



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP – 307885 – 20

Development

Planning permission is sought for: 1) the demolition of an existing attached single storey garage and two storey section to the rear of the garage containing a utility/kitchen on the ground floor plus a bedroom on the first floor; 2) construction of a two-storey dwelling to the side of existing dwelling; 3) use of the existing vehicular entrance to serve the proposed new house and construct a second vehicular entrance to serve the existing house; and, 4) all other ancillary site works.

Location

No. 58 Howth Road, Howth, Co. Dublin.

Planning Authority

Fingal County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

F20A/0192.

Applicant

Michael McGinn.

Type of Application

Planning Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Refused.

Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant	Michael Ginn.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	28 th day of October, 2020.
Inspector	Patricia-Marie Young.

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	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. Development Plan.....	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	7
6.0 The Appeal	8
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
6.2. Planning Authority Response	10
7.0 Assessment.....	10
8.0 Recommendation.....	17
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17
10.0 Conditions	18

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. No. 58 Howth Road, the appeal site, has a given site area of 0.077ha. It contains a c1960s two-storey semi-detached dwelling that has a given gross floor space of 131.3m² that has been extended to the side and rear. It forms part of a group of two originally matching in built form and architectural appearance semi-detached dwellings located on the northern side of the Howth Road (R105 Regional Road) in a well-established streetscape scene containing other similar in period and built form semi-detached pairs alongside detached dwelling houses of varying architectural styles, built forms and palette's of materials on generous garden plots. The rear of the subject property backs onto the railway line and is located in close proximity to the coastline. The site is located c0.7km to the west of the entrance to Howth Harbour and c0.9km to the east of the R105's T-junction with Offington Park in north County Dublin.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Planning permission is sought for the following:

- Demolition of an existing attached single storey garage and two storey section to the rear of the garage containing a utility/kitchen on the ground floor plus a bedroom on the first floor. The given gross floor area of demolition works is 25.06m² and the given gross floor space to be retained is 106.24m²;
- Construction of a two-storey dwelling of 98sqm² to the side of existing dwelling;
- Use of the existing vehicular entrance to serve the proposed new house and for the construction of a second vehicular entrance to serve the existing house; and,
- All other ancillary site works.

2.2. This application is accompanied by a Planning Report.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The Planning Authority **refused** planning permission for the following stated reasons:

- “1. *It is considered that the proposed development constitutes inappropriately designed, scaled and sited development that would have a significant impact and cause injury to the existing pair of semi-detached dwellings, streetscape and residential character at this location and therefore would materially contravene the RS zoning objective, Objective DMS39 and Objective DMS44 of the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 and as such would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
2. *The proposed development, through the addition of a new dwelling to the side of an existing pair of semi-detached dwellings results in the creation of a terrace row of three dwellings. The change in typology from a pair of semi-detached dwellings into a terrace row of three dwellings is considered to depreciate the value of the existing semi-detached dwellings.*
3. *The proposed development fails to achieve the required separation distances between the side gables of the newly proposed attached dwelling and the existing adjacent property further to the northwest in accordance with Objective DMS29 of the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 and as such is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
4. *The proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments, that being, the transformation of characterful pairs of semi-detached dwellings into unsymmetrical terrace rows of three properties, which would in themselves and cumulatively be harmful to the residential and visual amenities of the area and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

A report signed by the Planning Authority’s Planning Officer on the 17th day of July, 2020, considered that the general principle of the proposed development was acceptable. However, it raises significant concerns in relation particularly to the visual impacts of the proposed development alongside considered that the proposed development, if permitted, would contravene Objectives DMS39, DMS29 and DMS44 of the Development Plan.

It also notes that at pre-planning it was advised that a dwelling unit provided to the rear would be deemed to be more acceptable at this location.

Further concern was raised in relation to the modifications to the existing entrance in order to serve the existing and the proposed dwelling as no replacement tree was proposed in the public realm alongside the fact that the sightlines required would mean that such a provision would not be possible. It was therefore considered a shared entrance would be more appropriate than the solution proposed or a contribution towards replacement tree planting.

This report concludes with a recommendation to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in Section 3.1.1 of this report above.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Water: No objection subject to safeguards.

