



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL29S.249328

Development	Construction of mews dwelling with car-port and all ancillary site works.
Location	Rear garden of No. 39 Harrington Street (protected structure) fronting onto Grantham Place Lane.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	3392/17.
Applicant	Crackleford Limited.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse.
Type of Appeal	First Party -v- Refusal.
Appellant	Crackleford Limited.
Observers	None.
Date of Site Inspection	8 th January, 2018.
Inspector	Paul Caprani.

Contents

1.0 Introduction	3
2.0 Site Location and Description	3
3.0 Proposed Development	4
4.0 Planning Authority's Decision	5
4.1. Decision	5
4.2. Documentation submitted with the Application.....	5
4.3. Planning Authority Assessment.....	6
4.4. Observations	7
5.0 Planning History.....	7
6.0 Grounds of Appeal.....	7
7.0 Appeal Responses.....	9
8.0 Observations.....	9
9.0 Development Plan Provision.....	9
10.0 Planning Assessment.....	11
11.0 Conclusions and Recommendations.....	16
12.0 Decision	16
13.0 Reasons and Considerations	16
14.0 Conditions	17

1.0 Introduction

PL29S.249328 relates to a first party appeal against the decision of Dublin City Council to issue notification to refuse planning permission for the construction of a mews dwelling together with one no. off street car parking space to the rear of No. 39 Harrington Street fronting onto Grantham Place Lane. No. 39 Harrington Street is a protected structure. Dublin City Council issued notification to refuse planning permission for a single reason on the grounds that the proposed development, having regard to its layout and proximity to adjacent properties, would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity and would result in poor residential amenity for future residents through overlooking. The reason for refusal also states that the proposed development could be contrary to the policies and objectives of the Dublin City Development Plan.

2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. The appeal site is located on Grantham Place Lane, a small laneway off Grantham Place, which runs parallel to and to the north of Harrington Street off the South Circular Road in the south inner city. Harrington Street is located to the immediate west of Richmond Street South. Richmond Street Souths forms part of a radial route which links the city centre with Rathmines. Harrington Street forms a continuation of the South Circular Road. No. 39 Harrington Street comprises of a three-storey over basement red brick early Victorian residence. This residence has been converted into a number of flats.
- 2.2. It is proposed to construct the mews to the rear of No. 39 Harrington Street facing onto Grantham Place. Grantham Place comprises of a small laneway, approximately 50 metres in length ending in a cul-de-sac. The rear of No. 39 Harrington Street is the last but one of the rear gardens of the Harrington Street dwellings backing onto Grantham Place. Mews dwellings have been constructed within the rear gardens of No. 38 Harrington Street to the immediate west of the subject site and also at No. 41 Harrington Street two plots further east of the subject site. According to the drawings submitted with the planning application permission was granted for a mews

development under Reg. Ref. 4124/06 at No. 40 Harrington Street. However, this site is yet to be developed. 5 no. mews type developments, have also been constructed on the northern side of Grantham Place further east of the subject site. The Grantham Place cul-de-sac is approximately 6 metres in width and on-street parking is provided along the northern side of Grantham Place. Double yellow lines are located along the southern side of the cul-de-sac including the area adjoining the northern boundary of the site.

- 2.3. The site itself is rectangular in shape and is 18.3 metres in length and just under 6.6 metres in width giving a total area of c.117 square metres. The site currently forms part of the rear garden of No. 39 Harrington Street.

