



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-310708-21

Development	Change of use from single dwelling (protected structure RPS 262) to three independent residential units with all necessary associated refurbishment works and external site works.
Location	2 Rosebank Terrace, Upper Branch Road, Tramore, Co. Waterford.
Planning Authority	Waterford City & County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	21/110
Applicant(s)	Sharon & Sean Foster
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant, subject to 10 conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Parties -v- Decision
Appellant(s)	Ian Galvin & Others
Observer(s)	Bridie McNamara
Date of Site Inspection	24 th May 2022
Inspector	Hugh D. Morrison

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy and Context.....	5
5.1. National planning policies and advice	5
5.2. Development Plan.....	5
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	5
5.4. EIA Screening	6
6.0 The Appeal	6
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	6
6.2. Applicant Response	8
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	10
6.4. Observations.....	10
6.5. Further Responses.....	10
7.0 Assessment.....	11
8.0 Recommendation.....	17
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17
10.0 Conditions	17

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in Rosebank Terrace, which lies on the north-western side of Upper Branch Road, a residential street that radiates outwards from the town centre to the south. This terrace is set back from and elevated above the street level. It dates from c. 1890 and each of its 5 two-storey dwelling houses is a protected structure.
- 1.2. The eastern and central portions of the site are of regular shape, while the western portion tapers towards its narrow frontage onto Pond Road. (This frontage comprises a gateway to the site's rear garden). The total site area is 0.03 hectares. The site accommodates a two-storey dwelling house with a centrally sited two-storey return. This dwelling house has a total floorspace of 202.1 sqm (95.6 sqm on the ground floor and 106.5 sqm on the first floor). It affords four-bed/eight-person accommodation, although it is vacant at present.
- 1.3. The front elevation comprises three bays with a front door in the centre of these bays. External steps span the difference in levels between Upper Branch Road and the front door. The elevated front garden is in two halves on either side of these steps, and it is enclosed by means of railings and walls to the common boundaries on either side. Flights of external steps also span the difference in levels between Pond Road and the upper floor of the return and this floor and the lower floor. Two small sunken yards accompany this floor on either side of the return.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Under the proposal, the existing single dwelling on the site would be sub-divided to provide 3 self-contained residential units, i.e., 2 one-bed units at ground floor (GF) level and 1 two-bed unit at first floor (FF) level. The dwelling would be refurbished in conjunction with this sub-division and external site works would be undertaken, too.
- 2.2. The 3 residential units would vary in size. Thus, GF Unit A would have a floorspace of 36.9 sqm. It would utilise the ground floor of the return as a bathroom and a short passageway to the rear of the staircase as a lobby. GF Unit B would have a floorspace of 41.44 sqm and it would have a bathroom and a lobby installed within an existing rear room. Both these units would be accessed via the front door. FF Unit

C would have a floorspace of 101 sqm. It would utilise the first floor of the return as a bathroom and lobby, and it would be accessed from the rear off Pond Road.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Following receipt of further information, permission granted, subject to 10 conditions, including the following:

- No. 2: Detailed drawings of the replacement single glazed sliding sash windows for the front elevation and the removal of a satellite dish from this elevation.
- No. 3: All repairs to original features to be carried out in accordance with best conservation practice under the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The following further information was requested:

- Details of all materials to be used in replacement doors and windows:
Proposed front rooflight to be omitted,
- Floor plans to show internal storage spaces and principal dimensions and floor areas of each room,
- Revised proposals for bin storage, and
- Details of how fire-retardant measures would affect floors and ceilings.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Waterford City & County Council: Conservation Officer: Objection raised on the grounds that the number of the proposed units would establish an undesirable precedent and the works required to facilitate the necessary sub-division would not make a positive contribution to the character of the house or its setting. Following receipt of further information, advice given on conditioning (cf. Conditions Nos. 2 & 3).

4.0 Planning History

Pre-application consultations occurred with the Conservation Officer.

5.0 Policy and Context

5.1. National planning policies and advice

- Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines
- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments
Guidelines: Paragraph 6.9

5.2. Development Plan

Under the Tramore Local Area Plan 2014 – 2020 (LAP), the site is shown as lying within the town boundary and in an area zoned existing residential, wherein the objective is “To protect the amenity of existing residential development and to provide for new residential development at medium density.” The house on the site is identified under the RPS as protected structure 262 and under the NIAH as ref. no. 22816200. All five houses in Rosebank Terrace are protected structures and they are all included in the NIAH.