Transportation: No objection subject to safeguards. I note however, that it was considered that there is sufficient space to provide two off-street car parking spaces alongside it is recommended that the pedestrian gate and vehicle access gate should be kept separate.

Parks & Green Infrastructure: Revised access requested in order to avoid a detrimental impact on an existing tree.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. **Irish Water:** No objection subject to safeguards.

3.3.2. **Iarnród Éireann:** No objection subject to safeguards.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. None.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. **Subject Site: Relevant Planning History**

- **P.A. Ref. No. F18A/0506:** Planning permission was **refused** for a development consisting of: 1) the demolition of the existing attached single storey garage and

two storey extension to the rear of the garage containing a utility/kitchen on the ground floor plus a bedroom on the first floor; 2) construction of a three bedroom two storey detached house to the side with basement games room; 3) use of existing entrance to provide a separate entrance to serve the proposed dwelling and a separate entrance to serve the existing dwelling house; 4) raise a portion of the roof of the existing house by 450mm to allow for an attic conversion; 5) construction of a rear extension to the existing dwelling house; 6) all service upgrades and infrastructure provisions to serve existing and proposed dwelling house together with all associated site works for the following reasons:

1) It was considered that the proposed development would give rise to significant residential and visual amenity adverse impacts on its setting. It was also considered that the proposed development would materially contravene the 'RS' zoning objective, Objective DMS39 and Objective DMS44 of the Development Plan.

2) It was considered that the infill dwelling would result in a substandard residential amenity for future occupants.

3) Undesirable precedent for other similar developments.

4) Lack of adequate information in relation to the foul sewer and surface water drainage.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. The policies and provisions of the Fingal Development Plan, 2017-2023, apply. The site lies within an area zoned 'RS' which has an aim to: "*provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity*".

5.1.2. Chapter 3 of the Development Plan deals residential development.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. There are a significant number of Natura 2000 sites in the hinterland and wider setting of the appeal site. The nearest are:

- The appeal site is located c20.4m to the south of Special Area of Conservation: Baldoyle Bay SAC (Site Code: 000199).
- The appeal site is located c330m to the west of the Special Area of Conservation: Howth Head SAC (Site Code: 000202).
- The appeal site is located c1.2km to the north east of Special Protection Areas: North Bull Island SPA (Site Code: 000406) and Special Area of Conservation: Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000206).
- The appeal site is located c1.5km to the south west of Special Protection Areas: Irelands Eye SPA (Site Code: 004117).

5.3. **Environmental Impact Assessment/Screening**

- 5.3.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the residential development sought under this application, the residential zoning of the site and its setting, the serviced land and nature of the receiving environment, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. I consider that the need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

- 6.1.1. The grounds of this appeal can be summarised as follows:
- The proposed dwelling is reasonable in planning and design terms.
 - The proposed development would integrate successfully into its streetscape and would not adversely impact on residential amenities of adjoining houses.
 - It is requested that this submission is considered alongside the Planning Report accompanying the application.
 - The proposed dwelling is 800m from Howth Dart Station and its harbour.
 - It lies across the road from a park and golf course. There is also land which has been rezoned for residential development and the site is nearby the Techcrete industrial site which was subject for a high density development of 512 apartment

units at 191 units per hectare by the Board on the 8th day of April. It is anticipated the area in the vicinity of the site will transform when these sites are redeveloped.

- A number of the existing houses in the vicinity have been subject to alterations and additions. Some of the design solutions included flat roof structures.
- The applicant wishes to downgrade to a smaller house and continue living in an area where he has lived all his life.
- The original 167m² proposal sought under P.A. Ref. No. F18A/0506 was refused as it was considered excessive in scale and it would have adversely impact residential as well as visual amenities of the area. A smaller house is now sought.
- This application addresses the reasons for refusal and there are no objections.
- The location of the proposed dwelling to the rear did not prove feasible due to existing infrastructure present. This option was subject to investigations and plan preparation.
- The proposed dwelling is now reduced to 98m² and would be served by a rear garden space of 97m² as well as one off-street car parking space. There is a separation distance of 1025mm at the front extending to 1524mm to the rear with an average width of 1275mm. There is also rear access provided. The front façade closely harmonises in style, form, and external finishes with the existing as well as adjoining house of No. 59 with the single storey rear extension being visually unobtrusive.
- The Planning Authority have given little weight to what is a more sensitive and modest scale proposal.
- This proposal is fully compliant with planning provisions.
- This proposal is appropriate and proportionate for this site context.
- No. 59 would remain as a semi-detached and will not suffer any loss in value. There will be some loss of value to the original dwelling to which this application relates.
- The separation standard cited under Objective DMS29 of 2.3m refers to new developments in housing estates with this ordinarily including boundary provision. No. 57 is over 60 years old and maintains a side entrance of 1000mm despite being

