



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-312837-22

Development

Retention of 2-storey over basement property. Construction of a balcony to the rear of the main house.-
Alterations to the replacement of windows with doors. Construction of an external wall.

Location

Churchtown Park House (Protected Structure), Churchtown Road Upper, Dublin 14, D14 X6E5

Planning Authority

Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D21A/1047

Applicant(s)

Samantha and Gavin Smith

Type of Application

Retention.

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse Retention

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Samantha and Gavin Smith.

Observer(s) June Keaney.

Date of Site Inspection 28.09.2022.

Inspector Fiona Fair

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	8
5.0 Policy Context.....	10
5.1. Development Plan.....	10
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	11
5.3. EIA Screening	11
6.0 The Appeal	11
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	11
6.2. Applicant Response	14
6.3. Planning Authority Response	14
6.4. Observations	14
6.5. Further Responses.....	15
7.0 Assessment.....	15
8.0 Recommendation.....	21
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	21
10.0 Conditions	22

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1.1. Churchtown Park House (a protected structure) is located centrally on the Churchtown Road Upper, intersecting with Churchtown Road Lower to the north.
- 1.1.2. The subject building is semi-detached, three storey house with a sunken ground floor level / part basement and steps running up to the main front entrance at first floor. The building consists of an entry from both basement and upper ground floor levels.
- 1.1.3. The existing property is set back from the public roadway and is served by off street parking, a pedestrian access and amenity space to the front and amenity space to the rear. The site area is stated as 0.1162 Ha.
- 1.1.4. The subject site is bounded by Ronan House and Glenard House to the sides and the road serving Beaumont Drive to the rear. The streetscape of Churchtown Road Upper in the vicinity of the subject site is characterised by dwellings of varying style and appearance.
- 1.1.5. A photographic survey of the house and areas of the proposed retention works, internally and externally, was carried out. Survey photographs are appended to the Report on the Architectural / Historic Significance of Churchtown Park House & Observations on the Impact of the Retention of Works Undertaken to Date, submitted for planning purposes.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission for retention of unauthorised development. The development consists of:
 - The construction of a new balcony to the rear of the main house.
 - Alterations to and the replacement of windows with new doors at ground floor level to the rear of the house.
 - The construction of a new external wall to the rear garden between the modern detached Mews dwelling and rear boundary wall.

- The replacement of a window to the side of the main house.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Refuse Permission for Retention for the following reasons:

1. Having regard to the design of the balcony and the supporting wall's proximity to the windows serving the basement unit, it is considered that the balcony, including its supporting wall and replacement doors would significantly impact the residential and visual amenities of the basement apartment, contravening policy objectives contained within the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2016 - 2022, specifically the site's zoning objective, which is to protect and/or improve residential amenity. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The 1.9m high wall divides the rear garden area and subsequently severs the original curtilage of the Protected Structure impacting significantly upon the special character and appearance of the building, contrary to Development Plan Policy AR1(ii) and materially contravening conditions 2 and 3 of Planning Permission Reg. Ref. D99A/0855. The proposed development is therefore considered contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. The replacement window to the side elevation contravenes Section 8.2.11.2 Works to a Protected Structure, of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2016 - 2022 in that the replacement window does not accord with proper conservation standards and subsequently detracts from the significance of the building. The development, if permitted would set an undesirable precedent for similar developments and is therefore contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report:

- The site is subject to zoning objective A, which seeks 'to protect and/or improve residential amenity'. Residential development is permitted in principle under the zoning objective of the site; the main issues for consideration, therefore, are compliance with policy, visual impact, residential amenity and conservation.
- Concerns raised with respect to the positioning of the wall which supports the balcony at a separation distance of 1.2m from the rear elevation of the basement windows which significantly Impacts both the visual and residential amenities of the basement apartment, particularly with regards to overshadowing and by appearing overbearing.
- It is considered that the 1.9m high wall which has been constructed subdivides the rear garden area and subsequently creates a separate curtilage from the main house. As noted in the Conservation Report above, the Planning Authority considers that the wall should not be permitted to be retained in the interests of residential amenity and in order to allow the original curtilage of the Protected Structure to remain unsevered.
- The insertion of a upvc window to a Protected Structure is not acceptable and would set a precedent.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Conservation Officers Report: Recommends a Split Decision.

