



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-311769-21

Development	Construction of a two storey extension to side of dwelling.
Location	32 Dún Carraig Céibh, Leitrim Village, Co. Leitrim
Planning Authority	Leitrim County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	211
Applicant(s)	David Casey.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	David Casey.
Observer(s)	N/A.
Date of Site Inspection	10 th of March 2022.
Inspector	Stephanie Farrington

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at no. 32 Dún Carraig Céibh, a housing estate on the outskirts of Leitrim Village. The site has a stated area of 0.746ha and is currently occupied by a detached dwelling with a gross floor area of 232 sq.m.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises construction of a two storey extension to the side of an existing dwelling with hip roof, façade alterations and all associated site works.
- 2.2. The proposed extension has a floor area of 75 sq.m. and will accommodate a gym and store at ground floor level and a master bedroom with home office at first floor.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Leitrim County Council issued a notification of decision to grant permission for the development subject to 12 no. conditions. The first party appeal relates to Condition nos. 3,4,5,6,9 and 10 of the planning authority's decision as follows:

- Condition no. 3: The alterations to the rear existing roof plane/ridge of the existing dwelling shown on the elevations submitted are not permitted. Prior to the commencement of any development pursuant to this permission, the applicant shall submit a revised design to the Planning Authority and have received the written agreement of the Planning Authority to the revised design, proposals which result in the existing roof plane/ridge remaining unaltered and proposals for an alternative tie in/valley between the roof of the rear extension, with the roof of the existing dwelling. The revised drawings shall include a roof plan. All drawings shall be to a scale of not less than 1:100.
- Condition no. 4: The applicant shall source the exact stone cladding (colour, cut and sizing) used in the existing dwelling and all other dwellings within this

overall development. No deviation from the existing stone used within this development is permitted as part of this permission.

- Condition no. 5: The applicant shall amend the details of the windows, in particular the inclusion of glazing bars on the windows on the front elevation, in order that they are as shown on drawing Ref RF02, as submitted to the planning authority on the 20th of August 2020.
- Condition no. 6: The additional stone cladding shown to the front and side elevation of the extension is not permitted as part of this development. The provision of stone cladding between the ground and first floor window of the front elevation of the extension may be provided in a manner consistent with the original dwelling and shall extend above the first floor window to the soffit.
- Condition no. 9: The site shall be fully landscaped, including the bank areas to the rear boundary and the carriageway edge along the public road to the south, L7391 (Fawn Road), to commence no later than the first planting season following the occupation of the dwelling.
- Condition no. 10: The construction container which has been deposited on site shall be removed within 3 months of the completion of the construction works and shall not be retained on site for construction or other use, nor for use as a domestic shed or for other domestic use.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Initial Planner's Report (24th of February 2021)

The initial planner's report recommends a request for further information in relation to (1) the design and finish of the proposed extension and (2) accurate as constructed drawings. The following provides a summary of the main points raised.

- No objection is raised in relation to the location of the extension, nor its footprint and there remains an adequate extensive rear amenity space to the rear of the extended dwelling. A distance 6.15m is maintained to the east.

- Concerns are raised in relation to the aesthetic and visual impact of the proposed extension.
- The proposal includes removal of existing stone cladding and its replacement with new stone cladding. The extent of the cladding is extensive.
- There are a number of discrepancies between the application drawings and the development on site.
- In responding to the issues raised within the third party observation it is stated that the protection of a view is not a material planning consideration.
- The form and finish of the proposed extension and its proposed roof are not appropriate to the dwelling constructed on site.
- The extension would have a detrimental impact on the visual aesthetic of the area.
- A request for further information is recommended.

Planner's Report (28th of September 2021)

The planner's report dated the 28th of September 2021 recommends a grant of permission subject to conditions. The following provides a summary of the key points raised:

- A response to the issues raised has been submitted along with revised drawings containing revised proposals.
- Elements of the response are satisfactory including the roof profile to the front and side elevations, the revisions to the corner window. Alterations to the existing house are not considered appropriate.
- The site is capable of absorbing the overall design concept and subject to appropriate conditions the development will not have a negative effect on the visual amenities of the area.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One submission was received in respect of the application. The following points are raised:

- The observers view of the lake will be obstructed by the proposed extension and lead to a depreciation in the value of their property.
- The development is excessive in scale for the site.
- The extension would impact on and be at variance with the overall design of the cul de sac. The dwelling would appear as a commercial premises.