extended. The design at its narrowest point has a separation distance of 1025mm and this widens to 1524mm to the rear of the proposed dwelling.

- It is not accepted that this proposal, if permitted, would set a precedence.
- It is sought that the Planning Authority's decision be overturned.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1. The Planning Authority's response can be summarised as follows:

- This application was assessed against relevant local planning provisions alongside the impact on adjoining neighbours and the character of the area.
- They have no further comments to make having reviewed the grounds of appeal.
- The Board is requested to uphold its decision.
- Should the Board grant permission it is requested that a Section 48 condition be imposed.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Preliminary Comments and Assessment Overview

7.1.1. I have read the appeal file, all associated reports and plans and conducted an inspection of the appeal site and its setting. The development sought under this application essentially consists of the proposed demolition of an existing attached garage structure and part of the existing floor area that currently comprises No. 58 Howth Road and the construction of a separate dwelling unit together with associated ancillary site works and services comes forward on land zoned under the current Fingal Development Plan for residential development (Note: 'RS' – Residential). It is also consistent with national planning provisions which advocate more efficient use of zoned serviced urban lands within settlements alongside the provision of a greater mixture and variety of tenure types. As such I consider that the general principal of the development sought is acceptable, subject to safeguards.

7.1.2. Furthermore, the development generally exceeds minimum quantitative and qualitative standards for residential dwellings detailed in the said Development Plan

and I consider the proposed development to be generally acceptable in terms of its servicing, subject to safeguards.

- 7.1.3. Notwithstanding this I concur with the Planning Authority's Parks and Green Infrastructure Department that the design put forward does not provide any measures to replace the loss of an existing tree in the provision of separate entrances to maintain the existing dwellings access onto the R105 and to provide a separate access to serve the proposed dwelling onto the same road.
- 7.1.4. In this regard they advise that in an event of a grant of permission the preferred options would be the provision of a shared access or the provision of an appropriate contribution determined by the Planning Authority for the loss of this existing tree.
- 7.1.5. I note that the appellant has not addressed this concern in their grounds of appeal and as such this could be considered a new issue by the Board.
- 7.1.6. Should the Board be minded to grant permission for the development sought under this application this matter could be dealt with by way of condition and I consider that the shared entrance option would allow for a greater off-street car parking provision to cater for the existing as well as proposed dwellings alongside it would minimise the creation of a new entrance onto a heavily trafficked Regional Road that contains a plethora of individual entrances serving residential properties on either side of it within the immediate vicinity of the site and where the posted speed limit is 60kmph. Moreover, this tree contributes to the visual amenity of this streetscape and is one of a number individual trees that are present along the Howth Road.
- 7.1.7. I also concur with the Planning Authority's Transportation Department that there is sufficient space within the proposed subdivision serving the dwelling house to cater for the provision of two car parking space as opposed to the one off-street car parking space proposed under this application.
- 7.1.8. As said previously given the heavy volume of traffic that the R105 caters for and given that it is the main approach into the settlement of Howth from its northern side with no on-street car parking provision along this stretch with *ad hoc* on-street car parking occurring along this stretch of road with this appearing to arise from the lack of car parking space within curtilages of residential properties to meet their needs. With this adversely impacting on the free flow of traffic on this regional road, in my view the provision of two off-street car parking to serve the proposed dwelling unit would be a

more site appropriate provision at this location relative to the size of the dwelling unit proposed.