It is considered that the French doors within the existing window openings to the rear elevation and the associated balcony/staircase are acceptable. However, the construction of an external wall to the rear of the house set between the modern mews dwellings and the rear boundary wall, and the insertion of a upvc sash opening window to the side elevation cannot be supported.

- Drainage Division: No Objection subject to condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- An Taisce: Report recommends requesting Further Information to address the following:
 - The overall impact of the proposed retained works on the curtilage and setting of the Protected Structure.
 - The new balcony to be retained has a spine wall which is set back by a short distance from the back wall. The spine wall blocks any view of the windows at lower ground level which would be a significant element of the rear elevation of the Victorian House and as a result would leave residents in the apartment at this level with a view into a narrow passage without a vista into the garden.
 - The planning history for the sharing of the curtilage between the units in the main house and between the main house and the mews dwelling is not clear, particularly in regard to section 6.3 of the Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment that there was a pre-existing timber fence dividing the mews from the original house and that the physical separation was existing for some time with the dwellings in separate ownership.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. Two number third party submissions were submitted they are summarised as follows:

- Recommends that the application is refused due to the impact on the protected structure, impact on the amenity of adjacent properties and the sub-division of the curtilage.

- References Sections 6.8.2 and 7.15.4 of the Architectural Heritage Protection - Guidelines for Planning Authorities and contends that the application does not accord.
- The balcony would have a serious impact by way of darkening garden windows.
- The balcony gives rise to overlooking to adjoining gardens.
- Description of the floor levels are erroneous and misleading.

4.0 Planning History

- **PL06D.117911 / D99A/0855** - Permission overturned and granted by An Bord Pleanala (Aug 2000) following first party appeal for alterations and additions to convert existing garage/studio to 2 bed residential unit.

Condition no. 2 and 3 are noted which states the following:

2. The self-contained residential unit shall not be assigned a curtilage separate from the main house and the four residential units contained therein and the curtilage of the main house shall be shared between all five residential units. The proposed residential unit shall not be sold as an independent unit and shall be used as a residential unit in associated with the main house and the overall site.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

3. The proposed new two metre high fence to the side of the window at ground floor level to the kitchen area, as indicated on the submitted rear elevation drawing, scale 1:100, shall be omitted, and the existing rear garden area to the main house shall not be subdivided as indicated on the Site-Plan drawing received by An Bord Pleanala on 14th day of January, 2000.'

- **D09A/0560** - Retention permission refused by the Planning Authority at the subject site for material change of use from a residential house (protected

structure) to community facility, cultural and educational use of school of music at the lower ground, ground, first and second floor level - incorporated within the roof space, with overall gross floor area circa: 492.47m².

Permission was refused for the following reason:

The development for retention is located in an area with the zoning objective 'A; to protect and/ or improve residential amenity' in the 2004 - 2010 Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan. It is considered, by reason of the scale, nature and extent of the development to be retained, that the proposal would contravene the zoning objective for the site and would therefore be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of the area. The development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- **D14A/0485** - Permission granted by the Planning Authority at the subject site for Permission for works within the site curtilage of Churchtown Park House. It is proposed to remove the existing circ. mid-20th century plastered concrete block wall and pillars, including iron gates to the North front entrance. Construct a new plastered concrete wall boundary and pillars with a new iron gateway entrance all set back from the existing entrance and boundary line. Removal of the modern bituminous paving surface and installation of a permeable gravel surface to the North front external area. A protected structure.
- **Ref. 8121** – (July 2021) A section 5 application was deemed to be not exempted development for the following works:
 1. A new balcony to the rear of the main house.
 2. Alterations to and the replacement of windows with doors.
 3. New external wall to the rear garden between the modern detached Mews dwelling and rear boundary wall.
 4. The replacement of windows to the side of the main house.

