



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP 308262-20.

Development

Demolition of two-storey extensions and outbuildings and construction of two-storey over basement extension to main house. Extension to mews house to the rear. Replacement of lead roof covering.

Location

Ardeevin House, Ardeevin Road,
Dalkey, Co. Dublin.

Planning Authority

Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown Co. Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D19A/1023

Applicant

James Corrigan

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Permission

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellants

- (1) Paul O'Toole
- (2) Rosalind & Alan Barwise
- (3) Catherine Murtagh
- (4) Roger & Geraldine Barnes

Observers

(1) Ashley & Charlotte O'Brien

Date of Site Inspection

20/11/2020

Inspector

Siobhan Carroll

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
5.1. Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022.....	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	7
5.3. EIA Screening	7
6.0 The Appeal	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
6.2. Applicant Response	11
6.3. Planning Authority Response	15
6.4. Observations	15
7.0 Assessment.....	16
8.0 Recommendation.....	21
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	21
10.0 Conditions	21

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site with a stated area of 0.08 hectares is located to the south of Ardeevin Road, Dalkey in south County Dublin. Ardeevin House the subject property is located at the end of a cul-de-sac which is situated to the south of Ardeevin Road and contains 6 no. dwellings. The site is elevated above Ardeevin Road and has views north across Dublin Bay. Dalkey Dart Station is situated circa 380m to the north-west.
- 1.2. Ardeevin House is a two-storey, three bay, detached dwelling which has a floor area of 272sq m. The Victorian property dates from the 1880's and it features later extensions to the side and rear. It is served by a gated vehicular access. The site is bounded by the residential properties on all sides. No. 4 and no. 3 Ardeevin Terrace lie to the west. The dwelling Moreana, no. 9 Ardeevin Road is situated to the north. The dwelling, Level 5, Ardeevin Road is situated to the north-west of Ardeevin House.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the following;
 - (1) demolition of two storey extensions (124sq m) and outbuildings to the side and rear of the existing house.
 - (2) Construction of two storey over basement extension to the side and rear of the main house (287sq m) and associated site works.
 - (3) Construction of a 7sq m single storey extension to the mews house to the rear of the site.
 - (4) Amendments to the entrance steps and a new front door. Replacement of lead roof covering to the front elevation bays with zinc. Re-rendering the existing house with block marked render to match existing. Installation of wrought iron railings to the first floor window sills of the existing house.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was granted subject to 13 no. conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- Further information was sought in relation to the following (1) Submit a structural report where a basement level is proposed (2) To address potential impacts on existing residential amenities resulting from construction of the proposed development, submit – (i) A Site Specific Construction & Environmental Management Plan (ii) A Geotechnical Site Survey/Report to include full details of excavation works (iii) Management and Mitigation measures in relation to excavation works (iv) Condition survey of the existing boundary walls and method statement outlining how walls to be retained (3) Applicant proposes to demolish existing outbuilding within the site. Submit detailed plans and elevations of the outbuilding to enable an assessment.
- Clarification of further information was sought in relation to the following (1) No details in relation to method statement outlining how walls to be retained and altered will be protected have been submitted as requested by Item 2(iv) of the Further Information Request, save as for certain details outlined in respect of the western boundary, the applicant is requested to clarify this matter and submit a method statement outlining how all boundary walls will be retained and altered will be protected.
- Report dated 4/9/20: Following the submission of a response to the further information and clarification of further information the Planning Officer recommended a grant of permission.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Planning Section – No objection subject to conditions.

Transportation Planning Section – No objection subject to conditions.

3.3. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.3.1. The Planning Authority received eight submissions/observations in relation to the planning application. The main issues raised are similar to those set out in the appeals and observations to the appeals.

4.0 **Planning History**

PA Reg. Ref. D09B/0504 – Permission was granted for an extension to the rear of the existing detached two - storey dwelling, at first floor level over the existing lounge, consisting of a bedroom and ensuite bathroom, with one main window opening to the rear elevation, two high level window openings to the side elevation and a flat roof with parapet, all in render finish to match the existing.