3.0 Proposed Development

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey, three-bedroomed mews development with a car-port area at ground floor level. At ground floor level it is proposed to provide an entrance hall, adjacent to the car-port area with the sitting, dining, kitchen and utility area located to the rear. It is proposed to provide three bedrooms, one ensuite, and a separate bathroom at first floor level. Attic storage space is to be provided within the roof pitch and a number of velux lights are proposed within the roof pitch. The dwelling is to rise to a maximum ridge height of 8.7 metres but the roof pitch is stepped down at its western end to match the existing roof pitch of the mews dwelling to the rear of No. 38 Harrington Street. The drawings indicate that the higher ridge height of 8.7 metres is to match the roof pitch of the mews dwelling granted permission at 40 Harrington Street under Reg. Ref. 4124/06. The proposed external finishes are to comprise of red brick and timber cladding with a slate roof and a timber finish to the car-port door and timber finish to the windows. An area of private open space is to be located to the rear of the dwelling, 7.5 metres in depth, encompassing an area of 46.4 square metres. The rear elevation of the proposed mews dwelling is located 18.1 metres from the rear of No. 39 Harrington Street.

4.0 Planning Authority's Decision

4.1. Decision

Dublin City Council refused planning permission for the following single reason.

“The proposed development is located in a Z1 zoned area, the zoning objective of which is to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. It is considered that the proposed development, having regard to its layout and proximity to adjacent properties, would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity and would result in poor residential amenity for future residents through overlooking and would, in itself and by precedent established, be contrary to the policies and objectives of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

4.2. Documentation submitted with the Application

- 4.2.1. The planning application was accompanied by a planning application form, planning fees and drawings etc.
- 4.2.2. The application was also submitted by a **planning report** which sets out the site location and description, the development proposal, development plan policies as they relate to the proposal and the planning history associated surrounding sites. It concludes that the proposed development is consistent with the Dublin City Development Plan and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 4.2.3. Also submitted was a **Conservation Method Statement**. It states that there is no meaningful relationship between the existing building at No. 39 Harrington Street and the subject site on Grantham Place. The sites merely adjoins the curtilage of a protected structure and there are many such sites which have been developed for mews developments all over Georgian Dublin. It notes that the distance between the rear of No. 39 Harrington Street and the proposed dwelling at Grantham Place is 18 metres and that the residual garden at No.39 Harrington Street, if the development proceeds will be 10.5 metres deep. It is stated that the open space requirements for both 39 Harrington Street and the proposed mews dwellings comply with the requirements of the development plan. There are no works being carried out on the

listed building on Harrington Street. For this reason, there is no requirement for an Architectural Impact Statement to be submitted with the current application.

4.3. **Planning Authority Assessment**

- 4.3.1. A report from the **Drainage Division** states that there is no objection to the proposed development subject to standard conditions.
- 4.3.2. A report from the **Conservation Officer** recommends a grant of planning permission subject to two conditions. The report states that having reviewed the particulars of the file the conservation officer understands that the proposed development fits with the on-going evolution of the area and the design of the stepped roof profile provides transition between adjoining sites. Further details in relation to the treatment of historic boundary walls and the materials to be used should be submitted.
- 4.3.3. A report from the **Roads and Traffic Planning Division** notes that Grantham Place Lane currently has pay and display parking along the northern boundary. With regard to mews dwellings it is a requirement that all parking be provided within the curtilage of the mews and not the laneway. The Roads and Traffic Planning Division have no objection in principle to the proposed development subject to three standard conditions.
- 4.3.4. The **Planner's Report** notes the zoning objective as it relates to the site and states that the proposed two-storey mews development would be located in close proximity to adjacent properties and within 18.1 metres of the main four-storey building at 39 Harrington Street. Having regard to its layout and proximity to adjacent properties it is considered that the proposed development would seriously injure the amenities of adjacent properties and would result in poor residential amenity for future residents and would therefore be contrary to the policies set out in the development plan. While the precedent for mews dwellings along Grantham Place is noted, it is considered that the three bedroom windows at first floor level would cause undue overlooking of neighbouring properties to the north and south, particularly the rear windows at 39 Harrington Street. For this reason, the proposal is not considered consistent with the Dublin City Development Plan and it is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused for the reason set out above in my report.

4.4. **Observations**

- 4.4.1. One observation was submitted by the occupant of No. 37 Synge Street raising concerns in relation to the congested nature of Grantham Place Lane and issues in relation to overlooking of the observer's rear garden.
- 4.4.2. An observation was also submitted by Transport Infrastructure Ireland which states that Transport Infrastructure Ireland has no observation to make in respect of the proposed development.

