



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-308545-20

### Development

Alterations and extension to existing single storey dwelling house comprising alterations to the front façade, construction of extension for new first floor level, including terrace, and part two storey, part one storey rear extension together with internal alterations and associated site and ancillary works.

### Location

Nantasket, Coast Road, Kilmichael East, Fountainstown, Co. Cork.

### Planning Authority

Cork County Council

### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

20/05130

### Applicant(s)

Daniel & Stephanie Rock

### Type of Application

Permission

### Planning Authority Decision

Grant, subject to 14 conditions

### Type of Appeal

Third Parties -v- Decision

### Appellant(s)

Arthur and Ann Marie O'Leary

Michelle and Barry Manze

**Observer(s)**

Conor McNeice and Mairead O'Leary

Maolisa, Derval and Dana Dempsey  
and Ann Coughlan

**Date of Site Inspection**

18<sup>th</sup> February 2021

**Inspector**

Hugh D. Morrison

## 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
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy and Context.....	6
5.1. Development Plan.....	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations .....	6
6.0 The Appeal .....	6
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	6
6.2. Applicant Response .....	9
6.3. Planning Authority Response .....	12
6.4. Observations .....	12
6.5. Further Responses.....	13
7.0 Assessment .....	14
8.0 Recommendation.....	19
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	20
10.0 Conditions .....	20

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The site is located 2.4 km due south of Crosshaven in a position on the Coast Road (R612) between Myrtleville, which is 0.3 km to the north north-east, and Fountainstown, which is 1 km to the west south-west. This Road runs on a roughly east/west axis as it passes along the northern coastline to Ringabella Bay. This coastline rises at moderate/steep gradients and it is punctuated by dwelling houses, the majority of which are above the level of the Road, while a minority are either level with it or below the level of this Road. Each dwelling house is detached and set within its own grounds. While the sizes and designs of dwelling house vary considerably, at the upper level nearly all are either single storey or single storey with a first floor either wholly or partly within the roofspace.
- 1.2. The site itself is towards the eastern end of the Coast Road. It is of rectangular shape and it extends over an area of 0.176 hectares. A flat-roofed, single storey, three-bed dwelling house (92.18 sqm) is presently sited within the southern half of this site. The site is accessed off the Coast Road by means of a steep driveway and the land comprised in this site to the rear of this dwelling house rises further at a steep/moderate gradient. To the east, the neighbouring two dwelling houses are of single storey form and they, too, are sited within the southern halves of their sites. To the west, the neighbouring dwelling house is of single storey form and it is the first of a long row of dwelling houses which are sited within the northern halves of their sites.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The proposal would entail the following elements:
- Alterations to the front façade, i.e. the replacement of a window and a door by two circular windows,
  - Construction of a first-floor extension and an accompanying terrace to the front, and
  - The demolition of the existing single storey rear extension (12 sqm) and the construction of a new part two storey, part one storey rear extension.

- 2.2. These elements would be undertaken in conjunction with internal alterations and associated site and ancillary works. In total 101.9 sqm of new floorspace would be added and so the overall floorspace of the extended dwelling house would be 182.08 sqm.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

Following receipt of further information, permission was granted subject to 14 conditions.

### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

Further information sought with respect to the following:

- Contextual plans of the proposal in conjunction with the dwelling houses on either side of the site,
- Omit habitable room windows on the eastern and western elevations of the proposed first floor and ensure that westerly views from the proposed terrace are screened,
- Re-site the proposed soakaway on the eastern side of the site and down gradient from the percolation area, and
- Prevent surface water run-off from the driveway onto the Coast Road.

#### **3.2.2. Other Technical Reports**

- Cork County Council
  - Area Engineer: Following receipt of further information, no objection, subject to conditions.

## **4.0 Planning History**

No recent planning history on the site.

## **5.0 Policy and Context**

### **5.1. Development Plan**

Under the Cork County Development Plan 2014 – 2020 (CDP), the Coast Road is designated as a scenic route and the surrounding area lies within the Indented Estuarine Coast Landscape Character Type, which is deemed to be of very high landscape value and sensitivity and national importance.

Under the Bandon Kinsale Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017 (LAP), the site is shown as lying inside the development boundary around Crosshaven and Bays and in an existing built up area. On the opposite, seaward side of the Coast Road from the site, the land is zoned open space, which is subject to Objective O-08, “Open space to maintain the character of the coastal landscape and ensure protection of seaward views.”