PA Reg. Ref. D06A/2004 – Permission was granted for a development consisting of alterations and extension to existing detached two storey dwelling consisting of inter-alia construction of a new single & two storey extension to the western side of the existing dwelling, new ground floor bay window to rear elevation of existing kitchen, internal alterations at ground and first floor levels, 3no. velux windows at roof level, and minor alterations to existing rear fenestration and existing front garden wall located within the site. Additionally, it is intended to refurbish the existing coach house to the rear of the garden so as to provide a new shower room at ground floor level, along with all other associated site services and site development works to facilitate the overall development.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022**

- The site is zoned Objective A 'to protect and/or improve residential amenity'.
- Chapter 8 – Principles of Development
- Section 8.2.3.4 – refers to Additional Accommodation in built up areas
- Section 8.2.3.4(i) – refers to Extensions to dwellings

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- None of relevance

5.3. EIA Screening

- 5.3.1. Having regard to the nature and scale the development which consists of an extension to a dwelling in a serviced urban area, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. 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

Third party appeals have been submitted to the Board from (1) Paul O'Toole (2) Rosalind & Alan Barwise (3) Catherine Murtagh and (4) Roger and Geraldine Barnes. The issues raised are as follows;

(1) Paul O'Toole

- The appellant is the owner and occupier of Level 5 located to the north-west of Ardeevin House.
- It is considered that the proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the site due to its scale, height and mass.
- The ridge line of the proposed extension would be 1.37m higher than that of the neighbouring property to the west no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace. It is considered that the rectangular form of the extension would appear monolithic in particular in its west facing side elevation. Raised plaster bands are proposed however, it is considered that these would have a minimal mitigating effect. It is considered the vertical emphasis of these would exaggerate the bulk of the extension. The appropriateness of the overall extension design is queried.

- The first floor windows of the proposed extension would overlook the appellant's property and due to the higher elevation of the site above the appellant's home the sense of overlooking would be exacerbated. It is noted during the summer months the extension would cause overshadowing of the appellants rear garden. It is considered that the extension would reduce sunlight from November to February into the appellant's living areas.
- The proximity of the proposed extension to the boundary, in particular the southwestern corner is raised.
- In relation to the design of the extension, it is considered that the ratio of solid to transparent in the front elevation would be discordant with the adjoining facades. The appropriateness of the insertion of a contemporary extension at this location adjacent to a pair of late Victorian dwellings is question.
- It is considered that the proposed development would have a negative impact upon the value of their property.
- The applicant's Engineers Cora Consulting Engineers have not carried out the geotechnical survey requested by the Planning Authority. The submitted report did not state how much rock would be involved in the excavation for the basement. The Planning Authority were satisfied with this response. However, the appellant considers the matter was not satisfactorily addressed.
- The required removal of rock during construction would result in substantial disruption due to possible protracted periods of noise, vibration and dust. It is noted that the development of a dwelling at the Muglins in the vicinity (Reg. Ref. D09A/0780) required the excavation of rock for four months. This level of excavation was not sufficiently identified at the planning stage. The noise and vibration generated had severe negative impacts upon surrounding residents including the appellant. In light of this it is requested that the Board consider the following mitigatory measures. That the top storey of the side extension back as far as the main house be omitted. Or that the roof level be reduce to the same height as the eaves of No. 4 Ardeevin Terrace and that the front of the extension be setback 2-3m.

(2) Rosalind & Alan Barwise

- The appellants are the owners and occupants of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace located to the west of Ardeevin House.
- The appellants considered the proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site due to the proposed scale, height and mass of the extension.
- It is considered the development would have an overbearing impact upon their property. The design of the extension is not considered sympathetic or in harmony with its Victorian setting. The visual impact of the extension would be increased because the appellant's property is below the level of Ardeevin House. The ridge height of the proposed extension would be 1.37m higher than that of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace.
- There would be overlooking from the first floor of the extension into the appellant's rear garden. The height and scale of the extension would result in the reduction of light into the drawing room, kitchen and a bedroom of their property.
- Concern is expressed that the proposed development would impact the dry stone boundary wall. It is noted that any removal of earth which supports this wall would destabilise it.
- The Terrace is built on the site of an old quarry and there are areas of granite. Therefore, the proposed development would require the breaking and removal of rock off site which would cause noise and vibration. It is noted that the southern part of the proposed basement is located 500m from the boundary wall. Any drilling works at this location would impact the appellant's property and the boundary wall.
- It is considered that the proposed addition to the mews would have a negative impact upon the appellant's visual amenities.
- It is considered that the proposed development would have a negative impact upon the value of their property.

