



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL29S.248814

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Development | Demolition of single-storey extension and construction of new two-storey extension to the rear and all associated site. |
| Location | 31 Rathgar Avenue, Rathgar. Dublin 6 |
| Planning Authority | Dublin City Council. |
| Planning Authority Reg. Ref. | 2265/17. |
| Applicant(s) | Conor & Catherine Cusack. |
| Type of Application | Permission. |
| Planning Authority Decision | To Grant Permission. |
| Type of Appeal | Third Party |
| Appellant(s) | Colm & Noreen Costello Rathgar Residents' Association Andrea Mc Gill & Eoghain Murphy. |
| Observer(s) | None. |
| Date of Site Inspection | October 2 nd , 2017. |
| Inspector | Breda Gannon. |

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located at 31 Rathgar Avenue, Dublin 6 in a primarily residential area to the south of the city centre. The site forms the southern end of a terrace of 3 no. similar houses. It accommodates a single-storey, two bay, brick dwelling which has been extended to the rear. There are enclosed gardens located to the front and rear of the house. Vehicular access is via a gateway located towards the southern end of the site frontage.
- 1.2. The site is adjoined to the north by similar scaled dwellings, which support extensions of varying sizes and proportions. To the south there is a terrace of 3 no. two-storey rendered properties. South of the terrace, a laneway provides access to a more modern dwelling on the corner with Rathgar Avenue and to other structures including a service yard associated with Murphy & Gunn car sales. To the rear of the site are the houses associated with Rathgar Villas.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development as described in the public notices submitted with the application proposes the demolition of an existing single-storey extension and the construction of a new two-storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling.
- 2.2. The ground floor part of the extension would project by c.11m from the original rear building line of the house. It would be positioned tight to the common boundary (with No 32) to the north and located c.2.5m at its closest point to the boundary to the south (with No 29). It would be provided with a flat roof with a height of 3.3 m above ground level.
- 2.3. The first floor would project by 9m from the rear of the dwelling and the design would incorporate a curved roof with a pressed metal capping finish. The extension would be externally rendered.
- 2.4. Further information was requested on the application on 13/4/17 on the following matters;
 - that the depth of the first floor extension be reduced to reduce the overbearing impacts of the structure on adjacent residents.

- revised drawings showing the retention of existing chimney stack and stone gable end treatment.
- revised drawings showing existing front boundary and garden treatment and details of proposed alterations to entrance.

The response of 10/5/17 was to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to grant permission for the development subject to 6 no. standard type conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The **Planning Officer's** initial report of 10/4/17 noted that the new extension would form a significantly larger footprint to the rear of the dwelling than the existing structures. In the context of the single-storey dwellings along the avenue and the existing form to the rear, the principle of a two-storey extension was considered acceptable in principle. The depth and scale of the first floor element was considered excessive, with the potential to have undue impacts on the residential amenity of adjoining property.

The removal of the chimney stack and the provision of render on the stone gable end of the house was considered unacceptable and would result in negative impacts on the character and setting of the streetscape. It was noted that the proposed works include the widening of the existing entrance, which was not indicated on the drawings.

Following the receipt of further information, the planning officer's report of 6/6/17 considered that the reduction in the length of the extension by 1.4m was acceptable. The revised proposal also included the retention of the chimney stack and the stone gable. The choice of metal cladding to the rear extension was considered acceptable. It was noted that the proposal to widen the vehicular entrance to 3.2m is

above the recommended 2.6m (section 16.10.18) of the Plan. Having regard to the site context and the extent of the site frontage it was considered acceptable.

The **Drainage Division** in their report of 15/3/17 raised no objection to the development subject to standard type conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

A number observations were received by the planning authority raising similar issues to those raised in the appeal.

4.0 **Planning History**

No details of any relevant planning history relating to the site or the immediate vicinity has been forwarded by the planning authority.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Development Plan**

The operative development plan is the **Dublin City Council Development Plan 2016-2022**. The site is located in area zoned Z2 -Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) with the following objective,

‘To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas’.

Residential development is a permissible use in this zoning category.

Policies in relation to Conservation Areas/Residential Conservation areas are set out in Section 11.1.5.4 of the Plan.

