



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP310994-21

Development	Two-storey extension to rear and side and new dormer box in roof plane of existing house.
Location	1 Dunseverick Road, Dublin 3.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB 1521/21.
Applicants	Kevin Collins and Danielle O'Sullivan.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant.
Type of Appeal	First Party -v- Condition.
Appellants	Kevin Collins and Danielle O'Sullivan.
Observers	Bernard and Carol Lynch.
Date of Site Inspection	15 th December, 2021.
Inspector	Paul Caprani.

Contents

1.0 Introduction	3
2.0 Site Location and Description	3
3.0 Proposed Development	4
4.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
4.1. Decision	5
4.2. Planning Authority's Assessment of the Application.....	5
5.0 Planning History.....	7
6.0 Grounds of Appeal.....	7
7.0 Appeal Responses.....	8
8.0 Observations.....	9
9.0 Natural Heritage Designations	9
10.0 EIA Screening Assessment	9
11.0 Development Plan Provision	9
12.0 Planning Assessment.....	11
13.0 Appropriate Assessment	16
14.0 Conclusions and Recommendation.....	16
15.0 Reasons and Considerations	16
16.0 Conditions	16

1.0 Introduction

ABP310994-21 relates to a first party appeal against a condition attached by Dublin City Council in its decision to grant planning permission for a two-storey extension to the rear and side together with a change in the roof profile to the gable at No. 1 Dunseverick Road, Clontarf/ Killester, Dublin 3. The appeal specifically relates to Condition 4 which requires the first-floor level of the proposed side and rear extension shall have a maximum depth of 3.5 metres. The grounds of appeal argue that this limitation on the proposed development is unwarranted. An observation was also submitted objecting to the proposed development outright.

2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. No. 1 Dunseverick Road is located in the suburban area of Clontarf to the immediate south of the Howth Road approximately 5 kilometres north-east of Dublin City Centre. Dunseverick Road runs in a north/south direction linking Castle Grove to the south and the Howth Road to the north. No. 1 is located on the east side of the road approximately 40 metres south of the junction with the Howth Road. It comprises of the northern dwelling in a pair of semi-detached houses facing eastwards onto the road. Both dwellings are two-storeys in height incorporating hipped gable roof pitches with a single storey garage to side. The dwellings date from the mid-20th century. No. 1 incorporates a rear garden c.24.5 metres in length. The northern boundary of the site runs adjacent to a small commercial district centre which accommodates retail and commercial developments at ground floor level with residential / office overhead. No 87 Howth Road forms part of this amalgamation of buildings to the north. The single storey element associated with the residential dwelling is contiguous to the subject site and faces eastwards onto Dunseverick Road. The rear of these buildings back onto the northern boundary of the site. No. 3 Dunseverick Road is located to the immediate south of the appeal site. It incorporates a small single storey extension along the rear width of the dwelling.
- 2.2. The existing dwelling on site accommodates living room and sitting room together with a kitchen/dining area and garage at ground floor level. Four bedrooms and a

bathroom are located at first floor level. The floor area of the existing dwellinghouse has a gross floor area of 125 square metres.

3.0 Proposed Development

- Planning permission is sought for the partial demolition of the existing kitchen/dining area and toilet to the rear of the site and the construction of a new extended ground floor rear extension along the northern boundary of the site to accommodate a new kitchen and dining area.
- A new utility room is to be located to the rear of what is currently the existing single storey garage and it is also proposed to provide a small bathroom off the existing hallway to the front of the house where the garage area was.
- It is also proposed to provide a new patio area and new raised planters to the area to the immediate south of the ground floor extension. The main window serving the ground floor extension is located to the rear overlooking the applicants' rear garden. The proposed new bathroom and utility area at ground floor level is to be single storey in height and is to be illuminated by rooflights.
- At first floor level it is proposed to provide a new study area, bathroom and bedroom replacing the existing small bedroom (Bedroom No. 4) at the north-eastern corner of the house. The footprint of the first floor extension is to replicate the ground floor of the kitchen and dining area below. The windows at first floor level facing south-east and north-west are to incorporate external fins to reduce the potential for overlooking. The rear window serving the bedroom at first floor level overlooks the rear garden.
- At roof level it is proposed to incorporate a new dormer box extension in the rear roof pitch together with two new velux rooflights at the front to incorporate a new study/storage area. The dormer box extends just below the ridge of the roof and is to incorporate a metal clad exterior. The dormer extension is to incorporate a floor to ceiling height of 2.4 metres.
- It is also proposed to provide a new garden room at the north-eastern corner of the rear garden. This garden room is to accommodate a seating area, a

