



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP.302352-18

Development	Single storey flat roof extension.
Location	Stonybatter, Wexford.
Planning Authority	Wexford County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	20180786
Applicant(s)	Rev. M. Boggan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Parties
Appellant(s)	Bridget & Terry Mythen Con Hore
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	17 th October 2018
Inspector	Kenneth Moloney

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Internal Reports;.....	4
3.4. Third Party Observations	4
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy Context.....	5
5.1. Development Plan.....	5
6.0 The Appeal	5
7.0 Assessment.....	6
8.0 Recommendation.....	10

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in Wexford town situated to the west of the town close to Wexford General Hospital.
- 1.2. The appeal property is located within a suburban housing estate, i.e. Rose Park. Rose Park is a small suburban housing development comprising of detached and semi-detached single storey properties.
- 1.3. The appeal property is detached and the front elevation is a A-shaped gable. The attic space is essentially used as a first floor with a first-floor window to the front and rear elevations.
- 1.4. The appeal property has two side entrances providing access from the front of the property to the rear.
- 1.5. The western side entrance is larger than the side entrance on the opposite side.
- 1.6. A notable feature of the appeal site is the rear garden which slopes steadily upwards to the rear of the site. The lowest level of the rear garden is approximately 1 metre above the finished floor level of the established house. Steps provide access from the rear of the house to the rear garden.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is for a single storey extension to the front, side and rear of an existing single-storey house.
- 2.2. The single storey extension to the front and side of the house projects forward and outward respectively by approximately 1 metre. The proposed extension to the rear extends out beyond the existing rear elevation between 2.5m – 5m.
- 2.3. The overall floor area of the proposed extension is 60.5 sq. metres. The height of the proposed extension to the front is approximately 3.25 metres above ground level. The height to the extension to the rear is approximately 2.95 metres above ground level. The proposed extension to the side is 2.95 metres above ground level.
- 2.4. The floor plan of the proposed extension provides for additional living space and a bedroom at ground floor plan.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Wexford County Council decided to **grant** planning permission subject to 4 no. conditions. The conditions are standard for the nature of the proposed development.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. The main issues raised in the planner's report are as follows;

Area Planner

- The comments of third parties are noted.
- It is considered that the extension is a suitable modern solution to extend living accommodation.
- It is considered that the proposed development will not detract from the neighbouring dwellings or the character of the dwelling.

3.3. Internal Reports;

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

There are two third party submissions and the issues raised have been noted and considered. The issues raised are similar to those issues raised in the third-party appeal.

4.0 Planning History

- L.A. Ref. 97/2220 – Permission **granted** for the erection of 17 2-storey detached dwelling houses. Permission granted May 1998.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Town Development Plan

5.1.1. The operational Development Plan is the Wexford Town and Environs Development Plan, 2009 – 2015 (as extended). The appeal site is zoned 'Residential Medium'.

5.1.2. Paragraph 11.08.11 of the Wexford Town and Environs Development Plan, 2009 – 2015, offers guidance on house extensions.

5.2. County Development Plan

5.2.1. The operational county development is the Wexford County Development Plan, 2013 – 2019. Paragraph 18.13.1 offers guidance on house extensions.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. The following is the summary of a third-party appeal submitted by Con Hore.

- No objection to the side and rear extension.
- The front extension is inconsistent with the established design character.

6.2. The following is the summary of a third-party appeal submitted by Bridget & Terry Mythen;

- The proposed development would have a visually negative appearance.
- Property extensions have previously taken place in Rose Park but to the side and rear of properties.
- The granting of permission will set undesirable precedents for future redevelopment.

7.0 Responses

7.1. The following is a summary of a response from the Local Authority;

- The building line varies throughout the estate, and a modern extension is entirely acceptable at this location.

7.2. The following is the summary of a response submitted by Ian Doyle, Planning Consultant, on behalf of the applicant.

General

- It is submitted that building variety contributes to legibility, sense of identity and creates a strong sense of place.
- It is acknowledged that uniformity can achieve a sense of place however such uniformity is reserved for buildings of architectural merit. These buildings are listed for protection in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage.
- Rose Park is not listed for protection and is highly unlikely to achieve such protection in the future.
- The desire to protect the uniformity of the estate is an opinion of the appellant's and not representative of the Wexford Town and Environs Development Plan.
- The proposed development will increase insulation and reduce energy consumption.
- The proposed side entrance will provide a wheelchair accessible entrance as the current front door is accessed by 4 no. steps.
- The proposal will not result in any overlooking or loss of privacy for adjoining residential properties.