### **5.2. Natural Heritage Designations**

Cork Harbour SPA (004030)

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

(a) Arthur and Ann Marie O’Leary of Upper Deck (dwelling house to the east of the site), Coast Road, Fountainstown

- Privacy and overlooking

Attention is drawn to the separation distance of c. 14.5m between Nantasket and the appellants’ dwelling house, which has an c.0.5m lower ground floor level. The western side elevation of this dwelling house has habitable room windows and the front (southern) elevation has a bay window. While the appellants welcome the further information revisions to the proposal, they are concerned that the incidence of windows in the proposed rear portion of the applicants’ extended dwelling house would, in the absence of a boundary treatment, lead to overlooking/loss of privacy.

Existing levels of overlooking from within the grounds of Nantasket would be exacerbated by the proposed first floor terrace.

- Overshadowing and light

Attention is drawn to the west south-west position of Nantasket in relation to the appellants' dwelling house and the consequent implications for late afternoon/early evening lighting of their dwelling house under the proposal.

While the difference in the overall heights of the two dwelling houses would be 0.6m, the mass of Nantasket under the proposal would greatly increase and it would not be comparable with the appellants' dwelling house. Visual intrusion would thus result.

Illumination within the extended Nantasket would protrude through high level windows and alter the dark sky outlook that the appellants presently enjoy to the west of their dwelling house.

- Inappropriate development

- Out of character with its surroundings:

Attention is drawn to the Coast Road, which is a scenic route, and the pattern of development along it. Thus, to the south, dwelling houses are sited at a lower level and are thereby hid from view, while, to the north, they are generally sited in recessed positions and so of limited visibility. Nantasket, the appellants' dwelling house, and a further dwelling house to the east were built in more forward positions and so, under the proposal, Nantasket would be conspicuous. It would also be more visible than the other two storey dwelling houses further to the west, which tend to be of dormer design and sited in recessed positions.

- Overdevelopment:

Attention is drawn to the applicants' design statement, which identifies the need for upgrading and repair work to Nantasket if it is to be made habitable and energy efficient. Attention is also drawn to the scale of the proposal which would result in a virtual doubling of the existing floorspace. Objective RCI 8-1 of the CDP states that renovations/extensions should

be sympathetic, and the Planning Authority's practise elsewhere is to seek to ensure that extensions are ancillary in scale.

- Other matters – design and viability

The applicants' statements concerning the need for the proposal to ensure the viability of the dwelling house are neither relevant to planning nor do they comport with renovation/extension options that would avoid the addition of a first floor.

Under the proposal, daytime accommodation would be provided within the proposed first floor. Its location there would lead to greater noise and disturbance for the appellants than if night time accommodation had been proposed for this floor. In this respect, the existing ground floor enjoys seaward views and so such views would continue to be available at this level to any day time use of this floor.

(b) Michelle and Barry Manze of Invernia (dwelling house to the west of the site), Coast Road, Fountainstown

- The appellants dwelling house lies at the eastern end of a row of dwelling houses that were purposefully set back in their siting to reduce their visibility from the Coast Road. Nantasket is sited in a forward position in relation to the appellants dwelling house. However, as it is single storey, its impact upon the visual and residential amenities of their dwelling house is limited: This would change under the proposal.
- Noise and disturbance from the proposed first floor living accommodation, including the proposed terrace, would adversely affect the appellants' amenities.
- The appellants use and value highly their front garden. Under the proposal, it would be overshadowed, and its amenity eroded.
- The proposal would adversely affect the visual amenities of the Coast Road, which is a designated scenic route.
- Due to its scale, mass, and height, the proposal would constitute overdevelopment, which would be overbearing.



- Comparisons with dwelling houses to the south of the Coast Road are misplaced as these dwelling houses are new builds, at a lower level, and unaccompanied by close neighbouring dwelling houses.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

In responding to both appellants, the applicants begin by setting the scene as follows:

- Context:

The topography of the site is described: Nantasket is 7.8m above the Coast Road and the rear of the site rises to 16.6m above this Road.

A multiplicity of sizes, heights, and designs of dwelling houses is evident along the Coast Road: The one commonality is the quest to maximise upon seaward views.

Relevant CDP and LAP designations/zonings are acknowledged.

- Architectural design

Nantasket is in need of extensive upgrading and repair.

The applicants purchased Nantasket as their principal family home and they are committed to its modernisation and extension for such use.

