



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report 29S 248230

Development	Conversion from nine bedsits to single dwelling unit to include partial demolition works, alterations and new construction works to existing structure, boundary, railings and gates. (Complete description on notices)
Location	(Protected Structure) 18 Charlton Road, Ranelagh, Dublin 6.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council.
P.A. Reg. Ref.	4439/16
Applicant	Cathal and Claire Moran.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant	Marian Hogan.
Observers	
Date of Site Inspection	22 nd May, 2017
Inspector	Jane Dennehy.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3 Observer Submissions	6
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
5.1. Development Plan.....	6
6.0 The Appeal	6
6.1. Third Party Appeal	6
6.2. Applicant Response to the Appeal	8
6.3. Further Submission of the Appellant	12
6.4 Planning Authority Observations	
7.0 Assessment	13
8.0 Recommendation.....	17
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17
10.0 Conditions	18

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site of No 52 Charlton Road has a stated area of 807 square metres and is that of a late nineteenth century, two storey, two bay over garden level brick faced semi-detached house which is paired with No 53 Charleston Road. The house along with some similar brick faced pairs of semi period houses are located along the south side of Charleston Road some of which have been extended or have benefit of extant grants of planning permission for extensions and alterations some of which are referred to in connection with the appeal.
- 1.2. It has a rear return and a single bay two storey over basement side projecting element. Access to the front door is by a granite staircase which has cast iron railings on granite plinths along each side which is over a garden level entrance. There is a flat roof single storey extension at the rear of the house and a rear garden which has access at the side of the house via a wooden door set in a brick faced wall between the gable wall and side boundary. The side and rear elevations garden level façade beneath the granite staircase and the return are finished in a render and there is a brick finished chimney stack over the return. The front gardens have been converted to use as a multiple carpark and the historic front boundary plinth, railings and gate have partially been removed.
- 1.3. There have been several interventions to the internal accommodation within the dwelling which historically was a single dwelling incorporating staff accommodation but which subsequently was converted into nine bedsits involving major alterations to the internal layout and planform reason of subdivisions to provide for the nine separate units.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The application lodged with the planning authority indicates proposal for conversion including some demolition of works and extensions to the building which is laid out in nine bedsits returning it to use as a single dwelling unit. It will comprise four-bedroom, with the main reception rooms at ground floor level and kitchen and communal, open plan living and recreational accommodation at the garden level.

The main elements comprise:

Demolition of non-original single storey extension at the rear.

Partial demolition and removal of chimney stack (original fabric) of the three storey return

Construction of pitched roof over a three storey extension at the side and rear incorporating the retained part of the return

Construction of a single storey flat roofed extension at the rear

Replacement of nine modern windows at the rear and side with eight windows and one rose window matching the original

- 2.2. The proposals include provision for reinstatement of the internal planform and layout at ground and first floors along with en-suite and bathroom facilities are proposed including additional fenestration at the rear. The works include removal of internal partitions and mezzanines, upgrading the services, partial demolition of the rear return including removal of the chimney stack and extension and modifications to the return (by widening it) at full height to provide additional accommodation including a lower ground level bedroom. In addition, a garden level extension providing for and internal open plan space with glazing to facilitate the proposed use of and outlook from the internal accommodation and an additional staircase is to be provided.
- 2.3. The application is accompanied by a design report and a conservation assessment report inclusive of a photographic survey, key plan, desk study and works specification prepared by a historic building consultant according to which it is the intention of the applicants to remove modern insertions and interventions and to retain and restore historic fabric where possible providing for a dwelling with existing features being in conjunction with contemporary additions and alterations.
- 2.4. Written consent of the property owner to the application is available on file.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. By order dated, 6th April 2017 the planning authority decided to grant permission subject to conditions with specific requirement and with standard requirements.