5.0 **Planning History**

- 5.1. There appears to be no planning history associated with the subject site other than the subject site was the subject of an application for a two-storey three-bedroom mews dwelling under **Reg. Ref. 3871/10**. Additional information was requested by the Planning Authority with regard to layout and external finishes and this information was not submitted.
- 5.2. However, the planning report submitted with the original application makes reference to the planning history in the vicinity of the site and this is briefly set out below.
- 5.3. Under **Reg. Ref. 2484/15** permission was granted in October, 2015 for two semi-detached mews dwellings at Nos. 42 and 43 Harrington Street.
- 5.4. Under **Reg. Ref. 3631/10** permission was granted in February, 2011 for a three-bedroom two-storey mews dwelling at Nos. 44 and 45 Harrington Street.
- 5.5. Under **Reg. Ref. 4142/06** permission was granted in July, 2007 for a four-bedroomed three-storey mews dwelling to the rear of No. 40 Harrington Street
- 5.6. Under **Reg. Ref. 0393/99** planning permission was granted in December, 1999 for a two-storey mews dwelling with roof terrace to the rear of No. 38 Harrington Street.

6.0 **Grounds of Appeal**

- 6.1. The decision of Dublin City Council to issue notification to refuse planning permission was the subject of a first party appeal on behalf of the applicant by

Fenton and Associates, Town Planners and Architects. The grounds of appeal are set out below.

- 6.2. It is argued that permission was refused on the grounds that the proposal would result in poor residential amenity by reason of overlooking. Notwithstanding this, mews dwellings have been granted and constructed on adjoining sites along Grantham Place Lane. It is noted that sites on either side of the subject site have been developed for mews development and the entire northside of Grantham Place has also been redeveloped for mews type dwellings. The proposal represents the development of an underutilised site to the rear of No. 39 Harrington Street. The decision takes no account of the planning history associated with adjoining sites. The substance of the reason for refusal is not based on any empirical evidence. The proposal for development on a mews lane is consistent with many policies both in the development plan and nationally regarding increasing housing stock in inner cities.
- 6.3. The proposal fully accords with the Z1 zoning objective as it relates to the site.
- 6.4. Reference is made to the planning history of the site and it is noted that the site in question was the subject of an application for a two-storey three-bedroom mews dwelling under Reg. Ref. 3871/10. Additional information was requested by the Planning Authority with regard to layout and external finishes and this information was not submitted to Dublin City Council.
- 6.5. It is stated that the subject site is ideal for terraced housing similar to that already granted planning permission on adjoining sites. The grounds of appeal go on to outline the planning history associated with adjoining sites (see details on planning history above).
- 6.6. It is suggested that the omission of a mews dwelling on the subject site would cause an unnecessary gap along the laneway and would contribute to bad urban design. The proposed development will make use of an underutilised infill site and will help complete a continuous mews lane along the streetscape.
- 6.7. The subject site is located in a high density residential location. Dublin City Council have granted permissions for similar type mews developments with more modest separation distances.

- 6.8. The development plan specifically states that the distance between opposing windows of mews dwellings and the main houses shall be generally 22 metres but this requirement may be relaxed due to site constraints. The adjoining mews development at No. 40 Harrington Street was permitted notwithstanding the fact that there was a more modest separation distance between the mews development and the main house.
- 6.9. The proposed development fronts onto a laneway at Grantham Place and there will be no overlooking as a result of the proposed development.

7.0 **Appeal Responses**

Dublin City Council do not appear to have submitted a response to the grounds of appeal.

8.0 **Observations**

A single observation was submitted by Transport Infrastructure Ireland. It states that Transport Infrastructure Ireland request that the Board take account of the original observations submitted to the Planning Authority. (The Board will note that this observation stated that Transport Infrastructure Ireland has no observations to make).

