



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL29S.248563

**Development** Two storey extension to side / rear of no.6 Larkfield Park and to the rear of no.8 Larkfield Park, relocation of dwelling house entrance door to no.6 and provision of new vehicular accesses and off-street parking each to no.6 & no.8.

**Location** Nos.6 & 8 Larkfield Park, Harold's Cross, Dublin 6W

**Planning Authority** Dublin City Council  
**Planning Authority Reg. Ref.** WEB1001/17.  
**Applicant(s)** Paul Howard  
**Type of Application** Permission  
**Planning Authority Decision** GRANT with conditions.

**Type of Appeal** 2no. Third Party  
**Appellant(s)** Edurne Timmins; John & Yvonne Cantwell  
**Observer(s)** None

**Date of Site Inspection** 10/08/17  
**Inspector** John Desmond

# 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. Prescribed Bodies .....	5
3.4. Third Party Observations .....	5
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
5.1. Development Plan.....	6
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations .....	7
6.0 The Appeal .....	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	7
6.2. Applicant Response .....	10
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	12
6.4. Observations.....	12
6.5. Further Responses.....	12
7.0 Assessment.....	12
8.0 Recommendation.....	18
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	18
10.0 Conditions .....	18

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in south west Dublin City, c.150m southeast of Kimmage village centre, in a mature suburban area characterised largely by low density semi-detached and terraced dwellings, much of which is former council / state housing.
- 1.2. The application relates to the site of 578-sq.m stated area, containing a pair of terraced dwellings of 126-sq.m stated area, however, the site within the redline boundary measures only c.275-sq.m with the balance of the land indicated as accommodating a separate residential development. The existing dwellings are setback a little over 5m from the roadside boundary to the northeast at Larkfield Park. The two properties currently have extensive rear gardens extending up to 33m onto the public road to the rear at Larkfield Gardens. The rear garden to no.6 is set out in a hard surface and contains a number of shipping containers and scrap metal and has a large vehicular entrance to Larkfield Gardens to the rear. The rear of no.8 is under weeds.
- 1.3. No.6 abuts the rear boundary to no.4 Larkfield Park, to the northwest, to which it is an angle of c.45-degrees. That dwelling has been extended to the rear and also has erected a shed along the party boundary. No.6 also abuts the site of a single-storey dwelling erected to the rear of no.2 Larkfield Park which forms a semi-detached pair with no.4.
- 1.4. No.8 adjoins a similar property, no.10, to the southeast, which has a similar layout and orientation. The rear boundary of no.8 also abuts the side of the front garden to no.32 Larkfield Gardens.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Proposal - It is proposed to:
  - Erect a 2-storey extension to the side and rear of no.6 (an additional 33-sq.m at ground and at first floor), and to the rear of no.8 (an additional 15-sq.m at ground and at first floor), with dormer extensions (1no. each) to the rear of both dwellings (additional floor area not stated).

- Erect new porch extension (1.5-sq.m each) for each dwelling, entailing the relocation of the main entrance from the side to the front of no.6 and the removal of existing semi-detached porch at no.8.
- Provide a 3.5m wide entrance each to the front of both dwellings to provide access onto Larkfield Road.
- Provide private open space of 42.5-sq.m to the rear of no.6 and of 35-sq.m to the rear of no.8.

2.2. Further information - the following amendment was made by way of further information submission:

- First floor extension to no.6 reduced by c.6-sq.m through omission of en suite at westernmost corner.
- Dormer roof extensions were omitted and replaced with roof lights.
- The vehicular entrances were reduced to 3m in width and provision made for relocation of the bus stop and Kassel kerbing.

2.3. Supplementary documents - The applicant submitted a copy of an email from [Gabriel.Coll@dublinbus.ie](mailto:Gabriel.Coll@dublinbus.ie) indicating that Dublin Bus would not take issue with the applicant moving their Kassel Kerbing a maximum 2m closer to the driveway of no.6 and consequently a maximum of 2m further away from no.8 subject to specific requirements.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

**GRANT** permission subject to 10no. conditions. The following conditions are of note:

No.3 restricts the finishes to the proposed extension.

No.4 specifies the front boundary between the two properties and that the porch entrance to no.6 be as proposed in the drawings submitted with the initial application.

### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

There is no Planner's Report on file or on the Council's planning website, prior to the Council's request for further information. The Planner's Report of 27/04/17 considered the applicant to have addressed the issues raised in the request and recommended that permission be granted subject to 10no. conditions consistent with the decision of the Planning Authority.