4.0 Planning History

Parent Permission

PA Ref. P03/1140, ABP Ref. PL12.208226: Relates to a split decision issued by An Bord Pleanála in November 2004 in respect of the overall residential development.

Permission was granted for the following overall development on in the area:

- Phase no. 1: comprising 32 houses access onto road, surface water-attenuation pond and site works, infrastructural works to service 6 no. sites, o/p for 6no. houses on same.

Condition no. 4 relates to the agreements of external finishes for the development with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development, in the interest of visual amenity.

Outline permission was refused for Phase 2 of the development comprising outline permission for 43 no. houses. The reason for refusal related to the nature and scale of the development relative to the existing scale of Leitrim Village and its social and infrastructural capacity including the capacity of the sewerage treatment system.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Leitrim County Development Plan 2015 – 2021

- *Zoning*

5.1.1. The lands are zoned for “Primarily Residential” purposes within the Leitrim County Development Plan.

- *Development Management*

Section 5.1.1 of the Development Plan relates to Development Management Requirements and sets out a range of criteria under which development which is in accordance with the plans, other policies and proposals will be permitted. The following criteria are of relevance for the subject application:

- Respects the character or appearance, particularly the established scale, massing, rhythm and materials, of the building, group of buildings or surrounding area, including characteristic building lines and plot widths, of which it forms a part;
- is of materials, form and detailing appropriate to the design and function of the building and locality in which it is set;
- incorporates, where possible, existing landscape or other features, takes into account site contours, changes in level and avoids prominent skylines;
- does not materially/detrimentally affect the existing form and character of the surrounding townscape or landscape;
- does not materially/detrimentally affect the amenity of local residents, other land and property users or characteristics of the locality by virtue of increased activity, disturbance, noise, dust, fumes, litter & provides satisfactory amenity standards itself;

Section 5.3.10 relates to House Extensions. This outlines that proposals which involve the alteration, improvement or extension of an existing dwelling should reflect and enhance the existing building, adjoining properties and the setting in terms of scale, design and materials.

The Development Plan outlines that house extensions should: - 1. be subordinate to main building; 2. not have a negative effect on visual amenities of the area; 3. not detrimentally impact on neighbours; 4. not result in unacceptable reduction of open space.

Leitrim Design Guide

The Leitrim Design Guide advises against the use of inappropriate colours and materials. For extensions, external finishes should match the main house and that forms and external finishes that are incongruous with the main house should be avoided.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. A first party appeal has been received in respect of Condition nos.3,4,5,6,9 and 10 attached to the planning authority's notification of decision to grant permission for the development. The following provides a summary of the grounds of appeal.

- Condition 3: The inclusion of this condition is questioned. No amendments are proposed to the existing roof profile, it is proposed to connect the new roof into the existing roof.
- Condition 4: The existing stone cladding on the house is over 15 years old and is falling off resulting in a health and safety issue. Furthermore, the stone is no longer available and the condition is considered onerous.
- Condition no. 5: The applicant is unclear in relation to the requirements of this condition.
- Condition 6: The further reduction in stone cladding on the extension is contrary to the extent of stone cladding permitted under PA Ref 18/267 and PA Ref: 16/55. The type of cladding proposed for use is identical to that used within the estate with a slightly different shape.

- Condition no. 9: Relates to the landscaping of land not within the ownership of the applicant. The land is outside the red line application boundary.
- Condition no. 10: relates to the removal of the existing shipping container. The applicant states that this may be used for storage purposes and questions why the planning authority are dictating the type of garden shed he uses.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

Leitrim County Council provided a response to the grounds of appeal. The following provides a summary of the points raised.