Policy CHC4 -Seeks to protect the special interest and character of Dublin’s Conservation Areas.

Section 16.2.2.3 (Alterations and Extensions) and section 16.10.12 (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings) and Appendix 17 (Guidelines for Residential Extensions) of the Plan are relevant to the consideration of the proposed development.

Relevant sections of the Plan are appended to the back of the report for the information of the Board.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

None.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

1. *Colm & Noreen Costello*

The appellants reside at No 29 and the majority of the windows (serving two bedrooms, a living room, kitchen and dining room) are located in the side elevation facing No 31. The proposal will impact on these windows and have a significant negative impact on the amenity and enjoyment of the house. Whilst the revised proposal address the overlooking issues raised, there are concerns relating to the following;

Overshadowing and loss of light – The proposed two-storey extension is less than 4m from the site boundary. There are concerns regarding overshadowing impacts as a result of the proposed large two-storey extension. The main kitchen/dining and living spaces of No 29 have north westerly facing windows, which means that sunlight from the west in the late afternoon/early evening is the only direct sunlight these rooms get (diagrams attached). Any proposal that would seriously diminish sunlight penetration into these living space would be a significant loss of amenity. The height and bulk of the two-storey extension should be reduced to lessen negative impacts. Photographs are attached to illustrate impacts.

Negative visual impacts – The two-storey almost blank façade of the proposed extension will have an overbearing impact on No 29 and its garden. The use of metal cladding will not be successful in breaking down the mass and scale of the

development. It will have the opposite effect in that it will stand out rather than harmonise with the area.

The mass and bulk of the proposed extension is out of scale with the original house. It is more visually dominant to the house to which it is attached. Most of the houses in the area have rear returns which are subservient to the main body of the structure, which is not the case with the proposed development. The large two-storey extension dwarfs the original dwelling. In order to address this imbalance, it is considered that the height of the extension, the cladding materials proposed and the profile of the roof need to be revised to be more in keeping with the architectural character of the area.

The cladding of the upper floor with an unspecified metal is not an appropriate treatment for a façade in an ACA. Whilst the applicant's want a contemporary extension this will only be successful when it respects and harmonises with the period structure and the context in which it is located. An extension that is of a scale that it dwarfs the original period building and which is clearly visible from the public road does not harmonise with the building or the streetscape of the area.

Gable end finish – The existing gable together with its corner stones and chimney forms form an important part of the ACA and this character should not be lost by the demolition of the chimney or inappropriate rendering. Whilst the revised drawings submitted state that the chimney is to remain and that the gable end stone finish is to remain unchanged, the revised elevation drawing omits the chimney. A condition should be attached to any grant of permission requiring that the chimney and the southern gable stone be retained.

Summary – The amenity of the adjacent property should be protected by the following amendments. The metal cladding should be replaced by a more sympathetic material such as brick which would harmonise with the streetscape. The height of the two-storey façade wall should be reduced so as to reduce the visual impact on the interior of No 29. This amendment would allow more light penetration and the sky to be visible when viewed from within No 29. The applicants' state that they curved the roof downwards to No 32 to reduce daylight and visual impacts. The same rationale should be applied to the impacts on No 29. It is suggested that the roof profile be revised to continue the curved profile downwards and create a barrel

vault roof. This would retain the contemporary appearance of the extension whilst reducing its bulk and visual impact on the surrounding area. Alternatively, the roof could be revised to a more traditional pitched roof with a natural slate covering. Either option would provide a reduced height at eaves level in the proposed extension.

2. *Rathgar Residents' Association*

The proposed development even as amended by additional information is not in accordance with the objectives of the current development plan.

The design of the proposed two-storey extension to an existing low level single storey cottage is not acceptable in terms of design, size and height. The extension should be in accordance with the scale and size of the original house and not overwhelm it or surrounding properties.

The proposed development would have a serious detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the area and destroy the character of the existing house. When viewed from the south it would be oppressive and dominate its surroundings. The curved zinc clad roof is not an acceptable design. A traditional style roof and finish should be required. Windows should be traditional with vertical emphasis.