#### **3.2.2. Other Technical Reports**

Drainage Division (22/02/17) – no objection subject to standard conditions.

Roads Traffic Planning Division (21/02/17) – objected to the proposed vehicular entrance to no.8 on grounds that it would necessitate the removal of the existing bus stop; requested further information to be sought in respect of same and two other points relating to the existing, possibly commercial use to rear of no.6 and clarification on front boundary treatment between the two properties.

Roads Streets & Traffic Department (27/04/17) – no objection subject to standard conditions.

### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

None

### **3.4. Third Party Observations**

Observations were received from Michael King (32 Larkfield Park), Michael and Mary Lawless (26 Larkfield Park), Carmel Dwyer (2a Larkfield Park), Jennifer McGann (2 Larkfield Park), Penelope Dickson-Coleman (38 Larkfield Gardens), Terry and Edurne Timmins (10 Larkfield Park), and John and Yvonne Cantwell (4 Larkfield Park). The main issues raised are repeated in the grounds of appeal and are summarised in section 6.0.

## 4.0 Planning History

**PL29S.247255 / Reg.ref.3240/16** – Permission **REFUSED** by the Board (12/12/16), upholding the decision of the Planning Authority, for the construction of 2-storey house to rear of no.6 Larkfield Park on grounds of overdevelopment, serious injury to visual and residential amenities and depreciation of value of property in the vicinity.

**PL29S.247252 / Reg.ref.4239/16** - Permission **REFUSED** by the Board (12/12/16), upholding the decision of the Planning Authority, for the construction of 2-storey house to rear of no.8 Larkfield Park on grounds of overdevelopment, serious injury to visual and residential amenities and depreciation of value of property in the vicinity.

**PL29S.246471 / Reg.ref.2106/16** – Permission **REFUSED** by the Board (29/06/16), upholding the decision of the Planning Authority, for the construction of 2-storey house to rear of nos.6 and 8 Larkfield Park on grounds of overdevelopment, serious injury to visual and residential amenities and depreciation of value of property in the vicinity.

**Reg.ref.2684/05:** Permission **GRANTED** by the Planning Authority (23/05/05) for a new vehicular entrance and boundary wall at the rear of no.6 Larkfield Park. Enforcement file opened (**E0015/16** refers) in respect of non-compliance with condition no.4 requiring reinstatement of front boundary and pedestrian entrance.

**Reg.ref.3137/06** – Permission **REFUSED** by the Planning Authority (17/07/06) for the erection of a shed to rear of no.6 Larkfield Park for reason of scale and industrial design and consequential serious injury to residential amenities.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

Zoning objective Z1 *to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.*

Section 16.2.2.3 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.

Section 16.10.2 Residential Quality Standards – Houses.

Section 16.10.12 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.

Appendix 17 – Guidelines for Residential Extensions.

## 5.2. Other reference documents

*Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustainable Communities (2007)*

## 5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

South Dublin Bay SAC Site Code 000210 c.5km to the east.

South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA Site Code 004024 c.5km to the east.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. The main grounds of the third party appeal by John and Yvonne Cantwell of no.4 Larkfield Park (property adjacent west of application site), on behalf of residents of Larkfield Park and Larkfield Gardens, may be summarised as follows:

- Inadequate information / incorrect details:
  - Relevant information has been excluded from the proposed development, with incorrect and incomplete information provided, inter alia, in response to the further information request, including concerning method of application of external finishes and details of collection and disposal of surface water without encroaching on neighbouring property;
  - Boundary wall details;
  - Parking layout and drainage details to same;
  - Finishes to open space (concreted?);
  - Waste water management details;
  - Demolition not included on application form;
  - Porch not shown in correct location relative to existing entrance (no.8);
  - No details of current commercial activity on site;
  - Impact on Kassel kerbing at bus stop (relocation of same not included in public notices);

