



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP 301126-18

Development	Renovate and erect a two-story extension a protected structure
Location	Richview Lodge, Clonskeagh, Dublin 14.
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D17A/1101
Applicant(s)	Brigid Byrne
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	Applicant v Refusal
Appellant(s)	Brigid Byrne
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	4 th July 2018
Inspector	Hugh Mannion

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site has a stated area of 0.0812ha and is located on the left side of the southbound lane of Clonskeagh Road, Dublin14. Opposite the site on the western side of Clonskeagh Road is a junction with Whitethorn Road. The site accommodates Richview lodge which is a protected structure and once functioned as the gate lodge for Richview House. Richview House was originally built in 1790 as a private house but became a school for orphaned boys in 1885 and has been the UCD school of architecture, town planning and environmental policy since the 1980s. The balance of the lands once associated with Richview House has been developed as a series of individual low-rise office blocks in Richview business park.
- 1.2. Richview lodge is two storeys, rendered white and has a dark/black slate roof. The vehicular access is set back from the public footpath in a bell mouth with piers and gates. There are two main pieces of open space within the site; the more southern is just inside the gate to the front of the house, the second is in the northern end, is more secluded and is set out as garden area. The road side boundary is over 2m tall and the house is only partially visible over it. The adjoining business park is about 0.5m higher than the application site so that the boundary wall appears about 1.5m from within the business park but is 2m within the site. This boundary is well screened both within the application site and within the business park. The business park wraps around the application site on the southern, eastern and northern boundaries.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Renovate and erect a two-story extension to a protected structure at Richview Lodge, Clonskeagh, Dublin 14. Two sheds are proposed; one on the southern boundary to the left inside the vehicular gate and a wood shed immediately north of the northern elevation.

3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. **Decision**

The planning authority refused permission because;

The two storey extension and later additions to the lodge, a protected structure, would denigrate the prominence and irreparably alter the character of Richview Lodge thereby materially contravene an objective of the development plan to protect such structures and contravene the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities.

3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The planners report recommend refusal as set out in the county manager's order.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports:

Transport Planning reported no objection.

The **Conservation Officer/Architecture and Culture Department** recommended refusal.

3.2.3. Prescribed Bodies

An Taisce made a submission.

3.2.4. Third Party Observations

There were no third-party observations.

4.0 **Planning History**

Reference D04A/1288 – First floor extensions over ground floor annexes to side and rear.

Reference D05A/1157 – first floor bedroom extension to east side, fire place, chimney, two storey extension to west side with a total floor area of 43m².

Reference D15A/0580 – Internal/external alterations, single storey extension to side and rear, garden shed and ancillary works.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The site is zoned to “provide for economic development and improvement” in the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022.

The Development Plan at 8.2.3.4 states that in determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:

- Overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking - along with proximity, height and length along mutual boundaries.
- Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability.
- Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.
- External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.

5.2. Objective Ar1 in relation to protected structures states that;

It is Council policy to:

- i. Include those structures that are considered in the opinion of the Planning Authority to be of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, technical or social interest in the Record of Protected Structures (RPS).
- ii. Protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.
- iii. Ensure that any development proposals to Protected Structures, their curtilage and setting shall have regard to the Department of the Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht ‘Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities’

(2011).

iv. Ensure that new and adapted uses are compatible with the character and special interest of the Protected Structure.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

See AA screening section below.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- There is a long history of permitted additions to Richview Lodge which has resulted very significant alterations to the original building. The house is now about 2 ½ times the original lodge. Only two elements, the front façade and 1st storey section facing onto Clonskeagh Road read as original.
- The proposed development will add 65m² to an existing floor area of 235m² for a new total of 300m². The shed beside the entrance gate at the southern end of the site is 32m² while the rear 'wood shed' is 4m². All the proposed additions comprise a 10% increase in site coverage. The overall suet coverage will increase from 20% to 30% on foot of the proposed development.
- The south and west facades of the house remain unaffected by the proposed alterations. The original norther façade is not visible because of earlier extensions.
- The only façade to be impacted by is the eastern façade which is not generally visible from the public realm. A previous permission granted a single storey extension against this façade.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- The planning authority responded that there were no new issues raised in the appeal.

6.3. Observations

- There are no observations

6.4. Further Responses

There are no further submissions.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. Given the context of the existing house surrounded on three sides by commercial development and on the fourth side by a public road no issues of overlooking, overshadowing or impact on the amenity of adjoining property arise. The proposed extension will occupy a currently gravelled area of space between the eastern façade and the boundary wall with Richview business park. The principal private amenity space within the site is located at the northern end of the site and will remain so if the extension is constructed. I conclude therefore that the criteria set out in the Development Plan at 8.2.3.4 in relation to applications for first floor extensions are met by this application.
- 7.2. The Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines (paragraph 6.8) make the case that it will often be necessary to permit appropriate new extensions to protected structures to make them fit for modern living and keep them in viable economic use. Extensions should involve (a) the minimum loss of original fabric and (b) principal elevations should not be obscured. The grounds of appeal set out the changes that have been made to the original house over the years, see especially plates 2, 3 and 4 on the grounds of appeal. The case is made that while much of the original fabric of the house remains much of this has been encased in later additions. The planning authority's case is that the currently proposed extension is an addition too far.
- 7.3. The proposed development will require minimal impact on the original fabric of the protected structure to achieve a more rational internal layout thus satisfying a significant assessment criterion of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines.
- 7.4. The Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines make the point that modern extensions may not have protected structure status themselves. The design of the new two storey element reflects the design, colours and materials of the altered

original house. The majority of the proposed extension attaches to the already extended northern section of the existing house (see especially ground floor – proposed drawing 1501 RVL A2-20) and not to the original protected structure. I conclude therefore, having regard to the location of the extension and its concealment from the public realm, that the proposed development will not obscure a principal elevation in a manner to unreasonably detract from the special interest of a protected structure.

7.5. The appeal makes the point that the additional 65m² is not excessive in the overall context of the site coverage and it may be noted in this context that the new extension is tucked into what is effectively a well screened courtyard space. The proposed extension will not materially subtract from the amenity open space or the parking space within the site.

7.6. Finally, I consider that the woodshed at the northern end of the site and the store/shed along the southern boundary wall will not detract from the protected structure on site, or impact on the residential amenity of the house or the visual amenity of the area.

7.7. **Appropriate Assessment Screening**

7.8. Having regard to modest scale of the proposed development and its location in an urban area where public piped services are available 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 a European site.

8.0 **Recommendation**

8.1. Having regard to the foregoing I recommend a grant of planning permission for the reasons and considerations and subject to the conditions set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development comprises an extension to Richview Lodge which is a protected structure. Having regard to the residential character, modest scale and sympathetic design of the proposed extension and subject to compliance with the conditions set out below it is considered that the proposed development would accord with the policy of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2016 to 2022 in relation to residential extensions, would not detract from the special character of the protected structure and would accord with the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (Department of Arts, Heritage, Culture and the Gaeltacht, 2011) and 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 external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles/slates) shall be the same as those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

3. 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.

Hugh Mannion
Senior Planning Inspector

5th July 2018