



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-300823-18

---

<b>Development</b>	Construction of a single storey, 2 bedroom dwelling comprising 112m <sup>2</sup> of living accommodation located to the rear of the existing property, with pedestrian access and the alteration of location of the north boundary garden wall (unbuilt) as approved in Dublin City Council Ref. 3107/16.
<b>Location</b>	Site to rear of 18, St. Mary's Road, Dublin, 4
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	4188/17
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Jim and Fran Sheridan
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant Permission subject to conditions.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Tony Vincent and Vivienne Nulty
<b>Observer(s)</b>	none

**Date of Site Inspection**

5<sup>th</sup> July, 2018.

**Inspector**

Stephen Kay

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at No.18 St Marys Road South which connects Baggot Street Upper with Northumberland Road in Donnybrook, Dublin 4. The site of No.18 is a corner plot located at the junction of St Marys Road and St. Mary's Lane. The existing dwelling on the site comprises a two storey red brick end of terrace house with a single storey flat roof element to the east side. This side area is currently laid out as a self-contained residential unit and shares the front and back garden with the main house. The stated floor area of this existing dwelling is 265 sq. metres.
- 1.2. The site which is the subject of the current application is L shaped and comprises the existing two storey dwelling fronting St Mary's Road and the rear garden area immediately to the north plus the full width of the north end of the garden. The site therefore excludes the existing self-contained unit located to the east of the main dwelling and associated lands to the front and rear of this unit.
- 1.3. The excluded area of the overall site is already the subject of a grant of permission for a two storey detached dwelling. The site of this permitted development is protected in the proposed development and a slight realignment of the northern boundary of the permitted dwelling is proposed as part of the delineation of the current application site boundary.
- 1.4. The existing site boundary to the east comprises a stone wall. To the north the site adjoins a further single storey mews dwelling that has access onto St Marys Lane to the north. The footprint of this dwelling is such that it would have a shared boundary with the plan of the proposed dwelling.
- 1.5. The stated area of the appeal site is 159 sq. metres.
- 1.6. The application is accompanied by an architectural heritage report.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the construction of a single storey two bedroom dwelling having a stated floor area of 112 sq. metres. The floorplan of the proposed dwelling is L shaped with a courtyard proposed to be located in the south west corner of the site. This open space area measures c.7.0 metres by c.6.7 metres giving an overall area of approximately 47 sq. metres.
- 2.2. The overall height of the structure is c.3.42 metres and the design incorporates a low pitched roof. A green roof is proposed to be installed. Fronting St Marys Lane, the building above the height of the existing stone wall is proposed to comprise black powder coated aluminium panels. The new boundary to the rear garden of the protected structure at No.18 St. Mary's Road is proposed to comprise a new stone wall of approximately 2.4 metres in height.
- 2.3. Pedestrian access to the development is proposed to be via a new opening in the stone wall on St Mary's Lane. This opening is currently inaccessible as the access point adjoins a pay and display on street car parking space. As part of the proposed development it is proposed that the layout of the pay and display parking on this side of St Mary's Lane would be rearranged with three spaces relocated further to the south so as to facilitate access to the proposed entrance to the dwelling. Minor alterations to the kerb are also proposed in the location of the proposed new access.
- 2.4. The sub division of the site is such that the area of open space to be retained with the main dwelling at No.18 St Mary's Road is approximately 135 sq. metres.
- 2.5. The site is currently characterised by a number of trees and shrubs including a mature sycamore tree close to the eastern boundary, and these are proposed to be removed.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

The Planning Authority issued a Notification of Decision to Grant Permission subject to 9 no. conditions. The most notable of these are considered to be as follows:

Condition No.7 requires that all historic fabric from the existing boundary walls shall be retained in the proposed development. The repairs to boundary walls are to be undertaken by an experienced stone mason with conservation expertise and in accordance with best practice.

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

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planning Officer notes the development plan policy, internal reports and the planning history of the site. The report states that the layout of the proposed dwelling and open space are considered to be in compliance with the development plan and acceptable and that there would be no excessive impacts on the existing protected structure or adjoining dwellings. A grant of permission consistent with the Notification of Decision which issued is recommended.

#### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Conservation Officer – No objection subject to conditions including that the existing stone boundary walls would be retained.

Roads Streets and Traffic – No objection to the proposed development including the relocation of the existing on street parking spaces subject to conditions.

Drainage Division – No objection.

### 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

The application was referred to the Development Applications Unit of the Department of Arts Heritage Regional Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs and to An Taisce. No responses to these referrals was received by the Planning Authority.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

A third party observation from the occupants of the dwelling located immediately to the north of the appeal site (No.6 St. Marys Lane) was received by the Planning Authority. The following issues were raised in this submission:

- That Drawing No.P3-108 Proposed North Elevation shows the boundary wall with No.6 reduced in height from 3.4 to 2.6 metres with cladding raising the height back to 3.6 metres. This wall is within the property of No.6 and works to it are not consented to.
- That there is no provision for drainage to the area between the existing wall and that proposed on the appeal site.
- That the existing boundary wall to St Marys Lane is in courses however there is no commitment that it will be re built in this manner.
- That mature trees will be removed along the lane changing the character.
- That every existing property on St Marys Lane has off street parking and this should be a requirement as parking availability is very limited.

### 4.0 Planning History

The following planning history is of relevance.

Dublin City Council Ref. 3107/16 – Permission granted for the demolition of the existing single storey self-contained unit to the side of No.18 St Marys Road and the subdivision of the site and construction of a new two storey detached three bedroom dwelling on the site to the east side of No. 18 and at the junction of St Marys Road and St Marys Lane. Permission was granted subject to conditions including a requirement that the off street parking proposed would be omitted.

Dublin City Council Ref. 3763/13 – Permission granted by the Planning Authority for the removal of the existing single storey self-contained unit to the east side of No.18 St Marys Road and for the construction of new two storey extension containing a one bedroom self-contained residential unit at ground floor level and additional accommodation connected to the main dwelling at first floor level.

Dublin City Council Ref.2880/89 – Permission granted by the planning authority for a two storey dwelling to the side of No.18 St Marys Road.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

The appeal site is located on land zoned objective Z2 in the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 to 2022. This land use zoning objective seeks ‘to protect and / or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas’. Residential is a permitted use on lands zoned Objective Z2.

Paragraph 11.1.5.3 of the plan relates to protected structures and notes that the curtilage of protected structures are often an essential part of its special interest. It is also stated that the traditional proportionate relationship in scale between buildings Returns Gardens and new structures should be retained.

Paragraph 16.10.16 of the plan relates to mews dwellings and sets out a number of criteria to be met in developments on mews laneways. These provisions include that developments will generally be confined to two storeys, that new building should complement the character of the mews lane and the main building with regard to scale, massing, roof treatment and materials, the provision of off street garages / parking and that mews laneways must have a minimum carriageway of 4.8 metres in width. Open space is required to be provided to the rear of the mews building and this area of open space must have a depth of 7.5 metres across the full width of the site. Private open space shall be provided as a level of ten square metres per bed space.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The following is a summary of the issues raised in the third party appeal submitted by the owners of the adjoining property to the north, No.6 St. Mary's Lane:

- That the submitted plans are inaccurate in that they show the appellants property where it faces St Marys Lane as 3.328 metres when it is actually 2.95 metres. The difference in height between existing and proposed would therefore be greater than shown on the plans (Drg. No. P3-107).
- That the plans are unclear as to whether there is a separate independent structural wall proposed along the northern side of the proposed structure.
- That the appellants own the entirety of the existing boundary wall on the northern side of the site.
- That it is unclear what the reference to an amendment to the location of the northern boundary wall (unbuilt) as approved in Order P2635 relates to. The planning assessment makes no reference to this previous permission and the applicant should be requested to illustrate what is proposed.
- That any wall constructed along the northern boundary should not oversail the existing boundary line. No detail has been provided as to how the assumed northern wall would relate to the existing wall and how maintenance would be undertaken and damp prevented.
- There should be no windows permitted in the northern elevation of the proposed development.
- No details of sound insulation has been provided.
- The proposed development is contrary to the Objective Z2 zoning objective. Consideration needs to be given to the original curtilage of No.18 St Marys Road a protected structure. There are already two existing / proposed dwellings in the curtilage of No.18 and the proposed dwelling would be a third. The cumulative impact of this development needs to be assessed.