storage area and a bathroom. It rises to a height of 3.35 metres and incorporates a flat roof with a render or high-quality cladding finish on the elevations fronting onto the garden and a render finish on the elevations adjacent to the boundary. A planted patio area is to be located adjacent to the garden room.

4.0 Planning Authority Decision

4.1. Decision

- 4.1.1. Dublin City Council issued notification to grant planning permission for the proposed development subject to 10 conditions.

Condition No. 4 requires that the development shall not commence until revised plans, drawings and particulars showing the following amendments have been fully submitted to, and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority and such works shall be fully implemented prior to the commencement of development.

Condition 4(a) requires that the first floor level of the proposed side and rear extension shall have a maximum depth of 3.5 metres measured from where it projects from the existing two storey building line.

Condition 4(f) states that there should be one window in the rear dormer box extension. This window shall have a maximum dimension of 1.4 metres (width) by 1 metre (height).

Condition 4(g) states that the proposed rooflights on the front plane of the roof of the house shall be omitted.

Condition 4(i) states that the windows to the attic development including the dormer window shall be permanently fitted with opaque glazing to at least 1.8 metres above the finished floor level.

4.2. Planning Authority's Assessment of the Application

- 4.2.1. A report from the Engineering Department Drainage Division stated that there is no objection to this proposed development subject to conditions.

- 4.2.2. A report from the Transportation Planning Division stated that there is no objection to the proposed development subject to standard conditions.
- 4.2.3. The planning report notes that the flat roof side extension would be 7.71 metres in depth along the boundary wall and project a further 4.8 metres to the rear of the existing rear building line. The flat roof extension would rise to 6 metres in height. This is considered excessive in terms of being overbearing and overshadowing neighbouring property. The first-floor extension shall be reduced in order that the first floor extension does not project in excess of 3.5 metres from the existing rear building line of the house. This shall be addressed by way of condition.
- 4.2.4. It is noted that the proposed development would involve the alteration of an existing fully hipped roof to provide a standard A gable elevation. Such an alteration would be inconsistent with the established character of the house. In this regard an alteration of the roof from a fully hipped roof to a standard A gable shall be omitted. The alternative would be to provide a side dormer box projecting to the side plane of the roof of the house with a fully hipped roof. This should be addressed by condition.
- 4.2.5. With regard to the rear dormer box, it is considered that the proposed rear dormer box is excessive to the existing roof and inconsistent with the requirements for dormer box extensions set out in the development plan. This shall be addressed by way of condition.
- 4.2.6. With regard to rooflights, the provision of rooflights in the front plane of the roof of the house would be contrary to the established character and would set an undesirable precedent for similar visually obtrusive and incongruous front extensions in the vicinity. In this regard the proposed rooflights in the front plane of the roof house shall be omitted.
- 4.2.7. The proposal also involves the insertion of a large window in the gable elevation of the house. Such a window is excessive in height and shall be reduced to maximum dimensions of 0.6 metres by 0.5 metres and be fitted with obscure glazing. The proposed window in the side dormer box projection shall be fitted with fully obscure glazing in order to protect residential amenity.
- 4.2.8. The planner's report therefore recommends that planning permission be granted for the proposed development subject to the modifications set out in Condition No. 4.

5.0 Planning History

- 5.1. No appeal files are attached.
- 5.2. The planner's report makes reference to a number of applications on the subject site that were declared invalid (Reg. Ref. 5011/05 and WEB 1515/21).
- 5.3. Reference is also made to Reg. Ref. 5810/05 which related to alterations to the front boundary to include new vehicular access piers and gates etc. However, this application was the subject of clarification for further information, and it appears that such further information was not submitted.