9.0 **Development Plan Provision**

- 9.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022. The site is zoned Z1 which seeks to “*protect, provide and improve residential amenities*”. Residential use is a permitted use under this zoning.
- 9.2. Chapter 5 of the development plan specifically relates to housing. Policy QH5 seeks to promote residential development addressing any shortfall in housing provision to active land management and a coordinated planned approach to developing appropriately zoned land at key locations including regeneration areas, vacant sites and underutilised sites.
- 9.3.

9.4. Specific policies in relation to mews dwellings are set out below.

- (a) Dublin City Council will actively encourage schemes which provide a unified approach to the development of residential mews lanes and where consensus between all property owners has been agreed. This unified approach framework is the preferred alternative to individual development proposals.
- (b) Development will generally be confined to two-storey buildings. In certain circumstances three-storey mews developments incorporating apartments will be acceptable where the proposed mews is subordinate in height and scale to the main building and where there is sufficient depth between the main building and the proposed mews building to ensure privacy, where an acceptable level of open space is provided, where the laneway is suitable for traffic and where the apartment units are a sufficient size to provide a high quality residential environment. This is in line with national policy to promote increased residential densities in proximity to the city centre.
- (c) Mews buildings may be permitted in the form of terraces but flat blocks are not generally considered suitable in mews laneway locations.
- (d) New buildings should complement the character of both the mews lane and main building with regard to scale, massing, height, building depth, roof treatment and materials. The design of such proposals would represent an innovative architectural response to the site and should be informed by the established building lines and plot width.
- (e) The amalgamation or subdivision of plots on mews lanes will generally not be encouraged. All parking provision in mews lanes will be in off-street garages, forecourts or courtyards. One-off street car parking space should be provided for each mews building subject to conservation and access criteria.
- (f) New mews development should not inhibit vehicular access to a car parking space at the rear for the benefit of the main frontage premises, where this space exists at present. The provision will not apply where the objective to eliminate existing unauthorised and excessive off-street car parking is being sought.

- (g) Mews laneways must have a minimum carriageway of 4.8 metres in width and 5.5 metres where no verges or footprints are provided. All mews lanes will be considered to be shared surfaces and footpaths need not necessarily be provided.
- (h) In terms of private open space, such space shall be provided to the rear of a mews building and shall be landscaped so as to provide a quality residential environment. The depth of the open space for the full width of the site will not generally be less than 7.5 metres unless it is demonstrably impractical to achieve and shall not be obstructed by off-street parking. Where the 7.5 metres standard is provided, the 10 square metre of private open space per bedspace standard may be relaxed.
- (i) If the main house is in multiple occupancy, the amount of private space remaining after the subdivision of the garden for mews development shall meet both the private open space requirements for multiple dwellings and for mews developments.
- (j) The distance between opposing windows of mews dwellings and the main house shall generally be a minimum of 22 metres. This requirement may be relaxed due to site constraints. In such cases, innovative and high quality design will be required to ensure privacy and to provide an adequate setting, including amenity space for both the main building and the mews dwelling.
- (k) Chapter 16 of the development plan sets out details of development standards. Standards are contained for minimum floor areas for dwellings, requirements for natural lighting and ventilation, private open space standards, safety and security and acoustic privacy. These standards will be referred to where relevant in my assessment below.

10.0 Planning Assessment

I have read the entire contents of the file, visited the site in question and have had particular regard to the issues raised in the Planning Authority's reason for refusal together with the arguments put forward in the grounds of appeal, and I consider the following issues to be relevant in determining the current application and appeal before the Board:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on Amenity
- Urban Design Issues
- Traffic and Transport Considerations
- Compliance with Other Standards for Mews Developments
- Appropriate Assessment

10.1. Principle of Development

10.1.1. The proposal to develop the subject site for residential mews development fully accords with the Z1 zoning provisions set out in the development plan where residential development is permitted under this Z1 zoning objective. The proposal also accords with the wider policies contained in the development plan which seeks to increase housing stock particularly within the inner city at sustainable densities and encouraging the development of mews developments where appropriate subject to qualitative safeguards.