- That the proposed development constitutes inappropriate over development of the site that materially contravenes the zoning objective.
- That the proposal would be contrary to section 11.1.5.3 of the plan regarding the protection of the proportionate relationship between buildings, gardens and mews structures. The wall will be increased in height and trees lost. The development would be detrimental to the integrity of the protected structure and its setting.
- That the proposal would be contrary to section 16.10.16 of the plan relating to mews developments, specifically with regard to parking, open space and being complimentary to the character of the lane.
- There would be a loss of on street car parking.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

The following is a summary of the main issues raised in the first party response to the grounds of appeal:

- That the levels shown on the drawings relate to a datum of 00 set by the existing extension to the rear of No.18 St Marys Road.
- That the wall separating No.18 St Marys Road and 6 St Marys Lane is covered in dense vegetation that made an accurate measurement difficult. No access was available to No.6 St Marys Lane. It is noted that the photographs submitted by the appellants indicates the boundary wall on the side of No.6 as brick and extending to a height approximately the same as the parapet level of No.6. This is higher than previously anticipated and would significantly reduce the extent of metal cladding required.
- Considered that the submitted drawings accurately relate the levels of the proposed dwelling and the existing dwelling. The relative difference in height between the proposed dwelling and the parapet of the existing dwelling at No.6 is shown at 100mm and it is assured that this level will not be exceeded.
- That the application drawings clearly show that it is proposed to construct a new boundary wall at the northern end of the site and that the proposed structure will not bear on the existing wall.

- Regarding the reference to the relocation of the northern boundary wall, this is the wall between the existing and proposed dwellings on the site of No.18 St Marys Road.
- The proposed development will not over sail the boundary with No.6. Details of the connection between the properties will be developed in due course and made available to the owners of the adjacent properties for information and comment.
- That there is no proposal to have windows in the north facing elevation of the proposed development.
- That the proposed modest scaled single storey dwelling sited within the existing site boundary walls would not have a negative impact on the residential conservation area and would be consistent with the Z2 zoning.
- That the impact on the protected structure has been fully considered in the proposal and in the report of the planning officer and the submitted conservation report. The boundary wall to St Marys Lane is not an element of the site that is of 'special interest' and the removal of a small section as proposed would not impact negatively on the character of the structure. Similar works have been permitted by the council in other locations, including at the appellants property.
- The development will result in the removal of a single mature sycamore tree in the garden of No.18 as well as some other small trees and shrubs. These are not important trees, are close to the end of their life and cause problems for other adjoining properties.
- That the open space provision at 47 sq. metres exceeds the plan standard of 40 sq. metres. It is high quality in aspect and orientation. It measures 6.79 metres by 7 metres.
- That there will be no loss of on street parking. The adjustments to the existing parking bays has been accepted by the Traffic Department of the council.

### 6.3. Planning Authority Response

No further comments received.

## 7.0 Assessment

The following are considered to be the most significant issues arising in the assessment of this appeal:

- Principle of Development
- Design, Layout and Visual Impact
- Impact on Amenity of Adjoining Properties
- Other Issues
- Appropriate Assessment

