



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-315055-22

<b>Development</b>	Conversion of existing attic to habitable accommodation, restoration of existing roof, new roof lights, new roof structure between existing ridges, new stairs form first floor to attic in existing dwelling and associated site works, all within a PROTECTED STRUCTURE
<b>Location</b>	Mandalay, Violet Hill, Herbert Road, Bray, Co Wicklow
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Wicklow County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	221013
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Peadar & Danielle Bruton
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant with Conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Maria Gallen
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> July 2023
<b>Inspector</b>	Mary Crowley

## Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	4
2.0 Proposed Development .....	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	5
3.1. Decision .....	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies .....	5
3.4. Third Party Observations .....	5
4.0 Planning History .....	6
5.0 Policy Context .....	6
5.4. Natural Heritage Designations .....	8
5.5. EIA Screening .....	8
6.0 The Appeal .....	9
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	9
6.2. Applicant Response .....	10
6.3. Planning Authority Response .....	12
6.4. Observations .....	12
6.5. Further Responses .....	12
7.0 Assessment .....	13
7.2. Principle .....	14
7.3. Impacts on Protected Structure .....	14
7.4. Overlooking .....	16
7.5. Other Issues .....	16
8.0 Appropriate Assessment .....	17

9.0 Recommendation.....	18
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	18
11.0 Conditions .....	18

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The appeal site with a stated area of 0.2065 ha is located at 'Mandalay', Violet Hill, Herbert Road, Bray, Co. Wicklow.
- 1.2. Violet Hill House a neo-gothic Victorian country house built in circa 1862 was designed by William Fogarty and sits within a sylvan setting. The property is a Protected Structure and as described in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage was constructed in red brick with granite and Bath stone block. The exterior of the property was subsequently painted. There are a number of two-storey projecting gabled bays which in turn are faced with a mixture of single and two-storey square and canted bays. The window design features a mix of flat and pointed arched with timber sash frames. The pitched roof is finished with natural slate arranged in bands and has cast-iron rainwater goods; overhanging eaves have decorative bargeboards.
- 1.3. In the 1970's the property was sub-divided into three separate two-storey residential units within a terrace. 'Mandalay' the subject property is the central unit within the terrace. It is served by a separate gated vehicular entrance and the site includes a front and rear garden. It would appear that the exterior original features on 'Mandalay' have been substantially retained. The adjoining property to the north-east is 'Amber Gallery' and the adjoining property to the south-east is 'Violet Hill House'.
- 1.4. The building and its curtilage is a protected structure (No. B25 Herbert Road (Kilbride) Violet Hill). The property is listed in the current National Inventory of Architectural Heritage as Reg No 16400702, regional interest.
- 1.5. A set of photographs of the site and its environs taken during the course of my site inspection is attached. These serve to describe the site and location in further detail.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The development will consist of the conversion of existing attic to habitable accommodation, restoration of existing roof, new roof lights, new roof structure between existing ridges, new stairs from first floor to attic in existing dwelling and associated site works, all within a protected structure (WCC RPS No .B25 Kilbride, Violet Hill) at Mandalay, Violet Hill, Herbert Road, Bray, Co Wicklow.
- 2.2. The application was accompanied by the following:

- Cover Letter
- Conservation Report
- Conservation Report Appendix – Photographic survey of the interior

### 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

#### 3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Wicklow County Council issued a notification of decision to grant permission subject to 1 no conditions as follows:

1)	This permission refers to the developments as described in the documents lodged. <b>Reason:</b> For clarification
----	--

#### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

##### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

- **Case Planner** – recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions. The notification of decision to grant permission issued by DCC reflects this recommendation.

##### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- None

#### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

##### 3.3.1. None

#### 3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. There is one observation recorded on the planning file from Maria Gallen, The Gallery, violet Hill, Herbert Road. Photos included. The issues raised relate to loss of privacy, overlooking of adjoining property, inadequate details on conservation issues and requested that existing roof slates be reused, and only reclaimed slates should be added.