- 7.1.9. The appellant as part of their grounds of appeal did not address this matter and I consider that it is a new issue that could be dealt with by way of an appropriate condition should the Board be minded to grant planning permission for the development sought under this application. Further the provision of entrance for vehicle access and egress to serve the existing and proposed dwelling units has the potential to result in a greater area to the front of these dwelling units and between the roadside boundary in which off-street car parking spaces could be provided.
- 7.1.10. In relation to the planning history of the site, i.e. P.A. Ref No.F18A/0506, I consider that the Planning Authority's decision to refuse the previous recent proposal was with merit and that the previous proposed dwelling unit was excessive in its scale, mass through built form. It also failed to be appropriately subservient to the existing semi-detached dwelling house, No. 58 Howth Road.
- 7.1.11. I also consider that this current proposal does represent a significant reduction in the scale, mass through to built form with the now proposed unit being smaller than the existing dwelling which I have previously indicated has a given gross floor space of 131.3m² with the proposed unit having a given gross floor space of 98.3m² whereas the previously sought dwelling unit was c167m². The latter gross floor space could not have been considered as downsizing which is the purported reason to why the applicant is seeking the subdivision of his current property.
- 7.1.12. Further, this proposal seeks less significant alterations to the existing semi-detached property which results in less significant visual adverse impact on the modest originally matching set of two semi-detached dwellings.
- 7.1.13. I am further cognisant that No. 58 Howth Road, the semi-detached pair it forms part of and the modest group of two matching semi-detached pairs are not afforded any specific protection.
- 7.1.14. In particular they are not listed in Fingal County Councils Record of Protected Structures as Protected Structures nor do they form part of a designated Architectural Conservation Area.
- 7.1.15. I do raise a concern that the proposed dwelling unit does not provide an adequate in width clear area of at least 1200mm wide to access the proposed front door serving

the proposed dwelling unit. The provision of such a route is a requirement under current Building Regulations which I am cognisant is subject to a different code and authority to planning matters.

- 7.1.16. However, I consider that whilst the design in failing to provide this clear width to access the front door would provide a substandard level of access to serve future occupants particularly should an adverse emergency situation arise. This also in my view adds to the concern that is raised under Refusal Reason No. 3 which indicates that the proposed development fails to achieve the required separation distance between side gables of the newly proposed attached dwelling and the existing property to the northwest in accordance with Objective DMS29 of the Development Plan. This objective requires a separation distance of at least 2.3 metres between the side walls of semi-detached units.
- 7.1.17. These particular issues with the proposed design resolution in my view in part supports the concerns raised in the Planning Authority's notification of refusal in relation to their visual and residential amenity concerns.
- 7.1.18. Having regard to the above matters it is my view that the substantive issues for consideration in this appeal case relate to the reasons for refusal and those set out in the grounds of appeal. These are discussed in Section 7.2 of my assessment below.
- 7.1.19. In addition, the matter of appropriate assessment also needs to be assessed in my assessment below.

7.2. **Assessment**

- 7.2.1. The first reason for refusal relates to the design and its visual impact on its setting. It also sets out that the proposed development would, if permitted, materially contravene the 'RS' zoning objective as well as Objectives DMS39 and DMS44 of the Development Plan.
- 7.2.2. In relation to the 'RS' zoning objective this seeks to provide for residential development alongside protect and improve residential amenity. As previously discussed above the general principle of residential development on land subject to the 'RS' land use zoning is acceptable subject to safeguards.
- 7.2.3. Having read the Planning Authority's Planning Officer's report and the Planning Authority's notification to refuse planning permission for the development sought under

this application it would appear that the Planning Authority are of the opinion that the design, scale and the siting of this proposal would adversely impact on the existing semi-detached pair it forms part of, its streetscape setting and also the residential character of this location.