6.0 Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1. The decision of Dublin City Council was the subject of a first party appeal against Conditions 4(a), 4(f), 4(g) and 4(i). The grounds of appeal are outlined below.
 - 6.1.1. Condition 4(a) requires the first floor level of the proposed side and rear extension shall have a maximum depth of 3.5 metres measured from where it projects from the existing two-storey rear building line.
 - 6.1.2. It is considered that this condition is unwarranted. The applicants have set the first floor extension back from the front elevation by 4.8 metres. Furthermore, the extension has been stepped down by 500 millimetres to ensure it respects the scale and character of the existing house. It is considered that the proposed two-storey extension to the house is subordinate to the front elevation. It is noted that with the proposed works the rear private garden will be 235 square metres. With the proposed extension both the plot ratio and site coverage are considerably below the maximum guidelines set out in the development plan.
 - 6.1.3. A shadow casting assessment has also been undertaken which is contained in Appendix D of the appeal and it is stated that the proposed development will not directly impact at No. 187 Howth Road.
 - 6.1.4. The grounds of appeal go on to refer to numerous precedents where planning permission was granted for rear extension on a similar size and scale to that proposed under the current application. It is argued that the four precedents referred

to allowed for two-storey extension in excess of the condition attached in this instance.

6.1.5. Condition No. 4(f) states that there should be one window only in the rear dormer box extension and this window shall have maximum dimensions of 1.4 metres by 1 metre. In challenging this condition, reference is made to precedent decisions where planning permission was granted for dormer box windows and such limitations were not attached. Reference is made to four applications on Castle Grove and one on Dunseverick Road to support this contention.

6.1.6. Condition No. 4(g) states that the proposed rooflights on the front plane of the roof of the house shall be omitted.

In challenging this condition reference is made to precedent decisions where such velux type rooflights to the front plane were permitted. Reference is made to two extensions at Castle Grove and one at Dunseverick Road.

6.1.7. Condition No. 4(i) requires that the windows to the attic development including the dormer window shall be permanently fitted with opaque glazing to at least 1.8 metres above the finished floor level.

6.1.8. It is argued that there are no overlooking issues in respect of the current proposal as this window directly overlooks the rear garden and the nearest neighbouring first floor windows is over 30 metres away. This is in excess of the minimum requirements set out in the development plan (22 metres). Reference is made to precedent decisions for extensions to dwellings on Castle Grove and Dunseverick Road where such a condition was not attached.

6.1.9. The applicant accepts all the other conditions and limitations set down in Condition 4.

7.0 Appeal Responses

7.1. Dublin City Council have not submitted a response to the grounds of appeal.

8.0 Observations

8.1. One observation was submitted by the occupants of No. 187 Howth Road, the dwelling to the immediate north of the site. This observation wishes to object to the application for the following reasons:

1. The development will block all natural light from the back the observers house as it is two storeys high at the observers' boundary rising to three storeys with the attic conversion.
2. From a visual point of view, the observers will be looking at an 18 foot high wall.
3. The proposal constitutes a complete overdevelopment of the site and the entirety of the development is at the observers boundary.
4. It is stated that the building was extended before and no objection was made in respect of this.
5. The applicants have never approach the observers to address concerns or consult with neighbours in respect of the proposed development.

9.0 Natural Heritage Designations

9.1. The subject site is not located within or contiguous to a Natura 2000 site. At its closes point, the subject site is located approximately 2.4 kilometres from the North Bull Island SPA (Site Code: 004006) and the North Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000206).

10.0 EIAR Screening Assessment

10.1. An extension to an existing residential development is not a class of development for which EIAR is required.

11.0 Development Plan Provision

11.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 – 2022. The subject site is governed by the zoning objective Z1.