## 4.0 Planning History

4.1. There were 2 no previous appeals on this site that may be summarised as follows:

**ABP-PL27.246000 (Reg Ref 15/346)** – Wicklow County Council granted permission for the conversion of attic to habitable accommodation with new roof structure between ridges at a Protected Structure at Mandalay, Violet Hill, Herbert Road, Bray, Co. Wicklow subject to 5 no conditions. Following 2 no third party appeals the Board granted planning permission subject to 5 no conditions.

**ABP PL27.314979 (Reg Ref 22151)** – Wicklow County Council granted permission for demolition of existing single-storey rear extension and construction of new single-storey rear extension, attic conversion, restoration of roof, new stairs from first floor to attic and all associated site works at a Protected Structure at Mandalay, Violet Hill, Herbert Road, Bray, Co. Wicklow subject to 2 no conditions. The decision was appealed by 2 no third parties. No decision has issued to date.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028

- **PO 8.13** - To ensure the protection of all structures, items and features contained in the Record of Protected Structures.
- **CPO 8.14** - To positively consider proposals to alter or change the use of protected structures so as to render them viable for modern use, subject to architectural heritage assessment and to demonstration by a suitably qualified Conservation Architect / or other relevant expertise that the structure, character, appearance and setting will not be adversely affected and suitable design, materials and construction methods will be utilised.
- **CPO 8.15** - All development works on or at the sites of protected structures, including any site works necessary, shall be carried out using best heritage practice for the protection and preservation of those aspects or features of the structures / site that render it worthy of protection.

- **CO 8.16** - To support the re-introduction of traditional features on protected structures where there is evidence that such features (e.g. window styles, finishes etc) previously existed.
- **CPO 8.17** - To strongly resist the demolition of protected structures or features of special interest unless it can be demonstrated that exceptional circumstances exist. All such cases will be subject to full heritage impact assessment and mitigation.

## 5.2. Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018 – 2024

- 5.2.1. The appeal site is zoned **RE Existing Residential** where the objective is “*to protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas. To provide for house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity. In existing residential areas, the areas of open space permitted, designated or dedicated solely to the use of the residents will normally be zoned 'RE as they form an intrinsic part of the overall residential development; however new housing or other non-community related uses will not normally be permitted.* The LAP states that land uses generally appropriate for residential zoned areas include houses and apartments.
- 5.2.2. Violet Hill is **Protected Structure B25**. It is also listed on the NIAH as being of regional importance. Trees at Violet Hill are protected by **Tree Preservation Order No.2** (Schedule 10.08 Existing Tree Preservation Orders, Bray MD LAP)
- 5.2.3. **Chapter 9 Architectural Heritage** of the LAP is in relation to 'Built & Natural Heritage' sets out the following relevant objectives:
- **AH1** - To ensure the protection of all structures (or parts of structures) contained in the Record of Protected Structures.
  - **AH2** - To positively consider proposals to improve, alter, extend or change the use of protected structures so as to render them viable for modern use, subject to consultation with suitably qualified Conservation Architects and or other relevant experts, suitable design, materials and construction methods. All development works on or at the sites of protected structures, including any site works necessary, shall be carried out using best heritage practice for the protection and preservation

of those aspects or features of the structures / site that render it worthy of protection. To support the re-introduction of traditional features on protected structures where there is evidence that such features (e.g. window styles, finishes etc) previously existed, while not compromising the need for energy conservation.

- **AH4** - Where an item or a structure (or any feature of a structure) is considered to be of heritage merit (where not identified in the RPS1), the Planning Authority reserves the right to refuse permission to remove or alter that structure / item, in the interests of the protection of the County's architectural heritage.