- 7.2.4. Whilst I would share the Planning Authority's view that the proposed design of the dwelling unit is not consistent with the semi-detached pairs that not only character this modest group of two but also in terms of the semi-detached pairs of a similar period as well as similar overall design, layout, built form as well as building to space relationship to the west. It is also inconsistent with residential development that characterises its streetscape scene which is by and large defined by its two-storey built form of its predominantly detached and semi-detached dwelling units.
- 7.2.5. Even, if one considers the potential future high-density residential development permitted at the former Techcrete industrial site through to undeveloped pockets of residential zoned land that are yet to be developed as argued in the grounds of appeal. These development in my view in themselves will not significantly erode the visual setting of the streetscape scene the appeal site itself forms part of. Moreover, these developments do not characterise the streetscape scene which the site itself forms part of and as such reference to the level of change to the streetscape scene in the appeal submission is in my view not an accurate representation to make.
- 7.2.6. The surrounding streetscape scene that the site form part of is by and large defined by well established mature residential properties on generous plots despite their suburban context.
- 7.2.7. It is therefore appropriate that the proposed development is considered against this visual context.
- 7.2.8. In relation to Objective DMS39 of the Development Plan it states that: "*new infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units. Infill developments shall retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings*".
- 7.2.9. In general I consider that this current proposal seeks to visually integrate the proposed dwelling house into the existing visual aesthetics and built form of No. 58 Howth Road whilst still allowing for the subdivision of No.s 58 original curtilage into two by maintaining the ridge height and extending the ridge height of 8.708m westwards over

part of the proposed dwelling unit alongside echoing the hipped roof profile of the semi-detached pair it forms part of.

- 7.2.10. It also includes a bay window, though this bay window arguably as a result of it not being positioned towards the western most end of the principal façade, results in a lack of symmetry and an imbalance when considered alongside the modest group of two what were originally matching semi-detached pairs. In particular, the adjoining pair No. 58 Howth Road forms part of. Notwithstanding, the proposed attached dwelling would result in a wider frontage when the existing, that to be demolished and the attached new dwelling when compared to the two-storey extension that is present to the side of the semi-detached dwelling No. 58 Howth Road pairs with.
- 7.2.11. Moreover, the semi-detached dwelling pairs to the west, though of a two-storey character with a similar height, massing and built form are not matching the modest group that No. 58 Howth Road forms part of. This is the same for the semi-detached pairs bounding the modest group that No. 58 Howth Road forms part of to the east. Alongside this the streetscape scene contains a wide variety of architectural styles in its mainly single storey, dormer and 2-storey building stock.
- 7.2.12. Of further concern the subdivision of the 12.7m existing roadside boundary by way of this proposal has been broken up into two c3.7m vehicle entrances and two c0.8m pedestrian entrance along a streetscape where there is no similar such provision within the roadside boundary treatments associated with the residential dwellings that characterise the sites streetscape scene.
- 7.2.13. Alongside this I observed that the streetscape scene is characterised by a generous semi-private front gardens served by equally generous in width roadside boundary in between individual vehicle entrances with a balance of spacing in between these individual access points onto the public road network, i.e. Howth Road.
- 7.2.14. As such the provision of two vehicle entrances and two pedestrian entrances would result in visual imbalance within the streetscape scene and would also necessitate the loss of tree within the public domain in order to achieve the required sightlines.
- 7.2.15. The loss of this tree would in my view diminish the visual amenities of this sites streetscape scene and its loss could be easily overcome by way of a shared vehicle/pedestrian access provision, i.e. the maintenance of the existing entrance. The latter would likely result in a safer provision of car parking within the curtilage of

the site to accommodate the existing dwelling as revised by way of this proposal and the new attached dwelling unit as I question the appropriateness of providing off-street car parking that cannot achieve any substantial turning movements within the curtilage of the subdivided front garden area. Thus, requiring additional manoeuvres onto the heavily trafficked Howth Road which has the potential to obstruct its road users including resulting in additional hazards for those using the adjoining footpath and cycle path.

7.2.16. I therefore do not consider this arrangement to be appropriate solution to meet the car parking needs of the proposed and existing dwelling.

7.2.17. In terms of visual balance, I consider that when taken together with the concerns raised in the previous section of this report, alongside the cumulative changes that have occurred to the semi-detached pair No. 58 Howth Road form part of that there is merit in the Planning Authority's concerns that the proposed development, if permitted, would cause injury to the semi-detached forms that characterise the section of streetscape along the Howth Road that it forms part of. With the lack of substantive lateral separation distance at first floor level the built form balance and harmony in separation distances between these properties particularly at ground and first floor level would be eroded. This in itself could potentially give rise to other similar developments within this streetscape scene.

7.2.18. Notwithstanding, I consider that as No. 58 Howth Road, the streetscape scene it forms part of are not afforded any specific protection and having regard to the local through to national planning policy which advocates more efficient use of serviced residentially zoned land that subject to the safeguards of ensuring that a lateral separation distance of no less than 1200mm is achieved along the entire western elevation is achieved and subject to the provision of one shared vehicle/pedestrian access onto the public domain of Howth Road that the proposed development is otherwise acceptable.

