



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-301068-18

### Development

#### PROTECTED STRUCTURE:

Demolition of extension to the rear and construction of a part single storey flat roof extension with a roof lantern / part three storey pitched roof extension; a dormer projection at the upper second floor level landing; alterations to the rear elevation including realignment of existing windows at ground and first floor level; minor internal alterations and all associated works.

### Location

28, Marlborough Road, Donnybrook,  
Dublin 4

### Planning Authority

Dublin City Council Sth

### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

4420/17

### Applicant(s)

Brian Clarke and Gina Dowling

### Type of Application

Permission

### Planning Authority Decision

Grant

<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First V Conditions & Third Party V Grant
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Helen Kelly and James Bowen
<b>Observer(s)</b>	Domhnall Murray Fergus Sheils
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	22 <sup>nd</sup> June 2018 & 29 <sup>th</sup> June 2018
<b>Inspector</b>	Ronan O'Connor

## Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	4
2.0 Proposed Development .....	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	4
3.1. Decision .....	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies .....	5
3.4. Third Party Observations .....	5
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	5
5.1. Development Plan.....	5
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations .....	6
6.0 The Appeal .....	6
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	6
6.2. Applicant Response .....	9
6.3. Planning Authority Response .....	11
6.4. Observations .....	11
6.5. Further Responses.....	13
7.0 Assessment.....	15
8.0 Recommendation.....	19
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	20
10.0 Conditions .....	20

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The appeal site is located on the southern site of Marlborough Road. On site is a mid-terrace two-storey over basement dwelling. The building is a Protected Structure and forms part of a terrace of other such Protected Structures.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. Demolition of extension to the rear and construction of a part single storey flat roof extension with a roof lantern / part three storey pitched roof extension; a dormer projection at the upper second floor level landing; alterations to the rear elevation including realignment of existing windows at ground and first floor level; minor internal alterations and all associated works.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

- 3.1.1. Grant permission. A condition of note, and the subject of the First Party Appeal, is Condition No. 2, which requires the removal of the first floor extension and the dormer window extension at second floor level.

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

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

The report of the planning officer reflects the decision of the planning authority.

- Relocation of the first floor window would make a significant difference to the character of the room.
- No objection in principle to an extension at lower ground floor level.
- A number of other houses have been extended to the rear at lower ground floor level.
- Dormer window would appear as a fourth floor extension to the rear.

- There are no similar extensions in the surrounding area to that proposed here.
- Have concerns in relation to the precedent set.
- No objections to a modest ground floor extension.
- Extension at first floor and second floor level with the addition of the dormer extension would be out of keeping with the existing terrace.
- Would seriously injure the amenities of adjoining properties.
- Refers to a recent permission at No. 44 Marlborough Road (Ref 2558/17) for the construction of a new ground and first floor extension to the rear.
- A condition is recommended removing the first floor and dormer elements.
- Subject to this condition, a grant of permission was recommended.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage – No objection subject to condition.

### 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. None.

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

3.4.1. Four observations were received. The issues raised are also raised in the First Party and Third Party Appeals and are considered in the Grounds of Appeal below.

## 4.0 **Planning History**

4.1.1. None.

## 5.0 **Policy Context**

### 5.1. **Development Plan**

Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022.

5.1.1. The site is located in an area that is zoned Objective Z2 (To protect and improve the amenities of residential conservation areas) under the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022. Under this land use zoning objective, residential development is a permissible use.

Relevant policies and standards of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 include:

- Policy CHC2 - To ensure that the special interest of protected structures is protected.
- Policy CHC5 – To protect Protected Structures and preserve the character and the setting of Architectural Conservation Areas.
- Section 16.2.1 Design Principles.
- Paragraph 16.10.12 of the Plan relates to extensions to residential properties.
- Appendix 17 of the Plan provides guidance on residential extensions.

5.1.2. The following Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines is of relevance to the proposed development.

- ‘Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities’ (2011).

## 5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. None.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

#### First Party Appeal

- Appeal relates to condition 2 of Grant of Permission.
- Loss of first floor extension would result in the loss of a much needed bedroom for the family.
- To incorporate a bedroom at ground floor would be doing an injustice to the original purpose of those two rooms as formal reception rooms.