An acceptable two-storey extension could be achieved if the lower floor of the two-storey extension was partially sunk and the height of the extension reduced accordingly, adopting a traditional design with traditional finishes.

Both the single and two-storey elements of the proposal are excessive and need to be reduced. The proposed extension at ground floor level extends to the boundary with No 32. The size of the footprint is considerable compared to the existing extension and in this respect it differs from neighbouring houses. The large extension dwarf's the setting and scale of the existing house.

3. *Andrea Mc Gill & Eoghain Murphy*

Reside at No 32 Rathgar Avenue and have concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on the amenities of their property. The proposed development would also be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity of the site and would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity

and would therefore conflict with the Residential Conservation zoning objective for the area.

Single storey extension and impact on No 32 – The overall width of the rear extension is excessive, extending up to the shared boundary wall. The overall height and length in such close proximity to dining room would seriously injure the residential amenity by reason of overbearing impacts and overshadowing. The two-storey return which was built as part of the original dwelling is set back from the boundary with No 31 by 2.5m. The extension to No 31 should respect this separation between dwellings.

The height of the extension and its proximity abutting the boundary wall will be visually incongruous and interfere with the residential amenity currently enjoyed by residents in their private garden. The development constitutes overdevelopment of the property in terms of scale, height and proximity to boundaries. By virtue of its layout, scale and design it would be visually obtrusive and adversely affect the outlook from No 32.

First floor window – The proposed first floor extension includes a landing window from ground to first floor which will directly overlook No 32. The two storey extension does not properly consider the residential amenity of No 32 by reason of design with clear glazing directly facing living spaces at ground/first floor.

Summary – Wish to see the amenity of property protected through alterations to the design to include a reduction in the width of the ground floor element so that a 2.5m separation distance to the boundary with No 32 is achieved and the omission of the landing window in the northern façade.

6.2. Applicant Response

1. *Response to appeal by Colm & Noreen Costello*

The content of the appeal notes concerns in relation to overshadowing, height materials etc but the inclusion of suggestion that if conditioned would seem to appease the owners of No 29.

Replace the metal cladding with a similar brick to the main house - Appellants are content to replace the metal cladding with a preference for a smooth finished render

rather than a brick finish. Are of the strong opinion that the proposed contemporary extension should be a crisp and clean new addition and that trying to match the existing stone/brick mix would leave an undefined and undesirable finish, given the context of the area.

It is considered that a light coloured metal cladding would not impose visually or have a negative impact on the residents of No 29. It is noted that there is an existing property at 54 Garville Avenue which has a metal cladding finish onto Rathgar Avenue.

Reduce the height of the extension – The ridgeline of the proposed extension is lower than the ridge line of the main house and accordingly it is considered that the height of the extension does not need to be reduced. The proposed height of the extension is an essential component of the design in order to allow access into the converted attic space of the roof of the main house from the new proposed first floor roof level. Given that the height is similar/lower than existing properties it is not considered to be overbearing.

Alter the shape of the roof of the extension – The applicants are happy to change the shape of the roofline to a full semi-circle as suggested and indicated on revised drawing. This will have a positive impact on the perceived visual height of the extension.

2. Response to appeal by Andrea Mc Gill & Eoghain Murphy.

Single-storey element – The appellants raise issues regarding the width of the single storey extension and its proximity to the boundary wall. The extension was designed with a flat roof in consideration of the residents of No 32. Given that one can build an exempted development of 40m², tight up against the boundary up to eaves height, it is difficult to see how the residents of No 32 can make a justified argument for this element of the design to be conditioned in any way. The extension has been designed to avoid the creation of an undesirable alleyway between the boundary wall with No 32 and the proposed extension.

The height of the existing boundary wall is 1.24m with a timber fence on top bringing it to 1.94m. The extension with a height of 3.3m will extend beyond the wall by 1.36m. The floor to ceiling height is 2.7, which is the accepted norm and not excessively high.

Whilst it is accepted that the appellants would prefer not to have the extension tight up against the boundary wall, the proposal is an acceptable design solution to the rear of the house and within normal expected parameters of construction and floor to ceiling heights.