The extensive upgrading and repair needed is only viable if the existing dwelling house can be extended upwards as proposed. (Site topography makes extending to the rear prohibitively expensive). The alternative would entail the demolition of Nantasket and its replacement with a more extensive single storey dwelling house, an option the applicants do not favour.

The proposal would maximise on the existing garden space and its habitat value.

The design of the proposal would be contemporary and yet respectful of the existing dwelling house and the amenities of the neighbouring dwelling houses on either side.

Attention is drawn to the submitted contextual presentation of the proposal, which shows that its height would be minimised by the specification of a

shallow pitched roof. Consequently, its height would be similar to that of the nearest dwelling house to the east, while the relationship with the nearest dwelling house to the west is eased by its significantly higher ground floor level.

The design of the proposal is orientated towards the south to avail of the sweeping seaward views. Habitable room openings and the terrace would thus be in/on the southern elevation with only high level first floor windows in the eastern and western elevations.

To appellants (a):

- Privacy and overlooking

The openings at first floor level in the rear portion of the proposal would be over 14m from the common boundary with the appellants' residential property, i.e. in excess of standard separation distances. Ground floor openings are not subject to such standard separation distances.

No overlooking would ensue from the openings and terrace in/on the proposed southern elevation.

- Overshadowing and lighting

The proposal would entail the specification of a low-rise roof and so its height would be appropriate to the site and overshadowing of neighbouring dwelling houses would not, therefore, be an issue.

- Inappropriate development

The appellants view that Nantasket is "derelict" is misplaced and leads them to cite unduly restrictive provisions of the CDP.

The proposal would be in sympathy with both the existing dwelling house and its surrounding built and scenic landscape contexts.

- Design and viability

The appellants preference for the inversion of the layout of the proposal fails to recognise the applicants' understandable quest to make the most of the available seaward views.

To appellants (b):

- Loss of privacy

The appellants' dwelling house lies in a recessed position in relation to Nantasket. Under the proposal, overlooking of this dwelling house would not arise. To the contrary, their dwelling house, due to its elevated position, overlooks Nantasket.

- Loss of visual amenity

The proposal would maintain the existing relationships between Nantasket and neighbouring dwelling houses. Essentially, the height of this dwelling house would change. Views from the appellants dwelling house would be affected as a result, but, due to its elevated position, not significantly.

- Noise and disturbance

The proposal would be orientated towards the south and, insofar as it corresponds with the appellants residential property, this would be with its front garden rather than dwelling house.

- Overshadowing and loss of light

The proposal would entail the specification of a low-rise roof and so its height would be appropriate to the site and overshadowing of the appellants recessed dwelling house would not, therefore, be an issue.

- Adverse impact upon public amenity of the Coast Road

The Planning Authority in granting permission recognised that the proposal would not depart from the existing pattern of development along the Coast Road, which entails dwelling houses encroaching on the skyline. In this respect, the proposal would be significantly less dominant than some existing dwelling houses, due to its modest scale, site specific design, and low profile.

- Scale, mass, and height

Exception is taken to the description of the proposal as overdevelopment and its impact as overbearing.

- Development precedent

The multiplicity of designs exhibited by dwelling houses along the Coast Road is such that the question of precedent would not arise.

### 6.3. Planning Authority Response

None

### 6.4. Observations

(a) Conor McNeice and Mairead O'Leary of Silmaril, Coast Road, Fountainstown

- At present, the height of Nantasket is comparable to neighbouring dwelling houses, but due to its forward position, it is prominent from the Coast Road. Under the proposal, Nantasket would become visually obtrusive and out of keeping with these dwelling houses. It would also lead to overlooking.
- The depth of the site is such that the applicants could extend to the rear of Nantasket instead.
- The applicants' photographs taken from within Ringabella Bay are critiqued on the basis that they downplay how "forward" the proposal would be towards the Coast Road.

(b) Maolisa, Derval and Dana Dempsey of Lone Star, Poulgorm, Myrtleville and Ann Coughlan of Norman, Poulgorm, Myrtleville

- The precedent of two storey buildings is not valid in this case

Attention is drawn to the two distinct front building lines that apply (a) to dwelling houses to the west of Nantasket and (b) to Nantasket, and its neighbours to the east, i.e. Upper Deck and Cathernane. The former dwelling houses are set back on the hillside, while the latter dwelling houses are set forward. Two storey ones amongst the former dwelling houses thus have a discreet presence from the Coast Road, while the proposal would be conspicuous. Furthermore, it would be incongruous within the context of a row of art deco dwelling houses.

