



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL93.249245

Development	Retention of double doors to existing porch to an existing protected structure and all associated works.
Location	"Glenmora" Nunnery Lane, Stradbally, County Waterford.
Planning Authority	Waterford City and County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	17/458.
Applicant	Graham Healy.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refusal of permission.
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant	Graham Healy.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	13 th December 2017.
Inspector	Derek Daly.

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The site is located in the village of Stradbally County Waterford. The site is a corner site fronting onto Nunnery Lane which defines the site's northern boundary and Glenamarc which defines the site's western boundary. On the site is a two storied three bay detached dwellinghouse.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposal as submitted to the planning authority on the 28th of June 2017 was for the retention of double doors to a dwelling. The dwelling in question is a two storied three bay building which is a protected structure.

2.2. The structure is listed in National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) Ref. No. 22811004 and it referred to as a, "*detached three-bay two-storey double-pile house, c.1820, on a corner site retaining original fenestration with two-bay two-storey return to east. Renovated, c.1870, with single-bay single-storey flat-roofed projecting open porch added to centre. Reroofed, c.1995*".

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The decision of the planning authority was to refuse planning permission. One reason for refusal was stated which refers to the development negatively impacting on the visual character of a protected structure and would materially contravene a condition 4(a) of a previous planning permission

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

The planning report dated the 16th of August 2017 refers to:

- relevant provisions of the current development plan;
- the planning history.
- an appraisal of the development which concurs with the appraisal of the conservation officer which recommends refusal.

- Refusal of permission is recommended.

3.2.2. Other reports.

The report of the conservation officer dated the 16th of August 2017 refers to;

- The building is a protected structure and is listed in the NIAH.
- Reference is made to the planning history.
- It was indicated that the previous porch although not original did not obstruct the view of the front doors and therefore the rebuild of the porch was acceptable but not the insertion of double doors to the front was not.
- As a result, the doors were omitted by condition.
- The report refers to the front door being the focal point of Georgian houses.
- Larger houses later of the late 18th century and 19th century had porches but they were open.
- The report considers the outer doors detract from the historic building, the site is not in an exposed location and the extra doors are unnecessary.
- Refusal was recommended.

4.0 Planning History

P.A Ref. No. PD 16/193

Permission was granted for works to the structure on the appeal site but condition no. 4(a) omitted the outer double doors to the porch.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. The current operative plan is the Waterford County Development Plan 2011-2017.

5.1.2. On 1st June 2014 Waterford City & County Council was established following the amalgamation of Waterford City Council and Waterford County Council. The three existing development plans within the amalgamated Council area, Waterford City Development Plan 2013 – 2019, Waterford County Development Plan 2011 – 2017,

& the Dungarvan Town Development Plan 2012 – 2018, have had their lifetime extended, as per Section 11A of the Planning & Development Act 2000 (as amended) and remain in effect until the new Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy is made by the Southern Regional Assembly, and thereafter a new City and County Development Plan will be prepared.

5.1.3. Chapter 8 of the plan refers to Environment and Heritage

The building which is the subject of this appeal is a protected structure RPS WA750336 in the current development plan.

Section 8.31 refers to protected structures and paragraph 8.31.2 to alterations and extensions to protected structures where it is indicated “*proposed alterations and extensions to Protected Structures shall be permitted where they do not detract from the special character of the structure. High quality contemporary designs will also be considered if it respects the height, scale and massing of the receiving environment*”.

Relevant policy:

Policy AH 5. *It is the policy of the Council to protect the main building and curtilage of Protected Structures from any works which would visually or physically detract from the special character of the main structure or any structures within the curtilage.*

5.2. The structure is also listed in the RIAH inventory as ref. no. 22811004.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appellant c/o Wigham McGrath and Partners Architects in a submission dated the 8th of September 2017 refers to:

- The appellant acquired the property in 2015 indicates that considerable work was required to render it fit for habitation.
- A previous application was lodged for the carrying out of works in 2016 which was granted.

- In error the appellant' architect did not notice that condition no. 4 stated omissions to the works including the outer double doors of the porch a mistake acknowledged by the appellant's architect.
- If the condition had been properly recorded the works would not have installed.
- The applicant wishes to retain the doors.
- When purchased the house boasted an ugly open concrete porch outside of the fine original door.
- A new porch would protect this vulnerable door.
- Porches with door are not uncommon,
- The porch was sympathetically designed.
- The appellant considers the doors are appropriate and mimics the internal doors and assists in the preservation of the original vulnerable doors.
- Photographs of period houses with outdoor porch doors are submitted

7.0 **Assessment**

- 7.1. The issue in relation to this appeal is whether the double doors which were included as outer doors of a protected structure is or is not acceptable development in the context of the structure's designation as a protected structure.
- 7.2. Having regard to the submissions received and the documentation submitted the primary issue in relation to this appeal relates to the acceptability of the outer doors.
- 7.3. The appellant has contended that by mistake it was noticed that in a previous decision that there was a condition omitting the installation of outer doors in the porch but the appellant wishes to retain the doors which will protect the original doors from the elements and exposure.
- 7.4. I have in an appendix included a record of the NIAH ref. no. 22811004 in relation to the property. The record refers to the addition of a porch to the original structure constructed in the 1820s. The photograph with the record indicates the open nature of the porch and the original doors visible.

- 7.5. The planning authority in the previous permission on the site permitted the construction of a new porch on the basis that a previous porch had been added to the original structure. The condition 4 (a) of the permission under P.A Ref. No. PD 16/193 clearly omitted the outer doors.
- 7.6. In relation to the porch itself it is not at issue although it is evident it is a more recent addition. In relation to the outer doors I would concur with the assessment of the conservation officer of the planning authority in relation to the presence of the outer doors which I consider are unnecessary and would seriously detract from the focal point of the original door on the front elevation of the structure. The presence of the outer doors emphasise the porch element of the front elevation and detract from the rhythm of the front elevation.
- 7.7. I also consider that the development would be at variance with Policy AH 5 of the current county development plan where it is a policy of the Council to protect the main building and curtilage of Protected Structures from any works which would visually or physically detract from the special character of the main structure or any structures within the curtilage.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. It is recommended that permission for the development be refused for the following reasons and considerations.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

The development as constructed significantly impacts on the visual character of a protected structure listed on the record of protected structures in the current Waterford County Development Plan 2011-2017. It is considered that the insertion of the outer double doors detracts from the proportion and rhythm of the protected structure and obscures the view of the front door a focal point of the front elevation of the protected structure. The development is also in contravention of a condition of a previous permission on the site condition 4(a) which omitted the provision and installation of the outer double doors.

The development would therefore contravene policy AH5 of the current county development plan relating to protected structures to protect such structures from works which would visually or physically detract from the special character of the main structure which is considered to be reasonable. The development as constructed would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Derek Daly
Planning Inspector

10th January 2018