First Floor window – The applicants are happy to provide opaque glazing up to 1.8m high from the highest step at the window. This amendment is reflected in the drawing. No habitable rooms overlook No. 32 from the side elevation.

3. *Response to appeal by Rathgar Residents' Association*

The concerns raised cannot be achieved by minor amendments to the design. Design suggestions like lowering the floor plate, vertical windows and reduction in depth take no account of client's design brief and are based merely on the writers opinion of what type of extension is suitable for the house.

The applicants wish to maintain and improve the existing house and hope to incorporate traditional materials/items during the building phase whilst also recognising that the house is not currently fit for modern needs. f

6.3. Further Responses

1. *Response to Applicants' Submission by Andrea Mc Gill & Eoghain Murphy.*

The appellants (No 32 Rathgar Avenue) continue to object to the height and length of the extension adjoining their property and do not accept that it will not impact on their residential amenity. Whilst it is accepted that exempted development could be constructed, this is not the case and quite extensive development is taking place at the property.

The appellants request that the extension be located 2.4m from the party wall in the interests of their residential amenity and to respect the existing separation distance to the boundary. It is considered that the additional height of 1.36 above the boundary fence will be visually intrusive from their kitchen and dining room windows, resulting in overshadowing and overbearing impacts.

It is requested that in the event of planning permission being granted that the glazing is extended the full length of the landing window. In the interests of both residential and visual amenity.

2. *Response to Applicants' Submission by Rathgar Residents' Association*

Rejects that metal cladding is a suitable finish and would overwhelm and destroy the character and setting of the existing house, which should take precedence. The development at Garville Avenue should not be used as a yard stick as it is one of the most inappropriate developments constructed in Rathgar in recent years.

The house already has an extension which is appropriate to the style and size of the house. It should be appropriately modified in keeping with the character of the house. The principle of proper planning and development have been totally disregarded by the proposed development. The design is wholly inappropriate in this historic area of Rathgar and reducing the height of the elevation to the south will do little to address the concerns that the extension will have on the area. It is noted that An Bord Pleanála refused permission for an extension in a similar case, which could have been considered to have less of a negative impact on that house (PL29S.247291).

The single storey extension cannot be considered in isolation and the reference to exempted development is irrelevant. The extension doubles the size of the house and will exceed 45% site coverage. Building up to the boundaries with incompatible flat roofed extensions will adversely impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

The proposal is not in accordance with the Z2 zoning provisions and the policies of the Plan in terms of the preservation and protection of built heritage and the established character of the area. The intervention into the existing historic structure is excessive and much of its character will be lost with the extensive removal of internal/external walls. The existing house and extension with some sensitive conservation upgrading works could be made compliant with building regulations. It is not necessary to remove parts of the original historic structure and build a huge extension to make the house habitable to modern day standards. The changes proposed by the applicant are cosmetic and will result in very little change. The

structure will be visible from the road destroying the character, visual and residential amenities of the house.

3. Response by Rathgar Residents' Association to other appeals.

Accepted that the impacts on No's 29 and 32 would be adverse as the design and size of the development is wholly inappropriate. The proposal distorts the balance that exists between the houses in the area, which were not designed to have large two-storey returns.

The proposal fails to comply with the guidelines and standards of the development plan for extensions/alterations in residential conservation areas. It fails to respect the residential amenities of adjoining property and the character of the area.

It is accepted that the residents would suffer significant loss of residential amenity arising from overshadowing and loss of light to habitable rooms. The photograph presented on Page 8 of Noonan Moran submission (Colm and Noreen Costello appeal) illustrates the inappropriateness of the proposed development where the existing house has been resigned to total irrelevance.

A smaller extension that would not dwarf the main building is required using traditional materials harmonising with the main building and adjoining structures. The extension would have a lower height profile and a traditional roof structure. It is accepted that the requirement for the retention of the chimney and characteristics of the gable ends of the original house should be maintained and preserved. The metal cladding should be abandoned and a curved metal roof is not an appropriate finish in this Z2 conservation area.

6.4. Planning Authority Response

No response the grounds of appeal were submitted by the planning authority.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. The main issues that arise for determination by the Board in respect to the appeal relate to the following;

- Impacts on the residential amenity of adjoining property.