7.2.19. I also consider that the proposed development would not give rise to any undue residential amenity impact on properties in its vicinity over and above that which would be expected to arise in such a suburban context. In particular by way of overshadowing and/or overlooking.

7.2.20. In my view these safeguards can be reasonably achieved by way of condition without significantly compromising or amending the proposed development sought under this

application. In addition, the imposition of these particular safeguards would ensure a more qualitative residential amenity is achieved and also that the road safety concerns raised in relation to the car parking provision as well as the provision of more than one entrance vehicle and pedestrian entrance are overcome.

7.3. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.3.1. This appeal site does not form part of nor does it immediately adjoin a Natura 2000 site. However, it is located in very close proximity to a number of Natura 2000 sites with Special Area of Conservation: Baldoyle Bay SAC (Site Code: 000199) located 20.4m from it and the Special Area of Conservation: Howth Head SAC (Site Code: 000202) being located within c330m. In addition, to this there are a significant number of other Natura 2000 sites within a 15km radius of it. Despite the proximity of the aforementioned Natura 2000 sites the site is a brownfield serviced site with no tangible connectivity between it and any of these sites. In this case having regard to the documentation on file and that publicly available, which I consider is adequate to issue a screening determination, that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to have a significant effect on either of these sites mentioned or any other such sites within the wider area. I therefore consider that in this case a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment, is not required.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that permission is granted.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 9.1. Having regard to the location of the site on residentially zoned lands under the Fingal County Development Plan, 2017 to 2023; to the provisions set out in the said Development Plan for this type of development; alongside the nature, scale and design of the proposed development and to the pattern of development in this suburban serviced area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, that the proposed development would not detract from the character of the area. Nor would it give rise to seriously injury to the residential and visual amenities of the area. Further subject to the provision of one shared entrance to serve the existing and proposed dwelling the proposed development would not endanger public

safety by reason of a traffic hazard nor would it give rise to a loss of a tree within the public domain that contributes to the visual qualities of the streetscape scene the site forms part of. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 27th day of April, 2020, 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 lateral separation distance between the western elevation of the proposed attached dwelling and the inner boundary wall shall not be less than 1200mm along its entire length.
 - (b) The proposed development shall be revised by way of the provision of one shared vehicle and pedestrian entrance that shall serve the existing dwelling and proposed dwelling. It is advised that consideration is given to maintaining the position of the existing entrance to serve both developments so that there is no reduction in sightlines for vehicles accessing and egressing the site.

Revised drawings including revised site plans showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in the interest of traffic safety.

3. The first-floor bathroom window located on the western side elevation shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

4. Details of the materials, colours, and textures of all external finishes of the proposed dwelling unit shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

5. (a) Details of all boundary treatments shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for agreement and shall include a minimum of a 2m solid boundary along the entire length the rear boundary separating the existing dwelling and the new dwellings rear garden private amenity space.

(b) Development shall not commence without the prior written agreement of all boundary treatments with the Planning Authority and thereafter shall only be authorised to commence in accordance with the agreed plans.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

6. a) Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, and including rainwater and guttering details shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

(b) Surface water from the site shall be disposed of within the boundaries of the site and shall not discharge onto the public road or adjoining property. Permeable paving shall be incorporated to the front of the proposed dwelling and the existing dwelling as part of the car parking on-site provision and the existing surface water drainage for adjoining properties shall not be adversely affected by the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure orderly disposal of surface water.

7. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall enter into water and/or wastewater connection agreement(s) with Irish Water.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

8. 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.

9. Construction and demolition waste shall be managed in accordance with a construction waste and demolition management plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall be prepared in accordance with the “Best Practice Guidelines on the Preparation of Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects”, published by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in July 2006. The plan shall include details of waste to be generated during site clearance and construction phases, and details of the methods and locations to be employed for the prevention, minimisation, recovery and disposal of this material in accordance with the provision of the Waste Management Plan for the Region in which the site is situated.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable waste management.

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, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to 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 An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, 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.

Patricia-Marie Young
Planning Inspector

11th day of November, 2020.