



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL06D.248460

Development	Refurbishment & conservation of Beulah House (PS), to include demolition of an extension & sheds, and construction of a 2-storey extension, garden room & plant room.
Location	Beulah, Harbour Road, Dalkey, County Dublin.
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Co. Co.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D17A/0138
Applicant(s)	Martello Tower Finance
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Martello Tower Finance
Observer(s)	Helen Stephenson
Date of Site Inspection	22 nd August 2017
Inspector	Karla Mc Bride

1.0 Site Location and Description

The appeal site is located in the coastal village of Dalkey on the south side of Dublin and the surrounding area is residential in character. The site is located along Harbour Road and it is bound to the NW by a detached house (Batra Cove) on a large site, to the NE by rocky outcrops with the Irish Sea beyond, and to the SE by row of detached houses (Beulah Close), with St. Patrick's Church located on the opposite side of the road. The site contains an existing detached 2-storey over basement Georgian house (Beulah House) which is a Protected Structure with a single storey side extension, landscaped gardens and a curved avenue. The site boundaries are defined by stone walls and mature trees and shrubs. Photographs and maps in Appendix 1 describe the site and surrounding in more detail.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development would consist of the following works at Beulah House which is a Protected Structure:

- Refurbishment & conservation of Beulah House including:
 - the refurbishment of existing windows,
 - new mechanical and electrical services,
 - some internal alterations and re-roofing.
- The demolition of a single-storey side extension & single storey sheds.
- The construction of a new 2-storey side extension (180sq.m).
- The construction of a garden room & plant room (56sq.m), an out-door swimming pool, and a tennis court, with associated fencing and lighting.
- New landscaping including changes to ground levels.
- All ancillary site works and services.

2.2. Accompanying documents:

- Conservation Report
- Engineering Report (including a FRA)

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to refuse planning permission for 2 reasons related to:

1. The proposed extension by reason of its scale, height and visual prominence within its contextual setting would unduly detract from the architectural integrity and character of 'Beulah'; contrary to best conservation practice, Policy AR1 (Record of Protected Structures) and Sections 6.8.2 and 6.8.3 of Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines; and seriously injure the amenities and/or depreciate the value of property in the vicinity.
2. The proposed extension, by reason of its scale and height, would be visually obtrusive at this location and out of character with the existing dwelling; would contravene Section 8.2.11.2 (i) and (iii) of the Development Plan which relates to works to a Protected Structure; would set an unfavorable precedent for similar developments to Protected Structures; and seriously injure the amenities and/or depreciate the value of property in the vicinity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the planning officer recommended the refusal of planning permission for 2 reasons and this is reflected in the Decision of the County Council.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division: No objections subject to conditions.

Transportation Division: Requested FI in relation to the Lux levels for the floodlights.

Conservation Report: Recommended the refusal of permission for reasons related to the scale, height and visual prominence of the extension within its contextual setting, which would unduly detract from the architectural integrity and character of the PS.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Irish Water: No objection subject to standard conditions.

The case was also circulated to the Arts Council, Failte Ireland, Heritage Council, An Taisce and the DAHRR&GA with no responses received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

One letter received from the owner of the neighbouring house at Bartra Cove who raised concerns in relation to: - the impact on visual & residential amenity; lack of detail in the conservation report; the absence of a Tree Survey & Appropriate Assessment; inadequate engineering details; and adverse impact on the character & setting of the PS. Photographs and a Revit model of views was submitted.

4.0 **Planning History**

None on file.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **The Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2004**

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.

Section 6.8.1 states that it will often be necessary to permit appropriate new extensions to protected structures in order to make them fit for modern living and to keep them in viable economic use.

Section 6.8.2 states that if planning permission is to be granted for an extension, the new work should involve the smallest possible loss of historic fabric and ensure that important features are not obscured, damaged or destroyed. In general, principal elevations of a protected structure (not necessarily just the façade) should not be adversely affected by new extensions. The design of symmetrical buildings or elevations should not be compromised by additions that would disrupt the symmetry or be detrimental to the design of the protected structure.

Section 6.8.3 states that generally, attempts should not be made to disguise new additions or extensions and make them appear to belong to the historic fabric. The architectural style of additions does not necessarily need to imitate historical styles or replicate the detailing of the original building in order to be considered acceptable. However, this should not be seen as a licence for unsympathetic or inappropriate work. Careful consideration of the palette of materials with which the works are to be executed can mediate between a modern design idiom and the historic fabric of the structure. Extensions should complement the original structure in terms of scale, materials and detailed design while reflecting the values of the present time.