### 5.3. **Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities** (2011) –

Part 1 of these guidelines includes the criteria to be applied when selecting proposed protected structures for inclusion in the RPS. Part 2 contains supplementary detailed guidance to support planning authorities in their role to protect the architectural heritage when a protected structure, a proposed protected structure or the exterior of a building within an ACA is the subject of development proposals and when a declaration is sought in relation to a protected structure. While these guidelines are primarily addressed to planning authorities, it is intended that they will also be of assistance to owners and occupiers of protected structures, of proposed protected structures or buildings within ACAs and to those proposing to carry out works which would impact on such structures.

### 5.4. **Natural Heritage Designations**

- 5.4.1. The appeal site is not located in or immediately adjacent to a European Site.

### 5.5. **EIA Screening**

- 5.5.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. 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. The first party appeal was prepared and submitted by RML Planning on behalf of Maria Gallen, the Gallery, Violet Hill, Herbert Road.

- The proposed extension will seriously compromise the architectural significance of a unique protected structure listed of regional importance in the Inventory of Architectural Heritage of Ireland and contrary to the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028, the Bray Local Area Plan 2018 and the Section 28 Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2011 (AHPG). The proposed development fails to assess the impact on the entire roof of the protected structure and curtilage.
- The special architectural character of the protected Tudor-Gothic building includes the steeply pitched roofs. The AHPG specifically devote a chapter to roofs which has not been addressed in the application, submitted Conservation Report or Planning Authority assessment. The proposed new roof profile and materials will seriously compromise the special architectural character and original design of protected structure and is contrary to the AHPG in relation to interventions to roofs on protected structures. The development would set a precedent for further ad hoc roof extensions.
- The proposed rooflights will overlook the existing attic conservatory windows in The Gallery. The proposed new roof will have a serious negative impact on the adjacent roof of The Gallery owing to the lack of detail of how the appellant's roof will be protected by the new roof profile.
- The process of assessing the planning application was fundamentally flawed for several reasons, including that the application does not comply with the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 as amended relating to the late erection of the site notice and failure to provide correct drawings. No bat survey was sought. The Planning Authority failed to impose any or the proper conditions that should be applied to protected structures in accordance with the Guidance of the Office of the Planning Regulator and AHPG.

- The Board has a strong track record of refusing permission for development that detracts from the visual character of a protected structure and/or has a detrimental and irreversible impact on the essential qualities of the curtilage of a protected structure. The Board recently refused permission for an extension to this protected structure.
- The impact of the development by the construction process on the Tree preservation Order has not been addressed in the application.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. The third-party appeal was cross circulated to the relevant parties. The first party submitted the following response:

- **Planning History** - Planning permission was granted in 2016 for the conversion of the existing attic to habitable accommodation. The decision was appealed by the appellant to An Bord Pleanála and the Board upheld the decision of Wicklow County Council. The attic conversion in this application is very similar to the original permission. ABP 27.246000 WCC 15/346. The principle of the attic conversion has, therefore, already been established. The permission lapsed in 2021.
- **Adverse impact on protected structure** - The proposed profile change is limited to the valley area between the two existing roof pitches. The proposed change is almost imperceptible from ground level. A new drawing is provided with this appeal response showing the entire existing, and proposed, front and rear elevations of the protected structure. The proposed roof profile has already been granted planning permission by An Bord Pleanála reference ABP 27.246000.
- **Negative impacts of proposed new roof on The Gallery** - The proposed design will not lead to any additional surface water in the appellant's gutter than currently exists. There is minimal impact on the shared section of valley gutter. For clarity the applicant has added notes describing the fall of the valley gutters to the appended roof plan drawings.
- **Surface Water** – Applicant is happy to provide an Engineers Report if required by An Bord Pleanála.