- The Planning Authority consider that the visual aesthetic of the initial proposed extension would have had a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the area.
- Alterations to the roof pane of the existing house on the rear elevation as illustrated on the elevations are not considered aesthetically acceptable.
- The Planning Authority remain of the opinion that the use of stone throughout the development was intended as a subtle design feature and not a dominant feature of each dwelling. While it is acknowledged that the stone has been significantly reduced, it is considered that it still remains too dominant a feature within the proposal. The stone cladding to the front and side elevation of the proposal should be removed.
- The applicant was advised that the application of a new stone cladding to the extent proposed was considered extensive and excessive and the type of stone proposed in a buff colour did not compliment the type of stone used throughout the development and was therefore considered inappropriate.
- The Planning Authority remains of the opinion that the finishes of the dwelling including exact stone cladding which is used in the existing dwelling and all other dwellings within the development should be used. This is considered appropriate in the context of visual amenity, to integrate the proposed extension with the existing house and consistent with the built form of the housing development. It is understood that the stone is still available and was

used recently on a nearby property at no. 34 (PA Ref 21/111) and by the owners of no. 27 (PA Ref: 18/267).

- Condition no. 3: The Planning Authority does not have an issue with the construction method or industry standard for roof design. The proposal is not visually acceptable. The site is highly visible to the rear from Fawn Road and the purpose of the modifications is to integrate the proposed extension with the existing dwelling.
- Condition no. 5: The Planning Authority have no issue with replacing / upgrading windows. The window opening at first floor landing was extended without planning permission and constitutes a material alteration to the front elevation. The replacement picture window is also out of context with windows on existing properties in the estate. The provision of a glazing bar would integrate the development more appropriately.
- Condition no. 6: Each application is assessed on its individual merits and assessed appropriate to its context.
- Condition no. 9: This condition relates to landscaping of the Rear Bank Area. It is noted that the applicant notes that he does not own this area. The Planning Authority are of the clear understanding that the applicant owns this property. An extract from the land registry is attached, which illustrates that the applicant owns to the centre line of the local road to the rear. A similar condition was attached to an adjoining property under PA Ref: 18/136.
- Condition no. 10: In relation to the storage container, the Planning Authority are of the view that the use of a shipping container in the garden of a dwelling of a suburban estate is not appropriate. The planning authority would not permit the retention of the shipping container.
- The Planning Authority request the Board to uphold the detailed conditions in the decision of Leitrim County Council to grant permission for the development.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. In my opinion, the main issues for consideration in this case include:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Visual Impact
- Other Issues
- Appropriate Assessment

Each of these issues is addressed in turn below.

7.2. Principle of Development

- 7.2.1. The proposal relates to a two storey extension to the side of an existing dwelling, façade alterations and associated site works at no. 32 Dun Carraig Ceibh, Leitrim Village. The property is located within an existing residential development to the south of Leitrim Village and the site is zoned for Primarily Residential purposes within the Leitrim County Development Plan. The principle of residential use is established on the site.
- 7.2.2. The proposed 2 storey extension is located to the east of the existing dwelling, is 75 sq.m. in area and will accommodate a gym and store at ground floor level and a master bedroom with home office at first floor. The guidance for domestic extension as set out within the Section 5.3.10 of the Leitrim County Development Plan 2015-2021 seeks to ensure that improvement or extension of an existing dwelling should reflect and enhance the existing building, adjoining properties and the setting in terms of scale, design and materials. I have no objection to the siting and scale of the proposed extension and consider that an adequate separation distance is maintained to the east and that sufficient private amenity space remains to serve the property. The principle of an extension to an existing residential property at this location is considered acceptable.
- 7.2.3. This is a first-party appeal 'specifically' against Condition nos. 3,4,5,6,9 and 10 attached to the Leitrim County Council's notification of decision to grant permission. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the content of Conditions no. 3,4,5,6,9 and 10 it is considered that the determination by the Board of the application, as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted. Therefore, the Board should determine the matters raised in the appeal only, in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

7.3. Layout, Design and Visual Amenity

7.3.1. Leitrim County Council issued a notification of decision to grant permission for the development subject to 12 no. conditions. The first party appeal relates to a number of conditions attached to the permission including Conditions no. 3,4,5 and 6 which relate to design revisions to the existing house and proposed extension. The requirements of each of these conditions are summarised below:

- Condition no. 3: Revised design proposals shall be submitted which result in the existing roof plane/ridge remaining unaltered and proposals for an alternative tie in/valley between the roof of the rear extension, with the roof of the existing dwelling.
- Condition no. 4: The use of the “exact stone cladding” (colour, cut and sizing) used in the existing dwelling and all other dwellings within this overall development. No deviation is permitted.
- Condition no. 5: Inclusion of glazing bars on the windows on the front elevation.
- Condition no. 6: The additional stone cladding shown to the front and side elevation of the extension is not permitted as part of this development.