- No site notice provided on Larkfield Gardens entrance.
- Size and scale
  - Size and scale of proposed extensions are unprecedented in this neighbourhood and are out of character. Devastating impact on no.4.
  - Side extensions in the area are stepped back.
  - Unprecedented extension for mid-terrace dwellings and will result in tunnel effect on neighbour.
  - Contrary to S.16.2.2.3 of the City Development Plan.
  - Incongruous porches;
  - States total development as 578-sq.m, but it measures 267-sq.m;
  - Lack of clarity over development on balance of lands.
- Site planning history:
  - The planning history on these sites, which includes non-compliance (e.g. reg.regf.2684/05 subject of enforcement file E0015/16) and the poor condition in which they have been kept (rear garden used as a builder's yard and the properties used to house a transient tenant population of 10 to 11 adults) means the applicant cannot be relied upon to implement conditions or directives issued by the planning authority.
- Trespass / encroachment:
  - Not possible to finish or maintain external walls in the finishes required by the planning authority (nap plaster / dash finish – addressed by condition no.3(a)) without trespassing.
  - Proposed roof and gutters will oversail neighbouring property (addressed by condition no.9(d)). Should have been fully addressed prior to decision.
  - Proposed removal of existing shared roof porch and existing screen wall (to no.10) without consent or provision of information.
- Standard of development:
  - Inadequate open space;



- Will reduce 3-bedroom house to 2-bedroom house, but concerns that the dwellings will be increased to 4-bedroom through internal amendments, with inadequate private open space;
- Overdevelopment, including in context of redevelopment of balance of site.
- Impact on neighbouring amenities:
  - Excessive overshadowing and overlooking of neighbouring property.
  - The initial shadow analysis submitted with the application and the subsequent analysis submitted as further information are both incorrect in terms of orientation, inadequate in the time range assessed, and the appellants strongly refutes the applicant's conclusion of '*minimal impact*'.
  - Impacts on nos.4, 2, 2a and 10 Larkfield Park.
  - Revised proposals at further information stage are inadequate mitigation.
  - Impact on solar panels installed at no.4.
  - Contrary to S.16.10.12 of City Development Plan and zoning objective Z1 '*to protect, provide for and improve residential amenities*'.

6.1.2. The main grounds of the third party appeal by Edurne Timmins of no10. Larkfield Park (property adjacent east of application site) may be summarised as follows:

- Builder's yard operated from the site by the applicant without permission:
  - has disturbed the tranquillity and peace of mind of local residents;
  - have spoiled the look of the area;
- Encroachment:
  - Impact on existing screen wall and on shared roof to adjoining porches between properties;
  - First floor level is proposed to extend over the screen wall, with gutters overhanging no.10;
  - To finish the extension, scaffolding will have to be erected within no.10;
  - Maintenance will not be possible without trespass onto no.10;
  - Not addressed by the planning authority;

- Not possible to comply with the condition relating to finishes attached by the planning authority;
- The design means it is not possible to comply with the drainage condition attached by the planning authority.
- Unprecedented scale:
  - Unnecessary for houses that will be reduced from three to two bedroomed dwellings;
  - Inadequate open space – the extended dwellings have potential to become four-bedroom dwellings.
- Will injure the amenities of local residents and set an undesirable precedent.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

The main points of the first party's response to the appeals may be summarised as follows:

- Re inadequate information:
  - The further information submission and letter answered the Council's request point for point;
  - Pre-FI submission email correspondence between the applicant and Emer Uí Fhatharta SEP with Dublin City Council appended.
- Re size, scale, entrance relocation and consequential impact on established character of area
  - Rear extension was reduced from 4m to 3m, with 2.1m setback at first floor side elevation to no.6 to reduced overshadowing (see shadow analysis);
  - Precedent for extensions set by WEB 1024/13, 2663/09, 3424/08, 2409/06 and 2293/04.
  - Precedent for relocation entrance set by WEB 1024/13, 2663/09, 3424/08, 2409/06 and 2933/04.

- Re trespass:
  - The applicant will submit an alternative render that does not require maintaining / entering neighbouring property;
  - Shared wall will remain untouched;
  - Roof is finished with parapet wall, flashing, etc., with no overhanging;
  - The porch at no.10 will remain untouched by careful removal of porch. A method statement can be submitted to the neighbours.
- Re overshadowing:
  - Dormer windows omitted to curtail overlooking and the detailed shadow analysis submitted shows overshadowing not excessive;
  - Email attached from Barry Hennessy to confirm the submitted shadow analysis is correctly orientated, with sketch up file updated with correct house numbers.
- Re inadequate open space provision:
  - 25-sq.m, the minimum required, is exceeded with 42.5-sq.m and 35-sq.m provided respectively.
- Re relocation of entrance:
- Re no information on parking, drainage of driveways, finish and allocation of green areas, boundary details and treatment of waste water management:
  - 1no. space will be provided per dwelling;
  - No objection from Drainage Department subject to compliance with GDR Code of Practice for drainage works Version 6.0. Permeable cobble lock paving with soak hole proposed;
  - Private gardens will be green areas;
  - Boundary walls to be concrete post and plinth with timber cladding;
  - The appellant is liaising with the Drainage Department;

### 6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

No further comment.