- **Overlooking** - In response to the appellant's concerns that the proposed roof windows will overlook their roof light the applicant is happy to make these obscured or remove the proposed opposing roof light if deemed necessary by An Bord Pleanála.
- **Planning Assessment Process** – The site notice was erected on the date stated on the notice. Site layout plan at 1:500 scale showing the entirety of the site outlined in red provided with additional dimensions showing distances of structures from the site boundary.
- **Bat Report** - No bat roost or presence of bats were found during applicants inspections of the attic space. A bat survey would not normally be required for the conversion alterations to a domestic attic.
- **EIA & AA** - Neither an AA nor an EIA is required to be provided by the applicants in this instance.
- **An Bord Pleanála precedent for refusal** – Those referenced by the appellant are not relevant to this planning application:
- **Tree Preservation Order** – The proposed design has no material impact on either the TPO or the RPA of trees. If planning permission is granted the construction management process will be overseen by a conservation architect.
- **Conclusion** - The proposed development set out in this planning application represents an appropriate design, scale, form and layout for an attic conversion to a protected structure. The principle of the attic conversion has been accepted by Wicklow County Council and An Bord Pleanála. Planning issues raised by the Appellant, as set out in this letter, have either been addressed or can be addressed by way of additional and/or revised planning conditions.

6.2.2. The submission was accompanied by the following drawings:

- Revised site layout at 1:500 showing extent of site
- New schematic plan and elevations of Violet Hill
- Revised attic and roof plans showing neighbour's skylight & outline of Cedar tree's root protection area and photos of attic interior

### 6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. None

### 6.4. Observations

6.4.1. None

### 6.5. Further Responses

6.5.1. The first party response to the appeal was cross circulated to the relevant parties. The third-party response may be summarised as follows:

- **Submitted drawings** – The applicant had an opportunity to correct the invalid application and despite it clearly being highlighted in the appeal grounds, they have failed to provide the mandatory drawings in accordance with the regulations. The Board is respectfully requested to refuse permission.
- **Impact on the adjoining conservatory roof** - The applicant has submitted A4 drawing in the response to the appeal of a corrected existing roof profile and proposed which are completely inadequate to make any assessment owing to the totally incorrect scale and insufficient size, despite being noted as 1:100 and must be read with a magnifying glass. The conservatory roof window of The Gallery is noted on drawings as 'existing skylight' and is clearly overlooked by windows noted.
- **Surface Water** - The impact on entire roof structure remains unaddressed and there are no details if is it the plan to insert a steel beam supported by the walls below.
- **Red Line Boundary** - From an examination of the submitted drawings, the proposed new roof profile also appears to involve the removal of a short section outside the red line on the submitted root drawings to which no consent accompanies the application.
- **Heritage Appraisal** - The circulated response does not address the impact of current ad hoc development proposals on different properties and the lack of any coherent conservation plan. The response does not address any assessment of this development within the context of the entire site or address the issue of

precedent raised in the appeal. This appeal refers to development at Mandalay at roof level only. A concurrent appeal before the Board includes this roof development and an extension (ABP. Ref. PL27.314979, PA. ref. 22/151). The original roof profile is proposed to be altered. The structural element of the existing roof will be irretrievably lost. There is a presumption against altering roof profiles in the AHPGs that has not been overcome in this application or response to appeal

- **AA and EIA screening** - The Board as the competent authority shall carry out the screening.
- **Tree Preservation Order** - The Root Protection Areas of the trees to the front of the appeal site have not been indicated on the revised drawing submitted to the Board. These should have been identified and a management plan proposed. It is not appropriate to leave such matters of significance to be dealt with by way of condition.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. I note the concern raised by the appellant regarding the late erection of the site notice, failure to provide correct drawings and the absence of a bat survey. As the Planning Authority accepted the application and did not raise any concerns re validity and that the Board have also accepted the appeal, I do not propose to deal with the matter of the erection of the site notice any further in this assessment. I am also satisfied that taken together with my site inspection that there is adequate information available on the file to consider the proposed development.