(3) Catherine Murtagh

- The appellant's property is no. 3 Ardeevin Terrace. It adjoins no. 4 which is a direct neighbour of the appeal site at Ardeevin House.
- It is noted that Ardeevin House and Ardeevin Terrace were constructed at the same time and are of a similar design and scale. It is considered that the proposed extensions to Ardeevin House would appear bulky and visually dominant.
- It is considered that the development would be visually overbearing when viewed from the neighbouring property no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace and also from the appellant's property. Concern is expressed that the proposed development would cause overshadowing of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace.
- It is considered that the proposed development would have a negative impact upon the value of property in the vicinity.
- The appellant's experience when constructed a kitchen extension to their property was that granite was encountered close to the surface. Concern is therefore expressed that the proposed development will involve the removal of a significant amount of rock particularly in constructing the basement. The potential noise and vibration which would be generated are of concern in terms of disturbance and also potential damage to the appellant's property.
- It is considered that the proposed extension is excessive in scale for the site and that an extension of reduced scale would be more appropriate and in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding properties.

(4) Roger and Geraldine Barnes

- The appellants live at the property Moreanna, 9 Ardeevin Road which is located behind the appeal site.
- The proposed extension is considered excessive in term of size and height.
- Concern is expressed that the proposed extension would directly overlook the rear of the appellant's house. The proposal would significantly increase the window area of the property which the appellants consider would limit their enjoyment of their rear garden.

- The subject extension is considered out of character with the Victorian style of Ardeevin House and the four properties on Ardeevin Terrace.
- The development would require considerable rock excavation which will cause a significant level of disruption to the neighbouring properties. It is noted that the development carried out at the property 'The Muglins' created problems for the neighbouring properties on Ardeevin Terrace and Ardeevin Road.
- The appellants state that they have no objection to the extension of the property which would be in keeping with the Victorian character of the neighbouring houses both in terms of height and mass.

6.2. Applicant Response

A response to the 4 no. third party appeals was submitted by Marston Planning Consultancy on behalf of the applicant James Corrigan. The issues raised are as follows;

- In relation to the matter of the bulk, mass and scale of the proposed development, it is submitted that the proposed extension's bulk, mass, scale and form has been carefully designed by the project architects de Blacam and Meagher. It is considered that it represents a high quality architectural response which will enhance and contribute positively to the area. The proposal will not result in a dominant or overbearing form of development at this location.
- The extension extends only 1.5m beyond the original rear elevation of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace. The extension would be located between 2.9m and 3.9m from the eastern gable elevation of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace which contains no windows. There are ground and first floor windows within the rear return and extension of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace that face towards the proposed extension. These windows will be circa 8m from the south-west corner of the proposed extension and will not suffer any loss of light or visual impact.
- In relation to the proposed height of the extension and the statement in an appeal that the development will be 1.37m higher than that of no. 4 Ardeevin

Terrace, this incorrect. The ridge line of the proposed extension would be circa 650mm lower than the neighbouring property to the west no. 4. It is also noted that the proposed extension to the side would be 540mm lower than the existing extension which it is proposed to demolish.

- Regarding the design of the west facing side elevation, it is stated that this side elevation which is two-storey would address the blank elevation of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace. The extension would only extend circa 1.5m beyond the side elevation of no. 4 and will be visible over the boundary wall. It is considered that the bulk of the extension is broken in two parts from the side by the creation of two rectangular raised plastered bands which meet in the centre.
- In relation to the design of the front façade the first party disagrees with the assertion that the front façade will result in a discordant façade. It has been carefully designed to provide a contemporary response to the existing house and fenestration patterns of the Victorian property. It will read as a modern intervention which would be respectful of the Victorian design form of Ardeevin House.
- The height and form of the proposed extension is subordinate to the original house in terms of height aligning with the eaves.
- Regarding the matter of the proximity of the extension to adjoining boundaries, it is considered that the distance of the south-west corner of the side extension would not create a visually jarring and inappropriate relationship between both properties. The distance between the side of the extension and the inside of the boundary wall on site ranges from 0.815m to 2.43m. The visual impact of this corner of the extension would be reduced as it only extends 1.5m beyond the rear elevation of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace and due to the angled nature of both houses to each other. A separation distance of 2.9m-3.9m is provided between the proposed extension and the side elevation of no. 4 Ardeevin. The existing boundary wall and fence will further serve to reduce the visual impact upon no. 4.
- Regarding the issues of overlooking, privacy, overshadowing and loss of light which are referred to in the appeal submitted by Paul O'Toole, it is

acknowledged that Ardeevin House is positioned on a higher elevation than the surrounding dwellings. Due to the elevation of the site there are uninterrupted views to Dublin Bay to the north from Ardeevin House. The appellant's property Level 5 and also Moreana are positioned at a much lower ground level. Having regard to the differential in site levels it is stated that there is no potential for overlooking from the side extension into the rear gardens or the properties themselves. Moreana has a ridge level of 42.44m which is 3.5m below the ground level of Ardeevin House. The dwelling Moreana is located circa 30m from Ardeevin House which is in excess of the 22m required between opposing windows.