5.2. Development Plan

Zoning objective: The site is located within an area covered by the A zoning objective in the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown Development Plan, 2016-2022 which seeks “To protect and/or improve residential amenity.”

Built Heritage: Beulah House is a Protected Structure.

Residential extensions: Section 8.2.3.4 (i) states that side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation), and impacts on residential amenity.

Extensions to Protected Structures: Section 8.2.11.2 (i) seeks to ensure that:

- Alterations & interventions shall be executed to the highest conservation standards, and shall not detract from their significance or value.
- Original features of architectural & historic interest will be retained.
- Interventions should be minimised to retain the legibility of the floor plan.
- All works should be carried out to the highest possible standard.
- Appropriately scaled extensions should complement, and be subsidiary to, the main structure and be positioned generally to the rear elevation or less prominent elevation.
- Extensions should be clearly distinguishable and to a high standard of design using material that respects and compliments the original building.
- The retention of original features will be encouraged.

Development in Proximity to a Protected Structure: Section 8.2.11.2 (iii) states that any proposed development within the curtilage, attendant grounds or in close proximity to a Protected Structure has the potential to adversely affect its setting and amenity. The overall guiding principle will be an insistence on high quality in both materials and design which both respects and compliments the Protected Structure and its setting. Innovative design in accordance with international best practice is encouraged. Pastiche design should be avoided as it confuses the historical record of the existing building and diminishes its architectural integrity.

Protection of Coastline Heritage: Policy AR10 (ii) seeks to have regard to those items identified in the Coastal Architecture Heritage Survey when assessing any development proposals. The 17km coastline is central to the historical development and identity of the County. A wide range of coastal buildings and structures are currently on the Record of Protected Structures. These include Dun Laoghaire Harbour, the smaller harbours at Coliemore and Bullock, the Martello Towers and associated gun batteries, as well as private residences.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations** (within a 5km radius of the site)

- Rockabil to Dalkey Island SAC (Site code: 003000)
- Dalkey Island SPA (Site code: 004172)
- Dalkey Coastal Zone & Killiney pNHA (Site code: 001206)
- South Dublin Bay & River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site code: 004024)
- South Dublin Bay SAC (Site code: 000210)
- South Dublin Bay pNHA (Site code: 000210)

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

Need, conservation & design:

- Proposal complies with DP conservation policies & standards and a Conservation Strategy was devised with respect to the existing PS.
- The extension is required to meet the needs of a growing family and a new kitchen and master bedroom are needed to provide modern accommodation.
- Significant quantity of historic fabric is intact, the original floor plans remain at ground & first floor levels, and the single storey side extension has no merit.
- The new extension would accommodate all modern uses and preserve and restore the floor plan and fabric of Beulah with only minor interventions.
- The house is set in mature gardens and overlooks the coast to the rear, it is lower than Harbour Road and screened by a high stone wall and mature trees, and the site slopes down to the sea & the main view is from the coast.
- The existing single storey side extension to the NW is not visible and it is an ideal location for the proposed extension which will be screened from the front and sides, but open to the rear garden with views to Dublin Bay.
- The mass and proportion of the existing house give it a very strong form whilst the later single storey side extension is weak with a truncated appearance.
- The design would be off its time, distinctive and innovative, it would be screened from public view by existing trees with no impact on neighbouring amenities, and it would appear separate from the existing building.
- The proposed narrow front elevation would have minimum articulation, the extension would be joined to the house by a single storey glass structure, whilst the long rear elevation would read as a glass wing extending out from the house, and the extension would be set at an angle to the main house.

- The ground floor level would be 450mm above the house in response to topography & to maintain the continuity of horizontal lines into the extension, and the overall height would align with the eaves of the existing house.
- The front elevation would be clad in stone & brick, the rear elevation would comprise glass & copper, and the new screen wall would be rubble stone.

Other issues

- A tennis court previously existed in the garden; the location, orientation & height of the swimming pool and garden room were carefully considered in relation to setting & views from the house, with no views from the sea.

Response to public submission

- The line of the trees to the NW of the house with Bartra Cove are evergreen.
- The extension is contained between the prominent front and rear building lines of the existing and neighbouring houses (Bartra Cove).
- Almost 7m separation between extension and Bartra Cove.
- The extension is located SE of Bartra Cove with no impact on sunlight.
- No right to a view into the garden of Beulah.
- The landscaping is more mature than shown in the Observer's photographs.
- The Observer's description of the garden room is inaccurate.

