



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL15.248340

Development	Change of use from guesthouse to two dwelling houses, extension to rear and side, provision of coffee shop on ground floor and all associated site works (protected structure)
Location	1 & 2 Seatown Place, Dundalk, Co. Louth
Planning Authority	Louth County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	16/206
Applicant	KJR Holdings
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Orla Keegan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	18 th July 2017
Inspector	Niall Haverty

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.067 ha, is located on the southern side of Seatown Place in Dundalk town centre. The buildings on the site comprise two Georgian style mid-terrace three storey over basement buildings which have been internally amalgamated to function as a guesthouse. The terrace fronts directly onto Seatown Place, while rear access is provided via archways in other buildings on the terrace.
- 1.2. The terraced building adjoining the appeal site to the west is in residential use, while the terraced building to the east is in use as a counselling centre. St Vincent's Secondary School is located on the opposite side of Seatown Place, while the Rampart River is c. 50m to the south.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, as amended on foot of a request for further information, consists of:
 - The change of use of the existing buildings from guesthouse back to two houses.
 - Provision of coffee shop/café at basement level and ground floor level of No. 1 Seatown Place with rear stairwell extension at basement level and ground floor level.
 - Removal of existing rear extension to basement.
 - Construction of two storey extension to rear of No. 2 Seatown Place.
 - Internal alterations are also proposed to remove some existing partitions and to build new partitions.
- 2.2. The proposed development would result in No. 2 Seatown Place being a seven-bedroom three storey over basement house and No. 1 Seatown Place would be a four-bedroom duplex unit over a ground floor/basement coffee shop. Both dwellings would have private gardens and a shared parking area to the rear, as well as a refuse store for the café.

2.3. I note that the proposed development was described in Irish in the original public notices, and was subsequently described in English in the revised public notices, following the submission of further information.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Louth County Council decided to grant planning permission subject to six conditions, including the following summarised conditions:

- C2: The two dwellings shall each be used solely as a private dwelling house and shall not be sub-divided into multi-occupancy use or used for any other purpose.
- C3: Detailed architectural conservation requirements, including the reduction in the removal of the wall on the ground floor in the proposed café to a max. width of 3m and height of 2.1m.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. The final Planning Officer's report can be summarised as follows:

- Applicant has submitted deeds and maps showing right of way to the west, but has stated that only the right of way to the east will be utilised. This is acceptable.
- The revised extension to No. 2 Seatown Place is considered to be a reasonable compromise, reducing scale while providing considerable floor area and large private amenity area.
- Revised layout of café with duplex over is considered to be acceptable.
- Main visual impact will be from the rear of No. 3 Seatown Place, Dundalk Counselling Centre. Proposed extension will be lower than other surrounding elements and this is considered acceptable.
- Applicant's statement that there will be no proposed signage, lighting or services to the front or rear elevations of either building are at odds with the

proposal for the café at ground floor level which one would assume will have signage.

- Nature of uses proposed do not conflict with the zoning matrix or the uses permitted within the 'Town Centre Mix Use' zone.
- Proposed development, as amended by further information, is acceptable with regard to scale, bulk and layout.
- It is not anticipated that the development as revised will have any unreasonable impact on adjoining property.
- It is not considered likely that the proposal will have any adverse impact on the integrity of the Natura 2000 network.
- Parking provision is adequate. Parking to rear would be best suited to residential uses only, with café parking to utilise existing on-street parking.
- While site is located within a flood risk zone, detailed review by infrastructure engineers has identified that the site is not vulnerable to flooding.
- Proposed change of use from 18-bed B&B to two dwellings and a café would not lead to any intensification of demand on existing infrastructure, and no development contribution applies.

3.3. Other Technical Reports

3.3.1. Infrastructure Section:

- No objection subject to conditions.

3.3.2. Conservation Office:

3.3.3. The final Conservation Officer's report can be summarised as follows:

- Revised design reduces the bulk and scale of the extension and private amenity gardens have been provided.
- Heritage Impact Assessment submitted following RFI addresses all the issues requested in RFI.
- Some more detail is required in relation to repair and reinstatement works.

