



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-304175-19

Development	Dwelling to the side of the existing dwelling, including new entrance gates and associated works.
Location	Side garden of 118, Kincora Grove, Clontarf, Dublin 3
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council North
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2078/19
Applicant(s)	Pat Morrissey
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Kevin Henry
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	8 th September 2019
Inspector	Suzanne Kehely

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. No. 118 Kincora Grove is a large 'L' shaped site with a large Victorian house – a former Lodge to Clontarf Castle which has been considerably remodelled and extended. This house has a rear and side garden and is about 18m from its neighbouring dwelling at no.116 Kincora Grove to the east and is otherwise within metres of properties to its west and north. The development site as delineated is to the side of the house and presently forms part of its curtilage. Out of the original 31 road frontage the proposed site has frontage of 12.8m. It is set back about 4m from the existing house. The northern boundary is formed by an original stone mews which extends to a total length of 20m and is adjoined by a modern shed which also marks part of the northern boundary. This stone building is ancillary to a new development of 5 houses 1-5 Silverfield built on the site of 7 Stiles Court which fronts onto Clontarf Cricket Club and Rugby Club playing grounds. The proposed plot is screened from the road by an un-rendered concrete block and pierced wall (7 block high) as compared to the lower rendered wall with vehicular access for the remainder of the original frontage. The plot as delineated has a depth of around 18m and widens to 15m at the rear boundary with the sheds. The adjacent semi-detached house to the east on Kincora Grove has a site depth of 30m and the house is set back 9m from the road as is typical of the prevailing character. It partially adjoins the boundary with the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal is to construct a 137sq.m. part two-storey and part single storey house in the side garden of no. 118, the main elements being:
- A site of 210 sq.m. leaving a site of 490 sq.m. for the existing house.
 - New vehicular access.
 - 3 bed house.
 - Retain boundary wall and plant hedging for privacy to 60 sq.m. walled garden to the front.
 - Set back of ground level and first floor 1.384m from boundary with 116.
 - Set back of ground level and part of first floor of 1m from northern boundary and stepped setback of 2.5m at first floor.

- Set back of first floor 6m from new western boundary and 10m from existing house
- Contemporary style with flat roof.

2.2. In a cover letter it is highlighted that the following details address the previous reason for refusal:

- Impacts on no. 118 -The Lodge: **reduced parapet height and increased separation at first floor provide sufficient light** and enhance views of the Lodge.
- Impact on 116 – is similarly addressed by parapet height and increased separation.
- Boundary Treatment – revised to **maintain low wall and to introduce soft screening such as a hedge** which will preserve views along the road.
- Residential amenity of proposed house layout has been improved and bedroom 3 includes 1.8m high **glazed screen and skylight – no balcony proposed.**
- A Daylight study and Visual Amenity assessment are included.
- A substantial garden remains for 118 90 sqm. to rear and 70 sq.m. to side.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to grant permission for the development subject to 10 conditions. There is no condition omitting bedroom no. 3.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. The Planning Report refers to:

- The Development Plan –Z1 objective and section 16.10.2 (residential standards) section 16.10.9, (corner sites/side gardens) and 16.10.10 (Infill) and to policies QH 1,8, 21 and 22.
- The planning history of the site and adjacent site to the rear at 7 Stiles Court.
- The observations by third parties.

3.2.2. In light of this information the assessment the report examines issues in relation to heritage, design and visual amenity, residential amenities of existing house on site and those of adjacent and overall standard of development. Notably stating:

- Kincora Lodge is an interesting focal point due to its style and historic link with Clontarf Castle and while not a protected structure the policy CHC1 seeks preservation of built heritage. The proposal has no negative impacts in this regard. This is helped by the contrasting contemporary style and use of soft landscaping in screening.
- In determining impacts on surrounding properties, the relevant guidance is Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight. A Guide to Good Practice (BRE 2011).
- In respect of impact on Silverfield, the angle of the proposed building height to the centre of the lowest window in the rear of the silverfield is below 25 degrees and noted to merit assessment and is considered to be imperceptible in terms of daylight and sunlight received. The impact on sheds and garages is not judged by the same standards as habitable space.
- As the gardens are already in shadow as a consequence of the sheds the additional impacts would be minor in that the level of sunlight in garden area would not be reduced to below 80% of its previous value as a consequence of the proposal.
- There would be no overlooking of no.116 and the screen outside the window of bedroom 3 which is not a balcony addresses overlooking of adjacent properties with the exception of no. 118.
- Loss of outlook from the bedroom window over the garage and from the landing window is acknowledged.
- In terms of visual impact as viewed from the 8 bedroom windows, the reduced width of the first floor to 8m minimises the impact such that it would not be unacceptable.
- The use of the screen in bedroom 3 and reliance on a skylight would result in an unacceptable standard of development and it is recommended that this bedroom be omitted.
- The existing higher than average garden wall is considered to be sufficient to enclose a private open space subject to planting.