Visual Impact

- The proposed front extension will amount to the front building line stepping forward of no. 15 Rose Park by 1m and that of no. 13 Rose Park by 1.5m. This is not considered excessive given the established staggering building line in Rose Park.
- There is a staggering of building lines in Rose Park from 16/ 17 to no. 15.
- In terms of scale the subject house is located between two house types i.e. two semi-detached dwellings on one side and a detached dwelling on the other side.
- The semi-detached dwellings are larger in scale and occupy a larger footprint than the appeal property.
- The proposed development is not overbearing when viewed in context.
- The proposal will provide additional natural surveillance of the street.

Character

- Rose Park is not of any architectural merit.
- The proposed development will not alter the roof in any way.
- The proposed side entrance will not impact on the scale of the building or general proportions of the building when viewed from the street level.
- Exempted development regulations would allow for a porch to the front and a 1.2m wall constructed along the front boundary.

Precedent

- It is submitted that buildings need to be adaptable to be accommodate the changing demands of their users and the Council should not prevent these houses changing for modern needs. This would set an undesirable precedent.

8.0 Assessment

The main issues for consideration are as follows;

- Design
- Impacts on Established Residential Amenities
- EIA Screening

8.1. Design

- 8.1.1. The detached house, i.e. no. 14 Rose Park, the subject of the appeal, is situated between an existing detached house, i.e. no. 13 Rose Park on one side and a pair of semi-detached houses on the other side. It is notable, based on a visual observation of the area, that the pair of semi-detached houses are bulkier in scale than the established detached house no. 14 Rose Park.
- 8.1.2. The proposed front extension is single storey in height and extends forward of the existing front building line by approximately 1.8m. In accordance with the submitted Site Location Plan (scale 1:1000) the front building lines situated adjacent to the appeal site vary and there is no consistency.
- 8.1.3. Rose Park is a modern suburban housing development for which permission was granted in May 1998 for the development of 17 no. houses. Therefore, the existing development is contemporary and is not a noted development of architectural merit.
- 8.1.4. Overall, I would conclude that the proposed single storey extension to the front would not unduly impact on the design character of Rose Park.

8.2. Impact on Established Residential Amenities

- 8.2.1. The proposed single storey extension to the rear extends out a maximum distance of 5 metres from the existing rear elevation and a minimum distance of 2.5 metres. The

proposed 5m extension is set back approximately 0.9m with the common boundary wall with the neighbouring property no. 15 Rose Park.

8.2.2. The height of the common boundary wall, adjacent to the existing rear building line of no. 14 Rose Park is approximately 1.8m high. The height of the proposed single storey extension to the rear is 2.95 metres above the ground level and therefore will extend above the existing boundary wall and roof parapet. I would consider, given the scale of the extension relative to the boundary wall, that the proposed rear extension would be visible from the rear garden of no. 15 Rose Park and potentially from the rear living rooms of no. 15. Also, and having regard to the orientation of the rear garden of the appeal site the proposed single storey extension may impact, although marginally, on the receiving sunlight and daylight of the neighbouring property given the scale and height of the proposed rear extension.

8.2.3. The existing rear garden of the appeal site slopes steeply upwards, however the submitted plans demonstrate that the proposed development includes the excavation of the rear garden to ensure that the proposed rear extension is situated at a single level. The proposed excavation of the rear garden would ensure that any adverse impacts on neighbouring property will be mitigated to a significant extent.

8.2.4. Overall, I would conclude having regard to the proposed extension and the excavations proposed that the proposal would not have a significant overshadowing impact, nor would the proposal overlook the adjoining residential amenities. Furthermore, the proposed single storey rear extension would not be overbearing having regard to the proposed excavations. Overall the proposed development would not adversely impact on established residential amenities.

8.3. **EIA Screening**

8.3.1. Based on the information on the file, which I consider adequate to issue a screening determination, it is reasonable to conclude that there is no real likelihood of

significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development and an environmental impact assessment is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. I have read the submissions on the file, visited the site, had due regard to the Wexford Town and Environs Development Plan, 2009 – 2015 (as extended) and all other matters arising. I recommend that planning permission be granted for the reasons set out below.

REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Having regard to the zoning objective of the appeal site in the Wexford Town and Environs Development Plan, 2009 – 2015, and the extent of the proposed development, it is considered that subject to compliance with conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

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 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 and to ensure a proper standard of development.

3. Prior to commencement of development, details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development shall be submitted to the planning authority for agreement.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development and the visual amenities of the area.

4. That all necessary measures be taken by the contractor to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on adjoining roads during the course of the works.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.

5. 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 the 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 interest of amenities and public safety.

6. 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.

Kenneth Moloney
Planning Inspector
6th November 2018