10.1.2. I also note that there is a significant planning precedent for similar type mews developments in the wider area and specifically along Grantham Place Lane. The Board will note from the photographs attached, and from the contents of the grounds of appeal that there is undoubted precedent for similar type developments along the laneway. Specifically, I make reference to the five mews type developments which are permitted along the northern side of the laneway close to its junction with Grantham Place. The Board will also note that planning permission was granted for a similar type two-storey mews developments on the adjacent site to the west, No. 38 Harrington Street and also on the two adjacent sites to the east No. 40 and No. 41 Harrington Street. The latter two mews developments were stepped back from the laneway to allow for a front garden area to the front of the dwellings. No. 40 Harrington Street, while granted planning permission, remains undeveloped at present. It was apparent from my site inspection that the residential development is under construction to the rear of no. 42 & 43 Harrington Street. Thus all sites in the vicinity are developed, under development or received planning permission. There

can be no doubt that a precedent exists along Grantham Lane for similar type mews developments.

10.1.3. In conclusion therefore having regard to the zoning provisions and the wider housing policies as they relate to the inner city, together with the precedent in the immediate area; the principle of development the subject site for a mews development is acceptable subject to qualitative safeguards and these qualitative safeguards specifically in relation to residential amenity are dealt with below.

10.2. **Impact on Amenity**

10.2.1. The Planning Authority's reason for refusal made reference to the proposals' proximity to adjacent properties which would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity and would result in poor residential amenity for future residents through overlooking. The planner's report makes specific reference to potential overlooking to the existing residential units in No. 39 and also the rear garden of No. 37 Synge Street. It is noted that the issue in relation to the overlooking of No. 37 Synge Street was raised in the original observations submitted to the Planning Authority. I do not consider that it can be reasonably argued that the proposed development is unacceptable on the grounds of overlooking, particularly having regard to the decision of Dublin City Council in respect of other mews developments. The potential for overlooking is evaluated in more detail below.

10.2.2. With regard to the issue of overlooking the rear elevations of buildings fronting onto Harrington Street, Dublin City Council permitted mews developments at Nos. 32, 40 and 41 Harrington Street all of which have more modest separation distances of c.10 and 11 metres between the rear of the mews and the rear returns of the houses fronting onto Harrington Street. In the case of the current application and appeal before the Board, the separation distance between the rear of the proposed mews dwelling and the rear of No. 39 Harrington Street is 18.1 metres - almost twice the separation distance in the case of adjoining developments. Furthermore, Dublin City Development Plan under Section 16.10.10(j) allows a relaxation in the minimum separation distance of 22 metres, in appropriate circumstances. The separation in this instance is only marginally below the minimum requirement of 22 metres and the

site is of a constrained nature which in my view permits a relaxation of the standards contained in the Plan.

10.2.3. In relation to overlooking of No. 37 Synge Street I note that Dublin City Council have already granted planning permission for a mews development on the contiguous site to the west at No. 38 Harrington Street which allows for the same amount of overlooking of the rear garden of No. 37 as the current proposal. The Planning Authority in my view are being inconsistent in permitting a mews development at No. 38 while refusing to permit a mews development at No. 39 on the grounds that the proposal will result in unacceptable levels of overlooking in a northerly direction.

10.2.4. While I acknowledge there are modest separation distances between the mews developments on Grantham Place Lane and the rear garden of No. 37 Synge Street, the Board should however have regard to the tight urban grain of the area and the precedent set by existing mews developments which overlook the same rear garden together with the need to develop residential units at sustainable urban densities within the city core area. I do not consider that the development of the rear of No. 39 Harrington Street will significantly exacerbate overlooking to any material extent over and above that which already occurs.