- The impact on the habitable rooms at ground level of no 118 is protected by virtue of set back and reduced height of ground level and set back of first floor.
- There are no appropriate assessment issues.

3.3. **Technical Reports**

Engineering Department – Drainage Division: No objections subject to conditions

Transportation Planning Division: FI regarding tree and lamp-post.

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

No submissions.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1.1. PA ref: 3999/18 refers to a refusal of permission for 145 sq.m. house on a similar site for the following reasons:

- The proposed development including the increased enclosure with a high boundary treatment on the sensitive site in close proximity to the former lodge building and the development of a two-storey building close to the boundary with adjoining properties would seriously injure the amenity of the property in the vicinity due to impacts on visual amenity. It has not been demonstrated that daylight to no.116 Kincora Grove and daylight and sunlight to 118 Kincora Grove would not be significantly affected.
- The development as proposed would provide sufficient residential amenity for future occupants with substandard third bedroom having regard to the natural light and outlook which does not have regard to the Ministerial Guidelines Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities...contrary to section QH21 and zoning objective.

4.1.2. PA Reg Ref 4420/16 refers to permission for retention of alteration to previously approved alteration to no. 118

4.1.3. PA Reg Ref 3598/14 refers to permission for demolition works and single and two storey extension. Boundary treatment and entrance alterations and refurbishment works to no. 118.

4.1.4. PA reg ref: 2197/11 refers to permission for 5 dwellings to the rear of 7 Stiles Court. This site incorporates the mews building and is shown as sheds for four of the five proposed houses.

4.2. **Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022.**

4.2.1. The objective for the site is 'To protect, provide and improve residential amenities.'

4.2.2. Chapter 16 sets out development standards generally and in particular section 16.2.2.2 refers to infill development for gap sites within existing established urban areas and states that it is particularly important that proposed development respects and enhances its context and is well integrated with its surroundings ensuring a more coherent cityscape. DCC will therefore seek:

- To ensure that infill development respects and complements the prevailing scale, architectural quality and the degree of uniformity in the surrounding townscape,
- In areas of varied cityscape significant quality infill development will demonstrate that positive response to context including characteristic building plot widths, architectural form, and the material and detailing of existing buildings where these contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
- Within terraces and groups of buildings of unified design and significant quality infill development will replicate and positively interpret the predominant design and architectural features of the group as a whole,
- In areas of low-quality varied townscape, infill development will have sufficient independence of form and design to create new compositions and points of interest and have regard to the form and materials of adjoining buildings where these make a positive contribution.

4.2.3. Section 16.10.9 of the plan sets out the requirements with regard to the development of houses in side gardens. In addition to the design criteria other considerations include impact on amenities of adjoining sites, open space, parking, boundary treatment and landscaping and the maintenance of building lines where appropriate.

4.2.4. Relevant policies

- Policy QH8 -To promote the sustainable development of vacant or underutilised infill sites and to favourably consider higher density proposals with respect to the design of the surrounding development and the character of the area.
- Policy QH 21 – To ensure that new houses provide for the needs of family accommodation with a satisfactory level of residential amenity, in accordance with the standards for residential accommodation.
- Policy QH 22 – To ensure that new housing development close to existing houses has regard to the character and scale of the existing houses unless there are strong design reasons for doing otherwise.

4.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

Not relevant.

4.4. **Third Party Observations to planning authority**

- 4.4.1. P. O Carroll of 3 silverfield which is directly to rear of site strongly objects on the basis of the overshadowing cast by the 5.9m high structure at a distance of 14m from his living room window which face south. He refers to the benefit of low angle sun in winter months and that the shade cast before midday and interfere with his rights to light.

When the sun is at an angle of 22.5 degrees the garden would be in shade as a consequence of the developments. This would double the shading as currently experience by the shed structure.

It would also impact on neighbours

The front garden area as private open space has visual consequences for the neighbours. This is due to the raising of boundaries

Objects to balcony and overlooking garden and house. Privacy screens have not been successful in the case of no, 118 and impact on no, 2 Silverfield.