7.3.2. In summary the detailed design conditions attached by Leitrim County Council relate to the degree to which the finish of the extension reflect the original house and other properties within the development. The rationale for the inclusion of these conditions as cited within the planning authority’s decision was to *“integrate the proposed extension with the existing development in a harmonious manner, in the interest of visual amenity”*. The applicant questions the specific detail of these conditions within the 1st party appeal and considers their requirements to be onerous.

7.3.3. The Leitrim Design Guide outlines that for extensions, external finishes should match the main house and that forms and external finishes that are incongruous with the main house should be avoided. On-site inspection, I note that there is a similar material pallet and design approach throughout the Dun Carraig Ceibh development. The development was permitted by An Bord Pleanála in November 2004 (PA Ref. P03/1140, ABP Ref. PL12.208226) and subject to 17 no. conditions. Condition no. 4

of this permission relates to the material pallet within the development and outlines that:

“Prior to the commencement of development, details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed houses and in particular, samples of the timber or stone cladding to be used on the front elevations, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity”.

7.3.4. The first party appeal relates to design requirements imposed in Condition nos. 3,4,5 and 6 of the permission. I consider each of these conditions in turn as follows.

- Condition no. 3: Roof Profile

7.3.5. Condition no. 3 of the planning authority’s decision relates to the roof level interface of the proposed extension with the existing house. This condition outlines that the alterations to the rear of the roof plane/ridge are not permitted and revised drawings are requested which illustrate an alternative tie in/valley between the roof of the rear extension. The rationale for the inclusion of this condition is cited as being in the interest of visual amenity and having regard to the exposed/prominent nature of the existing house when viewed from Fawn Road.

7.3.6. I note that concerns in relation to the full roof profile of the extension as initially proposed as the impact on the streetscape were raised within Leitrim County Council’s request for further information. Revised plans and particulars were submitted to the planning authority which illustrate a tie in between the existing house and proposed extension at roof level as illustrated within drawing no. RF02. The planning authority raised no objection to the revisions to the roof profile as viewed from the front and side of the dwelling and outlines that the revised design assimilates the development more appropriately within the streetscape. I agree with the conclusions of the planning authority in this regard. However, concern is raised by Leitrim County Council in relation to the proposed interventions to the roof of the existing dwelling to the rear of the property on the basis of the visual prominence of the property from Fawn Road. The applicant maintains that no alterations are proposed to the existing roof profile at this location and requests the removal of the condition on this basis.

7.3.7. Condition no. 3 outlines that the proposed alterations are not permitted and alternative proposals are required. Having reviewed the application drawings and in light of the grounds of appeal I consider that the wording of Condition no. 3 is overly prescriptive. On review of Drawing no. RF02 I consider that the proposed tie in between the proposed extension and existing dwelling at roof level is not clearly illustrated. Interventions to the existing roof appear to be illustrated on the drawing but, having regard to the grounds of appeal, I consider that this appears to be a drawing error. I consider that clarity is required in relation to the interface between the proposed extension and existing dwelling on the rear elevation.

7.3.8. I consider that the wording of Condition 3 of the planning authority's decision should be amended to request revised drawings for written agreement prior to the commencement of development. I recommend the rewording of Condition no. 3 as follows:

Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit revised drawings for written agreement of the Planning Authority which clearly illustrate the interface/tie in between the roof of the proposed extension, with the roof of the existing dwelling on the rear elevation. The revised drawings shall include a roof plan. All drawings shall be to a scale of not less than 1:100.

Reason: To integrate the proposed extension with the existing dwelling in a harmonious manner and in the interest of visual amenity.