Condition No 3 contains requirements for omission of retrofitting of 'slimlite' double glazing to the sash windows on the front facade and the pedestrian entrance on the front boundary. Condition No 3 has the retirement for engagement of a conservation architect to oversee the works in accordance with the recommendations within, *Architectural Heritage Protection: Guidelines for Planning Authorities*: (DOEHLG, 2005)

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. The planning officer, having taken into consideration the observations and recommendations of the Conservation Officer (See section 4.23 below) noted that the proposed arrangements for a vehicular entrance and for front boundary treatment would be positive in effect, subject to omission of a proposed pedestrian entrance and omission of proposals for "retrofitting of slimlite" double glazing to the inner side of the front elevation sash windows is also advised. These modifications were provided for under Condition 2 of the decision to grant permission, details of which are in Para 4.1 above.
- 3.2.2. The conservation officer in her report dated 21st January 2017 indicates a recommendation for a grant of permission having noted the contribution to the streetscape of the building and limited internal architectural interest because of interventions that have previously taken place. It is recommended that a condition be attached with requirements for the works to be carried out under the direction of a qualified architect with specialist expertise in building conservation in accordance with statutory guidance.
- 3.2.3. The internal report of the Drainage section indicates no objection subject to standard conditions.
- 3.3. Observer Submissions
- 3.4. The issues of concern raised in the submission made on behalf of the owners of No 51 Charleston Road (Appellant Party) are that the proposed development would be visually intrusive, and would give rise to overlooking and have negative impact on the amenities of the adjoining property and would set undesirable precedent.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. According to the planning officer report there is no record of a prior planning history for No 52 Charlton Road.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The operative development plan is the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022 according to which the site is subject to the zoning objective Z2: *to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.*
- 5.1.2. No 52 Charleston Road and the adjoining nineteenth century houses are included on the record of protected structures.
- 5.1.3. Policies and objectives and standards for Alterations and extensions are in section 16.2.2.3, section 16.10.12 and Appendix 17. Building conservation and built heritage practice are addressed in Chapter 11.

6.0 The Appeal

- 6.1. Third Party Appeal.
 - 6.1.1. An appeal was received from Thornton O'Connor on behalf of Ms Marion Hogan of the adjoining property at No 51 Charleston Road on 23rd March, 2017. The appeal includes some sketches, photographs and photomontages. It is requested that permission be refused or alternatively, modifications should be requested from the applicant to ensure assimilation in to the receiving environment without undue adverse effect on residential amenity at No 51. It is stated that the proposed development would have severe negative impact on the residential amenities of the appellant's property, that the planning officer did not provide an adequate assessment of the concerns of the appellant in his report and that the appeal contains several relevant extracts from the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities on assessment of planning applications to support the claim. According to the appeal:

- The scale and bulk of the extension to the side and rear at three storey level is excessive. It would overlook, have overbearing impact and obstruct access to daylight/sunlight at No 51 Charleston Road.
- The four windows in the rear elevation of the extended return gives rise to potential for overlooking.
- It is clear that overlooking, overbearing impact and obstruction of light is not appropriate having regard to permitted development: Permission has been granted under P.A. Reg. Ref. 2646/16 for internal modifications and rear extensions at No 51 Charleston Road and a window in the first-floor elevation of the extension to the rear return' was omitted under condition No 2 to prevent overlooking. A prior grant of permission for development at No 53 Charleston Road is also relevant. (P. A. 5243/06/PL 29S 244244 refers.) Condition No 2 imposed following third party appeal omits a second level extension and requires a hipped profile for the first-floor extension. The reason for the required omission was due to overbearing impact and overshadowing on the adjoining property at No 54 Charleston Road.
- The plots for the properties on the south side of Charleston Road are irregular at the rear as they turn in a southerly direction affecting the relationship between properties. This results in enhanced and direct line of sight to the rear garden of No 51 from No 52 and this should be taken into consideration.
- The proposed design is in direct contravention of the zoning objective because of undue adverse impact on residential amenity at No 51. The proposed three storey extension involves an increase in depth of the non-original side extension to 4.3 metres. The changes to the original form of the rear return and the proposed removal of the chimney are in direction contravention of section 11.2.5.3 of the development plan which ensures that the original planforms for protected structures are protected or reinstated and not compromised by unsympathetic alteration or extension. The bulk and volume of the side and rear extension (which is to the south west of No 51) with potential overbearing impact affects residential amenity and fails to harmonise the scale and arrangement of adjacent houses and the streetscape. The 3D view in the application does not provide a true understanding or context.