- Main visual impact will be from the rear of No. 3 Seatown Place, however revised extension will be lower than other existing surrounding elements.
- It is disappointing to see a bedroom in the basement of No. 2 Seatown Place and access to rear garden from No. 1 is slightly convoluted.
- Applicant's response that there will be no signage, lighting or services to the front or rear elevations of either building is surprising for a café. Any signage, lighting or extraction/ventilation should be subject to a separate planning application.
- Proposal is an improvement on the originally submitted proposal. There are still some elements which are not ideal, but overall it is an improvement.

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.4.1. **Irish Water:** No objection.

3.5. **Third Party Observations**

3.5.1. Third party observations were made on behalf of the owners of the properties to the east (Dundalk Counselling Centre) and west (Orla Keegan) of the proposed development at both planning application stage and following the receipt of further information. An observation was also made by James D. Wynne. The issues raised were generally as per the appeal, as well as the following summarised issues:

- Non-compliance of application drawings and documentation with requirements of the PDR.
- Application is a replica of that proposed under Reg. Ref. 15/230, with the description changed from student accommodation to two houses.
- Laneway access is inadequate for cars.
- Gross overdevelopment of site.
- Sub-standard development due to basement bedrooms, shared usage of entrance for commercial and residential use, private garden areas are substandard in qualitative terms, lack of storage.
- Major intensification of use of a small site.

- Isolated gardens form a strange proposal to deal with the open space requirements.
- Impact on day-to-day operations and functioning of the adjoining counselling centre and its ability to provide a tranquil, peaceful and private setting for clients.
- Counselling rooms are provided in both No. 3 Seatown Place and its new building. The garden area in between is a therapy garden. Concern regarding construction and operational impacts on the centre.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

- 4.1.1. **Reg. Ref. 16/143:** Invalid application for change of use from guest house back to two dwelling houses, coffee shop, extension, etc.
- 4.1.2. **Reg. Ref. 15/230:** Application for development for the following: 1) Demolish two small annexes to the rear of the existing buildings. 2) Change of use for existing buildings from guest house to student accommodation. 3) Construct new 4 storey extension to rear, with part of ground floor used for bicycle and car parking and roof garden all for use as student accommodation. 4) Provide café/reception (opening hours 8.00am to 11.00pm) area on ground floor of existing buildings primarily for use by students, but also open to public. Application deemed withdrawn as no response to RFI.
- 4.1.3. **Reg. Ref. 01520266:** Permission refused in 2002 for change of use from private residence to guest accommodation at 1 Seatown Place and alterations to same to provide bathroom facilities and the taking down of an existing single storey extension and construction of a new 3 storey extension.
- 4.1.4. **Reg. Ref. 55524897:** Permission refused in 1988 for vehicular entrance to rear of No. 2 Seatown Place.
- 4.1.5. **Reg. Ref. 55524976:** Withdrawn application in 1988 for change of use from residential to commercial.

4.1.6. **Reg. Ref. 55523796:** Permission granted in 1983 for change of use of No. 1 from flats to bed and breakfast accommodation and restaurant.

4.2. **Surrounding Area**

4.2.1. I am not aware of any relevant recent planning history in the surrounding area.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Louth County Development Plan 2015-2021**

5.1.1. This Plan provides the strategic planning policies and objectives for the County. Section 2.16.4 notes that the Statutory Plan for Dundalk and the surrounding area is the Dundalk and Environs Development Plan 2009-2015 and Policy SS3 seeks to review the Dundalk and Environs Development Plan 2009 – 2015 and to prepare a Local Area Plan for Dundalk and Environs which will be consistent with the provisions of the County Plan.

5.2. **Dundalk & Environs Development Plan 2009-2015**

5.2.1. This Plan is still current. The appeal site is located within an area with the zoning objective 'Town Centre Mixed Use'. This zoning objective seeks to provide for mixed use development.

5.2.2. Relevant Policies include:

- **TC3:** Require the provision of mixed use development in accordance with the permitted uses within this zone and to ensure that the residential component is not less than 20% or more than 80 % of the total floor area of the proposed development.
- **TC11:** Promote the development of backland and infill sites and the refurbishment and regeneration of brownfield and grey field sites within the town centre.
- **CH9:** Protect and safeguard structures of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest which are included in the Record of Protected Structure in volume 2 of this plan.