- Only other available space would be at basement level which is not desirable.
- Existing WC facilities are not enough for a house of this stature.
- Extension to the rear have a small footprint, extending out 3.3m from the main house.
- Well below the existing eaves height. – Main house is still the dominant structure.
- No mention in the planner's report of impact on residential amenity and it only refers to precedent.
- Second floor extension was granted at No. 44 Marlborough Road (2558/17).
- Houses on the other side of the street have higher returns to the rear of the main house.
- Have submitted a revised option for a flat roof to the rear which will reduce the overall height of the extension.

### Third Party Appeal

- Proposal would have a negative impact on the architectural heritage of this intact terrace of Protected Structures.
- No detail is provided on how adjoining protected structures, including No. 26, would support the works.
- Plans do not show contiguous plans/elevations. – do not show the skylight serving the extension to No. 26
- Proposal would result in overshadowing and loss of light. (drawings included in Appendix 1).
- The required consultation to prescribed bodies has not been carried out.
- Failed to assure the assessment of its in-house Conservation Officer.
- If consultation had been carried out permission would have been refused.
- Independent Conservation Assessment demonstrated that permission should have been refused in its entirety.
- Planning Authority did not give full consideration to objections/would not have been resolved by the decision to limit the development at No. 28 to two stories.

- Decision of the planning authority is unclear. Does not indicate treatment of roof, - planning authority should have sought amended plans and allow third parties and prescribed bodies an opportunity to comment on them.
- Impact on residential amenity by way of loss of light/overshadowing
- Will have a significant overbearing impact on the private amenity space of No, 26 and will dominate its south-west boundary
- Will adversely impact on the visual and residential amenity of No. 26
- Loss of outlook
- Will cast a shadow over rear windows and block out natural light to the study
- Will impact on the light levels of the hall, stairs and landing
- Condition was imposed on permission at No. 26 (ref 3659/11) requiring the retention of the extant boundary wall between No. 26 and 28 – this has not been required in this case – there should be consistency in approach of how this wall is treated over time.
- Extension to No. 44 is materially different to this proposal and cannot be considered a precedent.
- No objection to a lower ground floor extension
- Request that ABP refuse the development.

6.1.1. The Third Party Appellants have submitted a Conservation Report with the appeal submission. This is summarised as follows:

- Proposed extension is excessive in scale and height. Proposed fourth floor of the extension projects above the existing eaves height interrupting the original roofscape.
- Alterations block up all of the original window openings obscuring the historic fenestration pattern,
- Proposed development will block light to the interior of No. 28 and to the appellant's property, negatively impacting the character of the entrance and stair halls in both properties.
- Unjustified loss of historic fabric.



- Proposal is in contravention of the Dublin City Development Plan.
- Conservation Assessment submitted by the applicants does not consider the impact on the curtilage of the protected structure, the adjoin buildings which are both Protected Structures, or on the terrace as a whole. No assessment is made on the impact on the proposal on Muckross Park House (a Protected Structure) or the nearby Mount Eden Road Architectural Conservation Area which overlooks the back of the terrace.
- An examination of adjoin windows contradicts the assertion that the windows are no original – the terrace shows complete consistency of fenestration patterns to upper levels at the rear of the eleven houses.
- Reconfiguration of room spaces will have a negative impact on the historic character.
- Proposal has not been assessed in conservation terms.
- Only No. 34 has been extended over two storeys and this may predate the planning and development acts.
- No. 34 should not be seen as a precedent but is an undesirable intervention into what is otherwise an intact late nineteenth century terrace.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. The applicants have submitted a response to the Third Party Appeal and this is summarised below:

- A shadow study is included with the response to the Third Party Appeal.
- Site is zoned for residential development.
- Meets with Development Plan standards. Would not have a negative impact on surrounding amenity.
- Site is zoned Z2 – Residential Conservation Area - A Residential Conservation Area is a non-statutory designation and should not be given the same weight as an Architectural Conservation Area.