- Further extension to the side of No 52 is in contravention of section 16.2.2.3 of the development plan that states that alterations and extensions should retain characteristic townscape spaces or gaps between buildings. The proposed development would erode the relief between buildings which is essential to the character and historical form. The house was designed to be positioned at the western side of the plot and attached to No 53. A separation distance from the boundary of one metre for each three metres of height should be achieved according to design guidance issued by South Dublin County Council. The side extension has a height of 9.33 metres so a separation of three metres should be provided whereas less than one metre is provided and this demonstrates overdevelopment based on separation distance.
- The increased window opening sizes increase overlooking especially from the two new windows at the side into the stairwell, the two windows in the rear facade of the side extension and the new window in the rear facade of the rear return. There is direct line of sight into the rear garden of No 51 from the proposed upper level windows. Due to the unusual garden configuration, the four new windows on the extended rear return will provide direct view into the amenity space at No 51 especially from the floor to ceiling height window in the rear return. This is in contravention of section 16.10.12 of the development plan which requires extensions to have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties particularly need for light and privacy.
- The proposed development will be visually obtrusive and set undesirable precedent for overbearing extensions, due to bulk and volume at upper level. Breathing space key to the character and original architectural style of the houses would be lost setting undesirable precedent for similar development with severe negative impact and on residential amenity and property value.

6.2. Applicant's Response to the Appeal

- 6.2.1. A submission which includes a daylight and sunlight analysis report was received on 24th April from Brock McClure on behalf of the applicant. The submission includes a detailed account of the planning context and the appeal. The observations on the appeal are outlined in summary below:

- Precedent can be taken from the grants of permission under P. A. Reg. Ref. 2646/16 for development at No 51 Charleston Road and P A. Reg. Ref. 5342/06/PL 224224 for development at No 53 Charleston Road.
- Contentions as to undesirable precedent are misleading due to the recently permitted extensions at No 51 and No 53 Charleston Road which are similar in design and include rear facing windows and side elevation windows up to the boundary.
- Precedent has been set by the permitted development under P A. Reg. Ref. 5342/06/PL 224224. The original proposal¹ allowed for additional, rear elevation fenestration on the permitted three storey extension at the side and rear of No 53 and side and return extensions as far as the boundary with No 54 leaving a separation distance of 1.4-1.5 metres. It included removal of the chimney on the rear return and a large conservatory infills the full width of the garden at ground floor level. Extensions to the side and rear have also been permitted at No 48 Charleston Road.
- The appeal is disingenuous because the grant of permission at the appellant's property (No 51) allowed for rear facing windows at first and second levels overlooking rear gardens especially at No 50. It includes retention of a side window for a bedroom at first floor to the south west elevation facing No 52. (P A. Reg. Ref 2646/16 refers.)
- The increased volume proposed is confined to the rear and linked to the functional requirements of a modern dwelling. The contention as to the bulk and volume of the proposed development is disingenuous. The appellant is constructing a similar extension at the rear of No 51 Charleston Road.
- The integrity of the structure is maintained in the proposal as indicated in the conservation assessment report and the conservation officer report. No changes to the front elevation are proposed and gaps between buildings are suitably maintained.
- The photomontages and 3D images in the appeal are questionable regarding the rear to the bulk. Alternative design options were considered with the proposed development being considered optimal, sensitive and critical to the

¹ The further information modifications were rejected.

needs of the applicant. It is more a consolidation than an increase in scale and volume. The widened return which is essential does not affect the separation distance between the two properties and is not overbearing. The primary alterations are to the later additions to the house and much of the planform is returned with removal of the partitions and existing extension.

- The width of the rear return does not extend beyond the existing side projection and a three metre separation distance is maintained. Separation distance between Nos. 53 and 54 is 1.5-1.6 metres, between Nos 51 and 52 is 3.1 metres and between Nos 49 and 50 is 2.99 metres. The existing key urban design element in the streetscape which is appropriate and associated front elevations are maintained.
- The removal of the chimney stack is accepted by the conservation officer even though it is an original feature. It obstructs the original rose window, is redundant and costly to retain and, precedent is set by the removal of the chimney over the return at No 53. Overlooking of No 51 is reduced with the removal of the east facing existing return windows which are replaced with a blank elevation.
- There are minimal impacts from a sunlight or daylight perspective as illustrated in the analysis attached to the submission that was prepared by Chris Shackleton Consulting. It demonstrates that the development will result in no change to access to daylight and sunlight at No 51. The accompanying shadow analysis indicates no shadow impact on the rear gardens, very minor impact which is far less than the 0.8 limit for the change in vertical sky component and on direct light to windows all of which are compliant with BRE guidance: Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to good practice and BS8206: 2:2008 Lighting for Buildings Part 2 Code of Practice for daylighting.
- Overlooking is reduced in the proposed development rather than increased by removal of two existing windows on the east side elevation of the existing return. The proposed rear windows have a design feature common to the houses on Charleston Road and will not overlook beyond the reasonable level in an urban environment. A relevant example is the permitted side and rear window at No 51 Charleston Road. The new opes do not materially affect the