Unacceptable impact on no. 118 in terms of open space.

overdevelopment which would change the dynamic of the area.

Inaccurate drawings

4.4.2. L. Schrimsher of 4 Silverfield strongly objects on grounds of

Post modern style of proposed dwelling is considered out of keeping with the character of the lodge and the houses along the road.

Light reduction and loss of amenity illustrated by reference to photographs of current view in which the proposed dwelling will feature.

Overlooking from balcony.

4.4.3. K Henry of 116 Kincora Grove strongly objects on grounds of

Design not in keeping with character of area by reason of style and height scale and massing. E.g. parapet levels higher. And breach of building line. As indicated in diagrams.

Impact on amenities of 116 by reason of proximity of two storey dwelling to bedroom and hall windows 1 and 2 and loss of daylight and aspect currently enjoyed as illustrated in attached photographs. The nearest wall is stated to be 2.2m from window and this wall will step forward over a distance of 7m to the front of the window. Causing an unacceptable loss of light and amenity and is contravention of development plan.

Private open space of proposed dwelling would be overlooked by no 116 as illustrated.

Contravention of permission for extension to no.118 by reason of reduced open space.

Light reduction and loss of amenity for rear garden, front garden and garage windows. The rear garden currently enjoys directly light from the west and the proposed dwelling would obstruct this line of light. Thereby having an overshadowing and overbearing impact.

The proposed beech hedge rising above the 1.4m wall would interfere with amenity by blocking light into front garden.

Traffic hazard by creation of new driveway with no turning and onto a busy road lacking traffic calming.

No provision for replanting cherry tree previously fronting the site.

In conclusion, the amendments to the previously refused proposal are not material insofar a change of decision is justified.

4.4.4. J. O'Carroll of 5 Silverfield strongly objects on grounds of

Reduction in light in dwelling 14m away and through skylights in refurbished shed along the boundary.

Loss of light in garden

Substandard private open space for existing and proposed dwelling at no. 118.

Loss of privacy as balcony would overlook property

It is overdevelopment

Drawing misrepresent scale and bulk of proposal.

4.4.5. T. Henry of 116 Kincora Grove strongly objects on grounds of impact on amenity of 116 as previously described in an objection from another household member.

4.4.6. N. Sheehan of 124 Kincora Grove strongly objects on grounds of impact on streetscape, discrepancies in area specified on notice and application form, private open space to front and boundary implications and traffic hazard.

4.4.7. B. McDermott of 2 Silverfield strongly objects on grounds of light reduction and loss of view, design is out of character, visually obtrusive and excessive in scale,

4.4.8. Cllr. J. Horgan-Jones supports the objects of neighbours and considers the previous reasons for refusal still hold.

5.0 The Appeal

5.1. Third Party Grounds of Appeal

Following a detailed letter of objection to the planning authority, as summarised in this report, an appeal has been submitted by the neighbour to the east (No116 Kincora Grove) who strongly objects to a grant of permission on the following grounds:

- Significant impact on light levels in the bedroom and first floor thereby damaging the residential amenity
- Impact of amenity of both front and back garden.
- Evening sun into the back garden will be blocked.

- Inadequate privacy in proposed private open space – it will be directly overlooked.
- Reduce views of a heritage building will detract from the visual amenity and character of streetscape.
- Out of character due to different design

5.2. First Party Response

5.2.1. In response to the issues the applicant refutes the points on the following basis:

- The impact on bedroom light is mitigated by reduced parapet height, increased separation at 1st floor and adherence to BRE Guidance. This is supported by the assessment by the planning authority that these impacts would not be unacceptable.
- The building lines have been respects to front and rear of 116 and no windows face this property. Impacts were assessed to not be significant.
- Private open space for proposed house is no different from rear garden in terms of overlooking from neighbouring first floor windows. Additional planting will also be provided. This is supported in the assessment by the planning authority.
- Revised massing of first floor and soft landscaping as a screen will enhance visibility and setting of the Lodge. The design approach was assessed to be acceptable.
- The design is also sensitive to the amenities of no. 118 by maximising light penetration to ground level side windows.
- Further design measures have also minimised impact on the Silverfield development to the rear.

5.3. Planning Authority Response

No response to the grounds of appeal were submitted by the planning authority.