Policy AH4 of the Waterford County Development Plan 2011 – 2017 (as extended and varied) (CDP) states the following:

It is the policy of the Council to promote sympathetic reuse of structures. Proposed works to accommodate such change of use shall not detract from the building or not adversely damage or disturb protected species, and the new use shall make a positive contribution to the character of the building/streetscape or setting.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- Mid-Waterford Coast SPA (004193)
- Ballyvoyle Head to Tramore pNHA (001693)
- Tramore Back Strand SPA (004027)
- Tramore Dunes and Back Strand SAC & pNHA (000671)

5.4. EIA Screening

The proposal is essentially for a change of use from an existing single dwelling to three dwellings. As such it is not a project for the purpose of EIA.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appellants reside at Nos. 1, 4 & 5 Rosebank Terrace, Rosebank Cottage, and “Satina” Queen Street. They cite the following grounds of appeal:

(a) Impact on nature and character of the area

- Attention is drawn to the other 4 houses in Rosebank Terrace. These houses have been refurbished and they are each in single household occupancy. This approach and outcome provide an appropriate exemplar for the remaining house, i.e., No. 2.
- Rosebank Terrace is one of six maritime terraces in Tramore, which are either protected or included in the NIAH. They form part of the heritage of Tramore. All of the houses in these terraces are in single occupancy and so they have not been sub-divided internally and, externally, their gardens have not been sub-divided. While a small number of other maritime terraces near the sea front are not wholly in single occupancy use, the proposal would establish an undesirable precedent for the six terraces cited.

(b) Impact on the existing protected structure and adjacent protected structures

- Contrary to Policy AH4 of the CDP, the proposal would not represent the sensitive development of the house in question. In this respect, interventions needed to meet the Fire Regulations, sanitary servicing requirements, and necessary noise mitigation would militate against respect for the existing fabric. Likewise, these interventions would not, in the main, be readily reversible. Accordingly, they would have a significant adverse effect on the special interest of the house, as a protected structure.
- The advice of the Conservation Officer is cited. Her advice was previously followed in the refurbishment of Nos. 1 & 5 Rosebank Terrace. Objective AH4

of the LAP was thereby furthered, i.e., the retention of terraces of historic vernacular houses. It states that, if the principle of sub-division is to be acceded to, then 2 rather than 3 units should be proposed.

- The bin storage arrangements submitted under further information would upset the rhythm evident in the front gardens of Rosebank Terrace with their retaining walls that accompany steps from the gates to the paths leading to the front doors.

(c) Density of what is proposed/lack of control over future usage

- The house is of modest size and its sub-division to provide 3 units would represent an over intensification of use.
- SPPR 2 of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines states that no more than 50% of multiple unit proposals should be studio type ones. By contrast, under the current proposal, 2 of the 3 units would be of this type. While Section 2.22 allows for exceptions to be made “having regard to the overall quality of the development”, it is this very quality that the appellants consider to be absent.
- The applicants may be considering a Repair and Lease Scheme (RLS) for the house. This Scheme incentivises maximising on the number of units – hence the 2 small bedsits. While this standard of accommodation may facilitate the requirements of the Housing Department, it is not conducive to tenants remaining *in-situ* long term.
- The funding model of the RLS is reviewed and its suitability to the refurbishment of protected structures is questioned.
- The Planning Authority’s decision includes no condition prohibiting the subsequent use of the sub-divided house for holiday lettings, e.g., Air B n’ B. In the event that the Board is minded to grant, such a condition should be attached.

(d) Inadequacy of facilities being provided for occupants of development

- Storage: Internal storage was not originally proposed. Under further information, it was included but, contrary to SPPR 6 of the Guidelines,

reliance would be had upon wardrobe and hot press areas to make up the needed provision.

- Disabled access: No provision would be made in this respect.
- Waste disposal and use of front garden: Three independent units would require to each be served by three bins. While the first-floor unit would be able to use Pond Road to the rear for bin collection, the ground floor units would have to use Lower Branch Road with the inevitable blocking of the public footpath that that would entail for disabled users and those with prams.
- The storage arrangements for bins shown under revised plans would detract from the visual amenities of the area.