### 6.4. **Observations**

None.

### 6.5. **Further Responses**

None.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

The main issues arising in this case may be addressed under the following headings:

- 7.1 Principle
- 7.2 Scale and visual impact
- 7.3 Impact on neighbouring residential amenities
- 7.4 Encroachment issues
- 7.5 Roads / traffic issues
- 7.6 Development standards
- 7.7 Appropriate Assessment

### 7.1. Principle

- 7.1.1. The site is zoned objective Z1 to protect, provide and improve residential amenities and is situated within a well-established suburban residential area. The principle of the development is acceptable.

### 7.2. Scale and visual impact:

- 7.2.1. Within the streetscape context the proposed side extension and porch extensions to no.6 and no.8 Larkfield Park would not be unduly obtrusive or out of character. The appellant is correct that there is precedent within the wider area, on reasonable comparable sites (e.g.66 and 68 Shanid Road), for 2-storey side extensions up to the party boundary, albeit with a slight setback from the front building line. I

therefore consider the side extension and porch extensions to the front to be generally acceptable. Condition no.4 attaching to the permission required the proposed porch entrance to no.6, which was amended in design and scale by the further information submission, to be as per proposed in the initial application drawings. The applicant has not appealed same and I consider the planning authority's condition to be reasonable as it would provide for better visual consistency on the terrace, however other issues arise with the proposed porches concerning interference with vehicular access and parking, which I address below.

7.2.2. Although the proposed rear extensions would be visible from the public road at Larkfield Gardens to the south, I do not consider the visual impact of same to be unduly obtrusive, particular given the reduction in scale and omission of dormer windows by way of further information submission.

7.3. Impact on neighbouring residential amenities:

7.3.1. The appellants have raised particular concern regarding the impact of overshadowing, loss of light and visual overbearing.

7.3.2. Overshadowing and loss of light - The proposed development is located to the southeast of No.4 Larkfield Park. The orientation and layout of no.4 is such the dwelling and its private amenity space to the rear will experience a significant increase in overshadowing in the morning period and also in loss of daylight, generally, through the proposed development.

7.3.3. No.10 Larkfield Park to the southeast, will experience an increase in overshadowing later in the evening and loss of daylight generally. Within this suburban context, where some allowance must be made for residential extensions to accommodate different family sizes, I don't consider that the impact on no.10 would seriously injure its amenities in this respect.

7.3.4. I don't consider the shadow analysis submitted as further information to be optimum, either in the visual diagrams, the dates chosen or in terms of an actual analysis which is effectively left for the viewer to determine for themselves. The supplementary shadow diagrams submitted in response to the appeal are incorrect, showing two starkly different shadow lengths for June 6pm in the with and without scenarios (I assume the last set of images represents much later in the evening than

6pm). No diagrams are provided for the equinox, which is the standard for such analyses.

- 7.3.5. In response to the further information request the proposed extension to no.6 was amended to omit the first floor element at the westernmost corner (i.e. behind the existing rear building line), with the proposed first floor rear extension following the line of the existing side building line with a c.2m setback from the party boundary with no.4. The proposed rear dormers also were omitted, marginally reducing potential overshadowing further. I consider this a reasonable compromise to mitigate the effects of overshadowing on no.4. The potential significant of the impact on no.4 is also lessened by the presence of a single-storey garage adjacent the party boundary approximately in line with no.6 and over which much of the shadow will fall from the proposed 2-storey side extension. I consider the impact not to seriously injure the amenities of no.4 and to be generally acceptable.
- 7.3.6. Overlooking – The proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity through overlooking or invasion of privacy subject to the omission of the first floor rear-facing window to the room indicated as HP (hot-press). Given the proximity of the window within c.1m to the party boundary and its orientation relative to the rear garden on no.4 and the restricted size of that garden, the said window would have potential to seriously injure the amenities of the neighbouring property by way of excessive overlooking should the space be converted to habitable or accessible space. This can satisfactorily be addressed by attaching a condition requiring the window to be omitted.
- 7.3.7. Overbearing / visual intrusion – The proposed extension would have a significant visual impact on the dwelling and garden area at no.4, although the significance would be mitigated by the intervening garage within the curtilage to no.4. On balance I consider the visual impact not to be excessive.
- 7.3.8. The visual impact on no.10 would be significant, but not unacceptable within the suburban context.
- 7.3.9. Having regard to the foregoing, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity and would be consistent with the provisions of the City Development Plan 2016-2022 (s.16.10.12 and Appendix 17) pertaining to extensions and alterations to dwellings.