Planning Enforcement

- ENF 05721 - The carrying out of works to a Protected Structure

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The operative development plan under which the PA made their decision was the Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2016 – 2022. Under which the subject site was zoned Objective A: "To protect, and-or improve residential amenity".
- 5.1.2. The site contains Churchtown Park House which is designated a Protected Structure.
- 5.1.3. Relevant sections of the 2016 - 2022 Plan that applied are considered to be:
- Policy AR1(ii) It is Council Policy to (i) protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.
 - Section 8.2.11.2 (1) Works to a Protected Structure "alterations and interventions to Protected Structures shall be executed to the highest conservation standards and shall not detract from their significance". "The retention of original features will be encouraged".
 - Chapter 8 - Principles of Development.
 - Section 8.2 - Development Management.
 - Section 8.2.3 - Residential Development.
 - Section 8.2.3.4 - Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas, including:
 - Section 8.2.3.4(i) Extensions to Dwellings.

5.1.4. **Under the new Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022 – 2028** the subject site remains zoned ‘A’ – “To protect, and-or improve residential amenity.”

5.1.5. Relevant sections of the 2022 - 2028 Plan that applies are considered to be:

Chapter 11 Heritage and Conservation

Chapter 12 Development Management.

12.11 Heritage

12.11.2 Architectural Heritage - Protected Structures

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

- None Relevant.

5.3. **EIA Screening**

5.3.1. Having regard to the nature of the development to be retained comprising of alteration to the rear and side of an existing residential structure in an established urban area, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

6.1.1. A first party appeal has been submitted by David Slattery Conservation Architects on behalf of Samantha and Gavin Smith. It is summarised as follows:

- The applicant is open to a compliance condition which addresses the replacement of the pvc sash with an historic sash.
- Revised drawings indicating proposed details have been submitted.

- The works, proposed for retention, significantly enhance the residential amenity of the basement apartment and allow for clear views into an open space which has the effect of opening up that basement apartment, allowing it to have clear windows and space for planting, bicycles etc.
- The tenure of the apartment spans from before and after the works and the tenant has submitted a letter of support.
- There is an unusual historic split of residential accommodation on this site which require an approach that balances the requirements to maintain the character of the Protected Structure and maintain and enhance the amenity of the existing residential units.
- The house is a large one used as a family home whilst allowing for the retention of smaller dwellings on site. There are many houses of this size with unused residential space.
- Habitability and privacy of both the main house and the residential unit at lower ground/basement level are enhanced by the works proposed for retention. The obscured glass to the south allowed for no visual amenity and a compromised privacy.
- The large historic curtilage of Churchtown Park House has been lost with the construction of the adjoining Ronan House and the faux-arts and crafts house encroaching to the west and development to the rear.
- The front setting to Churchtown Park House was expansive but has been subdivided.
- The proposal to retain the boundary wall seeks to make an area of private open space for this permitted dwelling into a more functional private space.
- Allowing this space to bleed into the rear setting of the Protected Structure provides little benefit to that rear setting and offers little in relation to the historic curtilage which has been lost to significant development adjoining to the west.

- The retention of this area as a private garden for the dwelling enhances its amenity by offering some level of privacy in accordance with the Development Plan zoning.
- The conditions on the previous permission are noted. This application is an opportunity to review these in a new context. The conditions were applied some 22 years ago under a different Development Plan and prior to much of the construction to the west which has encroached significantly on the setting to the Protected Structure.
- The provision of residential accommodation of different sizes in the city has become critically important and the zoning here requires that the amenity of such accommodation be enhanced where possible.
- The tenants have provided a letter of support for the retention of the garden layout. If there is a concern about severing curtilage, an opening with a door could be provided indicating a connection between the gardens.
- There is no significant loss to the amenity or rear setting of the main house.
- As described already, the works carried out here to reinstate a family home are exemplary and the balcony provides a much-needed interface to the garden from the main living spaces in the Protected Structure. Notwithstanding all of this, the applicant is open to any proposed compliance condition which could address the final detail or omission of this element.
- It is regrettable that these works weren't carried out after a consent was sought but they should nevertheless be welcomed as works which improve the character and amenity of the Protected Structure along with the other dwellings on site.
- The appeal is appended with Letters of support from:
 - David Mellon, Previous Owner of Churchtown Park House (1997-2012)
Received planning for works during ownership
 - Colin & Ann Maybin, Ronan House