appellant property's amenity. It is disingenuous to claim that rear facing windows are inappropriate given the grant of permission for similar windows at No 51. Both adjoining properties had permitted windows at upper levels that overlook adjoining rear gardens. Bedroom use reduces potential overlooking and is typical for the area. The proposed window faces onto the internal stairwell in the subject proposal and a blank gable end at No 51 and the side projection screens views of the rear garden. The view from the stairwell window does not impact on privacy. It lights an internal staircase and the side projection of 1.3 metre screens viewing into the rear garden of No 51. The photomontages in the appeal are not verified.

- The window in the side elevation of No 51 was omitted by condition as it would have had unobstructed view to the rear of No 52.
- The proposed development successfully assimilates into the existing environment which includes No 51 Charleston Road.
- It is requested that permission be granted and that the appeal be dismissed.
- The development maintains most of the plan form of the structure and provides a consolidated built form at the rear. The extension to the return is not significant, is not overbearing in impact and acceptable according to the sunlight and daylight analysis. It is consistent with recent prior grants of permission for extensions the context of the built form in the area where development has been permitted on the boundary and upper level window.
- The proposed development accords with the development plan Z2 zoning objective, with Section 16.2.2.3 of the development plan on alterations and extensions in that a sensitively designed extension with additional living space on a constrained site has been achieved without compromise to residential amenity. It also accords with Section 16.10.12 of the development plan for the reasons relating to consolidation and maintaining the footprint, with negligible impact on residential amenity by overshadowing, overlooking and separation distances which are reasonable for urban areas. Furthermore, site coverage at 17 percent, indicative plot ratio at 0.37. private rear garden space at 300 square metres and a 31 metres depth all of which are more than sufficient to ensure consistency with the built character and zoning objective.

- It is claimed that the proposed development is wholly acceptable. If considered essential, the applicant would accept a condition for opaque glazing for the floor to ceiling rear bedroom window at first floor level and a condition for opaque glazing for the side window.

6.3. Further Submission of the Appellant.

6.3.1. A further submission with observation on the response to the appeal was received on 18th May, 2017 from the appellant's agent comprising elaboration on and reiteration of the objections in the appeal and is outlined in brief below:

- The contention that the appeal is disingenuous is rejected. The appellant has real and genuine concerns all of which are planning matters.
- The permitted developments at properties on Charleston Road do not affect the width of the rear returns, the 2.5 to 2.6 metre width being retained so there is no local precedent for the increased width to 4.6 metres. Great care was taken to respect form and width and No 50 and 51 which when extended mirror each other. A grant of permission at No 52 would be irrevocable to the relationship between No 52 and No 53 due to the windows and the increased return width.
- The statement that there is no increase in overlooking potential is rejected. Four additional opes at upper levels are proposed at the side and the rear including a substantial floor to ceiling window. This is a significant and material increase on overlooking potential and only one window is to be a sash window whereas other permitted extension windows in the area have sash windows and a maximum of two modest scale sash windows in the rear returns.
- The applicants liaised with each other regarding the permitted development for the paired dwellings at No 50 and No 51 which are not precedent cases. The permitted development at No 51 did not increase overlooking as window numbers were not modified, no third floor is provided in the rear return and glazing in the rear return is reduced as double doors at first floor level are replaced with a window. The development at No 53 is not a precedent case as two modest scale sash windows were permitted in the rear return the form of which was unaltered. This rear return is on the western side of the plot and

cannot have material overlooking impact on No 52 because No 52 is at the eastern side of the plot with direct line of site to the rear garden of No 51.