11.2. Section 16.2.2.3 relates to alterations and extensions. It states that Dublin City Council will seek to ensure that alterations and extensions will be sensitively designed and detailed to respect the character of the existing building, its context and the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

11.3. In particular extensions should:

- Respect any existing uniformity of the street, together with significant patterns, rhythms or groupings of buildings.
- Retain a significant proportion of garden space, yard or other enclosure.
- Not result in the loss of, obscure, or otherwise detract from the architectural features which contribute to the quality of the existing building.
- Retain characteristic townscape spaces or gaps between buildings.
- Not involve the infilling enclosure or harmful alteration of front lightwells.
- Furthermore, extensions should be confined to the rear in most cases.
- Be clearly subordinate to the existing building in scale and design.
- Incorporate a high standard of thermal performance and appropriate sustainable design features.

11.4. In addition to the above, alterations and extensions at roof level, including roof terraces are to respect the scale, elevation proportions and architectural form of the building and will:

- Respect the uniformity of terraces or groups of buildings with a consistent roofline and not adversely affect the character of terraces with an attractive varied roofline.
- Not result in the loss of roof forms, roof coverings or roof features where they are of historic interest or contribute to the local character and distinctiveness.

11.5. Section 16.10.12 of the Development Plan also relates to extensions and alterations to dwellings.

11.6. The design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular the need for light and privacy. In addition, the form of the existing building should be followed as closely as possible, and the development

should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar finishes and windows. Extensions should be subordinate in terms of scale to the main unit.

11.7. Applications for planning permission to extend dwellings will only be granted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposal will:

- Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the dwelling.
- Not adversely affect the amenities enjoyed by occupants of adjacent dwellings in terms of privacy, access to daylight and sunlight.

11.8. Appendix 17 also provides additional guidelines in relation to alterations and extensions to dwellings.

11.9. It notes that the roofline of the building is one of the most dominant features and it is important that any proposal to change the shape, pitch, cladding or ornament of the roof is carefully considered. If not treated sympathetically, the dormer extension can cause problems for immediate neighbours in the way that the street is viewed as a whole.

11.10. When extending the roof, the following principles should be observed.

- The design of the dormer should reflect the character of the area, the surrounding buildings and the appearance of the existing building.
- Dormer windows would be visually subordinate to the roof slope, enabling a large proportion of the original roof to remain visible.
- Any new windows should relate to the shape, size and position and design of the existing doors and windows on the lower floors.
- Roof material should be covered with materials that match or complement the main building.
- Dormer windows should be setback from the eaves level to minimise the visual impact and reduce the potential for overlooking of adjoining properties.

12.0 Planning Assessment

I have read the entire contents of the file, visited the subject site and its surroundings, have had particular regard to the decision of Dublin City Council and in

particular Condition No. 4 attached to the grant of planning permission. I have also had regard to the issues raised in the observation contained on file and I consider the critical issues in determining the current application and appeal are as follows:

- Overdevelopment of the Site and the Requirement for Condition 4(a)
- Visual Impact Arising from the Proposal
- Condition 4(f)
- Condition 4(g)
- Condition 4(i)

Each of these issues will be assessed below.

12.1. Overdevelopment of the Site and the Requirement for Condition 4(a)

12.1.1. Dublin City Council in granting planning permission attach Condition 4(a) which require the following:

12.1.2. “The first floor level of the proposed side and rear extension shall have a maximum depth of 3.5 metres measured from where it projects from the existing two-storey rear building line”.

12.1.3. The implementation of the above condition would result in a reduction in the length of the first floor extension by about 1.5 metres. It will reduce the size of the proposed bedroom at first floor level to the rear by approximately 25%. It would in my view have little material impact in reducing the size and scale of the development or enhancing the amenity of adjoining residential developments.

12.1.4. With regard to the potential of the size and scale of the development on adjoining amenity, the Board should note that the proposed extension while contiguous to the rear boundary of No. 187 Howth Road, the lands to the north of the area where the proposed extension is to be developed, is almost entirely covered with buildings. Furthermore, the front portion of the side extension contiguous to the area of open space is to remain single storey and as, such the proposed extension will have a negligible impact on this small area of private open space to the rear of No. 187 Howth Road. The shadow casting diagram submitted with the grounds of appeal (See Appendix) indicates that the additional shadow cast by the extension almost

exclusively overshadows the roofs of the structures located to the rear of No. 187. There is no impact on the private areas of open space to the rear of No. 187 resulting from the proposed extension.