- Proposed extension has been designed to a high standard in line with CHC1 and CHC4/Improves the character and appearance of the main dwelling.
- Has been designed to ensure that the historical character and integrity of the existing dwelling and surrounding area is maintained.
- Proposal is removing unsympathetic features including uPVC window and restoring many original features.
- Proposal is in line with the Architectural Heritage Protection: Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2011 and is improving the standard of accommodation, more conducive to modern living.
- Omission of skylights at No. 26 was due to surveying constraints – applicants did not have access to No. 26/drawings now included with the appeal that show these skylights.
- Application was considered valid by the planning authority.
- Question the appropriateness of categorising a study as a habitable room/does not have a means of escape/cannot be categorised as a habitable room/is 7 sq. m. in size.
- Planning authority carried out the required consultations/no response received/would suggest no objection.
- Planner’s report has summarised all submissions made on the application, including that of the Third Party Appellant.
- Reference is made to the two options submitted to the Board, a pitched roof option and a flat roof option. It is contended that the first floor option with the flat roof profile does not differ much in terms of visual mass, from the extension as granted.
- All works are to be carried out within the boundary of the applicant’s site.
- The shadow study demonstrates that there will not be an unacceptable change to the existing shadow environment/was carried out for two options (1) drawings showing compliance with Condition No. 2 (2) drawings with the dormer omitted but with a flat roof first floor extension.
- Will not affect outlook of adjoining residents to an unacceptable degree.

- Rear elevations of these houses do not offer much in the way of visual amenity – a well-designed rear extension would enhance the character and appearance of the terrace.
- Level of works proposed are in line with other approved works to this terrace of houses, including that at No. 26.
- Applicants are happy to remove the fourth floor dormer element – the lower ground, ground and first floor levels remain subordinate to the main dwelling.
- The Residential Conservation Area is mostly concerned with the streetscape of Marlborough Road.
- Proposed development will not cause a loss of daylight to the windows to the rear of No. 26/windows to the left hand side of the rear elevation all serve non-habitable spaces.
- No impact would occur on Muckross Park, which itself has been severely compromised as a result of many additions over the years.
- Permission at No. 44 Marlborough Road is relevant to the appeal.
- Relocation of windows does not detriment to the integrity of the Protected Structure.
- Have submitted drawing showing rooflight to the rear extension at No. 26.

### 6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. None.

### 6.4. Observations

6.4.1. Two no. observations have been received. These are summarised as follows:

#### Domhnall Murray, 30 Marlborough Road

- Share the reservation expressed by Cathal Crimmins architects.
- The terrace has maintained its architectural integrity.

- Proposed development would compromise this integrity/significant visual disruption to the rear elevation and the terrace/roofline, roof shape and materials would not complement the terrace
- Scale and form would have a negative impact on the amenity and architectural quality of the area.
- Inconsistent with Dublin City Council conservation advice.
- Other recent extensions to houses on the terrace have been single storey.
- Extension at 44 was built in part in 1960 and the remainder about 25 year ago.
- Rear of the terraces is visible from Muckross College and Convent (and proposed primary school) and is visible from the offices in Argyll Square and the houses on Mt Eden road.
- Impact on light levels to no.'s 26, 30 and 32/would require increased artificial light.
- Relocation of the windows would impact on privacy – would allow increased view into the kitchen extensions of adjoining houses.
- Would have structural implications for the rear wall of No. 28 and for the facades of the entire terrace/this has not been addressed.
- Would overlook proposed primary school to rear.
- Inaccurate and inconsistent description of floor levels
- Grant of permission is not clear as to what has been given permission.
- No objection to a ground floor extension, subject to structural integrity been retained.

Fergus Sheils, 32 Marlborough Road

- Many families live in similar properties without space issues
- No comparable extensions in the terrace
- Would set a precedent for a link between number of bedrooms and the size of a family.
- Concur with Third Party objection to allow the construction of the second storey.

- Will negatively impact light for number 26 and 30
- Would negatively impact the symmetry of the terrace.