- The applicant relied heavily on addressing the planning officer's concerns. There is no written assessment of the appellant concern about scale and bulk of the three storey extension at the side and the rear or potential overlooking impacts of the four proposed new windows in the extended return. It is not clear if the planning officer considered that appellant's concerns. The appellant wish to avail of the opportunity for *de novo* assessment of the impacts. It is not agreed that the guidance parameters used in the appeal regarding separation distances should be rejected as a separation distance of less than a metre for a three storey development is not accepted and is overdevelopment with consequential material impact on residential amenity.
- An independent valuer has concluded that the property at No 51 could be devalued by as much as €200,000.00 A letter included in the appendix to the submission.
- The inspector is invited to visit the rear garden of the property at No 51 to assess fully the impacts.

6.4. Planning Authority Observations

- 6.4.1. In a letter received from the planning authority on 16th April, 2017 the planning officer confirms that there are no additional observations to those included in the planning officer's report and it is requested that the planning authority decision be upheld.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1.1. The issues central to the appeal and the determination of the decision with regard to impact on residential amenity, taking into account architectural heritage protection are considered together under the sub-headings below.

Precedent

Overbearing Impact and separation distances between buildings.

Overshadowing

Overlooking

7.1.2. Precedent.

The row of houses on the south side of Charleston Road which include the house on the application site are in pairs of Victorian semi-detached two storey over garden level, red bricked faced houses with a main entrance at accessed by granite staircases. Several of the houses had been converted into multiple dwellings units which recently and at present are being returned to use as single dwellings units involving upgrades to include refurbishment and servicing, alterations and extensions. In principle, this transition in the area if appropriately implemented is welcome as a planning gain having particular regard to the statutory protection by way of inclusion on the record of protected structures and the residential conservation area zoning objective.

7.1.3. While precedent can be taken from the permitted proposals to upgrade, alter and extend the houses to facilitate reversion to use as a single dwelling unit, the previously permitted developments are not identical. The potential to take precedent from the permitted developments is somewhat limited. For example, there is a claim that precedent can be taken from previously permitted development for the removal of the chimney at the top of the return but it is noted that the return is not widened in the case of the previously permitted development which included removal of an original chimneystack. Similarly, the permitted developments at No 51 and No 53 are limited in the extent to which potential precedent for the proposed development can be taken. These issues which primarily relate to the more detailed elements rather than the broad principle for upgrades and development are subject to considerable dispute in the submissions made on behalf of the applicant and the appellant.

7.2. Overbearing Impact and Separation Distances between buildings.

7.2.1. The dwelling on the subject site differs from those in the others pairs of semi-detached houses in that it has an existing projection at the side which is set back midway from the front building line. The proposed development incorporates this volume adding to its depth at the rear by way of the widening of the existing return to

a height of 9.3 metres which is proposed. In views from the street at the front there is no visual impact because the existing projection and setback position with the visual break in the streetscape between the pairs of semi-detached houses being unaltered. The proposed extensions are to the side and rear to the south west side of the appellant property at No 51 for which there is also an extant grant of permission for extensions to the rear. Bearing in mind the less sensitive location, at the rear over the return, the case made on behalf of the applicant to remove it to facilitate the development is considered acceptable.

- 7.2.2. The separation distance is of 1380 mm from the boundary of the party boundary from that of the existing projecting element which reduces slightly at the rear is increased in depth of 4.1 metres with the proposed development in place to seven metres from the existing three metres depth. Notwithstanding the change in outlook from the appellant property, with and without the development permitted at that property, the depth and mass of this element of the proposed development can be accepted bearing in mind the pitched roof, eaves height and separation from the party boundary and from gable walls of the adjoining property and the considerable depth of the rear gardens.
- 7.2.3. The relationship between the properties with the proposed and permitted developments in place is somewhat reciprocal. The appellant has referred to a guidance document issued by South Dublin City Council to support its claim that at least one metres in separation distance is essential for each three metres of height in adjoining buildings. This guidance would appear to be appropriate primarily for apartment block development, generally in new and or mixed dwelling the schemes as opposed to historic houses in an established urban streetscape.

7.3. Overshadowing

- 7.3.1. The application site is to the south west of the appeal site. The submitted shadow analysis comprehensively demonstrates marginal change in obstruction of daylight and sunlight although conditions at No 51 may be varied should the permitted development at No 51 be fully implemented. It is noted that the appellant in either the appeal or the supplementary submission lacks inclusion of a comprehensive

analysis ideally prepared by a specialist to support the case as to significant overshadowing attributable to the proposed development.