- Simone Magnani & Azucena Antonioli, Current Tenants to the Mews of Churchtown Park House (2017-to date)
- Aayushi Bhatia, Current Tennant to Rear Basement Apartment of Churchtown Park House (2020- to date)
- Alan Hogan, 15 A Bournont Drive (Rear of Churchtown Park House)
- John Paul Spratt 21 Beaumont Drive (Rear of Churchtown Park House)
- Mrs. Marie Nolan, 28 Beaumont Drive (Rear of Churchtown Park House)

6.2. Applicant Response

- None Received.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- None Received.

6.4. Observations

- One number observation received from Diarmuid O' Grada Planning Consultants on behalf of June Keaney, Glenard House, Churchtown Road Upper, Churchtown. It is summarised as follows:
 - Support the refusal of permission by DLRDCC.
 - The balcony arose from the subdivision of the protected structure into multiple units.
 - There is inadequate open space.
 - Jarring and intrusive balcony has materially reduced the residential amenity of Glenard House. By reason of its protruding situation, scale, design and dark finishes, it bears heavily on the living space of Glenard House.
 - Proposal materially conflicts with the zoning.
 - The description of the house is misleading and erroneous.

- Query whether planning permission was granted for the rear return annex unit or any subdivision of the house – a protected structure.
- Further obliteration of period features need to be halted.
- The combination of the overhanging balcony and the screen wall at ground level serve to darken the lower ground level accommodation. Contrary to protection of residential amenity.
- The balcony gives rise to overbearing and overlooking of the observers property.
- Excessive loss of amenity.

6.5. Further Responses

- None Received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having inspected the site and examined the associated documentation, the following are the relevant issues in this appeal.

- **Visual Amenity**
- **Residential Amenity**
- **Conservation**
- **Other Issues**
- **Appropriate Assessment**

7.2. Visual Impact

7.2.1. The subject building is included on Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council Record of Protected Structures. The site is zoned 'A' with the objective "To protect and / or improve residential amenity".

7.2.2. The context, setting, typology and chronology of the subject building and an extensive photographic survey of the house and areas of the proposed retention works, internally and externally, was carried out. Survey photographs are appended to the Report on the “Architectural / Historic Significance of Churchtown Park House & Observations on the Impact of the Retention of Works Undertaken to Date”, submitted for planning purposes and attached to the file.

7.2.3. There are, what I consider, four elements to the retention permission, namely:

1. The new balcony to the rear of the house with iron staircase and supporting wall at a separation distance of 1.2m from the rear elevation of the ground.
2. Alterations to and replacement of windows with doors to the rear of the property accessing onto the balcony.
3. New 1.9m high masonry wall which has been constructed between the mews and the garden of Churchtown Park House.
4. The side / bathroom window has been replaced with a upvc replica sash window matching that of the original.

7.2.4. The works carried out and to be retained are to the rear and west elevation of the building solely. Having carried out a site visit I was unable to gain entry to the rear garden itself, but I gained access to the observer’s property to the west ‘Glenard House’ to the front / north Churchtown Road Upper and to the rear / south Beaumont Drive. I can confirm that the photographic evidence on file, not least from the observer’s photos, is an accurate depiction of the works to be retained. None of the elements proposed for retention are visible outside of the site boundaries. With the exception of a limited view of the balcony and iron staircase from the kitchen window of ‘Glenard House’ and of the gable bathroom window on the western elevation, however, only by way of opening an obscure first floor stairwell window on the eastern gable of ‘Glenard House’, the observer’s property.