- **CH10:** Protect designated Architectural Conservation Areas within the plan area and require that new development within such areas is sensitively designed so as not to detract from the character of the areas.

5.2.3. Both Nos. 1 and 2 Seatown Place are included in the Record of Protected Structures (Record Nos. D293 and D294, respectively). The RPS notes that both buildings are also included in the NIAH and are of Regional importance. The appeal site is also located within Architectural Conservation Area 5, 'Jocelyn Street/Seatown Place', and the Development Plan states that it is the intention of the Council to protect the integrity of the streetscape and the setting of the buildings of Regional importance. I note that the appeal site is outside of the defined Special Archaeological Interest Area. Relevant Policies include:

- **CH9:** Protect and safeguard structures of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest which are included in the Record of Protected Structure in volume 2 of this plan.
- **CH10:** Protect designated Architectural Conservation Areas within the plan area and require that new development within such areas is sensitively designed so as not to detract from the character of the areas.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. A third party appeal was made on behalf of Orla Keegan, whose home adjoins the appeal site to the west. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Appellant welcomes and supports the sensitive refurbishment and upgrade of the buildings but the proposed development will have a detrimental impact on her residential amenity and will also depreciate the value of her property.
- Appellant's house was originally part of the same structure as No. 1 Seatown Place and at certain locations the two houses are only separated by partition walls. Potential impacts on the structural integrity of adjoining properties was not addressed by applicant.

- The proposed café will have a detrimental impact on residential amenity by reason of noise, general disturbance, odour and fumes.
- No right of way over the appellant's lands exists. Any use of this alleged right of way would seriously compromise the appellant's privacy and amenity.
- Proposed use is vague. Appellant's opinion, having regard to the recent planning history and the use of Irish language public notices, is that the application is a veiled attempt to convert the buildings to multi-occupancy use.
- Revised design for extension to No. 2 will be overbearing and oppressive when experienced from adjoining dwellings, specifically No. 3 Seatown Place.
- In the absence of sunlight/daylight studies, the appellant considers that the development will result in loss of daylight and privacy to her rear kitchen extension.
- It is difficult to envisage how the proposed 'public' café will operate, with regard to the location of the refuse store to the rear of the property, the circuitous route to access this via the laneway, and the presence of a gate from the café into the amenity space of the duplex unit.
- The applicant's statement that there will be no signage, lighting or services to the front or rear elevation of either building is most unusual given that a commercial use is proposed.
- The lack of commercial signage is a cause for concern and raises doubts over the actual use proposed.
- Matters of procedural fairness arise, as it would appear that the planning authority did not have regard to the appellant's observation on the further information submitted.
- Given that this is the third planning application on the site, the Board is asked to consider using measures under section 145(1) of the PDA to compensate the appellant for the expense incurred in making the appeal.
- Appellant considers Condition 2 to be ineffective.
- Planning authority decision did not restrict construction hours or opening hours of café. It could operate 16 hours per day, 7 days a week.

- Concern that smokers will congregate in the yard area to the rear, which is adjacent to bedrooms and living areas.
- Appellant seeks assurances regarding the structural integrity and safety of the dwelling.
- Proposed duplex will result in a poor quality layout which would be substandard in amenity and in terms of access to external open space.
- Proposed demolition works would adversely affect the protected structures, adjoining protected structures and the ACA. It would be contrary to Policies CH9 and CH10.
- Inadequate car parking is proposed.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

6.2.1. None.

6.3. **Observations**

6.3.1. None.

6.4. **Applicants' Response to Appeal**

6.4.1. None.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. I consider that the key issues in determining the appeals are as follows:

- Principle of Development.
- Proposed café use.
- Residential amenity.
- Architectural heritage.
- Car parking and Access.
- Other issues.

- Appropriate Assessment.