Response to planner's report:

- The Planner accepts that a 2-storey extension (and other elements) is acceptable in principle and it would not impact on neighbouring amenities.
- The reasons for refusal depend on the report of the Conservation Officer which advises that the extension would detract from the setting of the PS.
- The CO has taken the view that "subsidiary" means "smaller, lower and orthogonally aligned with the existing house, just like the existing single storey extension which has no architectural merit.
- The substantial house & large site can accommodate a large 2-storey extension which reads as a separate building in line with s.8.2.11.2 (iii).

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- The principle of an extension is acceptable however the proposal would be contrary to best conservation practice and:
 - Policy AR1 which states that works should not negatively impact the special character & appearance of a PS and sections 8.2.11.2(i) & (ii).
 - Section 6.8.2 of the Guidelines which states that “important features are not obscured” by the works; and section 6.8.3 which states that extensions should complement the scale of the original structure.
- The CO cannot support the proposed development, which would, by reason of its scale, height and visual prominence within its contextual setting would unduly detract from the architectural integrity & character of the PS.

6.3. Observations

One letter of observation received from the owners of Bartra Cove on the adjoining site to the N who raise the following concerns in addition to the concerns raised in their submission to the PA which are also summarised below:

General concerns:

- Excessive scale of the proposed development.
- Impacts on the visual and residential amenities of the neighbouring house and the surrounding coastal area.
- Lack of detail in the Conservation report.
- Absence of a Tree Survey and Appropriate Assessment.
- Inadequate details in relation to drainage, flood risk, construction traffic and rock excavations.
- Adverse impact on the character and setting of the Protected Structure.

Response to First Party appeal submission:

- The line of trees to the NW of Beulah, along the boundary with Bartra Cove do not form a continuous screen and include a number of deciduous trees.
- The photographs & Revit model views from Bartra Cove are accurate and show that the extension will block daylight & sunlight and affect amenity.
- The scale, height and skewed plan form & shape of the structure is at odds with the established building line and form of development along the coastline.
- The historic building line established by the 1804 Martello Tower with Bartra Cove, Beulah and later Bartra Cove would be unduly injured by the proposed swimming pool projection on the grounds sweeping down to the sea.
- The swimming pool within the curtilage of a PS and its attendant grounds is incongruous with the character of the unique seaward grounds of Beulah Bartra Cove & Bartra House, and it would affect views along the coastline.
- The photos of Beulah from Harbour Road and St. Patricks Church reflect the current context and no new mature trees have been planted in the interim.
- The existing contours levels at Beulah and the dimensions of the proposed extension were used to produce the Revit model, and the views are accurate.

6.4. Prescribed Bodies

The appeal was circulated to the DAHRR&GA (DAU) with no response received.

7.0 **Assessment**

The main issues arising in this case are:

- Principle of development
- Visual amenity & heritage
- Residential amenity
- Other issues

7.1. **Principle of development**

The proposed development would be located within an area covered by the “A” zoning objective in the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown Development Plan, 2016-2022 which seeks “To protect and/or improve residential amenity.” The proposed 2-storey extension to the side of an existing 2-storey over basement detached house would be compatible with this zoning objective and the proposed development would therefore be acceptable in principle.

7.2. **Visual amenity and Heritage**

The appeal site is located along Harbour Road in Dalkey which is an established residential area and the surrounding is characterized by a mix of house types of various ages, styles and designs. Several of the buildings are designated Protected Structures, including the appeal premises at Beulah House, St. Patrick’s Church on the opposite side of Harbour Road, and a large detached house and Martello Tower to the far NW of the site. The surrounding area is not designated as a Residential Conservation Area and there are no protected views through the site, however the existing house overlooks the coast and the site slopes down to the rocky outcrops that form part of the Dalkey Coastal Zone & Killiney pNHA.

The substantial site is occupied by Beulah House which is a detached 2-storey over basement Georgian house that is in a good state of repair and the application was accompanied by Conservation Report.

The proposed development would comprise the refurbishment of Beulah House, the demolition of the existing single-storey side extension and its replacement with a new 2-storey side extension which would be 180sq.m. The proposed development would also include the construction of an outdoor swimming pool with ancillary single storey buildings in the NE section of the site, and the reinstatement of tennis courts in the SW section, along with two small sheds and landscaping works.