7.2.5. Having reviewed the proposed development, I am satisfied the insertion of French doors within the existing window openings to the rear elevation and the

associated balcony/staircase, boundary wall and window replacement does not give rise to a negative visual impact. It is not readily or substantively visible from the surrounding area and therefore not a material change, in my view, to the visual amenity or character of the adjoining area.

- 7.2.6. I note that the applicant is open to a compliance condition which addresses the replacement of the pvc sash with an historic sash. This matter and the subdivision of the original curtilage of the protected structure will be assessed under 'Conservation', in a subsequent section of this report. It is clear that the large historic curtilage of Churchtown Park House does not exist, it has been lost with the construction of 'the adjoining Ronan House and Glenard House' to the west and the permitted annex development to the rear. The setting to Churchtown Park House has long been subdivided. Regard is also had to D14A/0485 permission granted at the subject site to remove the existing circ. mid-20th century plastered concrete block wall and pillars, including iron gates to the North front entrance. This is a gated dwelling which is well set back from the front boundary and obscured from view by planting and high walls.

7.3. Residential Amenity

- 7.3.1. The first reason for refusal by the PA, set out fully in section 3.1 of this report above, considers that the design of the balcony and the supporting wall's proximity to the windows serving the basement unit, would significantly impact the residential and visual amenities of the basement apartment.
- 7.3.2. The first party argue that the works, proposed for retention, significantly enhance the residential amenity of the basement apartment and allow for clear views into an open space which has the effect of opening up that basement apartment, allowing it to have clear windows and space for planting, bicycles etc. It is submitted that there is an unusual historic split of residential accommodation on this site which require an approach that balances the requirements to maintain the character of the Protected Structure and maintain and enhance the amenity of the existing residential units. The

balcony and iron staircase provide access from the first floor unit to the rear garden for amenity and fire egress purposes.

- 7.3.3. I note the concerns raised with respect to overshadowing and overbearing impact to the ground floor windows. However, cognisance being had to the conservation officers report, it is clear that this type of development has been permitted in previous cases and is acceptable in principle.
- 7.3.4. Churchtown Park House is a large period house which the first party does not dispute has been sub-divided into residential units/apartments. On balance, I consider that given the proposed function / use and design of the ornate iron balcony, offset from the back wall at ground floor to allow for natural light to enter the ground floor apartment while ensuring that the structure can be easily removed without having any effect on the structure and integrity of the Protected Structure, is acceptable from a residential amenity perspective. I do not consider that the diminution in terms of loss of light or overbearing to the ground floor windows of the host dwelling / ground floor apartment unit is such that it warrants a refusal of planning retention. The structure can in the future be removed without any damage to the integrity of the protected structure and I consider this should be taken into account.
- 7.3.5. With respect to impact upon the residential amenity of the adjoining dwelling Glenard House to the west. As set out above, there is only minor glimpses of the balcony and iron railing from a ground floor kitchen window in Glenard House. The first party has included a screen at the top of the iron staircase which screens the west side of the balcony. Glenard House has been extensively extended to its rear and a high boundary wall separates it from the subject appeal site. The private amenity space serving Glenard House is to its west and there are no direct views from the appeal site to its garden / private open space. I do not consider that overlooking from the balcony is so material that it should give rise to a refusal of planning permission in this instance.