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the nature of the receiving environment, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the

environment arising from the proposed development. The need for EIA can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Issues

- 7.1.1. This appeal relates to a proposal for an atypical 137 sq.m two-storey house to the side of an extended Victorian Lodge house. It involves the splitting of a site of 700sq.m. with the consequent new site of 210sq.m. affording adequate standard of private open space in quantitative terms. The proposal is between the old lodge no.118 and the side of no.116 a semi-detached house that typifies the character of Kincora Grove – being 1960s semi brick and rendered house with hipped roof. While the principle of infill housing development is supported in the development plan in accordance with national policy, in this case there are issues raised in the objections relating to impact on residential amenities of adjacent houses in terms of overshadowing and overlooking and impact on streetscape by reason of design. Other matters relate to standard of accommodation of existing and proposed dwelling on the site and traffic hazard.

7.2. Design

- 7.2.1. It is argued by the appellant and objectors to the proposal that the architectural style is out of character with that prevailing in the area. In addition, the breach of building line and obscuring of views of the Lodge along the road are considered by the appellant to further heighten its incongruity and detract from the visual amenities of the area. The planning authority however considers the contemporary approach to be appropriate to the context and I concur. It is distinctly modern, but it is modestly scaled and the proposed stepped building line subtly bridges the slight angle between the facades of No.118 and no.116 and is not obtrusive. Furthermore its simple form and treatment is a suitable foil to the distinctive steep double pitch roof with ornate fascia and detailing. In these ways the proposal is respectful of the Lodge context and the overall streetscape.

7.3. Impact on Adjacent Dwelling no.116

- 7.3.1. The owner of this dwelling is the appellant and concerns in relation to impact on the amenities of this house centre on overshadowing of the windows to front and garden to rear.
- 7.3.2. There are two windows in the front of the house that will be affected. Firstly, the front façade bedroom over the garage which is recessed from the principal façade and secondly, the side window facing the site.
- 7.3.3. Applying the 45-degree rule to the first-floor bedroom window, the window, in elevation, is well clear of the of the 45-degree line, while on plan the line will be breached. However the bedroom window is large and south facing and has good sky views. I note that the recessed elevation is a feature in many of the hoses in the area and neighbouring properties have extended over the garage and forward of this comparable window, in close to the party wall, whereas in this case the proposal is stepped back in excess of 1m from the boundary. The Board could give consideration to a stepping back of Bedroom 1 (and thereby permit a facade en-suite window. This could be balanced by a mirrored extension alongside bedroom 2. This would however widen the house as viewed from Silverfield and reduce separation from the Lodge which has east facing ground floor principal windows. It would also increase external wall area and perhaps contribute to an overly complex design. On balance I do not consider this alteration be entirely warranted.
- 7.3.4. In terms of the side window, this is a secondary first floor window and while it is stated to light the master bedroom the planning authority refer to it as a landing window. It is also described as a hall window. The primary source of light to the master bedroom is likely to be from the façade. In any event I note that the proposed parapet is set at a 25 degree line taken from the centre of this window to minimise impact on daylight to this space and impact will therefore be within acceptable limits.
- 7.3.5. While there will be some loss of outlook and light levels in these windows, such will be within acceptable limits. In view of the pattern of development, I do not, on balance consider it unreasonable to permit a two-storey development to the side of no. 116 at a distance greater than 1m. and that is in accordance with building lines to the front and back of no.116.

- 7.3.6. With respect to overshadowing of the back garden, I note that the proposed house is not as deep as the no.116 in terms of building line and that there is a shed/ outbuilding along the rear west boundary of the no.116 which raises this boundary. The house has been designed to keep a low profile and will have minimal impact.
- 7.3.7. With respect to overlooking there are no windows facing onto no.116. Overlooking from the first-floor façade will be at an oblique angle over the front garden of no.116 which is overlooked from the street and is not a primary private open space.
- 7.3.8. With respect to boundary treatment there is concern about the hedge height and obstruction of views. It is true that the proposed house will be reliant on a hedge to height of 1.8m to provide privacy to the front garden space in lieu of a rear garden. However the planting of a hedge is not development within the meaning of the Planning and Development Acts and could be carried out regardless of this proposal. I do not consider the planting of a hedge to be reasonable grounds of objection.