Beulah House:

The existing detached, 2-storey over basement house, which dates from the early to mid-1800s with later additions and alterations, is in a good state of repair and in contains many of its original features. The proposed refurbishment and conservation works would include the refurbishment of existing windows, the installation of new mechanical and electrical services, some minor internal alterations which would include the closing up and relocation of a small number of internal doors, and re-roofing the structure. The proposed interventions are considered acceptable as they would entail a combination of essential maintenance and minor works which would not have a significant adverse impact on the fabric, character or setting of the protected structure, provided that the works are carried out under the supervision of a specialist Conservation Architect.

Proposed extension:

It is proposed to demolish the existing single storey extension to the side of Beulah House and construct a new 2-storey extension which would be approximately 180sq.m. The proposed flat roofed extension would have a contemporary design, it would be located at an angle to the existing house and the two structures would be connected at ground floor level by means of single storey glazed corridor which would be approximately 2m long and 2.4m wide. The NE facing elevation would have extensive glazing whilst the SW facing elevation would comprise a mix of stone and brick, and the edges of the oval shaped roof to the rear would be defined by copper cladding.

The ground floor could contain a large oval shaped kitchen/dining/living room area which would overlook the rear garden and coastline, and a rectangular shaped area to the rear which would contain a larder, laundry, boot room and shower room. The smaller first floor level would contain a bedroom, dressing room and bathroom which would be accessed via an internal stairway.

The Council's Conservation Officer had serious concerns in relation to the impact of the proposed 2-storey extension on Beulah House and the planning authority decided to refuse planning permission for two reasons which are summarised in section 3.1 above. The reasons for refusal related to the adverse impact of the proposed extension, by way of its scale, height and visual prominence relative to the Protected Structure; visual intrusion, out of character with the existing dwelling, unfavorable precedent for similar works to Protected Structures, and serious injury to the amenities in the vicinity; and contravention of the Architectural Heritage Guidelines and Development Plan policies for works to Protected Structures.

The First Party did not concur with the planning authorities reasoning and submitted that the proposed works would comply with both national and local policies and standards for extensions to Protected Structures; the proposed extension would be set back from Harbour Road, well screened by existing trees and not visible from the public domain; the design would be contemporary, distinctive and innovative; the extension would appear separate from the existing building but maintain the continuity of horizontal lines from the existing house; and the overall height would be subordinate and align with the eaves of the main house.

The relevant policies and standards are summarised in sections 5.1 and 5.2 above.

In relation to the 2004 guidelines, section 6.8.1 accepts the principle of constructing domestic extensions to Protected Structures, section 6.8.2 states that the new work should involve the smallest possible loss of historic fabric and the principal elevations should not be adversely affected by new extensions, whilst section 6.8.3

states that the architectural style of new additions does not need to imitate historical styles or replicate the detailing of the original building, although extensions should complement the original structure in terms of scale, materials and detailed design while reflecting the values of the present time.

The proposed development would comprise the demolition of a single storey side extension which dates from the c.1930s which is in turn attached on to a double height “bowed” structure on the side elevation of the original house. It is noted that this “bowed” structure was constructed at a slightly later date than Beulah House and that the external appearance of this feature would be restored with no loss additional of historic fabric to either the main house or this structure. The proposed extension would be located to the side of the existing house and not the front and rear which comprise the most prominent and intact elevations, it would be separated from the main house by a c.2m long single storey corridor, and it would have its own distinctive design and layout. Having regard to the foregoing, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would largely comply with sections 6.8.1, 6.8.2 and most of section 6.8.3 of the Guidelines. However, a more detailed analysis of the proposed extension relative to the remaining elements of section 6.8.3 and the Development Plan standards will be undertaken below.

As previously stated, section 6.8.3 of the 2004 Guidelines states that new additions do not have to replicate the original style and that extensions should complement the original structure in terms of scale, materials and detailed design while reflecting the values of the present time. Section 8.2.11.2 of the Development Plan seeks to ensure that extensions are appropriately scaled; that they complement and are subsidiary to the main structure; generally positioned to the rear elevation or less prominent elevation; be clearly distinguishable; and to a high standard of design using material that respects and compliments the original building.