- The property Level 5 has a ridge level of 44.17m and it is 1.82m below the ground floor of Ardeevin House. The ground floor level to the rear of Level 5 is 6-7m below the ground floor of Ardeevin House. The separation distance between the two houses is significantly above the 22m separation distance beyond which overlooking is viewed. Therefore, the proposal would not result in overlooking of those properties.
- The rear of the proposed extension also would not result in additional overlooking of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace. One bedroom is proposed to the rear at first floor level in a similar position as the existing extension. The relationship in terms of privacy as a result of the extension on no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace will remain the same.
- Regarding the issue of overshadowing due to the slope of the neighbouring gardens and the north facing gradient of this part of Dalkey it is stated that the proposed extension would have no impact on the existing dwellings and their rear gardens to the north. The distance and orientation between Ardeevin House and the dwelling Level 5 means that no overshadowing or loss of light will occur during winter and also at the Spring and Autumn equinoxes. Therefore, adequate sunlight and natural light will continue to reach the appellant property at all times of the year.
- No. 4 Ardeevin Terrace is located to the west-north-west of the extension and therefore the proposal will not result in any discernible levels of overshadowing.

- The visual impact of the proposal is referred to in the appeal from Catherine Murtagh where it was stated that the west facing side of the extension will be visually dominant when viewed from the rear garden of the no. 3 Ardeevin Terrace. In response to this it is considered that the preserved visual impact and proximity of the proposed development have been overstated. The scale of the extension is subordinate with its height aligning with the eaves of the original house.
- In relation to the proposed basement construction the appeals expressed concern regarding the amount of rock removal that may required, the disturbance of vibration and noise relating to neighbouring house and possible prolonged disturbance. The basement was subject of specific consideration by the design team which included CORA Consulting Engineers. The reports prepared by CORA Consulting Engineers submitted with the application as well as the response to the further information and clarification of further information have provided a full and comprehensive assessment of all matters relating to the proposed basement construction. Appropriate monitoring practices will be put in place to monitor the vibration on the adjacent structures. The structural construction methodology is wholly in accordance with best practice and will ensure the structural stability of the house on site and also neighbouring properties. The Planning Authority in their grant of permission attached a condition in respect of the hours of operation on site in order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity. A condition specifically in relation to vibration was not attached, however the first party would be the amenable to such a condition should the Board decide to grant permission.
- Regarding the matter of impact on property values it is reiterated that the proposed development has been carefully designed and articulated by the project architects in order to successfully integrate into the streetscape. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed development will affect property prices in the area.
- In relation to the proposed mews extension the boundary wall is only circa 300mm high within the site at the location of the proposed modest extension. The mews extension will be built entirely within the red line site boundary. The

extension will be timber clad to the side elevation facing the rear garden of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace, this will ensure that its visual impact will be significantly mitigated for its 4m length.

- The appeal submitted by Paul O'Toole suggested specific design amendments. It is considered that there are no grounds for the suggested mitigation measures.
- It is requested that the Board uphold of the decision of the Planning Authority, given that the proposed extension (with basement) is at an appropriate scale and is fully in keeping with the height and form of the existing house and neighbouring properties.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- The Board is referred to the previous Planner's Report.
- It is considered that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matters which in the opinion of the Planning Authority would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

6.4. Observations

Observation to the appeal were submitted by Ashley and Charlotte O'Brien. The issues raised are as follows;

- The Observers own no. 1 Ardeevin Terrace located within a development of 7 no. dwellings.
- The original houses including Ardeevin House date from 1860.
- In recent years two further dwellings were constructed within the road. The additional properties have increased traffic onto the existing road serving the development. The building of these properties generated parking and traffic particularly during construction including lorries, construction machinery and from deliveries. This led to disruption and congestion.

- Having regard to the scale of proposed extension to Ardeevin House, it is considered that similar issues will arise in terms of congestion due to construction traffic and parked vehicles.
- The site is located on an old quarry where there is granite. The development would entail rock breaking which would generate significant noise and disruption. The previous development of new properties in the area during the construction phase was detrimental to existing residential amenities. It is requested that the Board take these matters into consideration in assessing the appeal.