- 7.4. Encroachment issues
- 7.4.1. The owners of the neighbouring properties (no.4 and no.10) have raised concern regarding overhanging of eaves and gutters, etc., onto their properties. In response to the further information request the applicant submitted revised proposals for a parapet wall to the western side of the 2-storey side extension at no.6, omitting eaves and gutters overhanging no.4. With the proposed design, overhanging or encroachment by eaves and rain water goods would still result from the single-storey extension at no.6 (over no.4) and the 2-storey extension at no.8 (over no.10). This could be omitted by incorporating a similar parapet design where the development meets the relevant party boundaries, which can be addressed by condition.
- 7.4.2. I am satisfied that the demolition of that part of the semi-detached front porch to no.8 (attached to no.10) can technically be carried out without damaging the integrity of the neighbouring porch. The applicant has indicated that he is willing to provide the neighbouring property owner with a method statement for same. However, the proposed replacement porches conflict with the proposed vehicular access and off-street car parking (see below) and it may be preferable to retain the existing porch structure to no.8.
- 7.4.3. It would not be feasible to render the northwest and southeast sides of the proposed extensions along the party boundaries (to match the wet-dash render finish to the existing dwellings) as the neighbouring property owners have indicated they would not consent to such works being carried out from their lands. The applicant proposed to use Forticrete Split Face Block to the relevant faces, thus removing the need to render the elevations, however this was prohibited by condition no.3 of the permission which stipulated as nap plaster / dash finish only. In response to the appeal the applicant indicated that he will submit an alternative render that does not require maintaining / entering neighbouring property, but he does not explain how same can be applied without trespass. An appropriate brick, block or other pre-cast finish would appear to be necessary for the relevant elevations. This can be agreed with the Planning Authority by condition.
- 7.4.4. In this regard, section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended states:

*A person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under this section to carry out any development.*

7.5. Roads / traffic issues

- 7.5.1. In response to the further information request the proposed vehicular entrance gates to no.6 and no.8 were reduced to 3m to accommodate the relocation of the existing bus stop with Kassel kerbing adjacent the property (see drawings P-100, and P-002 attached to the applicant's FI response letter). The applicant also submitted a copy of correspondence from Gabriel Coll, Chief Inspectors Office, Dublin Bus Operations, indicating no objection to the revised proposals. On receipt of the further information, the Council's Roads Streets & Traffic Department had no objections subject to standard conditions.
- 7.5.2. The front gardens are a little over 5m in depth. It is proposed to a new front porch extended c.1.2m from the front of both dwellings, directly opposite the proposed widened vehicular entrances. The proposed porches reduce the space available for vehicular access and parking such that it will not be possible to park a standard car in the proposed driveway of no.6 without projecting out onto the public pavement which is only c.1.4m wide. This may also be the case for no.8, but it is difficult to determine without autotrack details. This is a **NEW ISSUE**.
- 7.5.3. It is not an option to relocate the proposed vehicular entrances due to the presence of the bus stop with Kassel kerbing. The omission of the proposed porch to no.6 and to no.8 will be necessary to accommodate vehicular access and parking. Given the smaller size and location (at the party boundary) of the existing porch to no.8, vehicular access and parking would likely be feasible with retention of that existing structure. This can be addressed by condition and the final details of vehicular access and parking made subject of the agreement of the Planning Authority.

7.6. Development standards

- 7.6.1. Under the Development Plan (S.16.10.2) a minimum of 10-sq.m private open space is normally required per bedspace, to a maximum of 60-70-sq.m generally sufficient for houses in the city. It is proposed to reduce the existing three-bedroom dwellings to two-bedroom dwellings suggested as 3-bed spaces per dwelling. Private open space is indicated at 35-sq.m for no.8 and at 42.5-sq.m for no.6, which technically



meets the standard. It should be noted that the proposed development effectively includes for the subdivision of the original curtilages to each of the existing dwellings which extend up to the public road at Larkfield Gardens. In response to third party concerns regarding insufficient private open space, the applicant submits that the proposed development provides in excess of the minimum standard of 25-sq.m - I could find no reference to same in the Development Plan.

