



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-317555-23

---

<b>Development</b>	Demolition of house and garage. Construction of house, garage, connection to public services and all associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	Rosbeg, Westport, Co. Mayo
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Mayo County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	221015
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Declan Keane & Fionnuala Breathnach
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Chris & Fidelma McGuirk & others
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	9/11/23
<b>Inspector</b>	Darragh Ryan

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is in the townland of Rosbeg approximately 400m southwest of Westport. The site has a stated area of .48ha.
- 1.2. The site slopes gently from the northeast down to the southwestern boundary. There is an existing bungalow dwelling on site with maintained lawns and driveways thereon.
- 1.3. The northern & southern boundaries are planted with a mix of species from bramble to creeping buttercup. There are stone walls to the north, south & west of site with a post and wire fence to the eastern boundary of the site.
- 1.4. Clew Bay house is located to the northwest of the site. There is a large dwelling located to the southeast of the site.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the following:
  - Demolish existing dwelling house. (176sqm)
  - Construct a new dwelling house and domestic garage. (395 sqm)
  - Connect to public services.

The further information submitted to the Planning Authority included the following:

- Revised Drawings and particulars for the proposed dwelling
- 3D renders for the proposed dwelling from various perspectives, contiguous elevation submitted with detail provided for the adjacent dwellings.
- Appropriate Assessment Screening report the report concludes that the development is not likely to have a significant impact on the status of the SAC.
- Visual Impact Assessment

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The Planning Authority issued a Notification of Decision to GRANT Permission on the 20<sup>th</sup> of June 2023 subject to 10 no. conditions. The following conditions are of note;

- C2 – Prior to commencement of the development, the applicant is required to provide an amended dwelling design for the written agreement of the Planning Authority which includes the following details:
- Blue Bangor slates must be used on all roof slopes available from the public road.
- The front pitched roof shall match that of “Sunnyside” house in terms of roof pitch, depth, height and eaves detail.
- Windows of the 2-storey element facing the sea shall be a traditional sliding sash type
- The first-floor flat roof section of the dwelling house shall be omitted.
- The balcony serving the master bedroom shall be omitted.
- C3 – all existing trees on site shall be retained for screening purposes.
- C4 – finished floor level of the house shall be at 12.4m as indicated on site layout plan.

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Basis for Planning Authority Decision

There were two planning authority reports on file, the first planning report includes the following comments;

- The proposed dwelling of 401sqm is significantly larger than neighbouring plots in a sensitive coastal setting. The provision of an extensive first floor patio and the overall height, scale and massing are considered inappropriate. (Advice given for the applicant to seek a redesign)

3.2.2. The second report of the Planning Officer includes the following comments;

- The revised design as submitted is appropriate subject to conditions. The proposed development will result in a development which will enhance the visual amenity of the area and respect the built heritage and character of the surrounding area.
- The Visual Impact Assessment submitted demonstrates that the revised design solution is a significant improvement and as such, will better reflect the character and built heritage of the area. The amended design is acceptable subject to conditions.

### 3.3. Other Technical Reports

Area Office – applicant responsible for the diversion of services and associated infrastructure. No water from the development to enter the public road. All works on public roads shall be done to appropriate guidelines.

Architects Office – Revised design is architecturally poor and unsuitable to this sensitive and prominent historic setting. A meeting with agent did occur and while the design suggestions were followed in principle, the resulting design is unresolved and undeveloped. The new design represents a collection of varying building forms and architectural styles joined up together. The proportioning is poor by comparison with surrounding buildings.

### 3.4. Prescribed Bodies

None

### 3.5. Third Party Observations

The main issues raised in the third-party observations can be summarised as follows:

- The revised design is not in keeping with the with adjacent houses in “Villa style” from the 1890’s.
- The size and scale of development in addition to the proposed finished floor levels will result in overlooking of neighbouring properties and result in significant loss of privacy.