## 6.5. Further Responses

6.5.1. Two further responses from the Third Party responding to the First Party appeal have been received. These are summarised as follows:

- Third Party Appellant's property is mirror-image of Applicant's property – have been able to accommodate a young family in the property and have only extended at basement level.
- There are multiple alternative designs which would accommodate the needs of the applicants within the footprint of a reasonably sized single-storey basement level extension.
- Applications response the Third Party Appeal now contains commitments including building entirely within the boundary, use of timber sash windows, restoration of cornicing and ceiling roses and repointing, use of materials to complement the character of the house – however there is an overall lack of detail
- The importance of Residential Conservation Areas is supported by the City Development Plan.
- Architectural Heritage Protection: Guidelines for Planning Authorities are of relevance to this proposed development including the principle of minimum intervention.
- Have not consulted An Chomhairle Ealaíon or Fáilte Ireland
- Importance of protecting and conserving the built environment is clearly understood within Project Ireland 2040, the National Planning Framework and the National Development Plan 2018-2027.
- The two or three storey proposal here will make adequate daylighting impossible to both the study/home office and main building.
- Shadow study shows that the development will have a negative impact on the natural lighting of the study/home office.

- 2006 Building Regulations Guidance confirms that the study/home office can be defined as an inner room.
- Reasonable to expect that no development should be allowed to seriously injure the residential amenity of, or depreciate the value of, the appellant's property.
- Loss of light/overshadowing to the hall, stairs and landing.
- Only two properties in this terrace have extensions of more than a single storey, - No. 44 and No 32 (the construction of this extension precedes the building been listed).
- Neither sets a precedent as the considerations of each are materially different
- Applicant's photos are misleading - the rear of the terrace is consistent in appearance from one end to the other.
- Would set a precedent/some properties may become sandwiched between neighbouring houses with similarly intrusive multi-storey extensions.
- A supplementary report from Cathal Crimmins Architect has been received. This is summarised as follows.
- Muckross House along with all of the houses on Marlborough Road are Protected Structures
- In relation to the previous permission at No. 44, it is clear that the Conservation Section of the planning authority acknowledge the value of the rear elevations of these properties/Proposal at No. 44 retained the original opening and all of the original fabric.
- Removal of the fourth storey element is welcomed but the two submitted options include unacceptable alterations to the original fenestration pattern, removal of large sections of original back wall, block light to historic interiors and will adversely impact the character of the terrace/can be viewed from Muckross House, a Protected Structure and from Mount Eden Road, an Architectural Conservation Area.
- Some of the drawings purport to show that a two-storey extension has been granted. This is not the case.

6.5.2. A further response has been received from Domhnall Murray, an observer on the appeal. This is summarised as follows.

- Proposal is an overdevelopment of the site.
- Would impact on neighbouring amenities.
- Would detract from the integrity of the building.
- Need to consider impact on other Protected Structures.
- No reference is made to the Architectural Conservation Area of Mount Eden Road and Belmont Avenue.
- Skylights are readily visible from the rear windows of No. 28 and No. 30.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. The following assessment covers the points made in the appeal submissions, and also encapsulates my *de novo* consideration of the application. The main planning issues in the assessment of the proposed development are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Conservation
- Residential Amenity
- Other Issues
- Appropriate Assessment

### 7.2. **Principle of Development**

7.2.1. The site is zoned 'Z2' under the Dublin City Development Plan, 2011-2017. The stated objective for 'Z2' zoned land is "to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas". The principle of residential development is generally acceptable on 'Z2' zoned land, subject to safeguards.

### 7.3. **Impact on Protected Structures, the Belmont Avenue/Mount Eden Road Architectural Conservation Area and the Residential Conservation Area.**

7.3.1. The applicants have submitted a Conservation Appraisal (dated 15<sup>th</sup> November 2017) with application. This concludes that the internal alterations would be in

character with the house, while those at the lower ground floor level would largely replace previous alterations. It is further noted that the extension to the rear would have a footprint that is of similar size to many others along this terrace.