12.1.5. Arising from my assessment above therefore I consider that the reduction in the depth of the proposed extension as required by Condition 4(a) is neither warranted or justified in terms of protecting or enhancing the amenity of surrounding dwellings. On the other hand the restriction would materially reduce the size of living accommodation at first floor level. It should be a reasonable expectation that occupiers of residential dwellings be permitted to extend and alter an existing family dwelling in order to cater for future family needs particularly where such alterations and extensions do not materially affect surrounding residential amenity. I am satisfied in this instance that the proposed extension as originally conceived and submitted with the planning application is appropriate in terms of size and scale and I therefore do not consider Condition 4(a) to be necessary in this instance.

12.1.6. Finally, in relation to the issue of overdevelopment it is readily apparent that even with the extended area as originally proposed and submitted, the dwellinghouse remains significantly below the indicative site coverage standards and plot ratio standards set out in the development plan. Under the Z1 zoning objective the development plan outlines an indicative plot ratio of 0.5 to 2.5 whereas the plot ratio for the proposed development is 0.4. Likewise, the development plan for the Z1 zoning objective indicates an indicative requirement of 45 to 60% whereas the site coverage with the proposed extension amounts to only 31%. On the basis of the above standards, it cannot be reasonably argued in my view that the proposed extension as submitted to the Planning Authority constitutes overdevelopment of the subject site.

12.2. Visual Impact Arising from the Proposal

12.2.1. The observation submitted expresses concerns that the visual impact arising from the proposed extension would be unacceptable as the observers in this instance as they would be facing onto an 18 foot high wall. I do not consider that there will be any significant adverse impact arising from the proposed extension to the side of the dwelling. The area of the appeal site which is contiguous to the area of open space to the rear of No. 187 Howth Road currently accommodates a single storey garage.

Under the proposed development this portion of the building is to remain single storey. There will be no discernible impact in this regard. The rear part of the extension is to replace an existing two-storey element to the side of the house which is slightly setback, c.1 metre from the common boundary. The incorporation of a two-storey element to the side of the dwellinghouse which extends to the common boundary to the rear of No. 187 will not be so significant over and above the existing configuration of the building on the subject site. The size and scale of the proposed extension to the side is in my view acceptable.

12.3. Condition 4(f)

- 12.3.1. Condition 4(f) requires that should be one window only in the rear dormer box extension and this window shall have maximum dimensions of 1.4 metres (width) by 1 metres (height). The dormer box extension at roof level is approximately 4.2 metres in length and 2.5 metres in height. The window proposed to serve the dormer box is 2.5 metres in length and 1.8 metres in height. The window in question directly faces onto the rear garden and will not be readily visible from vantage points in the vicinity. I therefore do not consider that the size and scale of either the dormer box or the window serving it would adversely impact on the residential amenities of the area. Furthermore, as the window in question directly overlooks the applicants' rear garden. Therefore the window of the size and scale proposed will result in any excessive overlooking.
- 12.3.2. I note that the Board in determining a recent planning application and appeal under Reg. Ref. ABP301298-21 which related to an extension to a suburban type dwellinghouse at No. 77 Bettyglen, Raheny, permitted a dormer box extension with a maximum width of 5.6 metres (measured externally) which is of a size greater than proposed under the current application. It is further noted that the Planning Authority in granting planning permission for this application at 77 Bettyglen permitted a window with a maximum dimension of 2 metres (width) by 1.5 metres (height).
- 12.3.3. I do not consider that the window of the size and scale proposed will adversely affect the visual or residential amenities of property in the vicinity and will offer better natural illumination into the proposed attic space. It would also obviate the need for additional natural illumination in the form of rooflights to the front of the dwelling serving the attic space.

12.3.4. On the basis of the above I consider the dimension of the windows as proposed in the drawings submitted with the application to be acceptable.