7.6.2. I consider legitimate the appellants' concern that the internal layout of the proposed extended dwellings could quite easily be rearranged to create 2no. three-bedroom (5-bed space) dwellings to *Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines* (2007) standards (this is the required standard under the Development Plan). The extended dwellings exceed the minimum gross floor area of 92-sq.m for a three-bed 2-storey 5-bedspace dwelling (no.6 is c.122-sq.m and no.8 is c.93-sq.m, exclusive of accessible attic level). With minor internal rearrangements it would be feasible to provide 1no. double >13-sq.m, 1no. double >11-sq.m and 1no.single >7-sq.m for each dwelling at second floor level. 50-sq.m private open space would therefore be required per extended dwelling.

7.6.3. Having regard to the existing land forming part of the original sites to no.6 and no.8 Larkfield Park, which is within the blue line boundary under the control of the applicant as indicated on the submitted plans, it would be possible to amend the proposed development to provide a minimum of 50-sq.m private open space to the rear. I would recommend that a condition be attached to this effect, however I would highlight to the Board that the applicant has indicated that this land is proposed to accommodate 2no. detached houses subject of a separate application and such a condition may impact on the viability of further development proposals of that land.

## 7.7. Appropriate Assessment

7.7.1. Having regard to the relatively small scale nature of the proposed development, comprising extension and alterations to two neighbouring dwellings within a built up area, it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect, directly or indirectly, individually or in combination with other plans or projects on any European site. I consider no Appropriate Assessment issues to arise.

## 8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that permission be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out under section 10.0.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development comprising alterations and extensions to two neighbouring dwellings, with revised vehicular accesses, subject to compliance with the amending conditions under section 10.0, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity and would be consistent with the zoning objective 'objective Z1 to protect, provide and improve residential amenities' and with 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 5<sup>th</sup> day of April 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. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit revised drawings, for the written agreement of the planning authority, showing at least 50-sq.m private open space each provided for the sole use of no.6 and no.8 Larkfield Park, respectively, as extended.

Reason: To provide for an appropriate level of residential amenity for each of the proposed extended dwellings to the standard required under the

Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 in accordance with the land use zoning objective for the site.

3. The proposed porch to no.6 and the proposed porch to no.8 shall be omitted from the development.

Reason: To accommodate vehicular access and off-street car parking for 1no. vehicle within the curtilage of each dwelling.

4. The northwest and southeast walls adjacent the party boundaries with no.4 and no.10 Larkfield Park, respectively, shall be of parapet design.

Reason: To prevent encroachment of development onto neighbouring properties.

5. (a) The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles/slates) shall be the same as those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture, other than the northwest facing and southeast facing 2-storey walls adjacent the party boundaries with no.4 and no.10 Larkfield Park, respectively.

(b) Prior to the commencement of development, full details of the external wall finishes to the northwest-facing and southeast-facing 2-storey elevations adjacent the party boundary with no.4 and no.10 Larkfield Park, shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

6. The proposed first floor rear facing window to the room indicated as HP (westernmost window) at no.6 Larkfield Park shall be omitted from the development and the wind opening replaced with wall to match the adjacent wall area.

Reason: To prevent unwarranted overlooking and protect the amenities of no.4 Larkfield Park.

7. Walls to the front of the site shall not exceed 1.2m and shall be capped and finished in render.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

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

**Reason:** In the interest of public health.

9.
  - a. All alterations to the existing bus stop shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority and shall be carried out at the developer's own expense prior to the opening of the vehicular entrance to no.8 Larkfield Drive.
  - b. The vehicular entrance gates shall be inward opening only.
  - c. The dishing of the footpath and kerb at the vehicular entrance shall be to the standard required by the planning authority for such works.
  - d. All costs incurred by Dublin City Council, including works and any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development shall be at the developer's expense.

**Reason:** To ensure a satisfactory standard of development.

10. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.  
Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

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

11. During construction and demolition phase the development shall comply with British Standard 5228 'Noise Control on Construction and Open Sites Part 1, Code of Practice for Basic Information and Procedures for Noise Control'.

**Reason:** In the interest of residential amenity.

12. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution of €4,536.00 (four thousand, five hundred and thirty-six thousand euro) in

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

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

---

John Desmond  
Senior Planning Inspector

15<sup>th</sup> August 2017