belville apartments which have car parking spaces along the boundary wall; with no additional noise or visual impacts.
- There will be an improvement to the access arrangements subject to a reduction in the entrance width to prevent the loss of on-street car parking spaces; and the limited use of the Stillorgan Road entrance is acceptable.
- Proposal comprises additional parking and the use of the Ailesbury Road access as an exit only, with a new entrance between the existing access and Belville which will be an entrance only; traffic flows will be improved; and overspill car parking in the surrounding area will be reduced.

#### 4.5. **Further correspondence.**

The first Third Party Appellant (Philip O'Reilly) expressed support for the issues raised by the second Third Party Appellant (Shrewsbury Property Services Ltd.)

#### 4.6. **Observations**

None received.

#### 4.7. **Prescribed Bodies**

No responses received from the Heritage Council or Arts Council.

#### 4.8. **Planning Authority Response**

No new issues raised.

## 5.0 **Assessment**

The main issues arising in this case are:

- Principle of development
- Visual amenity and heritage
- Residential amenity
- Access and car parking
- Other issues

### 5.1. **Principle of development**

The appeal site is located within an area covered by the “Z2” zoning objectives in the current Dublin City Council Development Plan which seeks to “To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.” The proposed development would be compatible with this objective, subject to compliance with other requirements in relation to heritage, amenity, access and car parking.

### 5.2. **Visual amenity and heritage**

The appeal site is occupied by the Church of the Sacred Heart, Parochial Houses which comprises a pair of 3-storey, semi-detached, red brick houses, and a single storey Victorian schoolhouse which is used as a Parish Centre. The existing houses read as 2-storey over basement to the front and 3-storey to the rear, however for the purpose of this assessment the houses will be described as 3-storey. The Church and houses overlook Stillorgan Road whilst the schoolhouse overlooks Ailesbury Court. The area to the NW of the church is landscaped and the areas to the front and rear of the houses and schoolhouse are used for car parking.

Planning permission is being sought to erect a 2-storey extension to the rear of one of the houses and demolish the schoolhouse, and to provide additional car parking spaces to the rear of the second house and within the site of the schoolhouse.

The appeal site is located within a Z2 Residential Conservation Area and the Church of the Sacred Heart is a Protected Structure which dates from the early 19<sup>th</sup> Century. The pair of semi-detached houses and the single storey schoolhouse, which date from the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century, are not covered by any heritage designations. However, these buildings lie within the curtilage of the Protected Structure as they are functionally linked, historically connected and in the same ownership as the Church. This accords with the definition of curtilage as set out in sections 13.14 (a), (b) and (c) of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines (2004). Therefore, any proposals for development that could potentially affect the character and setting of the Church and the buildings within its curtilage requires sensitive consideration along with a high standard of design.

### **Proposed 2-storey extension:**

The existing 3-storey, semi-detached, red brick houses occupy the front section of the appeal site, they are located to the side of the Church and are used as Parochial Houses. It is proposed to construct a 2-storey extension to the rear of house no.1 which would occupy most of the rear garden. The ground floor of both of the houses and the first floor of house no.1 would be connected to the new extension to provide an "L" shaped parish and pastoral care centre. The application was accompanied by a Photographic Record of the Parochial Houses.

The proposed extension would be between 21m and 24m long, 8m wide with a c.2m set back at first floor level, and 7m high. The NW elevation would run along the existing rear garden boundary wall with the Church with a c.4m separation distance, whilst the SE elevation would be slightly set back from the boundary with the garden

to the rear of house no.2. The proposed flat roofed extension would have a contemporary design and the external finishes would comprise granite cladding and aluminium windows with extensive glazing on the SE facing elevation. The proposed 2-storey extension would be located entirely to the rear of the 3-storey house and the height, design and external finishes are considered acceptable. However, the overall length of the proposed 2-storey extension at between 21m and 24m would render the structure insubordinate to the existing houses.

The proposed 2-storey extension would not be visible from the public domain to the front of the church along Stillorgan Road. However, having regard to its overall height, length and proximity to the Church, taken in conjunction with the proposed demolition of the schoolhouse and the provision of car parking on the schoolhouse site and the rear garden to house no.2, the proposed extension would be highly visible and overly dominant when viewed from the rear along Ailesbury Road and Ailesbury Court. The proposed development would therefore have an adverse impact on the character and setting of the Protected Structure and the visual amenities of the area.