(e) Deficiency in car parking in area

- The growth of Tramore and its seasonal attractiveness to visitors has led to traffic congestion and a high demand for parking. Traffic management measures have been instigated and Upper Branch Road is the subject of a one-way system.
- Under the CDP, 1.5 spaces should serve each residential unit. At present the site is served by 1 off-street parking space, albeit one that is heavily constrained. The area surrounding the site includes 6 commercial/community uses that generate demand for finite on-street parking leading to significant problems of availability for existing residents. The proposal would simply exacerbate still further this situation.

6.2. Applicant Response

Housing policy

- Attention is drawn to Pillar 5 of the Rebuilding Ireland Action Plan, which promotes the utilisation of existing housing. This Pillar has prompted the National Vacant Housing Reuse Strategy 2018 – 2021, and the Bringing Back Homes Manual for the Reuse of Existing Buildings, which recognises the importance of rental properties.

- The existing house has five-beds, and it could afford accommodation to a 7-person household. The activity thereby generated would be greater than that which would occur under the proposal.

Housing standards

- The proposal would comply with the dimension and areas standards of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines. The first-floor apartment would significantly exceed these standards.
- Two bin options are outlined for the ground floor units: (a) in the front garden enclosed by the side boundary walls and new screen walls, or (b) in recessed spaces off the initial path between the front gate and steps. Given the single person occupancy of these units, bin sharing would be logical.

Impact on protected structure

- Externally, the proposal would entail the repair of the only original moulded timber side pilasters to the front door of the house still remaining in Rosebank Terrace and the replacement of uPVC framed windows with painted timber sliding sash ones.
- Alterations to two ground floor windows so that they function as doors to rear yards would not be visible from Pond Road.
- Internally, few original features remain. The layout of the first-floor would be retained as it is. Where compartmentalisation is required for the purpose of fire safety, this would be reversible and compatible with the retention of ground floor features.

Building regulations

- The house is in need of refurbishment regardless of whether it remains in single occupancy or, as under the proposal, becomes a multiple occupancy one. Thus, electrical and plumbing fittings all need to be replaced. The proposed hot water system would be demand-led and so the need for hot tanks would not arise.

Car parking

- The existing house has 2 car parking spaces associated with it as per CDP standards.
- Under the aforementioned Guidelines, the site is in an intermediate urban location, wherein a reduce car parking standard is applicable.
- Tramore Bus Station is close by, and so sustainable transport options exist.

Without prejudice to the above cited response, if the Board considers that the proposal would benefit from being laid out as a single unit on the ground floor, then the applicants would accept such an outcome.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

None

6.4. Observations

The observer, who resides at No. 3 Rosebank Terrace, supports the appellants appeal.

6.5. Further Responses

The appellants have responded to the applicant's response to their appeal.

Housing policy

- The national shortfall in residential accommodation is acknowledged. However, this does not justify *per se* the density of the proposal. The applicants signal that this may be too great. A reduction to two units remains to be illustrated by means of revised plans.
- The applicants have only referred to those wishing to rent. Testimony from a local auctioneer is submitted, which confirms that, with the higher incidence of working from home, Tramore is in high demand for owner-occupier housing.

Housing standards

- While it is acknowledged that the house at No. 2 is in need of refurbishment, it has not remained unoccupied since the 1990s, as students resided there in recent years.

Impact on protected structure

- Consultations only appear to have been held with the Housing Department rather than the Planning Department. While the application forms refer to contact with the Conservation Officer, no details are available.
- The incidence of uPVC windows and doors elsewhere on Rosebank Terrace is addressed.

Building regulations

- The key point with respect to activity and intensification of use is that, under the proposal services, would need to be provided in triplicate with all the attendant interventions.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. I have reviewed the proposal in the light of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines, the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines, the Waterford County Development Plan 2011 – 2017 (CDP), the Tramore Local Area Plan 2014 – 2020 (LAP), the submissions of the parties, and my own site visit. Accordingly, I consider that this application/appeal should be assessed under the following headings:

- (i) Intensity of use and conservation works,
- (ii) Car parking,
- (iii) Water, and
- (iv) Appropriate Assessment.