7.4. Overlooking:

7.4.1. The appellant party's agent points out to the plot configuration of the application site and adjoining sites in that the end section of the rear come behind the rear of the adjoining property to the east increasing potential for direct overlooking of private open space to the rear of adjoining properties. The rear gardens of the properties are considerable in depth, and to this end the rear sections of the gardens are at a considerable distance from the rear walls of the existing returns. It is agreed that there is potential for overlooking from the first-floor windows in the proposed widened rear return but that owing to the considerable distances from the lower rear garden the potential for overlooking is not unreasonable for a suburban area. It is likely that there is greater potential for reciprocal overlooking from upper floors of back to back two to three storey suburban residential development schemes.

7.4.2. However, the rear facing first floor window in the extended return area closest to the boundary with No 51 Charleston Road gives rise by reason of configuration and proximity to the boundary to overlooking which itself may not be particularly unreasonable but which has potential for significant perceptions of overlooking from this bedroom. Some modification to ameliorate this impact is required and in this regard, it is recommended that the window in the widened return be substituted with a timber sash window similar in size to the existing timber sash window in the original element of the rear return. This change would also facilitate amelioration of any potential for the widened rear return to stand out in views along the rears of the row of houses, notwithstanding alterations and extensions at the rear and adjacent to the return at the house.

7.4.3. Other Considerations.

7.5. There is no objection to the modifications required under Condition No 2 attached to the planning authority decision providing for omission of the 'trimlite' double glazing to the front elevation windows and for omission of the pedestrian entrance to the front which are recommended by the planning officer.

7.6. Appropriate Assessment.

- 7.6.1. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development which comprises conversion of the house which has been subdivided into nine bedsits to use as a single dwelling along with extensions, alterations and upgrades in an inner suburban location on zoned and serviced lands, it is considered that no appropriate assessment issues arise. The proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

- 8.1. In view of the foregoing, it is recommended that the decision to grant permission be upheld with the additional requirement for substitution of the upper floor rear elevation in the new build section of the return with a traditional timber sash window to match the existing window which can be addressed by condition. Draft Reasons and Considerations and Conditions are set out below

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of the site within an area subject to the zoning objective Z2: *'to protect the amenities of residential conservation areas'* and to the inclusion of the existing house and the adjoining houses on the record of protected structures according to Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022 it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of adjoining property and to the established historical characteristics of the streetscape on the southern side of Charleston Road including the open gaps between the pairs of semi-detached houses by reason of scale, height and mass, overbearing impact, overlooking and overshadowing and would not adversely affect the integrity of the existing historic fabric by reason of the extent and nature of interventions proposed. Thus, the proposed development would not be seriously injurious to residential amenities, would not devalue property in the vicinity and would not adversely affect the integrity and character of the protected structure or the established architectural character of the residential conservation area and would be in accordance with the proper planning and development of the area.

10.0 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 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 The following modifications shall be provided for in the development:
 - (a) The upper floor rear elevation window for the widened section of the rear return shall be omitted and replaced with a timber sash window to match the adjoining upper floor rear elevation window in the existing element of the rear return.
 - (b) The 'slimlite' double glazing for the timber sash windows on the front elevation shall be omitted.
 - (c) The pedestrian entrance on the front boundary shall be omitted.

Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit revised plan, section and elevation drawings to the planning authority for written agreement.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities and integrity of the historic character of the building, a protected structure in the residential conservation area and the protection of residential amenities of properties in the vicinity.

- 3 The proposed development shall be carried out under the direction of an architect with specialist expertise in urban and building conservation in accordance with the recommendations within Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines for planning authorities issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local government in 2005.

Reason: In the interest of best building conservation practice in architectural heritage protection.

- 4 Details of colours and textures of all the external finishes shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity

- 5 Hours of construction shall be confined to the hours of 0800 and 1900 Mondays to Fridays excluding bank holidays and 0800 hrs and 1400 hrs on Saturdays only. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of the residential amenities of the area and clarity.

Jane Dennehy
Senior Planning Inspector
24th May, 2017.