7.4. Impact on Silverfield Houses.

- 7.4.1. There is a new row of 5 houses that back onto the site. There is an intervening converted stone building that serves as a series of sheds accessed via a passage between the rear gardens and the sheds. Based on the plans submitted with that application these sheds are divided into three small sheds (for nos. 2, 3 and 4 Silverfield) and one larger shed of over 40sq.m. which is ancillary to no.5 Silverfield and this shed appears to have been extended with an additional timber structure to the side along the rear boundary of no 5 and abutting the subject site.
- 7.4.2. The residents are most concerned about the obstruction of sunlight into both, their gardens and rear habitable space due to the proximity and height of the development to the rear boundary. These concerns were raised in submissions to the planning authority and impact on their amenities is referred to in the grounds of appeal. However the residents are not party to the appeal. I note that in the drawings the applicant has demonstrated how the proposed building has been lowered and remodelled from the previous proposal such that the angle of shadow cast by the shed is not significantly breached and furthermore does not breach the angle of 25 degrees taken from the ground floor window centre point. Light

penetration will be within acceptable limits for the purpose of maintaining adequate amenity. I further note that the row of houses has a particularly open aspect to the front which faces onto a private cul-de sac alongside playing fields. The houses have balconies which are not overlooked and provide an additional amenity.

- 7.4.3. There is reference to the impact on the refurbished shed which has rooflights. While I note curtains in the windows and 6 post boxes serving the site of 5 permitted houses, the authorised development on this site relates to 5 houses with ancillary sheds for which there is no evidence of permission for conversion to habitable space. The inserted rooflights to the larger shed do not warrant the same protection as authorised habitable space. While the Board may wish to seek further clarification from the planning authority on the status of these sheds, I note the planning history and that the planning authority report refers to the building as a shed. On balance I do not consider the issue of overshadowing of rooflights in a shed to be injurious to residential amenity and am satisfied that the amenities of Silverfield are not unduly impacted upon.

7.5. Impact of Proposed Bedroom 3

- 7.5.1. The first-floor bedroom to the rear has a window in the side elevation at right angles to and at a distance of 1.5m from the boundary with Silverfields and would have oblique views over the sheds into rear gardens and rear facades of these properties. It would be 9m from the boundary with the Lodge which would result in a distance of 14m between opposing windows of this house and that proposed.
- 7.5.2. The applicant has proposed a glazed screen enclosing roof space outside the bedroom window but the planning authority considers this to be potentially substandard for the bedroom accommodation. Having reviewed the plans I do not consider the aspect would be unduly compromised as sky views would be permitted from both windows. The use of a screen is a reasonable solution to providing a modestly scaled three bed house while respecting the building lines and protecting amenities of surrounding properties . A condition restricting balcony use is appropriate.

7.6. Traffic hazard

- 7.6.1. I do not consider the addition of a vehicular access at this location would give rise to traffic hazard given the sightlines and low traffic volumes on this minor suburban road. Tree and lamppost issues can be reasonably addressed by condition in addition to standard requirements of the Roads and Traffic Planning Division.

7.7. Standard of accommodation.

- 7.7.1. There are concerns about the consequential substandard accommodation of no.118. I note the separation distance maintains adequate light penetration and aspect. I also note the levels of open space exceed minimum standards and I do not consider the standard of accommodation has been unduly compromised by the proposed development. The provision of private open space in the front is acceptable having regard to the existing and proposed boundary treatment.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

- 8.1. Having regard to the location of the development within a serviced built up area, the nature of the development and the separation distance from any European Sites, I consider that the proposed development either alone, or, in combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to have significant effects on a European site, in view of the sites' conservation objectives and that, therefore, a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and the submission of a Natura Impact Statement is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. Having considered the contents of the planning application, the decision of the planning authority, the provisions of the development plan, the grounds of appeal and the responses thereto, my inspection of the site and my assessment of the planning issues, I recommend that permission be granted for the proposed development based on the following reasons and considerations set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 and the zoning for residential purposes, to the location of the site in an established residential area and to the nature, form, scale and design of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 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. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 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.

3. The front boundary wall shall be rendered and finished to harmonise with existing boundary treatment.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

4. Notwithstanding the exempted development provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, and any statutory provision replacing or amending them, no development falling within Class 1 or Class 3 of Schedule 2, Part 1 of those Regulations shall take place within the curtilage of the house, without a prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of the area.

5. The applicant or developer shall enter into water and/or waste water connection agreement(s) with Irish Water, prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

6. Footpath shall be modified and dished at entrance in accordance with the requirements of the planning authority. Details of the location and materials to be used in such dishing, replanting of roadside tree(s) and repositioning street lighting shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of safety and visual amenity

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

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

8. The applicant or developer shall enter into water and/or waste water connection agreement(s) with Irish Water, prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

9. No part of the flat roof, screened or otherwise, shall be used a balcony.

Reason: To protect the privacy of surrounding neighbours.

10. 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.

Suzanne Kehely

Senior Planning Inspector

18th September 2019