7.0 **Assessment**

The main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal and the observation to the appeal. I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise. The issues can be dealt with under the following headings:

- Design and impact upon residential amenity
- Appropriate Assessment

7.1. **Design and impact upon residential amenity**

- 7.1.1. The primary issues raised in the third party appeals refer to the proposed design of the extension in terms of its scale and the appropriateness of the contemporary extension design in the context of the existing Victorian property and neighbouring Victorian properties. It is proposed to demolish the existing extensions to the side and rear of the dwelling and construct a two-storey extension. The first party stated in their appeal response that the proposal has been carefully designed by the project architects and that the bulk, mass and scale of the proposed development was considered in the context of the existing property Ardeevin House.
- 7.1.2. Regarding the proposed contemporary design of the extension and specifically the front elevation, the first party stated that they would disagree strongly with the

narrative in the appeals that the proposed extension would result in a discordant façade. The first party note in their response that the design of the extension follows the fenestration patterns of the Victorian property in terms of their vertical emphasis. The first party also highlighted that the height and form of the proposed extension is subordinate to the original house in terms of the proposed height aligning with the eaves. They submit that proposed extension will read as a modern intervention which would be respectful of the Victorian design form of Ardeevin House.

- 7.1.3. I consider the contemporary extension design is of a high quality. The design and proportions of the fenestration at ground level and first floor level reflect those of the existing windows. I consider the given the setback of 1.5m of the side extension from the existing front building line and the marginal lower height of the extension of 500mm at the intersection of the extension and the main building that this provides an appropriate transition between the original and new sections of the property. While I note that there would be predominantly a glazed finish to the front elevation having regard to the proposed metal cladding within the large section of glazing, I consider this sufficiently breaks up the void area. I consider that the proposed design provides a clear delineation between the original and contemporary elements of the scheme. In terms of this design approach it represents best practice as the extension would be clearly legible as a later addition to the property.
- 7.1.4. Accordingly, I would concur with the opinion of the first party that the represents a high quality architectural response which will enhance and contribute positively to the area. The proposed extension is subordinate to the main dwelling and consequently I am satisfied that it would not result in a visually dominant form of development at this location.
- 7.1.5. The appeals also raised the issues of overlooking, overshadowing, overbearing, proximity to boundaries, the proposed basement and impact on property valuation.
- 7.1.6. In relation to the matter of overlooking having assessed the submitted drawings and having regard to the extensive separation distance between the front of the extension and the appellants properties to the north of in excess of 26m, I am satisfied that it will not result in any undue overlooking. I note that there would no new overlooking of the adjacent property to the west no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace. Regarding the issue of overshadowing this is raised in respect of the property 'Level

5' located to the north-west of the site. Having regard to the separation distance between the two properties and the location of 'Level 5' to the north and the sloping nature of the area, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in any undue overshadowing of this property.

- 7.1.7. The issue of potential overbearing impact is referred to in respect of the neighbouring property of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace to the west. The proposed extension would extend back 11m from the front building line and it would only marginally exceed the rear building of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace. I note that a minimum separation distance of 2.9m will be provided between the side of the extension and the side of this dwelling. This separation distance increases to 3.9m at the front of the extension due to the orientation of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace which is marginally angled away from Ardeevin House toward the north. Accordingly, having regard to the siting and design of the proposed extension relative to no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace, I am satisfied that there would be no undue overbearing impact.
- 7.1.8. The appellants resident at no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace also had concerns regarding the boundary wall and also the potential visual impact of the extension to the mews house to the rear of the site. Regarding the protection of the boundary wall as detailed in the first party appeal response the project engineers, Cora Consulting Engineers have advised that provisions will be made for temporary support structures to be installed during works to allow for retention of the existing boundary wall. In order to ensure this is carried out I consider that it would be appropriate to attach a condition to address this.
- 7.1.9. The first party in their response have confirmed that the mews extension will be built entirely within the red line site boundary and that it will feature timber cladding to the side elevation which addresses the rear garden of no. 4 Ardeevin Terrace. I consider that this will satisfactorily reduce any potential visual impact.
- 7.1.10. Having reviewed the design and layout of the proposal relative to the existing surrounding properties, I consider having regard to the proposed siting of the buildings and relative separation distances to the existing property that the proposed scheme would not result in any undue overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing of neighbouring residential properties.