### 7.1. Principle of Development

- 7.1.1. The appeal site is located on lands that are zoned Objective Z2 under the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022. The stated objective is '*to protect and / or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas*'. Residential development is identified as a Permissible Use on lands zoned Objective Z2.
- 7.1.2. The site is located in the curtilage of a protected structure, No.18 St Marys Road. The existing dwelling at No.18 St Marys Road has a two storey return with a single storey rear extension constructed beyond this. The proposed layout is such that the separation distance from the rear extension to the proposed new boundary wall with the proposed mews dwelling would be c.10.7 metres. This degree of separation between the proposed development and the existing protected structure and low scale of the proposed mews, is in my opinion sufficient to ensure that there would not be an adverse impact on the character or setting of this protected structure.
- 7.1.3. I note the comments made in the third party appeal with regard to the accuracy of the submitted plans and specifically the representation of the height of the appellants dwelling (located immediately to the north of the appeal site) in the application

drawings. The appellants specifically state that the application drawings indicate the appellant's property where it faces St Marys Lane as 3.328 metres in height when it is actually 2.95 metres. It is therefore contended that the difference in height between existing and proposed would be greater than shown on the plans (Drg. No. P3-107) and that an inaccurate representation of the proposed development has been given in this drawing. In response, the first party state that the levels shown on the drawings relate to a datum of 00 set by the FFL of the existing extension to the rear of No.18 St Marys Road and that the wall separating No.18 St Marys Road and 6 St Marys Lane is covered in dense vegetation that made an accurate measurement difficult. On further review including reference to the photographs from with the appellant's property submitted with the appeal, it is contended that the submitted drawings accurately relate the levels of the proposed dwelling and the existing dwelling. The relative difference in height between the proposed dwelling and the parapet of the existing dwelling at No.6 is shown at 100mm and it is assured by the first party that this difference in levels will not be exceeded.

- 7.1.4. From an inspection of the appeal site I agree with the first party that the extent of vegetation on the existing boundary wall between the appeal site and the appellant's property makes an accurate measurement difficult. Externally I measured the height from the ground on St. Marys Lane to the top of the boundary wall at 2.3 metres and estimate that the height of the appellants dwelling is c.2.75 metres closest to the appeal site rising to c.3.20 metres in the centre of the dwelling. From observations on the appeal site the ground level on the appeal site is slightly higher than on the adjoining St Marys Lane however I cannot verify the level of the lane relative to the FFL of the existing extension at No.18 St Marys Road which has been used as the datum on the submitted drawings. It is not therefore possible for me to definitively verify the accuracy of the heights shown in the submitted drawings, specifically Drg. P3-107. I do however note that Drg.P3-107 indicates the height of the top of the wall to St Mary's Lane as 2.60 metres above the FFL / datum. On this basis, it would appear that the height of the appellant's property in the vicinity of the appeal site is closer to 3.0 metres above datum / FFL than the 3.328 indicated. I note the comments of the first party in the response submission to the Board and specifically the commitment that the height of the proposed dwelling would not be more than 100 mm higher than that of the appellant's property where it adjoins the site. In the event

of a grant of permission it is considered appropriate that a condition restricting the height to a maximum of 100mm above that of the existing dwelling adjoining the appeal site would be attached.

- 7.1.5. I note the fact that the application site boundary is indicated as including the entirety of the site of the proposed new dwelling as well as the existing house at No.18 St. Mary's Road and the curtilage to the rear with the exception of the permitted dwelling to the north of No.18 St. Mary's Road. I also note the fact that the northern boundary to this permitted dwelling (DCC Ref. 3107/16) is proposed to be relocated south by approximately 1.3 metres and such that the area of private amenity space serving the permitted dwelling to the side of No.18 would be reduced. The configuration of the red line boundary and the alteration of the northern boundary of the permitted dwelling would appear to be a means of seeking to maximise the potential development of the site. It would also appear to me that implementation of permission Ref. 3107/16 and the current proposed unit would potentially be incompatible as the boundaries for both applications overlap. It is presumed that the intention of the first party in this case is that the current application would serve to amend permission Ref. 3107/16, however I do not consider that this possible. Enforcement and ensuring compliance with planning permission is however a matter for the Planning Authority and, given that no development on foot of Ref. 3107/16 has been undertaken to date on site, it is proposed to proceed with an assessment of the proposed development on the basis of the layout as indicated in the submitted drawings.