- Condition no 4: Type of stone on the façade

7.3.9. Condition no. 4 of the planning authority's decision outlines that the applicant shall use the exact same stone cladding used in the existing dwelling and all other dwellings within the development. The condition specifically identifies that no deviation from the existing stone used will be permitted. Concerns are raised within the grounds of appeal in respect of the prescriptive nature of this condition and outlines difficulty in sourcing the exact same stone. The applicant outlines that the type of cladding proposed for use is identical to that used within the estate with a slightly different shape.

7.3.10. On an overall basis I consider the requirements and detail of Condition no.4 to be overly specific and particularly onerous for a domestic extension within an existing housing development. While I acknowledge that there is a harmonious design and

finish approach within the Dun Carraig Ceibh development and the guidance set out within the Leitrim County Development Plan which outlines that extensions should reflect existing development in terms of design and finish I do not consider that an alteration to the type of stone used on the building façade would render a property visually incongruous in the local streetscape.

7.3.11. I refer to the guidance set within Section 7.3 of Development Management Guidelines which details specifications for conditions including conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable. I consider the prescriptive nature of Condition no. 4 in its current format to be unreasonable. I recommend that the wording of Condition no. 4 is AMENDED as follows:

The developer shall use a similar stone cladding (colour, cut and sizing) in the extension to that used in the existing dwelling and in all other dwellings within the overall development. Details of the materials shall be submitted for written agreement of the Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of development. In default of agreement on any of these requirements, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to integrate the extension with the existing house and existing housing development within the area.

- Condition no. 5: Window Treatment

7.3.12. Condition no. 5 of the planning authority's decision relates to compliance with the details shown on Drawing Ref RF02 and specifically refers to the provision of glazing bars on windows of the front elevation of the dwelling. The reason cited for the inclusion of this condition is to "*integrate the proposed extension with the existing dwelling in a harmonious manner, in the interests of visual amenity*".

7.3.13. On review of the planner's report, I note that particular concerns are raised in relation to omission of the glazing bar from the central window pane at front elevation of the property as illustrated in the attached presentation document. However, I note that there is a variety in window formats evident within the area. I do not consider that a variety of window presentations either detract from the visual amenity or render the property incongruous with existing development within the area. I furthermore note the requirements of Condition no. 1 of the permission which outlines that the

development shall be constructed, completed and retained in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted and consider the requirements of this condition to be sufficient. In this regard, I do not consider the condition to be necessary. I recommend that Condition no. 5 is REMOVED from the permission.

- Condition 6: Proportion of Stone on Façade

7.3.14. Condition no. 6 of the planning authority's decision relates to the proportion of stone used within the proposed extension. The condition stipulates that the additional stone cladding to the front and side elevation of the extension is removed while the cladding between the first and ground floor extension may be provided in a manner consistent with the existing dwelling. The condition also requests the reinstatement of the stone cladding over the front door of the existing dwelling.

7.3.15. A case is made within the first party appeal that the reduction in stone cladding on the extension is contrary to the extent of stone cladding permitted under PA Ref 18/267 (27 Dun Carraig Ceibh) and PA Ref: 16/55 (31 Dun Carraig Ceibh). Drawing no. RF02 illustrates the proposed extent on stone cladding on the extension. I do not consider the proposed extent of stone cladding to be excessive or of a scale which would render the property visually incongruous with the existing dwelling or of dwellings in the area. I recommend that Condition no. 6 is REMOVED.

7.4. Other Issues

Landownership – Condition no. 9

7.4.1. Condition no. 9 of the planning authority's decision relates to landscaping of the site including the bank area to the rear boundary and the carriageway edge along the public road to the south L7391 (Fawn Road) as part of the development.

7.4.2. Condition 9 in its current format includes reference to lands outside of the application boundary. I note that the appeal site is enclosed by a timber rail boundary as illustrated within the attached presentation document. The rear site boundary is adjoined by a grass verge adjacent to Fawn Road. This area is currently overgrown and limited in extent.

7.4.3. The appeal outlines that the applicant is not the owner of this parcel of land. The planning authority outline that, based on a land registry search, the applicant is the

owner of the land in question and cite examples where similar conditions have been applied to properties in the area (PA Ref: 18/136- 27 Dun Carraig Ceibh).