(i) Intensity of use and conservation works

- 7.2. Under the proposal the existing single dwelling on the site would be sub-divided to provide three residential units, i.e., two on the ground floor and one on the first floor. This dwelling, along with the other four dwellings comprised in Rosebank Terrace, is a protected structure, i.e., it is on the Record of Protected Structures (RPS) and it is also on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH). The dwelling is presently vacant and in need of some repair and the modernisation of plumbing and electrical fittings. The proposal would hold out the prospect of the reuse of this protected structure and its repair and modernisation. Under Policy AH4 of the CDP, the Planning Authority undertakes to promote the sympathetic reuse of protected structures.
- 7.3. The appellants raise objection to the intensity of use that would arise under the proposal. They draw attention to the fact that all the dwellings comprised in Rosebank Terrace are in single household occupancy at present and that this pattern of usage is replicated in directly comparable maritime terraces elsewhere in Tramore, i.e., other ones that are on the RPS and NIAH. They contend that there is a ready market for owner-occupied dwellings in Tramore and so they question the need for the dwelling to be sub-divided. They express concern that the interventions needed to facilitate the proposed intensity of use would have a significant adverse effect on the special interest of the protected structure.
- 7.4. The applicants have responded by citing national policies that promote the reuse of existing dwellings, the need for repair and modernisation that would arise under whatever intensity of use may arise, and the positive improvements that would be made to the dwelling under the proposal, e.g., the repair of the only original moulded timber side pilasters to the front door still remaining in Rosebank Terrace and the replacement of uPVC framed windows with painted timber sliding sash ones.
- 7.5. The appellants have responded to the applicants by stating that contributing to the solution of the housing crisis does not override the need to consider the appropriateness of the density envisaged for the protected structure in question. In this respect, the provision of services in triplicate would lead to a greater level of intervention than would be necessary were the dwelling to remain as a single unit or be sub-divided into two units.

- 7.6. Under the LAP, the site is shown as lying within the town boundary and in an area zoned existing residential, wherein the objective is “To protect the amenity of existing residential development and to provide for new residential development at medium density.” While I understand the reference in this objective to “new residential development” to be to new build residential development, it does envisage the densification of the lands thus zoned. By implication, if the amenities of existing residential development are protected, then, in the absence of any policy/objective to the contrary, the densification of existing houses would be consistent with this objective. In the current case, the house in question is a protected structure and so, under Policy AH4 of the CDP cited above, the critical issue is whether its reuse as proposed would be sympathetic to its special interest.
- 7.7. During my site visit, I observed that, due to the rising levels across the site from front to rear, the dwelling is capable of being accessed externally at both ground floor and first floor levels. The topography of the site thus provides the opportunity for separate front and rear accesses to be established. Accordingly, under the proposal, the first floor would be occupied separately from the ground floor.
- 7.8. During my site visit, I also observed that the ground floor and first floors in the main body of the house each comprise four spacious rooms with generous floor-to-ceiling heights. These rooms are laid out around the central circulation space, which comprises the hallway, staircases, and intermediate and final landings. At present, the kitchen is in the rear room on the LHS of the hallway and toilet and bathroom facilities are in the return at ground and first floor levels.
- 7.9. Under the proposal, the sub-division of the ground floor into effectively studio apartment type units would lead to kitchens being provided in each of the two front rooms and, in the case of Unit B, toilet and shower facilities would be inserted in what is at present the rear room on the RHS of the hallway. The pattern of four rooms at ground floor level would be lost as the internal wall between each of the front and rear rooms would be removed and the existing doors into the front rooms would be closed. A new door and lobby for Unit A would be installed to the rear of the staircase and a new door and lobby for Unit B would be installed in the existing rear room on the RHS of the hallway.