#### **Proposed demolition of schoolhouse:**

The schoolhouse occupies the rear section of the appeal site, it is located directly to the rear of the Parochial Houses and to the side of the Church and it is used as a Parish Office. It is proposed to demolish the building to provide space for additional car parking and a section of the new internal access road that would run along the SE site boundary to connect the front and rear car parks.

The application was accompanied by a Conservation Appraisal and Structural Inspection Report. The Conservation Report stated that the building is not suitable for use as a parish centre and concluded that it needs re-roofing and repairs, it is not a Protected Structure nor it does not form part of the original setting of the Church,



and its removal would have no appreciable impact on the Protected Structure or its setting. The Structural Inspection Report concluded that there are no evident structural concerns although the roof and guttering system need to be repaired.

As previously stated, I am satisfied that the schoolhouse lies within the curtilage of a Protected Structure. It is an attractive “T” shaped heritage building with granite walls and a slated timber pitched roof. Although the building has been modified by 20<sup>th</sup> Century alterations and extensions, it retains many of its original external features and internal layout. It is in a reasonably good state of repair although the roof and guttering require attention. The ensemble formed by the schoolhouse, semi-detached Parochial Houses and the Church make a valuable contribution to the heritage value of the surrounding area.

The proposed demolition of the schoolhouse and its replacement with car parking spaces and a section of the internal access road, taken in combination with the loss of the rear garden at house no.2 to further car parking spaces, would have an adverse impact on the character and setting of the Protected Structure, the heritage value of the site and the visual amenities of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the Development Plan does not contain any specific car parking standards for parish or pastoral care centres however Table 16.1 states in relation to “Other Cultural, Recreational & Leisure Uses” that the level of provision will be dependent on the nature and location of the use. Given that the proposed use would serve a local need and that the site is located within along a QBC and within an area that is well served by public transport, the proposed level of car parking would not justify the proposed demolition of the schoolhouse or the loss of the rear garden at house no.2.

### **5.3. Residential amenity**

#### **Existing houses:**

The existing 3-storey houses are in residential use. It is proposed to change the use of the ground floor level in both houses and the first floor level in house no.1 to

parish centre use. The remaining residential use at first and second floor levels would be retained to provide one 2-bed apartment split over the first and second floors and one single bed unit on the second floor.

Section 16.10.13 of the Development Plan states that the sub-division of large dwelling houses may be permitted in highly accessible areas to provide for the demographic changes in the city, subject to compliance with residential amenity standards including minimum floor space and the provision of private and communal open space. The proposed apartments would provide for an acceptable level of residential amenity in relation to floor area and room size in accordance with Development Plan standards. However, the two long rear gardens would be replaced by the extension to the rear of house no.1 and the carpark to the rear of house no.2, and a very small garden would be provided in their place. It is acknowledged that the apartments will be occupied by the parish priest and clerical visitors. However, this might not always be the case and the proposed units should provide for an acceptable level of amenity space in line with Development Plan standards. This aspect of the proposed development would not be compatible with Development Plan requirements for residential amenity.

The proposed 2-storey extension to the rear of house no.1 would be between 21m and 24m long, 8m wide and 7m high and it would be located to the NE of the house no.2. However, having regard to the orientation, the proposed apartments would not be overshadowed to any significant extent. The SE facing elevation would have extensive glazing at first floor level although the c.10m separation distance between the existing first and second floor rear windows and the proposed glazing is sufficient to ensure that the apartments would not be overlooked to any significant extent. The proposed extension would not overshadow, overlook or give rise to a loss of privacy at the apartments and this aspect of the proposal would be compatible with Development Plan requirements in relation to extensions and the protection of residential amenity. However, the excessive length of the extension would be

overbearing and it would not be subordinate to the main house, and this could have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of future occupants.

### **Neighbouring apartments:**

The proposed 2-storey extension would be located to the NW of the existing apartment block on the adjoining site at Belville. The proposed extension would be between 21m and 24m long and c.7m high with extensive glazing at first floor level along the SE facing elevation. There would be a c.37m separation distance between the proposed extension and the front elevation of the neighbouring apartment block and the two sites are separated by a high wall and mature trees. Having regard to the scale and orientation of the proposed extension relative to the position of the existing apartment block, and to the substantial separation distance between the two structures, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not give rise to overshadowing or be unduly overbearing. It is acknowledged that several existing trees would probably be removed to accommodate some of the proposed car parking spaces and the internal access road, and that the extensive glazing at first floor level could give rise to a sense of being overlooked with a loss of privacy at the apartments, however this impact could be mitigated addressed by way of a planning condition.