The depth of the site is such that the applicants could extend to the rear of Nantasket instead.

- Past breaches of development policy:

Notwithstanding Objective O-08 of the LAP, concern is expressed that the recent construction of Driftwood on the southern side of the Coast Road interrupts views from this Road and illustrates the need to protect the same.

- Architectural heritage:

Nantasket is neither a protected structure nor one identified in the NIAH. However, it should be protected as an example of local architectural heritage.

- Lone planner's decision:

Exception is taken to the case planner's conclusion that the proposal would be satisfactory within its context, which, the observers state runs contrary to public opinion.

- The addition of a balcony at ground level to the existing dwelling house:

Such a balcony would be intrusive and out of keeping with neighbouring dwelling houses.

- Financial concerns:

The applicants' contention that the demolition of Nantasket and its replacement with a larger single storey dwelling house would not have been economic is not a material planning consideration.

The proposal would risk the establishment of a further adverse precedent for dwelling houses that fail to be in sympathy with the scenic landscape of the area.

## **6.5. Further Responses**

None

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1. I have reviewed the proposal in the light of the Cork County Development Plan 2014 – 2020 (CDP), the Bandon Kinsale Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017 (LAP), the submissions of the parties and the observers, and my own site visit. Accordingly, I consider that this application/appeal should be assessed under the following headings:

- (i) Landscape, conservation, and visual amenity,
- (ii) Residential amenity,
- (iii) Water, and
- (iv) Appropriate Assessment.

### **(i) Landscape, conservation, and visual amenity**

- 7.2. Under the CDP, the site and the surrounding area lie within the Indented Estuarine Coast Landscape Character Type, which is deemed to be of very high landscape value and sensitivity and national importance. Under the LAP, the site is shown as lying inside the development boundary around Crosshaven and Bays and in an existing built up area.
- 7.3. Under the CDP, the Coast Road, which passes the site, is designated as a scenic route. Under the LAP, on the opposite (seaward) side of this Road from the site, the land is zoned open space, which is subject to Objective O-08, “Open space to maintain the character of the coastal landscape and ensure protection of seaward views.”
- 7.4. Collating these strands of planning policy, the site lies within both an important landscape and an area within which there is no in principle objection to development. The Coast Road running through this landscape is of scenic value due to the attractive sea views that it affords to the south over Ringabella Bay.
- 7.5. The site lies on the northern landward site of the Coast Road and it forms part of a row of dwelling houses that occupy elevated positions in relation to this Road. Appellants and observers draw attention to the siting of the existing dwelling house in a forward position within its site. In this respect, it is similar to the two neighbouring dwelling houses to the east, rather than the neighbouring dwelling house to the west,

which is the first of a row of dwelling houses that are sited further back on their respective sites. The existing dwelling house on the site is of single storey form, as are the two dwelling houses to the east. Appellants and observers contend that, within this context, the proposed first floor extension to the applicants' dwelling house would break from the existing pattern of single storey dwelling houses only in forward positions. If permitted, the applicants' proposal would lead to an unduly prominent and visually obtrusive dwelling house on the site.

7.6. During my site visit, I observed the existing dwelling houses along the upper (northern, landward) side of the Coast Road from public vantage points along the length of this Road both to the east of the site and to the west. I observed the variation in sitings highlighted by the appellants and the observers. I also observed the eclectic mix of dwelling houses in-situ borne of a variety in size and design.

- Approaching the site from the east, the Coast Road rises and the existing dwelling house is clearly visible in conjunction with the nearest neighbouring dwelling house to the east and, if viewed in a northerly direction, in conjunction with the nearest two neighbouring dwelling houses to the east.
- Approaching from the west, the Coast Road meanders and so views of the existing dwelling house fluctuate. Beyond this dwelling house and the two nearest dwelling houses to the east, lie a further three dwelling houses, the first two of which are visible. The second of these dwelling houses is particularly prominent, due to a combination of its siting in a position further forward again than the dwelling house on the subject site and to its gabled western side elevation, which is on the skyline. This elevation is long, it encompasses first floor windows within its gable, and it is finished in white render.

7.7. In the light of my site visit, I consider that the existing pattern of development includes not only the two rows identified by the appellants and observers but also the third row further to the east of the site, which includes the dwelling house with the prominent side elevation.