## **7.2. Design, Layout and Visual Impact**

- 7.2.1. The proposed design comprises a single storey mews dwelling with an L shaped floorplan. The maximum height of the structure is proposed to be 3.428 metres and, based on the submitted drawings, it would project c.828mm above the height of the existing boundary wall fronting onto St. Mary's Lane. The building would project c.1.34 metres above the height of the existing wall to St. Marys Lane where it fronts the site. This area above the existing wall is proposed to comprise a planter topped by powder coated aluminium panels. Subject to the agreement of details regarding finishes, the view from St. Marys Lane is considered to be acceptable and not to

have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the area or the Objective Z2 residential conservation area.

- 7.2.2. The proposed layout incorporates two double bedrooms and an area of private open space is proposed in the south west corner of the floorplan. The extent of this south west facing space is c.47.5 sq. metres and therefore meets the development plan standard of 10 sq. metres per bedspace. While the dimensions of the open space area does not accord with the development plan requirement as set out at paragraph 16.10.16 of the Plan relating to mews developments, it is my opinion that having regard to the size and orientation of this space, an adequate extent and quality of private amenity space is provided.
- 7.2.3. As noted in 7.1.5 above, the proposal involves the sub division of the existing site of No.18 St Marys Road into three separate residential units. The extent of private amenity space provision for the permitted dwelling to the east of No.18 depends on whether this dwelling is constructed on foot of the extant permission or an application for revisions to this permission is made to and permitted by the Planning Authority. With the reduced rear garden depth as required to facilitate the submitted layout, the private amenity space provided is slightly above the minimum development plan requirement of 50 sq. metres. Usable private amenity space provision for the retained dwelling at No.18 St. Mary's Road measures approximately 113 sq. metres with the layout proposed in the subject application. This exceeds the development plan requirement of 80 sq. metres and is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.2.4. The proposed development will result in the loss of existing vegetation within the site. Specifically, a large sycamore tree on the eastern side of the garden and two smaller birch trees on the west side as well as a number of shrubs would be lost. The existing rear garden to No.18 is an attractive open space area and the loss of trees and sub division of the garden as proposed will result in some loss of amenity. In my opinion, the main impact of this would be on the amenity of the existing garden and for the residents of No.18 St. Marys Road rather than the wider visual amenities of the area.
- 7.2.5. Overall therefore, while the proposed development taken in conjunction with existing and permitted developments on the original plot of No.18 St. Mary's Road would

result in an intensive form of development, I do not on balance consider that this is excessive or such that it would constitute over development of the site.

### **7.3. Impact on Amenity of Adjoining Properties**

- 7.3.1. The proposed dwelling would project above the existing boundary wall that separates the appeal site from the existing mews dwelling located to the north which is in the ownership of the third party appellants. This adjoining mews dwelling has a courtyard area located in the south west corner of the site that could be potentially impacted by the proposed development in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight. As set out at 7.1 above, the exact height of this boundary wall is difficult to assess as it is covered by vegetation. As noted by the first party, however, the photograph of the courtyard to the appellant's property indicates that the boundary wall is approximately the same height as the parapet level of the appellant's house at this end of the site. The application drawings and the statement of the first party indicate that the height of the proposed dwelling would not extend more than 100mm above that of the adjoining mews owned by the appellants and, given the uncertainty with regard to exact levels, it is recommended that a condition requiring this height would be attached to any grant of permission. Subject to the proposed new structure not projecting above the existing boundary wall with the appellant's property by significantly more than the 100mm proposed, I do not consider it likely that there would be a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the appellant's property by virtue of overshadowing or over bearing visual impact.
- 7.3.2. The appellants have raised a number of concerns with regard to the potential impact of the proposed development on the existing boundary wall and the treatment of the boundary with the appeal site. From the submissions on file it is apparent that the existing boundary wall is located on lands within the ownership and control of the third party appellants. It is clarified by the first party that what is proposed is the construction of a new boundary wall at the northern end of the site and that the proposed structure will not bear on the existing wall. This arrangement is in my opinion clearly indicated on the submitted drawings, notably the sections shown on Drg. P3-109.