- Impacts on the visual amenities of the area.
- Appropriate Assessment.

I would point out to the Board that there are 3 no. copies of the planning drawings attached to the file, which are as follows;

- 2016-136-P-100 – Submitted in support of the application.
- 2016-136-AI-100 – Submitted in response to further information.
- 2016-136-ABP-100 – Submitted in response to the appeal.

1. Impacts on the residential amenities of adjoining property.

Concerns have been raised in the appeals regarding potential impacts on the residential amenity of adjoining property on both sides of the site, each of which is considered below.

No 32 Rathgar Avenue lies to the north of the subject site. It is an identical house, which has been extended to the rear. A single-storey extension has been provided close to the boundary with No 34, with a two-storey element located adjacent to the appeal site. It incorporates a first floor window which directly overlooks the appeal site at c 2.5m from the common boundary.

The proposed ground floor extension would be built tight up to the common boundary with No 32. There are no windows proposed which would give rise to overlooking with impacts on privacy. The extension would extend by 9m along the common boundary and project by 1.3m above the common boundary. I note from the drawings submitted to Dublin City Council (2970/15) that the extended area of No 32 accommodates a kitchen/dining room with a corner window facing both the common boundary and the rear garden.

Whilst I accept that the single-storey scale minimises the potential for overbearing impacts along the site boundary, which would significantly impact on the residential amenities of the adjacent property, I consider that a set-back would be appropriate in order to reduce potential overshadowing impacts associated with the extension. Setting back the northern boundary by c 2.5m (in line with the utility room) would result in the loss of the ground floor office and a reduction in the floor area of the living room. Having regard to the level of accommodation proposed, the reduction in

floor area would not significantly impact on the residential amenity afforded by the house. I do not accept that a set-back would result in a redundant alleyway as contended by the applicants. The space could be developed to integrate with the courtyard/ rear garden, complementing the proposed extension.

The two-storey element would be set back from the common boundary. With the exception of a landing window facing No 32, part of which would be fitted with obscure glazing, there are no windows in the gable that would result in overlooking. The applicants have agreed to reduce the overall depth of the first floor by 1.4 m, ensuring that the extension does not project beyond the line of the extension appellants' site. The height of the proposed extension is significantly lower than the height of the adjacent development.

Whilst there is potential for some increase in overshadowing of the property particularly in the early morning, there are large glazed areas serving the kitchen/dining room area, which will continue to ensure that there is adequate sunlight/daylight to these rooms and that no significant adverse impacts will occur on the amenities currently enjoyed. The reduction in the height of the extension, coupled with the curved profile of the roof, will further reduce potential impacts.

No 29 Rathgar Road lies to the south of the appeal site. It accommodates a two-storey residence with a two-storey return and a later single storey extension. The gable of the house facing the subject site incorporates windows at both and first floor level. The separation distance between the gable wall and the proposed extension is c 9m. A kitchen window is proposed at ground floor level, and various alterations have been made during the processing of the application /appeal to reduce the impact of the windows at first floor level. The revised proposal put before the Board incorporates two high level roof lights serving a wardrobe and en-suite, which eliminates any potential for overlooking of the adjacent property at first floor level.

The low level kitchen window, coupled with the boundary wall and intervening vegetation would curtail the potential for impacts on privacy from the ground floor. Whilst I do not consider it to be necessary, the potential for overlooking could be eliminated completely by the provision of glass blocks in the window, should the Board consider it appropriate.

Issues have been raised regarding the potential for overbearing impacts on No 29 arising from the scale and height of the proposed extension. This argument is difficult to support on the basis that the proposed extension would coincide with the rear projection of No 29. The set-back of the extension coupled with the separation distance (9m) and the revised proposal to scale back the length and height of the first floor, significantly reduces the potential for such impacts.

The proposed development would be located to the north of No 29 and accordingly there will be no appreciable increase in overshadowing. I accept that the outlook from the gable windows will be impacted to a degree, but regard must be had to its urban context. I do not share the concerns of the appellant regarding the design of the proposal which I consider is innovative and an appropriate design response. I note that the applicants' have revised the proposal to address the concerns of residents of No 29 and to ensure that there will be no serious diminution in the residential or visual amenities of the property arising from the proposed development.