The existing 2-storey house would be approximately 485sq.m. following the demolition of the existing single storey side extension and the proposed 2-storey side extension would be approximately 180sq.m. The existing house is approximately 18m wide and 9m high, whilst the overall width of the proposed

extension would be approximately 15m and approximately 7m high at a point corresponding to the height of the eaves of the existing house. The proposed flat roofed extension would have a contemporary design with extensive glazing on the NE facing elevation and a combination of stone and brick on the SW facing elevation along with copper cladding around the roof of the ground floor section to reflect the materials used in the external facades of the existing house. The proposed extension would be set back a substantial distance from the site boundary with Harbour Road which is defined by a high stone wall, the intervening space comprises a curved avenue with mature evergreen exotic trees and the SW facing elevation would not project beyond the front elevation of the existing house. Therefore, the proposed 2-storey extension would not be visible from along Harbour Road or from along the approach to Beulah House along the internal avenue, although it would be visible when viewed from St Patricks Church to the SW and from the coast to the NE.

The design and layout of the proposed extension would not replicate the original style of Beulah House and I am satisfied that the structure would complement the original house in terms of materials and detailed design whilst also reflecting the values of the present time with a contemporary and functional style. The principle of locating the proposed extension to the side of the original house rather than to the rear is acceptable because of the historic character of the rear façade, although the possibility of constructing a narrow extension (relative to the overall width of the house) to the rear has not been fully explored. Although the least prominent elevation is located on the opposite SE side of the house to where the proposed extension would be located, it is noted that there would not be sufficient space to accommodate a structure of the scale proposed. The high standard of design is noted.

The proposed extension would therefore comply with most but not all of the criteria for additions and extensions to Protected Structures.

Notwithstanding all of the foregoing, section 6.8.3 of the 2004 Guidelines and section 8.2.11.2 (i) of the Development Plan also seek to ensure that extensions are both appropriately scaled and subsidiary to the main structure. Both the existing house

and proposed side extension would be 2-storeys high although it is noted that they would not be the same overall height. The floor area of the proposed c.180sq.m. extension would just over one third of the floor area of the original house, and the width of the proposed extension would be slightly less than the width of the original house at ground level. Having regard to these dimensions, which are considered excessive for a domestic extension, I am not satisfied that the proposed extension would be appropriately scaled and subsidiary to the main structure. Therefore, the proposed 2-storey extension would have an adverse impact on the character, setting and integrity of Beulah House which is a Protected Structure.

Finally, although I also have concerns in relation to the self-contained nature of the proposed extension and the absence of any physical connection between the proposed and existing bedrooms at first floor level, I am satisfied that this concern could be addressed by way of a planning condition which would require the permanent integrated use of both structures as a single family house.

Swimming pool & ancillary building:

The proposed swimming pool and ancillary single storey building would be located to the NE of the Beulah House. The swimming pool would be approximately 25m long and 6m wide whilst the flat roofed ancillary building would be approximately 7m wide, 8m deep and 2.8m to 4m high (to take account of the slope). This facility would be set back in excess of 45m from the rear elevation of the existing house and it would occupy a low lying section of the site at a distance of approximately 4m to 7m from the site boundary with the rocky outcrops along the coastline that form part of the Dalkey Coastal Zone & Killiney pNHA. This element of the proposed development are considered acceptable as the works would not affect the character and setting of the Protected Structure.

Having regard to the scale and location of the proposed c.56sq.m. ancillary building, it is likely that this structure would be highly visible along the coastline and it could

have an adverse impact on the character and visual amenities of the Dalkey Coastal Zone & Killiney pNHA. However, this concern could be addressed by way of a planning condition to require a substantial reduction in the scale of the building, in the event that the Board decide to grant planning permission.

Tennis courts:

The proposed tennis court would be located to the SW of Beulah House and parallel to the site boundary with Harbour Road. It would occupy the site of the former tennis court which is now laid out as a landscaped garden around a linear water feature.

The proposed court would be approximately 30m long and 15m wide and it would be surrounded by a c.2.4m high chain link fence with six c.8m high floodlights. The tennis court would be set back c.25m from the front elevation of the existing house and c.12m to the S of the main entrance off Harbour Road. The tennis court element of the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of visual amenity and the works would not affect the character and setting of the Protected Structure. The works would also be located a substantial distance from the Dalkey Coastal Zone & Killiney pNHA to the NE, which not be affected by this element of the development.

The proposed c.8m high floodlight structures would be visually dominant to the fore of the Protected Structure, particularly so when viewed from St Patricks Church on the opposite side of Harbour Road. This concern could be addressed by way of a planning condition requiring the omission of the floodlights having regard to the established residential character of the area and the potential for adverse impacts on views from St Patrick's Church to the SW, which is also a Protected Structure.