7.2. Principle of Development

- 7.2.1. The appeal site is zoned Town Centre Mixed Use and both 'residential' and 'restaurant/café' are permitted uses under this zoning objective.
- 7.2.2. The original public notices associated with the planning application were published in Irish and the appellant contends that this results in uncertainty with regard to the actual nature of the development proposed. However, I note that the revised notices published on foot of the request for further information were in English and I have had regard to these in the first instance.
- 7.2.3. I consider that the proposed change of use of the buildings from guesthouse back to two houses and a café and the associated extensions and alterations are consistent with the zoning objective for the site and that the proposed development is therefore acceptable in principle, subject to further consideration of the planning issues identified in Section 7.1 above.

7.3. Proposed Café Use

- 7.3.1. With regard to the design and layout of the proposed café at basement and ground floor of No. 1 Seatown Place, I have a number of concerns. I note that the café store at basement level and the café WC at ground level appear to be located within the structure of No. 2 Seatown Place, and that the café has windows that would open directly onto the private open space of Nos. 1 and 2. I also note that the emergency exit from the café exits via a gate into the private open space of No. 1. Also, as a result of the presence of the café at ground floor, I consider that the duplex unit at first and second floor of No. 1 has a fragmented layout, with access to its rear garden only being possible via basement level. The refuse store for the café is located to the rear of the site, and since the café does not have direct access to the rear (other than via the private open space of No. 1) this would necessitate a circuitous c. 100m walk from the café along Seatown Place, down the laneway and into the car park area to deposit café-related refuse.
- 7.3.2. In terms of the services associated with the café, the applicant has stated that no additional services are required for the café other than an extractor fan venting to the

basement light well, whilst the supplementary planning application form indicates that while a commercial food preparation area is proposed at basement level, it is not proposed to provide a grease trap. Having regard to the location of the proposed commercial kitchen at basement level, I consider it likely that more significant ventilation and extraction equipment will be required, and I consider that such equipment has the potential to give rise to odour and noise issues for adjoining residential properties and for future residents of Nos. 1 and 2 Seatown Place.

- 7.3.3. The applicant has stated that no signage is proposed for the café but it is not clear to me how a café serving the public would operate effectively without any signage indicating its presence. The supplementary planning application form indicates that the proposed opening hours of the café are 08:00 to 22:00. Having regard to the proposed residential use of the upper floors and the adjoining residential uses to either side, I consider that these opening hours are excessive.
- 7.3.4. With regard to the relationship between the appeal site and the appellant's property, I note that the layout of the return to the rear of No. 1 Seatown Place is highly unusual, as it appears to be shared with the appellant's property, with the ownership of the return alternating between the two parties on a floor-by-floor basis. As a result, the proposed stairwell area and fire escape of the café would be extremely close to the appellant's windows within the return.
- 7.3.5. On the basis of the information provided, and having regard to the layout and character of the protected structures and the various issues outlined above, I do not consider that a café can be successfully accommodated within No. 1 Seatown Place in the manner sought, and I do not consider that it is compatible with preserving either the existing residential amenities of neighbouring properties or the residential amenity of future occupants of Nos. 1 and 2 Seatown Place.
- 7.3.6. If the Board is minded to grant permission, I therefore recommend that the café should be omitted by way of condition, with its associated floor area incorporated within the residential unit in No. 1 Seatown Place. However, if the Board is minded to grant permission for the café, I recommend that its opening hours be limited to 08:00 to 18:00.

7.4. Residential Amenity

- 7.4.1. The appellant has raised concerns in relation to the potential impact of the proposed development on her residential amenity. These concerns primarily relate to the proposed café use which is addressed above, the proposed extension to the rear of No. 2 Seatown Place and the nature of the proposed residential use.
- 7.4.2. With regard to the potential impact of the proposed extension to No. 2 Seatown Place on the appellant's property, I do not consider that any significant overshadowing will occur as the proposed extension is two storeys high with a flat roof and would be located c. 6.7m from the appellant's rear extension. With regard to overlooking, I note that obscure glazing is indicated on the first floor windows on the side elevation facing the appellant's property which I consider adequate to prevent undue overlooking.
- 7.4.3. While the location of the proposed extension along the eastern boundary of the site will result in it being somewhat overbearing when seen from the neighbouring property to the east, this building is in commercial use as a counselling centre. While there will be some overbearing and overshadowing of its garden area, having regard to the flat roof and reduced ground floor level of the extension relative to the main house, I do not consider that the impact would be so severe as to warrant refusal of planning permission.
- 7.4.4. The appellant has expressed concern that the proposed development will result in the buildings being used for student accommodation rather than as single residential units, with reference to the recent planning history, the proposed layout of the buildings and the scale of the extension proposed to No. 2 Seatown Place. I consider that these concerns can be addressed by way of condition, and while I generally share the appellant's concern with regard to the proposed café use, I consider that the renovation of the protected structures and their use for residential purposes would be consistent with the principles of proper planning and sustainable development.
- 7.4.5. In conclusion, I am satisfied, subject to the conditions outlined above, that the proposed development will not seriously injure the residential amenities of properties in the area.