The proposed development would provide for additional car parking spaces and an internal access road in the SE section of the site. Several spaces would be located in the vicinity of the boundary wall with Belville, and the new internal access road would run parallel to the boundary wall and alongside the side elevation of house no.2. The SW section of the Belville apartment block is set back c.9.5m from the boundary wall and proposed internal road, and c.12m from the site boundary with the Stillorgan Road; the central section is set back c.20m from the boundary wall and internal road; whilst the NE section is set back between c.11m and c.14m from the boundary wall

and proposed car parking spaces. It is also noted that a significant number of the Belville car parking spaces are located parallel to the boundary wall and that some of the existing car parking spaces for the Parish Centre are located in close proximity to this wall in the E section of the appeal site. The proposed development would also provide for a new vehicular access which would be located c.10m to the N of the vehicular entrance to the Belville apartments. This arrangement is considered acceptable as it would not have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of the Belville apartments.

#### **5.4. Access and car parking**

Vehicular access is off Stillorgan Road to the front of the site and Ailesbury Close to the rear of the site. Car parking is provided in front of the Church and Parochial Houses, and in front of the Parish Centre (former schoolhouse) and the two car parking areas are not connected.

It is proposed to retain and modify the existing entrance to the rear off Ailesbury Close and create a new entrance further SE along Ailesbury Close to provide for a new “In-Out” arrangement; to demolish the Parish Centre (former schoolhouse) to provide for additional car parking spaces and a new internal access road along the SE site boundary with Belville which would connect the front and rear car parks; to restrict the use of the existing Stillorgan Road access to funeral and wedding events only; and to provide a total of 63 car parking spaces in the SE section of the site.

The proposed vehicular access arrangements, including the restricted use of the Stillorgan Road entrance and the proposed internal access road are considered acceptable in principle. The planning authority raised concerns in relation to the excessive width of the new entrance that could result in the loss of on-street car parking spaces along Ailesbury Close, however this issue could be addressed by way of a planning condition. The absence of secure cycle parking facilities is noted although this issue could also be addressed by way of a planning condition.

A total of 63 car parking spaces would be provided. As previously stated, the Development Plan does not contain any specific car parking standards for parish or pastoral care centres. However, Table 16.1 states in relation to “Other Cultural, Recreational & Leisure Uses” that the level of provision will be dependent on the nature and location of the use. Given that the proposed use of the development as a parish office and pastoral care centre would serve a local need, and that the site is located along a QBC and within an area that is well served by public transport, and there is on-street pay parking in the vicinity, on balance, the proposed level of car parking would not justify the demolition of the schoolhouse and the loss of the garden to the rear of house no.2.

## 5.5. Other issues

**Appropriate assessment:** Having regard to the long established built up character of the area and the separation distance with the nearest European site, the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any sites in the wider area.

**Environmental services:** The proposed arrangements are considered acceptable subject to compliance with the requirements of Irish Water, the planning authority.

**Financial contributions:** None required.

**Flood risk:** The contents of the Flood Risk Assessment are noted and the proposed development would not give rise to a flood risk, subject to compliance with the drainage requirements of the planning authority.

**Trees and landscaping:** The SE site boundaries are defined by mature trees and measures should be put in place to ensure their protection during construction or their replacement after the works are completed in the event of damage, and a detailed landscaping scheme should be submitted to the planning authority for their written agreement before development commences.

## 6.0 Recommendation

I recommend that planning permission be should be refused for the following reasons and considerations.

## 7.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the provisions of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2004 and the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016 to 2022 with regard to the protection of architectural heritage,

and to the location of the proposed development within the curtilage of the Church of the Sacred Heart which is a Protected Structure, the proposed development, which could comprise the demolition of a late 19<sup>th</sup> Century schoolhouse, the erection of a substantial 2-storey extension to the rear of the Parochial House in close proximity to the Church, and the provision of an extensive level of car parking, would have an adverse impact on the character and setting of the Protected Structure and it would seriously injure the heritage and visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016 to 2022 with regard to the provision of an acceptable level of residential amenity, the subdivision of large dwellings and construction of residential extensions, as set out in Section 16 and Appendix 17 of the Development Plan, the proposed development would fail to provide an acceptable level of private amenity space to serve the occupants of the two apartments located within the Parochial Houses. Furthermore, the proposed 2-storey extension would seriously injure the amenities of future occupants by virtue of its excessive length which would also render the structure insubordinate to the original houses. The proposed development would therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Karla Mc Bride  
Senior Planning Inspector  
1<sup>st</sup> March 2017