7.4.4. I refer to the guidance set out within Section 7.3.2 of the Development Management Guidelines which outlines that “*Unless the requirements of a condition are directly related to the development to be permitted, the condition may be ultra vires and unenforceable*”.

7.4.5. Condition no. 9 of the permission includes reference to lands outside of the application boundary which are not relevant to the proposed development. I consider the requirements of the condition to be ultra vires and unenforceable in this regard. I recommend the rewording of Condition no. 9 as follows:

“The site shall be fully landscaped to commence no later than the first planting season following the occupation of the dwelling”.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

Shipping Container – Condition no. 10

7.4.6. Condition no. 10 requires the removal of the existing shipping container on site within 3 months of the completion of construction works and outlines that it shall not be retained for construction, domestic use or for use as a domestic shed.

7.4.7. The applicant questions the necessity for this condition within the appeal and refers to the potential use of the structure for storage purposes or for use as a domestic shed. The planning authority’s response to the grounds of appeal outlines that the structure is considered inappropriate within a suburban residential setting.

7.4.8. On-site inspection, I consider that the shipping container is located within a visually prominent area of the site as illustrated within the attached presentation document. I consider that the structure detracts from the overall visual amenity of the area and is inappropriate within the existing site context. I consider the requirements of Condition no. 10 to be appropriate and recommend that this condition is attached to the decision.

7.4.9. I consider the reason stated for Condition no. 10 as currently drafted provides no indication of the particular object of the condition. For clarity purposes, I recommend that the reason for this condition is AMENDED as follows:

Reason: In the interest of orderly development and visual amenity.

7.5. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.5.1. A Screening Statement for Appropriate Assessment is submitted in conjunction with the application. This outlines that there are no Natura 2000 sites within a 15km radius of the proposed development and concludes that the proposed development would not have significant adverse impacts on the conservation objectives of any Natura 2000 site.
- 7.5.2. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the distance from the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect, individually, or in combination with other plans or projects, on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. Having inspected the site and reviewed the drawings and documents on file, I am satisfied that the determination by the Board of this application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted. Accordingly, I consider that it would be appropriate to use the provisions of Section 139 of the 2000 Act, as amended as follows:

AMEND Condition nos. 3, 4,9 and 10 as follows:

- Condition no. 3:

Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit revised drawings for written agreement of the Planning Authority which clearly illustrate the interface/ tie in between the roof of the proposed extension, with the roof of the existing dwelling on the rear elevation. The revised drawings shall include a roof plan. All drawings shall be to a scale of not less than 1:100.

Reason: To integrate the proposed extension with the existing dwelling in a harmonious manner and in the interest of visual amenity.

- Condition no. 4:

The developer shall use a similar stone cladding (colour, cut and sizing) in the extension to that used in the existing dwelling and in all other dwellings within the overall development. Details of the materials shall be submitted for written agreement of the Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of development. In

default of agreement on any of these requirements, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to integrate the extension with the existing house and existing housing development within the area.

- Condition no. 9:

The site shall be fully landscaped to commence no later than the first planting season following the occupation of the dwelling.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

- Condition no. 10:

The construction container which has been deposited on site shall be removed within 3 months of the completion of the construction works and shall not be retained on site for construction or other use, nor for use as a domestic shed or for other domestic use.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development and visual amenity.

REMOVE Condition nos. 5 and 6.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

AMEND Condition nos. 3,4,9 and 10 for the following reasons and considerations>

- Condition 3: For clarity purposes.
- Condition 4: To ensure the requirements of the condition are reasonable.
- Condition 9: To ensure the requirements of the condition are directly related to the development to be permitted and enforceable.
- Condition 10: To include a clear rationale for the condition, namely, in the interests of orderly development and visual amenity.

REMOVE Condition nos. 5 and 6

Having regard to the residential land use zoning for the site, and to the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the proportion of stone on the extension as proposed, or the proposed window treatment does not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area.

The planning authority's Condition 5 and 6 are, therefore, not warranted.

Stephanie Farrington
Senior Planning Inspector

24th of March 2022