7.5. Architectural Heritage

7.5.1. Nos. 1 and 2 Seatown Place are protected structures and are listed in the national inventory of architectural heritage as being of regional importance. The description of the buildings in the RPS is as follows:

- **No. 1:** c.1840, terraced two-bay three-storey over basement. Associated with Sir Francis Leopold McLintock. The fenestration pattern and scale of the building is in keeping with its surroundings and it is enhanced by the quality craftsmanship of the timber sliding sash windows, doorcase and boundary railings.
- **No. 2:** c. 1840, terraced three-bay three storey over basement. The scale and fenestration pattern punctuate the streetscape and contribute to the coherence of the character of the street. The fine timber sliding sash windows, doorcase and decorative fanlight enhances the character of the building.

7.5.2. The houses are currently not in use and are in relatively poor condition, with extensive cracking and peeling paintwork on the front elevations, internal disrepair and overgrown rear gardens. I noted on my site inspection that some internal works have commenced on the buildings, when compared to the photographs submitted with the planning application. These works generally appear to relate to plumbing and electrical works and have entailed the removal of floor finishes and floorboards.

7.5.3. I consider that the proposed change of use from guesthouse back to residential use and the associated repair works are positive aspects of the proposed development. Many of the original rooms within the buildings have been subdivided to provide guesthouse accommodation, with resultant negative impacts on room proportions and features of architectural merit such as cornicing. The proposed removal of some internal subdivisions and the steel fire escape to the rear, and the various repair and reinstatement works proposed will serve to protect and enhance the character of the protected structures and the wider ACA and will be consistent with Policies CH9 and CH10 of the Development Plan. I note that the majority of the building fabric to be removed is non-original, and I consider that the small areas of original fabric proposed for removal is acceptable in the context of returning the vacant structures back to active residential use. In this regard I consider there is a balance to be struck

between conserving the original building fabric and providing a sustainable use that will ensure the longevity of the structures.

- 7.5.4. The Heritage Impact Assessment submitted in response to the RFI outlines the proposed works, their rationale, as well as some specifications and mitigation measures. I note that the Planning Authority's conservation officer was generally satisfied with the proposed development as amended on foot of a request for further information, subject to compliance with a number of conditions.
- 7.5.5. With regard to the proposed extension to the rear of No. 2 Seatown Place, I consider that the revised proposal, as submitted in response to the request for further information is suitably respectful to the main structure due to its reduced height and massing, its simple contemporary design and link structure which separates the extension from the original return. The height of the extension is lower than the existing return, and it will not be visible from Seatown Place, thus ensuring that there is no impact on the character of the ACA.
- 7.5.6. In conclusion, subject to compliance with conditions regarding the protection of architectural features during construction, the recording of elements to be removed, and the supervision of a conservation architect, I consider that the proposed development is acceptable from an architectural heritage perspective and will not have a significant negative impact on the architectural heritage or character of the protected structures or the wider Architectural Conservation Area.

7.6. Car Parking and Access

- 7.6.1. It is proposed to provide five car parking spaces to the rear of the site, with two spaces for each house and a visitor space. While the houses are sizable and feature four and seven bedrooms, respectively, I consider, having regard to the town centre location of the site, that the proposed car parking provision is adequate and consistent with the car parking requirements set out in Table 5.4 of the Development Plan. Access to the car parking area will be via the laneway to the east, which passes through an archway in No. 6 Seatown Place. The laneway is narrow and does not have a footpath. However, having regard to its historic nature, limited length and its alignment which limits achievable speeds, I consider that the use of the

laneway to access a limited number of car parking spaces associated with the houses is acceptable.