7.1. Having regard to the information presented by the parties to the appeal and in the course of the planning application and my inspection of the appeal site, I consider the key planning issues relating to the assessment of the appeal can be considered under the following general headings:

- Principle
- Impacts on Protected Structure
- Overlooking
- Other Issues
- Appropriate Assessment

## **7.2. Principle**

- 7.2.1. Planning permission is sought for the conversion of existing attic to habitable accommodation, restoration of existing roof, new roof lights, new roof structure between existing ridges, new stairs from first floor to attic in existing dwelling and associated site works, all within a protected structure, Mandalay.
- 7.2.2. I refer to the Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018 – 2024 where the site is zoned RE Existing Residential and where the objective is to protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas and to provide for house improvements, alterations and extensions in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity. It is also the Council policy to positively consider proposals to improve, alter, extend or change the use of protected structures so as to render them viable for modern use subject to consultation with suitably qualified conservation architects and / or relevant experts, suitable design, materials and construction methods.
- 7.2.3. I am therefore satisfied that that the principle of the development of an attic extension is acceptable at this location subject to the acceptance or otherwise of site specifics / other policies within the development plan and government guidance.

## **7.3. Impacts on Protected Structure**

- 7.3.1. Much of the appeal centres on the impact of the proposed development works on the architectural character of the protected structure. A similar scheme was previously permitted by the Board (ABP-PL27.246000 (Reg Ref 15/346) refers). A conservation report which assesses the house and the proposed interventions, accompanied the application. The report concludes that the works will not adversely impact on the historic fabric or character of the house.
- 7.3.2. As documented in the appeal file Violet Hill was originally built as a large, single dwelling in a Neo-gothic style. The whole structure and its curtilage is a protected structure. Violet Hill is no longer a single dwelling; the main building was subdivided into 4 separate dwelling (two of which are apartments) circa 1970 and the gardens were similarly subdivided creating new entrances and gardens for each dwelling. The outbuilding to the north-east of the curtilage have also been converted to residential use. Violet Hill now comprises a terrace of dwellings. Mandalay, the appeal site, is

the central dwelling in this terrace. The entire facade of Violet Hill is an assemblage of varied elements both on the facade and roof scape. The roof has a variety of heights and levels with large roof skylights on both the front and rear elevation.

7.3.3. The proposed attic conversion consists of the re-roofing of the hidden valley of the roof area and the introduction of new skylights to include the following:

- Installation of 2 roof lights to the south-east rear elevation,
- Installation of 3 roof lights to the north-eastern side elevation,
- Installation of a roof light to the south-western side elevation,
- New section of zinc/lead roof with skylights and valley gutter and side cladding to the central area of the roof between the existing ridges.

7.3.4. While the proposal makes a change to the exterior façade, I agree with the applicant that the varied elements and asymmetry that make up the character of the existing building allow for the discrete insertion of new section of roofing and rooflights that are absorbed into the overall elevation with negligible impact on the building's special character. I am satisfied that the scale and design of the attic extension does not overwhelm or dominate the original form or appearance of the parent building and I do not consider that this element of the scheme will have a significant negative impact on the overall protected structure, established character or visual amenities of the area.

7.3.5. With regard to the visibility of the new section of roof from the front of the property I refer to the applicant's submission where their calculations show that the existing rear ridge only becomes visible on the front facade, from ground level, at a distance of approximately 60 metres from the front of the building. The proposed metal roof spanning the internal valley (which will be located below both the front and rear ridge levels) would only be visible at ground level at a distance of 75 metres approximately from the front of the house. At these distances, the views of the building are effectively obscured by large mature trees.

7.3.6. It is evident from the plans submitted that the design of the proposed scheme has been carefully considered in detail to try to achieve optimum spatial organisation for future inhabitants. It is also evident that this restricted site presents a complex and difficult context to deal with not least of which is its listing as a Protected Structure within the larger protected structure complex. Overall I am satisfied that the solution

proposed has been arrived at through careful design with detailed consideration given to its context and that the resultant proposal reconciles the need to maintain the architectural character of this Protected Structure with the proposal to provide a modern family dwelling without compromising the established spatial character and built form of the overall protected structure.