- The proposed new design is aesthetically poor with ill-judged proportions, with insensitive handling of window styles and chimney stack design.
- The proposed new dwelling shall overlook adjacent property with the provision of a first-floor balcony.
- The scale height and massing are poorly handled with no linking of the internal arrangement to the external façade. The facades of the house are littered with poor fenestration patterns. The proposal is out of character with the mature quiet coastal residential neighbourhood.
- The proposed location of the new house deviates from the footprint of the existing bungalow therefore will result in Clew Bay House to the North being significantly overlooked resulting in a loss of privacy and potential devaluation of both neighbouring properties.
- The revised design lacks topographical detail with no site contours, ground levels etc. A cross section should be provided including Clew Bay House to the north. Concerns that the drop in floor level of the house by 1m would put the proposed house at risk of flooding. No details have been provided with respect to change of site levels and potential for knock on effects.

## 4.0 Planning History

Planning Authority Reference 73/0393 – Permission granted for the construction of a dwelling. (Existing dwelling on site)

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

The provisions of the Mayo County Development Plan 2023-2029 relevant to this assessment are as follows:

- **RHP 7** To consider replacement dwellings or development of other structures to habitable homes in all rural areas, subject to normal planning considerations.

- **RHO 5** To advise all rural housing applicants to utilise the Design Guidelines for Rural Housing (Mayo County Council) and core principles of same.
- **RHO 8** Applicants seeking to replace or reuse an existing house or other structure such as a church, schoolhouse or other substantial building in any rural area will not be required to demonstrate a housing need and will be assessed under normal planning considerations.
- **RHO 9** To discourage the demolition and replacement of traditional or vernacular rural houses in order to protect the varied types of housing stock in rural areas of the County and to preserve the rural built heritage. Demolition and replacement will only be considered, on a case-by-case basis, where it is clearly demonstrated by way of a suitably qualified structural engineer's report that the dwelling/structure is not reasonably capable of being made structurally sound or otherwise improved.
- **NEO 26** To consider applications for development, within Mayo's Coastal Areas and Lakeshores and within areas along scenic routes with designated scenic views, that can demonstrate a long-standing social link to the area concerned, whilst ensuring that it:
  - Does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area.
  - Cannot be considered at an alternative location.
  - Meets high standards in siting and design.
  - Contributes to and enhances local landscape character.
  - Satisfies all other criteria, with regard to, inter alia, servicing, public safety and environmental considerations.

Rural housing applications along Coastal Areas and Lakeshores must comply with the requirements set out in Objective RHO 4 (Chapter 3)

## 5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

Clew Bay SAC – located immediately adjacent to appeal site.

Brackloon Woods SAC- located 2.9km of the appeal site.

### 5.3. EIA Screening

See completed form 2 on file. Having regard to the limited nature and scale of development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity of the site as well as the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning & Development Regulations 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

This is a third-party appeal against the decision to grant permission. The appeal was made jointly by Chris and Fildelma McGuirk, Patrick & MaryClare Durcan, Derek Bennett and Maighread F. Costello who are all local residents and neighbours of the above property. The grounds of the appeal can be summarised as follows:

#### Condition number 2

- Condition number 2 of grant of permission by Mayo County Council is undemocratic. The request to amend the design through condition is un-just as it does not offer the opportunity for third parties to make observations.
- The condition is in breach of the legal and constitutional rights of the appellants. There has been no justification provided in the assessment for this condition. Therefore, the condition lacks transparency.

#### Design/ Impact on Residential Amenity

- The proposed new dwelling shall be double the size of the existing structure, the scale and mass of the structure is not sympathetic to its context with little screening or visual mitigation provided.
- The proposed design is out of character with the historic locality and would detract from the high-level visual amenity of the area. There is no coherent design theme which contravenes the rural housing design guidelines of Mayo County Council.