- 7.1.11. A number of appeals raised the issue of potential impacts from construction works and specifically in relation to the construction of the basement. The appellants have highlighted the prevalence of granite bedrock at this location. I note that the proposed works would involve the removal of rock. The Planning Authority in their assessment of the proposal required the submission of further information and specifically in relation to the proposed basement. They requested the submission of a Site Specific Construction & Environmental Management Plan, a Geotechnical Site Survey/Report to include full details of excavation works and details of Management and Mitigation measures in relation to excavation works.
- 7.1.12. The appellants have specific concerns in relation to the amount of rock removal that may required, the disturbance of vibration and noise relating to neighbouring houses, and possible prolonged disturbance. The project Engineers CORA Consulting Engineers prepared the following reports in respect of the proposal, Buildability Report and Construction and Environmental Management Plan. As detailed in the Buildability Report the proposed finished floor level of the basement is 43.41m approximately 2.8m below the existing ground floor level. The report advised in respect of the proposed excavations that at trial pit no. 01 the bedrock level was not established. Records of trial pits indicated that no rock was encountered at a depth of 42.21m OD and the ground level is approximately 44.81 AOD. The basement formation level is at 42.91m. It was concluded in the Buildability Report that no rock is expected to be encountered at the front basement excavation. It is advised in the report that should rock removal be required to the rear of the excavation that rock breaking would be carried out using hydraulic rock splitting. This technique is noted in the report to provide for the minimisation of noise, vibration and the extent of rock breaking.
- 7.1.13. Regarding the generation of vibration during excavation, it is proposed to install vibration monitors on the eastern and western boundary walls. The monitors will be installed a minimum of one week prior to bulk digging works to establish a baseline level. It is detailed in the Buildability Report that vibration levels will be restricted in accordance with BS 5228 – 2:2009 +A1:2014 ‘Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open sites’.
- 7.1.14. The Construction and Environmental Management Plan also outlines the proposed measures to be carried out in respect of vibrations. I also note that it is stated in the

Plan that additional vibration monitoring stations could be installed on adjoining properties should they be requested by the property owners. I consider that this satisfactorily addresses concerns of appellant in relation to potential vibration.

7.1.15. The Planning Authority in their grant of permission attached a condition in respect of the hours of operation on site in order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity. A condition specifically in relation to vibration was not attached, however the first party would be amenable to such a condition should the Board decide to grant permission. As detailed above I consider that appropriate monitoring practices will be put in place to monitor the vibration in accordance with the details provided in the Construction and Environmental Management Plan and Buildability Report. Therefore, I do not consider it necessary to attach a condition specifically in relation to vibration.

7.1.16. In order to ensure that construction and demolition works on site would have as limited an impact as possible, I consider that should the Board decide to grant permission that a condition be attached requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan which was submitted to the Planning Authority on the 19th of June 2020. In relation to the hours of operation for site development and building works, I note that the condition attached by the Planning Authority limited it to between the hours of 08.00 to 17.00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08.00 to 14.00 hours on Saturdays. I consider these hours are reasonable and appropriate and should the Board decide to grant permission I would recommend that the same operating hours are conditioned.

7.1.17. The appeals raise the matter of impact on property values. Having regard to the nature of the proposal, an extension to existing property in a residential area, I do not consider that the proposal would negatively affect property prices in the area.

7.1.18. The observation to the appeals raised the matter of potential disruption which could result from construction traffic. I consider that it can be satisfactorily addressed by the attachment of a condition in respect of the implementation of the Construction Environmental Management Plan.

7.2. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.2.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development which consists of an extension to a property, and the location of the site within an established urban area, and its distance to the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend a grant of permission.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the pattern of development in the area and the design and scale of the proposed extensions and to the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council Development Plan 2016-2022 it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or the character of the streetscape and would not seriously injure the amenities of nearby dwellings. 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 19th day of June 2020 and the 12th day of August 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. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. The hardstanding areas shall be constructed in accordance with the recommendations of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure a proper standard of development.

3. Details of the external finishes to the proposed extension shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

4. The existing site boundary walls shall not be damaged or undermined as a result of the proposed works. Specifically, measures shall be implemented to provide for temporary support structures to be installed during works to allow for retention of the existing western boundary wall. Any damage to existing walls shall be repaired in a manner which matches the existing walls on site.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

5. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1700 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or public holidays. Deviation from these times shall 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.

6. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with the Construction and Environmental Management Plan which was submitted to the Planning Authority on the 19th day of June 2020.

Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.

7. 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 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 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.

Siobhan Carroll
Planning Inspector

3rd of December 2020