#### 7.4. **Overlooking**

- 7.4.1. I note the concerns raised that the proposed windows (rooflights) on the Gallery side will overlook the existing conservatory in the adjoining property at the Gallery. I refer to the plans and cross sections submitted and note that 2 no new roof light windows identified as No 3 in plans serving an office area are closest to the Gallery property.
- 7.4.2. I note that in their response to the appeal the applicant states that they are willing to make these rooflights obscure or remove the proposed opposing roof light if deemed necessary. I do not consider it necessary to remove these rooflight however, to ensure that there is no overlooking it is recommended that a condition be attached requiring that these windows are obscure.

#### 7.5. **Other Issues**

- 7.5.1. **Development Contribution** – I refer to the Wicklow County Council Development Contribution Scheme. Proposed works are stated as 28.3sqm habitable attic space. A waiver for the first 40sqm applies. Recommended that a Section 48 Development Contribution condition **is not attached**.
- 7.5.2. **Red Line Boundary** – I note the concerns raised that the works appeal to involve the removal of a short section outside the red line to which no consent accompanies the application. In this regard I would draw attention to Section 34(13) of the Planning Act that states, that a person is not entitled solely by reason of a permission to carry out any development. Therefore, should planning permission be granted and should the appellant or any other party consider that the planning permission granted by the Board cannot be implemented because of landownership or title issue, then Section 34 (13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is relevant.
- 7.5.3. **Conditions** – I note the concerns raised by the appellant regarding the conditions attached by the Planning Authority. I am satisfied that the conditions as recommended



below are satisfactory and align with the requirements of the Guidance of the Office of the Planning Regulator and the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011).

- 7.5.4. **Tree Preservation Order** – I note the concerns raised by the appellant that the construction process will have an impact on the Tree Preservation Order. Having regard to the limited nature and extent of works proposed I am satisfied that subject to a suitably worded condition requiring that detailed measures in relation to the protection of trees at Violet Hill that are protected by Tree Preservation Order to be agreed in writing prior to commencement of work on site that there will be no significant impact to said trees.
- 7.5.5. **Surface Water Drainage** – I note the concerns raised with regard to surface water drainage by the appellant whereby an Engineers Report is required. I am satisfied that this matter can be dealt with by way of standard condition whereby drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.
- 7.5.6. **AA & EIA** – Matters pertaining to both are dealt with in Section 5.5 EIA Screening above and Section 8.0 Appropriate Assessment below.
- 7.5.7. **Bats** – I note the concerns raised that no bat survey was sought as part of this application. I further note that the applicant carried out a visual bat survey of the attic. The applicant states that no bat roost or presence of bats were found during their inspections of the attic space. I accept these findings. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable impact on biodiversity and that no significant impacts are likely to arise as a result of the proposed development.

## 8.0 Appropriate Assessment

- 8.1.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and its distance 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.

## 9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. Having considered the contents of the application the provision of the Development Plan, the grounds of appeal and the responses thereto, my site inspection and my assessment of the planning issues, I recommend that permission be **GRANTED** for the following reason.

## 10.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1. Having regard to the location, nature, design and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not materially or adversely affect the protected structure and would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 11.0 Conditions

1.	<p>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 commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity</p>
2.	<p>a) All works to the protected structure shall be carried out under the supervision of a qualified professional with specialised conservation expertise.</p> <p>b) The proposed roof finish shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of work on site.</p>

	<b>Reason:</b> To secure the authentic preservation of this protected structure and to ensure that the proposed works are carried out in accordance with best conservation practice
3.	<p>The 2 no proposed roof lights on the rear elevation and identified as No 3 in plans submitted shall be obscure glass. Details shall be agreed in writing with the Plannign Authority prior to commencement of work on site.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of residential amenity</p>
4.	<p>Detailed measures in relation to the protection of trees at Violet Hill that are protected by Tree Preservation Order shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning authority prior to commencement of work on site.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To ensure the protection of the natural heritage on site</p>
5.	<p>a) 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>b) Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a water and wastewater connection agreement with Irish Water.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of public health and surface water management.</p>
6.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

---

**Mary Crowley**

**Senior Planning Inspector**

**23<sup>rd</sup> July 2023**