7.8. The applicants outline the factors that influenced their approach to the development of their site. Thus, the poor condition of the existing dwelling house, particularly its flat roof, and the adverse topography of land to the rear of this dwelling house

pointed towards the approach that they have adopted under their proposal. (They go on to contend that to extend to the rear would be prohibitively expensive, a view that the appellants and observers correctly identify as not being a material planning consideration).

- 7.9. The applicants draw attention to their commitment to retaining the elevations of the existing dwelling house, which exhibit an attractive art deco style of design, albeit with alterations to the front elevation to replace a window and a door with two circular windows. They also draw attention to the comparable height of their proposal with the nearest dwelling house to the east and to its lower height than that of the nearest dwelling house to the west, i.e. the proposed front parapet and ridge heights would be 61.020 and 61.184m OD, whereas that to the east and west would be 60.570 and 63.630m OD.
- 7.10. Appellant (a) draws attention to the greater mass of the dwelling house, as proposed, than their dwelling house to the east borne of its two storey form and low-pitched roof compared to their single storey form under a conventional double pitched roof with half gabled ends.
- 7.11. Appellant (b) draws attention to how the dwelling house, as proposed, would be more visible from within residential property than the existing one.
- 7.12. In relation to appellant (a)'s comments, I would make the following points:
- On approach from the east, the dwelling house, as proposed, would be viewed in conjunction with appellant (a)'s dwelling house to the east. Its greater mass would be evident alongside this dwelling house, albeit this would be relieved by the solid-to-void ratios of walls to openings/the recessed first floor terrace in the front elevation.
  - On approach from the west the dwelling house, as proposed, would be visible on the skyline to a greater degree than at present. However, such visibility would be "read" by road users travelling eastwards as typical of many of the dwelling houses on the upper side of the Coast Road and in particular it would be viewed against the backdrop of the dwelling house with the prominent side elevation, which I have described above. Within this context, the intrusion of the proposal upon the skyline would be seen as unexceptional.



- 7.13. In relation to appellant (b)'s comments, I note the considerably higher level of their dwelling house to that of the applicant's. Thus, the former dwelling house has finished floor and eaves levels of 59.080 and 61.620m OD, while the latter has comparable levels of 54.710m and 60.595m OD. The corner-to-corner separation distance between these two dwelling houses on a 45-degree line orientated south-east/north-west would be 28m. The common boundary between the two adjoining sites is the subject of planting which does/would provide partial screening. I consider that these levels, distances, and planting would lessen the visibility of the proposal from within the appellants' residential property.
- 7.14. In the light of the above considerations, I take the view that, while the proposal would cause the dwelling house to become more visible and prominent on the skyline than at present, within its context, this would not lead to the dwelling house appearing visually intrusive or obtrusive.
- 7.15. Returning to the details of the proposal, I welcome the applicants' commitment to conserving the elevations of the existing dwelling house. However, I consider that the proposed alterations to the front elevation would depart from this commitment and lead to the introduction of novelty that would struggle to cohere: For example, the purpose of the canopy that extends over the existing retained bay window and the existing front door would appear anomalous if this door is replaced, as proposed, by one of two circular windows. In these circumstances, I consider that the existing openings in the front elevation should be retained to ensure that this elevation remains coherent. Such retention should be conditioned.
- 7.16. During my site visit, I observed that, while there is planting to the side boundaries of the site, there would be scope for such planting to be augmented in a bid to ease the presence of the dwelling house, as proposed, when viewed from the neighbouring residential properties on either side. A landscaping scheme should be prepared of the existing planting within the site and of additional planting that would be contribute in this respect. Such a scheme could be conditioned.
- 7.17. I conclude that the proposal would be compatible with its landscape setting and with the visual amenities of the area. I conclude, too, that it would be compatible with the conservation interest of the existing dwelling house, provided the front elevation is retained in its unaltered state.