2. Impacts on the visual amenities of the area

It is contended in the appeals that the proposed development is unsuitable and will detract from the amenities of the designated Residential Conservation Area.

Residential Conservation Area are described in the development plan (section 14.8.2) as having '*extensive groupings of buildings and associated open spaces with an attractive quality of architectural design and scale. The overall quality of the area in design and layout terms is such that it requires special care in dealing with development proposals which affect structures in such area, both protected and non-protected. The general objective for such areas is to protect them from unsuitable new development or works which would have a negative impact on the amenity or architectural quality of the area*'.

No alterations are proposed to the front elevation of the existing house. The extension will be accommodated in its entirety behind the rear building line. It will be set back by c 1.5m from the gable wall and its roof will be significantly lower than the established ridge line of the house/terrace. Whilst there may be visibility of the extension from the gap between the appeal site and the property to the south, this

will be limited and not, in my opinion, of such magnitude to impact adversely on the architectural quality of the streetscape, to warrant refusal on such grounds.

I consider that the site has the capacity to accommodate the extension proposed and that the design, whilst contemporary, does not detract from the character or appearance of the street. The development plan does not require slavish adherence to traditional design, and supports contemporary solutions provided they do not detract from the character of an area. I consider that the retention of the red brick chimneys and the stone gable finish as required by the planning authority is entirely appropriate. I consider that the curved roof profile adds an interesting and innovative dimension to the design of the proposed extension, which will not detract from the form or character of the house. Whilst I do not share the concerns raised by the appellants regarding the proposed roof finish, the applicant has agreed to use a render finish to address the issues raised.

3. Appropriate Assessment.

Having regard to the location of the development within a built up area, the nature and scale of the development and the separation distance from Natura 2000 sites, I consider that the proposed development either alone, or, in combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to have significant effect on any other European Site, in view of the sites conservation objectives and that, therefore, a Stage Appropriate Assessment and the submission of a Natura Impact Statement is not required.

Conclusion

I consider that the site has the capacity to accommodate the proposed development and that the innovative design addresses the sensitivities of the area. I note that the applicant has made considerable efforts to address the issues raised. I consider that subject to a set back from the common boundary with No 32, there will be no significant adverse impacts on the residential property. I accept that the proposal, which is located entirely behind the rear of the house and will not be prominent in the public realm, minimises the potential for significant impacts on the form and character of the house and terrace within the residential conservation area. I recommend that permission be granted for the development.

Note: As the proposed extension exceeds 40 m² in area, a financial contribution is required under the Dublin City Council Development Contribution Scheme 2016-2020 (Clause 12 Exemptions & Reductions).

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. Having considered the contents of the planning application, the decision of the planning authority, the provisions of the development plan, the grounds of appeal and the responses thereto, my inspection of the site and my assessment of the planning issues, I recommend that permission be granted for the development for the reasons and considerations set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential zoning of the site, the pattern of development of the area, the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not detract from the visual or residential amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would, therefore, 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 10th day of May 2017 and by the further plans and particulars received by An Bord Pleanála on the 1st day of August. 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 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 interests of clarity.

2. The proposed ground floor extension shall be set back a minimum of 2.5m from the northern boundary of the site and the floor area shall be reduced accordingly. Revised plans showing compliance with this requirement shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To preserve the residential amenity of adjoining property

3. The existing chimney stack and stone gable end treatment of the existing house shall be retained.

Reason: To preserve the character of the existing house and the visual amenities of the area.

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

Reason: In the interests of public health and to ensure a proper standard of development.

5. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 07.00 to 18.00 hours Monday to Fridays inclusive, between 08.00 to 14.00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays, Deviation from these times shall be allowed only in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

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

6. Prior to commencement of development, a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. The plan shall include details of intended construction practice, proposals for traffic management, noise management and measures for off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interests of amenities, public health and safety.

7. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution 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 planning 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 is 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. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme 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 the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

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.

Breda Gannon
Senior Planning Inspector

9th October 2017