Sheds and walls:

Two single storey sheds would be located to the NW of the proposed extension and they would be located to the rear of a new curved rubble stone wall that would mirror a similar curved wall to the SE of the existing house. This element of the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of visual amenity and the works would not affect the character and setting of the Protected Structure. The works would also be located a substantial distance from the Dalkey Coastal Zone & Killiney pNHA to the NE, which not be affected by this element of the development.

7.3. Residential amenity

Proposed extension:

The proposed development, in combination with the existing house, would provide for an acceptable level of residential amenity in line with development Plan requirements in relation to floor area, room size, orientation, daylight, sunlight, storage and private amenity space. However, it is noted that the proposed extension, which would be linked to the existing house by a c. 2m long corridor at ground level, would house the master bedroom at first floor level, which would be at a substantial remove from the first floor bedrooms in the existing family home.

Relationship to Bartra Cove:

The proposed 2-storey extension would be located to the SE of the neighbouring 2-storey house at Bartra Cove, and the site levels slope down from NW to SE. The site boundaries are defined by a high stone wall and a line of reasonably mature indigenous and exotic evergreen trees which would be retained. The proposed extension would be located at an angle to the existing 2-storey house and the neighbouring 2-storey house at Bartra Cove. The separation distance to the site boundary would vary from c.4.5m to c.8m, whilst the separation distance with the side elevation of the Bartra Cove would vary from c.6.5m and c.11m.

There would be no windows located at first floor levels in the opposing side elevations and the angle of the proposed first floor roof garden along with the SE location of the terrace are such that the neighbouring site would not be overlooked to any significant extent. Having regard to the change in site levels between the two sites, the separation distances, the design and layout of the extension, including the reduced scale of the first floor level, it is unlikely that the proposed extension would overshadow the neighbouring house and gardens to any significant extent.

Having regard to the foregoing, I am satisfied that the proposed 2-storey extension would not seriously injure the residential amenities of the neighbouring house at Bartra Cove to any significant extent by way of overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing or overbearance.

Relationship to Beulah Court:

The proposed extension, which would be located on the NW side of the existing house, would have no impact on the row of houses to the SE along Beulah Close. The concerns raised by the Roads Department in relation to the impact of the proposed tennis court floodlights on the residential amenities of nearby houses is noted. However, this concern was addressed in section 7.2 above which recommended the omission of the floodlights.

7.4. Other issues

Appropriate Assessment: The proposed development would be located in close proximity to the Rockabil to Dalkey Island SAC and Dalkey Island SPA. Given that there is no direct aquatic connection between the proposed works and these sites, and given that the proposed development would be located within in an existing built up area that is served by the public drainage system, the proposed development would not affect the European sites. This would be subject to compliance with the requirements of Irish Water and the planning authority and compliance with best construction practice which should prohibit any works in the vicinity of the foreshore.

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

Flood risk: The contents of the applicant's Flood Risk Assessment are noted and I am satisfied that the proposed development would not give rise to flooding subject to compliance with the requirements of Irish Water and the planning authority.

Vehicular access & car parking: There would no change to the existing access and parking arrangements. The Roads Department raised concerns in relation to the impact of the tennis court floodlights on the public road. However, this concern was addressed in section 7.2 above which recommended the omission of the floodlights.

Trees & landscaping: The appeal site is well landscaped and it contains an interesting variety of indigenous and exotic trees and shrubs. The applicant should be requested by way of a planning condition, to submit a detailed tree and shrub survey and a detailed landscaping scheme to the planning authority before development commences, in the event that the Board decides to grant permission.

Financial contributions: The standard Section 48 condition should be attached.

8.0 Recommendation

Arising from my assessment of this appeal case I recommend that planning permission should be refused for the proposed development for the reasons and considerations set down below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed two-storey extension, by reason of its excessive scale, height, location and visual prominence would be out of character with the existing two-storey house on the site which is a designated Protected Structure. The proposed extension would fail to comply with the standards and criteria for additions and extensions to Protected Structures as set out in Sections 6.8.2 and 6.8.3 of Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines, 2004 and Section 8.2.11.2 of the Dun Laoghaire County Development Plan 2016-2022. Furthermore, the proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for similar future works to Protected Structures in the vicinity, and it would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Karla Mc Bride
Planning Inspector

23rd August 2017