## **(ii) Residential amenity**

- 7.18. The appellants and observers express concern over the impact of the proposal upon the amenities of the adjoining residential properties on either side of the site. They draw attention to the inverted layout of the dwelling house, as proposed, which would have day time accommodation on the first floor and night time accommodation on the ground floor. Concern is expressed that the inclusion of a terrace on the first floor would be the source of noise and disturbance to neighbours. They also draw attention to the opportunities for overlooking/loss of privacy from this terrace, the proximity of the enlarged dwelling house to its site boundaries and the increased overshadowing that would ensue, and the prospect of light breakout from high-level windows and the lessening of dark sky experience.
- 7.19. Under further information, the applicants addressed the question of overlooking/loss of privacy by altering the originally submitted proposal to show only high-level windows in the side elevations of the proposed first floor extension. They also enclosed the exposed western side to the terrace. The applicants now insist that the orientation of front habitable room openings and the terrace is to the south, so as to avail of the seaward views of Ringabella Bay. They explain that the inverted layout of the dwelling house would ensure that these views are fully capitalised upon.
- 7.20. The applicants draw attention to the design of their proposal, which would incorporate a low-level roof in a bid to minimise its height. They also draw attention to the separation distances that would pertain between their dwelling house and the neighbouring ones on either side. Thus, while some increase in the overshadowing of neighbouring properties would result, this would be limited in its impact upon amenity.
- 7.21. I have reviewed the changes that were forthcoming under further information and I concur with the applicants that they have addressed the question of overlooking/loss of privacy. I am also satisfied that excessive overshadowing would not result from the proposal. The other concerns raised are that of noise and disturbance and night time illumination. The former has been addressed by the changes to the terrace secured under further information and the latter could be eased by the specification of a sensor to the staircase in the proposed rear extension.

7.22. I conclude that the proposal would be compatible with the residential amenities of the area.

### **(iii) Water**

7.23. The proposal is to alter and extend an existing dwelling house only. This dwelling house is served by the public water mains and an existing conventional septic tank system (reg. no. KTBP9GF2XM). Under the proposal, no changes in these respects are envisaged.

7.24. Under the proposal, a trench type soakaway as per BRE Digest 365 would be installed. Under further information, the siting of this soakaway was revised to ensure that it would not conflict with a percolation area. Likewise, the driveway to the dwelling house would be connected to this soakaway.

7.25. Under the OPW's flood maps, the site is not shown as being the subject of any identified flood risk.

7.26. I conclude that no water issues would arise under the proposal.

### **(iv) Appropriate Assessment**

7.27. The site is not in a European site. The nearest such site is the westernmost portion of Ringabella Bay, which forms part of the Cork Harbour SPA (004030). The proposal for the site is to alter and extend an existing dwelling house only. The site itself is thus already developed and in residential use. In these circumstances, no Appropriate Assessment issues would arise.

7.28. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the proposal, the nature of the receiving environment, and the proximity to the nearest European site, it is concluded that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise as the proposal would not 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. That permission be granted.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Cork County Development Plan 2014 – 2020 and the Bandon Kinsale Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017, the Board considers that, subject to conditions, the proposed alterations and extensions to the dwelling house on the site would be compatible with the landscape setting of the site, the conservation interest of the dwelling house, and the visual and residential amenities of the area. No water or Appropriate Assessment issues would arise. The proposal would thus accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>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 21<sup>st</sup> day of September 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.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed development shall be amended as follows:</p> <p>(a) The proposed alterations to the existing front elevation of the dwelling house shall be omitted, i.e. the existing window and door that were proposed to be replaced by two circular windows shall be retained.</p> <p>(b) The illumination of the proposed staircase shall be the subject of a light sensor.</p> <p>Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of visual and residential amenity.</p>

3.	<p>The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This scheme shall include the following:</p> <p>(a) Contoured drawings to scale of not less than 1:500 showing –</p> <p>(i) A survey of all existing trees and hedging plants on the site, their variety, size, age and condition, together with proposals for their conservation or removal, and</p> <p>(ii) The planting of trees and shrubs to augment existing planting along the site's eastern and western boundaries.</p> <p>(b) Proposals for the protection of all existing and new planting for the duration of construction works on site, together with proposals for adequate protection of new planting from damage until established.</p> <p>(c) A timescale for implementation.</p> <p>Deciduous trees shall be planted at not less than two metres in height and evergreen species at not more than 750 millimetres in height. Species to be used shall not include either <i>cupressocyparis x leylandii</i> or <i>grisellinia</i>. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In order to screen the development and assimilate it into the surrounding landscape, in the interest of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed extensions shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
5.	<p>The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p>

	<b>Reason:</b> In the interest of public health and road safety.
6.	<p>The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.</p>
7.	<p>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.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
8.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution of €732 (seven hundred and thirty-two euro) 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. The application of any indexation required by this condition 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.</p>

	<b>Reason:</b> 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.
--	--

---

Hugh D. Morrison  
Planning Inspector

23<sup>rd</sup> March 2021