10.3. **Urban Design Issues**

10.3.1. While the proposed mews development will only be visible from public vantage points along Grantham Place Lane, the development of the subject site will create a more uniform streetscape which will be more appropriate in urban design terms. To leave the subject site undeveloped would result in an inappropriate gap in the built environment along the lane. The development of the subject site as an infill site would result in a continuous mews lane streetscape along Grantham Place Lane as well as create more sustainable density patterns within the area.

10.4. **Traffic and Transport Considerations**

10.4.1. Concerns were expressed in the objection submitted to the Planning Authority that the proposed development would exacerbate traffic congestion and parking problems along the laneway. Having regard to the modest width of the laneway and the fact that on-street car parking is permitted on front of the mews dwellings on the northern side of the lane, it is imperative that off-street car parking be provided as part of the proposal. The applicant in this instance has provided an off-street car-port

within the overall design, thus providing one off-street car parking space to cater for the proposed development. Having regard to the residential permit scheme which is in operation on the site, and the parking restrictions along the southern side of Grantham Place Lane there is no scope to cater for additional parking demand associated with the development and therefore all parking must take place within the curtilage of the site. With this in mind I do not consider that the proposed development will in any way exacerbate parking or traffic problems in the area. I further note that the car parking arrangements proposed are in accordance with development plan standards (one space per dwelling for parking zone areas 1 and 2) and the more general policies in respect of parking arrangements for mews developments.

10.5. Compliance with Other Standards for Mews Developments

- 10.5.1. Finally, I am satisfied that the proposed development complies with Dublin City Council's general policies in respect of mews dwellings. The Council seek to actively encourage schemes which provide a unified approach to development on residential mews lanes. The infilling of the subject site will assist in providing a unified approach to development along the laneway. The laneway serving the site at c.6 metres in width is in accordance with the minimum carriageway widths set out in the development plan.
- 10.5.2. The residual open space behind the building line amounts to just over 46 square metres which provides the requisite 10 square metres of private open space per bedspace. The open space also incorporates a depth of 7.5 metres which is in accordance with the development plan standards. I also consider that the overall design and palate of external finishes to be appropriate in this instance.

10.6. Appropriate Assessment

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the nature of the receiving environment together with the proximity to the nearest European site, no appropriate assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development will be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

11.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

Arising from my assessment above, I consider that the development of the site in question to accommodate a mews dwelling is appropriate having regard to the zoning objective relating to the site, the general requirement set out in the development plan to increase residential densities in the inner city area to more sustainable levels and the precedent for similar type developments in the vicinity, therefore I consider that the proposed development is in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. I therefore recommend that the decision of Dublin City Council be overturned and planning permission be granted for the proposed development.

12.0 Decision

Grant planning permission for the proposed development in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged based on the reasons and considerations set out below.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Z1 residential zoning objective associated with the site together with the pattern of development in the immediate area including the development of similar type mews dwellings on adjacent sites, it is considered that, subject to compliance with conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would not be prejudicial to public health and would generally be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

14.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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 the 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. Details of materials, colours and textures of all external finishes to the proposed mews dwelling shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity

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

Reason: In the interest of public health.

4. Details of all boundary treatments including where appropriate, the retention of existing boundary walls, shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

5. All water closets, bathrooms and en-suite windows shall be fitted and permanently maintained with obscure glazing.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

6. The attic space within the proposed mews dwelling shall not be used for human habitation and shall only be used for storage purposes.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

7. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

8. All necessary measures shall be taken by the contractor to prevent spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris adjoining Grantham Place Lane and Grantham Place during the course of construction works.

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the area.

9. All damage to surrounding public road shall be made good at the expense of the developer to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and orderly development.

10. Construction works shall only take place between the hours of 0800 hours to 1700 hours Monday to Friday and 0800 hours to 1400 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Work outside the above times shall only take place with the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the surrounding area.

11. 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 authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000. The contribution shall be paid prior to the 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. 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 the Board to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000 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.

Paul Caprani,
Senior Planning Inspector.

9th January, 2018.