7.6.2. The appellant has expressed concern regarding the potential use of the laneway to the west to access the car parking area. This laneway passes through the appellant's property, and the appellant contends that no right-of-way is in place to facilitate such access. I note that the applicant has undertaken not to seek to utilise this laneway, and I am satisfied that the laneway to the east is adequate for the limited residential use proposed.

7.6.3. With regard to parking and deliveries associated with the proposed café use, I note that on-street car parking is available on both sides of Seatown Place, and having regard to the town centre location of the site, I consider that this is adequate.

7.7. Other Issues

7.7.1. Impact on Structure of Appellant's Property

The appellant has raised issues with regard to the impact of the proposed development on the structural integrity of her property and contends that portions of the party wall between her property and No. 1 Seatown Place are only comprised of partition walls. As outlined elsewhere, I am recommending that the café be omitted by way of condition, which would result in the two buildings being converted entirely to residential use. Subject to this, I do not consider that the relatively limited extent of works proposed to No. 1 Seatown Place are likely to impact on the structure of the appellant's property. Notwithstanding this, I note that as per section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, a person shall not be entitled solely by reason of planning permission to carry out any development.

7.7.2. Development Contributions

The Planning Authority considered that no development contributions were payable, on the basis that the change of use would not lead to any intensification of demand on existing infrastructure. This is provided for by Class 10 of Article 6.1 of the Louth Development Contribution Scheme 2016-2021. I concur with this view and I also note that Class 19 of Article 6.1 provides an exemption for renovations to protected structures and for extensions to protected structures for private residential use where the works protect and enhance the character of the protected structures. I am

satisfied, therefore, that no development contributions arise in respect of the proposed development.

7.8. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.8.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, which relates to the change of use of, and extensions to, existing structures in an established and serviced town centre area outside of any Natura 2000 sites, I am satisfied that no appropriate assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions as set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 9.1. Having regard to the zoning objectives for the area and 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 property in the vicinity, would be acceptable in terms of traffic impact and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable 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 as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 24th day of February 2017, 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. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:

- (a) The proposed café at ground floor level and basement level in No. 1 Seatown Place shall be omitted and the associated floor area shall be incorporated into the residential unit, so as to provide one residential unit within this building.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

2. The two dwellings shall each be used as a private dwelling house and shall not be sub-divided into multi-occupancy use or amalgamated or used for any other purpose.

Reason: To protect the amenities of properties in the vicinity.

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

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

4. (a) A conservation expert shall be employed to manage, monitor and implement the works on the site and to ensure adequate protection of the retained and historic fabric during the works. In this regard, all permitted works shall be designed to cause minimum interference to the retained building and facades structure and/or fabric.

(b) All repair works to the protected structures shall be carried out in accordance with best conservation practice as detailed in the application and the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht in 2011. The repair works shall retain the maximum

amount of surviving historic fabric in situ, including structural elements, plasterwork (plain and decorative) and joinery and shall be designed to cause minimum interference to the building structure and/or fabric. Items that have to be removed for repair shall be recorded prior to removal, catalogued and numbered to allow for authentic re-instatement.

- (c) All existing original features, including interior and exterior fittings/features, joinery, plasterwork, features (including cornices and ceiling mouldings) staircases including balusters, handrail and skirting boards, shall be protected during the course of refurbishment.
- (d) where possible the remaining rainwater goods and bargeboard shall be repaired and reused, the replacement rainwater goods and bargeboard shall match the original in terms of design and materials,
- (e) replacement windows shall be modelled on surviving windows and shall match them in dimensions, opening mechanism, profiles and materials;

Reason: To ensure that the integrity of the protected structures is maintained and that the structures are protected from unnecessary damage or loss of fabric.

5. Water supply and drainage arrangements including the attenuation and 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.

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0800 hours to 1900 hours Monday to Friday inclusive and between 0800 hours and 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays. Deviation from these times shall 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 properties in the vicinity.

Niall Haverty
Planning Inspector

26th July 2017