- 7.10. I consider that the loss of the existing layout of the ground floor would be to the significant detriment of the character of the house and it would stem directly from the quest to have two units rather than one on the ground floor. Likewise, the addition of a second unit necessitates greater intervention to provide toilet and shower facilities for Unit B and separate access arrangements for both units. I, therefore, consider that the ground floor should be used as one unit only. Such usage would afford the opportunity to minimise the interventions needed at this level, i.e., the kitchen could remain in its existing location and, as only one bathroom would be needed, it could be located, as proposed, in the ground floor of the return, where there is an existing toilet.
- 7.11. Turning to the first floor, I consider that in a bid to minimise the interventions that would be needed here, the proposed kitchen should be located above the ground floor one, i.e., in the rear room on the LHS rather than the front room on the LHS of the landing. I acknowledge that the initial staircase between the ground floor and the intermediate landing would need to be enclosed for the purpose of fire protection and privacy/security. However, such enclosure would be reversible, if the dwelling were to revert to use as a single dwelling in the future.
- 7.12. Externally, the above cited improvements by the applicants would be most welcome, as they would contribute to the restoration of the original character of the principal elevation of the house. Elsewhere, the appellants have critiqued the proposed siting of bin shed facilities for the ground floor units. The applicants have identified two possible locations, i.e., the first option, beside the boundary walls on either side of the elevated front gardens, forward of the principal elevation of the house and behind a new screen wall, and, the second option, in a new recessed space on either side of the initial path to the house behind the front gate.
- 7.13. The need for bins to serve the ground floor would effectively be halved by having only one unit at this level. Any use of the elevated front garden would be unduly conspicuous and somewhat impractical, given the steps that would need to be negotiated to reach street level. I, therefore, consider that the first option should be set aside in favour of the second option, which would provide a discrete and convenient solution to the problem of bin storage. (The first floor unit would be capable of being served by bin storage facilities in the rear garden adjacent to the vehicular gates to Pond Road).

- 7.14. The appellants draw attention to fact that the other dwellings in Rosebank Terrace are in residential use. They also draw attention to the absence of a condition requiring that the proposed units be used exclusively for residential purposes, i.e., not for seasonal holiday lettings. They request that, if the Board is minded to grant, then such a condition should be included. I consider that this is a reasonable request, in the interest of safeguarding residential amenity.
- 7.15. I conclude that, subject to the ground floor being used to provide a single residential unit only, the proposal would exhibit an appropriate density, which would be consistent with respect for the character of the house and compatible with the residential amenities of the area.

(ii) Car parking

- 7.16. Under the proposal, the single dwelling on the site would be sub-divided to provide three residential units. Accordingly, while the dwelling is presently vacant, it has the potential to accommodate a single household. Under the proposal, three households would be accommodated. *Ceteris paribus* it is reasonable to assume that an increase in the demand for car parking would arise, although this is not certain, e.g., the dwelling could be reused by a single household of adults that would match in number the adults that could be accommodated under the proposal.
- 7.17. The appellants draw attention to the fact that the site is served by only one off-street car parking space, which is accessed via a narrow gateway from Pond Road. They also draw attention to the existing high demand for finite on-street car parking spaces on Upper Branch Road and neighbouring streets for which there is competition, especially during the tourist season. They cite the CDP's car parking standards, which require 1.5 spaces for new build residential units, and they contend that the implications of the proposal for increased car parking demand is a further indication that the envisaged use of the site would be over intensive.
- 7.18. The applicants have responded by contending that two off-street car parking spaces would be available, that the site lies within an intermediate area and so a reduction in car parking provision is in order, and sustainable transport options are to hand, e.g., the bus station lies nearby on Lower Branch Road.
- 7.19. I undertook a site visit at 11am on Tuesday 24th May 2022, during which I noted that the site is close to the town centre, which is partially pedestrianised. I noted, too, that

this site is close to the town's bus station on Lower Branch Road, which is readily accessible via Train Hill, and which is accompanied by public car parks. I observed that Upper Branch Road is the subject of a one-way system in favour of northbound traffic only. The far-side of this Road from Rose Terrace is the subject of virtually continuous on-street car parking. Likewise, while Pond Road is the subject of intermittent double yellow lining, on-street car parking was occurring there, too.