7.3.3. The appellants also raise concerns with regard to the treatment of the connection between the two properties and how the proposed development would tie in with the existing boundary wall and the appellants dwelling. As set out above, the existing situation at this boundary is unclear due to the extent of the existing vegetation. It would however appear that the height of the existing boundary wall between the appeal site and the appellant's property is approximately the same height as the parapet of the appellants dwelling where it adjoins the boundary and that the proposed mews dwelling would be c.100mm higher than this. Some form of flashing or watertight connection between the proposed development and the existing wall and dwelling on the appellant's site will be required. It is considered that the detail of this arrangement is something that needs to be agreed between the parties.

#### 7.4. **Other Issues**

7.4.1. No off street car parking is proposed as part of the proposed development. I note that paragraph 16.10.16 of the Dublin City Development Plan requires that off street car parking would be required however in the case of the appeal site the only means of access is via St. Mary's Lane in a location where there is existing pay and display car parking. The provision of off street parking access would result in the loss of one of these existing pay and display spaces and for that reason it is agreed by the Planning Officer and the Roads and Traffic section of the council that there is no requirement for off street parking in this instance. While section 16.10.16 of the Plan does require that all parking provision in mews lanes will be in off street garages, the situation on St. Mary's Lane is atypical in that there is existing on street pay and display parking. Policy MT14 of the Plan states that it is the policy of the council to minimise the loss of such on street parking and, given the circumstances with regard to on street parking and the location of the site it is considered acceptable that the development would be permitted without off street parking provision.

7.4.2. Pedestrian access to the development is proposed to be provided via a new entrance onto St. Mary's Lane. This new entrance is to be facilitated by the re organisation of the existing on street parking spaces on the western side of the lane to provide a gap to the proposed site access. From an inspection of the site and having regard to the comments of the Roads and Traffic Division of the council it is



considered that the proposed re organisation of the existing parking is feasible and acceptable.

## **7.5. Appropriate Assessment**

- 7.5.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and its location relative to Natura 2000 sites, no appropriate assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect either individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

## **8.0 Recommendation**

- 8.1. Having regard to the above, it is recommended that permission be granted based on the following reasons and considerations and subject to the attached conditions:

## **9.0 Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the residential zoning objective for the area and the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with conditions below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would not have an adverse impact on the character or setting of a protected structure or the character of the residential conservation area and would 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.

## **10.0 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 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. The height of the permitted dwelling shall be a maximum of 100mm higher than the parapet level of the adjoining dwelling to the north where it adjoins the boundary with the application site.

**Reason:** In the interests of clarity and to minimise the impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining dwelling.

3. Prior to the commencement of development, details of all external finishes shall be submitted for the prior written agreement of the Planning Authority.

**Reason:** In the interests of visual amenity and protection of the amenity of this conservation 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:** To ensure adequate servicing of the development, and to prevent pollution.

5. All historic fabric from the existing boundary walls shall be retained within the proposed development. Repairs / repointing shall be executed by an experienced stonemason with conservation expertise in accordance with best conservation practice and the Department of Arts Heritage and the Gaeltacht Advice series, and designed and supervised by an architect with appropriate conservation expertise.

**Reason:** In order to maintain the integrity of the protected structure and to ensure that all works are carried out in accordance with best conservation practice.

6. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

**Reason:** In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.

7. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details of the alterations to the pay and display parking layout and associated markings for the agreement of the area traffic engineer. All agreed works shall be undertaken at the expense of the developer.

**Reason:** In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development.

8. Site development and building works shall be carried only out between the hours of 07.00 to 19.00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08.00 to 14.00 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.

9. Proposals for a house numbering scheme shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to the first occupation of the development.

**Reason:** In the interests of urban legibility [and to ensure the use of locally appropriate place names for new residential areas].

10. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution of €9,676.80 (nine thousand six hundred and seventy six euro and eighty cent) 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. 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 the Board to determine.

**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.

---

Stephen Kay  
Planning Inspector

11<sup>th</sup> July, 2018