- 7.3.2. The Third Party Appellants have submitted a Conservation Impact Assessment (dated March 2018) which contends that the proposed extension is excessive in scale and height, will obscuring the historic fenestration pattern, will impact on interior light levels and there is an unjustified loss of historic fabric. It is stated that the proposal, therefore is in contravention of the Dublin City Development Plan.
- 7.3.3. The originally submitted proposal to the planning authority indicated a 4-storey extension, which included a dormer element projecting above the eaves, with a flat roof ground floor element, with the first and second floor element topped by a pitched roof. I shall refer to this as Option 1.
- 7.3.4. In the grant of permission, Condition No. 2 required the omission of the first floor extension and the dormer window element. In the response to the Third Party Appeal, the First Party has submitted a drawing indicating what the extension would appear like, having complied with the above condition. For the purposes of this assessment I shall refer to this option as Option 2.
- 7.3.5. The First Party Appeal relates to Condition 2, and within the First Party Appeal Submission, two alternative options have been submitted. These both show a three storey extension, one with a pitch roof and one with a flat roof. For clarity I shall refer to these Options as Options 3 and 4, respectively. The First Party has noted that Option 3 (Pitched roof) is the preferred option.
- 7.3.6. The Third Party Appeal relates to the decision of the planning authority to grant permission for the ground floor element of the extension although a well-designed lower ground floor extension is accepted.
- 7.3.7. I shall consider the issues raised in both appeals in the assessment below.
- 7.3.8. In terms of the proposed bulk, scale and mass of the extensions, I concur with the view of the planning authority that the dormer and first floor elements are not appropriate and have a detrimental impact on the Protected Structure itself, and on the setting of the adjoining and adjacent Protected Structures within the terrace.



- 7.3.9. Having regard to the established pattern of development to the rear of these structures, I consider there is scope for a relatively large scale lower ground floor element. I have considered the precedent set by the extensions at No. 34 and No. 44. The rear extension at No. 34 is a half-width two storey extension over lower ground floor and ground floor. This appears to have been built quite some time ago, and Third Party Submissions state that it was started in the 1960's and completed some 25 years ago.
- 7.3.10. Of greater relevance in my view, is the recent permission at No. 44, for a two-storey extension and other works (Planning Ref 2558/17). This is an end of terrace property, so the context is slightly different. However, my view is that some regard must be had to this, as the scale of development permitted in this instance is significant in my view, and it allows for development above lower ground floor level.
- 7.3.11. Having regard to these two extensions, it is my view that there is some scope for an extension at ground floor level, over a full width lower ground floor element, indeed similar to what has been granted by the planning authority. However, the drawing submitted by the applicant showing this option (Option 2) with a pitched roof, is unsatisfactory in my view. It has a somewhat squat appearance and there is still intervention into the built fabric of the Protected Structure, over and above what is necessary to improve the living accommodation of the property, such as the removal of the window at landing level. A ground floor element with a flat roof would appear more in keeping with the contemporary appearance of the lower ground floor element. It would also allow for the retention of the landing window.
- 7.3.12. As such, if the Board are minded to approve I would recommend amending the wording of condition No. 2, requiring the drawings to be amended to allow for a full-width lower ground floor extension, and a flat roof ground floor extension, with the retention of the window at landing level.
- 7.3.13. Subject to the condition as outlined above being imposed, I do not consider that a lower ground floor extension, and a flat roof ground floor extension of limited scale, would have a detrimental impact on either the Protected Structure itself, nor on the setting of the terrace of Protected Structures that it sits within.
- 7.3.14. In relation to the impact on the setting of the Belmont Avenue/Mount Eden Road Architectural Conservation Area, the boundary of this ACA is approximately 80m

from the appeal site boundary, with very limited inter-visibility between the ACA and the appeal site. As such, I do not consider the proposal would have any adverse on the setting of this ACA.

- 7.3.15. Similar considerations apply to the setting of Muckcross Park House, a Protected Structure located some 100m to the south of the appeal site. I do not consider the setting of this Protected Structure would be adversely impacted as result of the proposed development.
- 7.3.16. In terms of the impact on the Residential Conservation Area, I consider that subject to a condition limiting the extension to two-storeys, there would be no adverse impact on the character of the Conservation Area, having regard to the limited visibility of the extension as a result of its location to the rear of the dwelling house.