7.20. In the light of the foregoing, I would make the following comments:

- I remain to be convinced that the site can accommodate, in practice, more than one off-street car parking space. Under the proposal, this space would serve the first-floor residential unit.
- I have no doubt that competition exists and would continue to exist under the proposal for on-street car parking spaces. That said, the site is close to town centre shops and services and the bus station and so having a car may not be a "necessity" for all future residents of the proposal.
- New build car parking standards are of limited relevance to the current proposal, which is for an intensification of use of the dwelling. As this dwelling is a protected structure, which would be extensively repaired and modernised to ensure its continued economic use, weight is rightly given to these conservation objectives.
- As discussed under previous headings, the reduction from three to two residential units would be welcome on conservation grounds. Such a reduction would also ease any potential additional pressure upon on-street car parking that would arise under the proposal.

7.21. I conclude that from a car parking perspective it would be desirable for the proposal to comprise two rather than three residential units.

(iii) Water

7.22. The site is an existing urban one, which is fully serviced by the public water mains and the public foul and stormwater sewerage system.

7.23. The OPW's flood maps do not show the site as being the subject of any identified flood risk.

(iv) Appropriate Assessment

- 7.24. The site is a fully serviced existing urban one and the proposal is for a change of use of the existing dwelling to three residential units. This site does not lie in or beside a European site and, under the proposal, it would continue to be serviced as at present. No Appropriate Assessment issues would therefore arise.
- 7.25. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the proposal, the nature of the receiving environment, and the proximity of the nearest European sites, 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

That permission be granted.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Waterford County Development Plan 2011 – 2017 (as varied and extended) and the Tramore Local Area Plan 2014 – 2020, it is considered that, subject to conditions, the proposal would fulfil the existing residential zoning objective for the site. Provided the ground floor is used for one residential unit only, the proposal would represent a sympathetic reuse of the house on the site, which is a protected structure. Policy AH4 of the Local Area Plan would thereby be adhered to. The car parking demand generated by the proposal reduced to two residential units would be capable of being met by a combination of on-site and on-street parking. 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.	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 10 th day of May 2021 and by
----	---

	<p>the further plans and particulars received by An Bord Pleanála on the 26th day of July 2021, 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>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed development shall be amended as follows:</p> <p>(a) The ground floor shall be laid out to provide one residential unit only. The kitchen shall remain in its existing location and the ground floor return shall be used to provide the only bathroom/toilet facilities for this residential unit. The existing rooms shall be retained as they are at present, including the doors to them from the hallway.</p> <p>(b) The first floor shall continue to be laid out to provide one residential unit only. The proposed kitchen shall be relocated to be above the ground floor kitchen.</p> <p>(c) The bin storage arrangements for the ground floor residential unit shall be provided in the proposed recessed spaces on either side of the initial path behind the front gate.</p> <p>(d) The bin storage arrangements for the first floor residential unit shall be provided in the rear garden.</p> <p>(e) Details of the proposed replacement 5 no. painted, 6/6 light, timber framed, sliding sash windows for the front elevation of the house.</p> <p>(f) Removal of the satellite dish from the front elevation of the house.</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>Reason: In the order to protect the character of the protected structure.</p>

3.	<p>(a) A conservation expert shall be employed to manage, monitor and implement the works on the site and to ensure adequate protection of the retained and historic fabric during the works. In this regard, all permitted works shall be designed to cause minimum interference to the retained building and facades structure and/or fabric.</p> <p>(b) All repair works to original features such as walls, gates, railings, the front door and its surrounds, plasterwork, and rainwater goods shall be carried out in accordance with best conservation practice as detailed in the application and the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht in 2011. The repair works shall retain the maximum amount of surviving historic fabric in situ and shall be designed to cause minimum interference to the building structure and/or fabric. Items that have to be removed for repair shall be recorded prior to removal, catalogued and numbered to allow for authentic re-instatement.</p> <p>(c) All existing original features, including interior and exterior fittings/features, joinery, plasterwork, staircases including balusters, handrail and skirting boards, shall be protected during the course of refurbishment.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the integrity of the retained structures is maintained and that the structures are protected from unnecessary damage or loss of fabric.</p>
4.	<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>Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.</p>

5.	<p>Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 6(5) of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended, or any statutory provision modifying or replacing them, the residential units shall not be used for short term lettings, as defined by Section 3A(5) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, without a prior grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.</p>
6.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution of €8,100 (eight thousand, one hundred 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> <p>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.</p>

Hugh D. Morrison
Planning Inspector

7th June 2022