12.4. Condition 4(g)

12.4.1. This condition requires that the proposed rooflights on the front plane of the roof of the house should be omitted. I consider that the Board should retain the above condition. While the applicant makes reference to precedent decisions only one of which relates to Dunseverick Road. On the whole the existing houses along Dunseverick Road and in the vicinity of the site restrict the incorporation of velux rooflights on the roof pitch to the side and rear of the dwellings. Furthermore, the drawings submitted indicate that the attic space is to serve as a study/storage area. The requirement therefore for a dual aspect natural illumination is by no means critical. If the Board omit Condition No. 4(f) which requires a reduction in the size and scale of the window and consider omitting Condition No. 4(i) which requires the incorporation of opaque glazing (discussed below), I consider that the provision of one large east facing window is sufficient to serve the room in question. On this basis I recommend that Condition 4(g) be retained.

12.5. Condition 4(i)

12.5.1. Condition No. 4(i) requires the windows to the attic development including the dormer window shall be permanently fitted with opaque glazing to at least 1.8 metres above the finished floor level.

12.5.2. If the Board, consider it appropriate to retain Condition 4(g) which omits the rooflights on the front of the roof, this condition would only relate to the large window incorporated into the dormer box to the rear of the dwelling. This window overlooks the applicants' garden. The nearest windows facing the applicants' rear elevation are windows associated with No. 11 Dunseverick Road which are c.30 metres from the proposed dormer box windows. As the appellant points out in the grounds of appeal this is generously in excess of the 22 metre separation distance guideline referred to in the development plan. It is my considered opinion that the proposed window serving the dormer box will not give rise to any overlooking and therefore the need for opaque glazing to be incorporated into the window is not justified. This condition should therefore be omitted.

13.0 Appropriate Assessment

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and nature of the receiving environment together with the proximity 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.

14.0 Conclusions and Recommendation

Arising from my assessment above, I consider that the Board should uphold the decision of the planning authority and grant planning permission for the proposed extension with amended conditions based on the reasons and considerations set out below.

15.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Z1 zoning objective relating to the site and the nature and extent of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area or of nearby dwellings. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

16.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The development hereby approved shall be amended as follows:
 - (a) The proposed alteration of the roof of the dwelling from a fully hipped roof to a standard "A" gable shall be omitted.
 - (b) A subordinate floating side dormer box extension shall be provided as an alternative which projects through the side plane (north facing) of the retained hipped roof.
 - (c) The side dormer box extension shall have a fully hipped roof to match the existing roof pitch, and which is set a minimum 200 millimetres below the level of the existing roof ridges and developed fully inside the existing side roof plane.
 - (d) The dormer box on the roof plane of the roof shall not exceed 3.5 metres in width and shall be developed entirely within the existing rear roof plane only, and shall be centred on the existing roof plane, and shall not physically integrate with the proposed side dormer.
 - (e) The proposed rooflights on the front plane of the roof of the house shall be omitted.
 - (f) The attic level shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with the current Building Regulations.
 - (g) All elevations, facias/soffits, rainwater goods, window frame, glazing bars shall be finished in a dark colour so as to blend in with the existing roof finish. No white coloured uPVC shall be used.
 - (h) The vertical privacy fin treatment to the rear first floor extension shall be angled such that all views will be channelled north-eastwards and eastwards down the rear garden rather than across towards the southern boundary of the site.

Details of all the above alterations shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual and residential amenity.

3. The vehicular entrance serving the driveway shall not exceed 3 metres in width and shall not have outward opening gates.

Reason: In the interests of traffic and pedestrian safety.

4. The footpath and kerb shall be dished in accordance with the requirements of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

5. All costs incurred by Dublin City Council including any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development shall be at the expense of the developer.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

6. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Details of all rainwater collection and guttering servicing the proposed development and the proposed extension shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

7. The applicant shall enter into a water and/or wastewater connection agreement with Irish Water prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

8. Details of all the materials, colours and textures of all external finishes to the proposed extension shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

9. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 hours to 1900 hours Monday to Friday inclusive and between 0800 hours and 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where written prior approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of areas in the vicinity.

Paul Caprani,
Senior Planning Inspector.

17th January, 2022.