7.4. Conservation

- 7.4.1. Refusal reasons 2 and 3 of the decision by the PA, set out in full in section 3.1 of this report, consider that the 1.9m high wall divides the rear garden area and subsequently severs the original curtilage of the Protected Structure impacting significantly upon the special character and appearance of the building and materially contravening conditions 2 and 3 of Planning Permission Reg. Ref. D99A/0855. Also, that the replacement window to the side elevation does not accord with proper conservation standards and subsequently detracts from the significance of the building.
- 7.4.2. In the first instance with respect to the 1.9m high wall which subdivides the rear garden area, creating a separate private open space area to the rear of the annex structure granted planning permission under PL06D.117911 / D99A/0855 some 22 years ago. I do not agree with the planning authority this wall severs is the original curtilage of the protected structure impacting significantly upon the special character and appearance of the building. As set out above, the large historic curtilage of Churchtown Park House has been lost many years ago. Permission was granted for the annex unit and adjoining structures within the historic grounds. The rear wall proposed to be retained enhances the residential amenity, privacy and use afforded to the annex unit by way of more useable private rear garden area.
- 7.4.3. Clearly from a review of the documentation on file it would be irrational to consider that the wall would sever the original curtilage of the Protected Structure. The whole curtilage of which has been compromised and changed by way of permitted developments. There is in my opinion no significant loss to the amenity or setting of the main house. In this regard, cognisance is further had to D14A/0485 permission granted at the subject site to remove the existing circ. mid-20th century plastered concrete block wall and pillars, including iron gates to the North front entrance. Construct a new plastered concrete wall boundary and pillars with a new iron gateway entrance all set back from the existing entrance and boundary line. Removal of the modern bituminous paving

surface and installation of a permeable gravel surface to the North front external area. Additionally photographic evidence and maps attached to the file.

7.4.4. While regard is had to the consideration by the PA that to permit the wall would materially contravene conditions 2 and 3 of PL06D.117911 / D99A/0855, I do not agree. As stated this permission is some 22 year old and review of the said conditions is wholly acceptable. I consider that the intent of the conditions is no longer relevant and accordingly I recommend that retention of the wall be granted permission.

7.4.5. With respect to the insertion of a upvc window and the precedent it would set. The applicant is open to a compliance a condition which addresses the replacement of the pvc sash with an historic sash. Should the Board agree that planning retention permission be forthcoming, I recommend that a condition be attached requiring that within 6 months of the grant of retention permission that the Upvc sash bathroom window on the western gable elevation be replaced with a new timber sash window, to the written satisfaction of the planning authority.

7.5. Other issues

7.5.1. Concerns have been raised with respect to subdivision of Churchtown Park House into apartments, in particular, that it is a protected structure. Concern is also raised with respect to whether planning permission was granted for the annex accommodation. As set out in the planning history section of this report above, on foot of PL06D.117911 / D99A/0855 planning permission was granted to convert the existing garage/studio into a 2 bed residential unit.

7.5.2. With respect to whether subdivision of the host dwelling, it being a protected structure, received planning permission and is authorised, this is a matter for the planning authority. Enforcement comes within the sole remit of the PA and is not within the remit of An Bord Pleanála. My report deals specifically and solely with the retention of elements set out in section 2.1, 'Permission for retention of unauthorised development', of this report above. I recommend that a condition be attached to any grant of retention permission to clarify this matter.

7.6. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.6.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the availability of public services, the nature of the receiving environment, and the proximity of the lands in question to the nearest European site, it is my opinion that no appropriate assessment issues arise and that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on any Natura 2000 site. A Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1.1. Following the assessments above, I recommend that Retention permission should be granted, subject to conditions, for the reasons and considerations set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 9.1.1. Having regard to the 'A' zoning objective pertaining to the site it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the development to be retained would not seriously injure the residential amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would be acceptable from a visual amenity perspective and would generally be acceptable in terms of compliance with the criteria stipulated under the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022 -2028. The proposed development will therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be retained, 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 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>Within 6 months of the grant of retention permission the Upvc sash bathroom window on the western gable elevation shall be replaced with a new conservation timber sash window, to the written satisfaction and agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.</p>
3.	<p>This retention permission relates solely to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The construction of a new balcony to the rear of the main house.• Alterations to and the replacement of windows with new doors at ground floor level to the rear of the house.• The construction of a new external wall to the rear garden between the modern detached Mews dwelling and rear boundary wall.• The replacement of a window to the side of the main house. <p>And does not permit or authorise any unauthorised use or works carried out within the curtilage of Churchtown Park House</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of orderly development.</p>

4.	<p>Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health</p>
----	--

Fiona Fair

Planning Inspector

29.09. 2022