#### **7.4. Impact on Amenity**

- 7.4.1. The Third Party Appellants, and the observers on the appeal, have raised the issue of residential amenity including impacts on daylight and sunlight, overshadowing, loss of privacy and loss of outlook.
- 7.4.2. In relation to loss of daylight and sunlight, and overshadowing, the First Party, in the response to the Third Party Appeal, has submitted a shadow analysis, which considers the impact of the extension as permitted by the planning authority (which I have termed Option 2 for ease of reference) and also a three storey flat roof option, which I have termed Option 3. This shadow analysis indicates that there will be some impact on the windows nearest the appeal site, to the rear elevation of No. 26 Marlborough Road (property of the Third Party Appellants), and also on the rooflights of the single storey extension of the same property.
- 7.4.3. In relation to the windows of the main rear elevation of No. 26, those closest to the appeal site are serve circulation areas and, having regard to the BRE Guidelines (Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice, 2011), are generally not considered when assessing loss of daylight and sunlight.
- 7.4.4. The smaller rooflight on the lower ground floor extension at No. 26 serves a study/office area. The appellants have raised particular concern in relation to the impact on this room. From my observations on site, which included observations internally at No. 26, I note that this room is also served by a high level clerestory light, which in turn receives light from the larger skylight. Notwithstanding this I do

not consider that there will be significant loss of daylight and sunlight to the smaller or larger skylight as a result of either option as presented in the shadow analysis.

7.4.5. I note any impact will be further reduced should a condition as recommended in Section 7.3 be imposed, which requires a flat roof to the ground floor element.

7.4.6. In terms of loss of privacy, I do not consider that any overlooking of adjacent properties would result from any of the options present, over and above that which already occurs.

7.4.7. While each option presented would be visible from the rear windows of neighbouring properties, there would be still sufficient outlook available from these windows.

7.4.8. Overall, I do not consider that any of the options put forward would result in any injurious impact on residential amenity and would not have an impact on property values, as contended by the Third Party Appellants.

#### 7.5. **Other Issues**

7.5.1. Structural issues have been raised by the Third Party Appeal. This is not a planning matter and is dealt with by other legislative codes.

7.5.2. In relation to consultation, I note that the relevant prescribed bodies have been consulted on this appeal, with no response received.

#### 7.6. **Appropriate Assessment**

7.6.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, extensions to an existing property, within a serviced area and separation distance to the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on the conservation objectives of any European site.

### 8.0 **Recommendation**

8.1. Grant permission.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the design, appearance of the proposed extensions, and the pattern of development in the vicinity, it is considered that, subject to compliance with conditions below, the development proposed would not adversely impact on the Protected Structure on the appeal site, nor any other Protected Structures in the vicinity, would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or residential amenities of property in the vicinity nor adversely impact on the setting of the Belmont Avenue/Mount Eden Road Architectural Conservation Area and would not adversely impact on the character of the Residential Conservation Area. The proposed development, therefore, would 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 received by An Bord Pleanála on the 5<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2018 and on the 9<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2018, 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 proposed development shall be amended as follows:
  - (a) The proposed first and second floor (dormer) extensions shall be omitted.
  - (b) The ground floor extension shall have a flat roof. The lower ground floor extension shall be as per drawing 2017-25-P-100 received by the planning authority on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2017.
  - (c) The window serving the landing at first floor level shall be retained in

situ.

Development shall not commence until revised plans, drawings and particulars showing the above amendments have been submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority.

**Reason:** In the interests of visual and residential amenity and to ensure that the integrity of the Protected Structure is maintained and that the structure is protected from unnecessary damage or loss of fabric.

3. a) A conservation expert shall be employed to manage, monitor and implement the works on the site and to ensure adequate protection of the retained and historic fabric during the works. In this regard, all permitted works shall be designed to cause minimum interference to the retained building and facades structure and/or fabric.

(b) All repair works to the protected structure shall be carried out in accordance with best conservation practice as detailed in the application and the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht in 2011. The repair works shall retain the maximum amount of surviving historic fabric in situ, including structural elements, plasterwork (plain and decorative) and joinery and shall be designed to cause minimum interference to the building structure and/or fabric. Items that have to be removed for repair shall be recorded prior to removal, catalogued and numbered to allow for authentic re-instatement.

**Reason:** To ensure that the integrity of the Protected Structure is maintained and that the structure is protected from unnecessary damage or loss of fabric.

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

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

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

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

---

Rónán O'Connor  
Planning Inspector

25<sup>th</sup> July 2018