- The proposed palette of materials is ambiguous and left open for interpretation with the future potential for poor quality materials being used and poor-quality finishes. There is no list of suppliers for the materials proposed.
- The design would result in a loss of privacy due to the proposed overlooking balconies and first floor windows within 10 meters of site boundaries. The proposed balconies on both sides are within 11 meters of the adjacent boundaries and are a clear example of overlooking. Given the size of the site there is no requirement to have windows so close to boundaries.

#### Substandard drawings

- The drawings provided give a distorted view and the proposed and existing finished floor levels. The proximity to adjacent neighbouring dwelling is also distorted given the lack of dimensions provided.
- The OS mapping provided is inaccurate – normal procedure would be to use a measured topographical survey which would have a higher level of accuracy regarding site boundaries. It is not clear what the finished floor level is related to. Not known if this is ordnance datum or arbitrary datum.
- It is not clear what impact the lowering of the finished floor level would have on the rest of the site contours and whether this would result in meeting potential water table or impact upon sea level flood risk

## 6.2. Applicant Response

- The applicant contends that the revised design was the favoured approach of Mayo County Council, who met with the agent at further information stage and the revised design was based on this meeting. The contemporary approach was not accepted, and a more traditional approach was sought. The design approach agreed was for a two-storey traditional core with more contemporary wings to both sides. It was advised that “Marine Villa” be used as a template to advise the design.
- In the agents opinion the reference to “Sunnyside House” in condition 2 is an error according to the applicant and is a source of confusion for the appellant.



The house “Marine Villa” was involved in discussions with planning authority and in much closer proximity than “Sunnyside House”. A map indicating location of “Sunnyside House” and “Marine Villa” have been provided as part of the applicants response.

- The applicant has submitted a full set of compliance drawings to comply with condition 2 to demonstrate removal of balcony elements on first floor level and the omission of first floor flat roof element in the design.
- The applicant maintains that the planning authority report is supportive of the design proposal.
- The applicant contends that some of the assertions made in the appeal are incorrect. There are no longer any balconies proposed. There are no 1<sup>st</sup> floor windows within 10 meters of any neighbouring window. The distance to each of the neighbouring properties have been provided on the site layout plan.
- The levels provided for the site are clear and unambiguous. Finished floor levels for the proposed dwelling are provided. Floor and roof levels have been provided for in the visualisations. The OS datum provided is extremely accurate and regularly updated.

### 6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

- None

### 6.4. **Observations**

- None

## 7.0 **Assessment**

7.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the appeal, and having inspected the site and having regard to the relevant national and local policy guidance, I consider the main issues in relation to this appeal are as follows:

- Condition No 2

- Design, Impact on Residential amenity
- Flood Risk
- Appropriate Assessment

## 7.2. Condition 2

The appellant sets out that Condition 2 outlined within the schedule of conditions by Mayo County Council mandates a complete redesign of the existing dwelling. There was no consultation with the third parties on the file and therefore this condition is undemocratic. There has been no justification provided in the assessment for this condition, therefore the condition lacks transparency. The condition is set out under Section 3.1.1 above.

In response to this element of the appeal the applicant has provided revised drawings to demonstrate compliance with condition 2. The first-floor balcony has been omitted from the final design and a first-floor flat roof element to the rear of the property has been replaced with a pitched roof. The applicant states that there is an error in the condition with the reference made to “Sunnyside” House which is not adjacent to the property but on another cove south of the site and “Marine Villa” is the appropriate reference. The applicant has provided a map with the location of the two properties referenced.

Having reviewed the condition and response of the applicant, I do not consider the condition specified to be a complete redesign of the development. The design of the building remains almost identical with minor revisions. The requirement for specification of finishes and omission of certain elements of the design is not exceptional in terms of a planning condition. I do not agree with the appellant that this condition is exceptional or unprecedented.

## 7.3. Design/ Impact on Residential Amenity

- 7.3.1. The further information submitted to the Planning Authority provided for a revised house design of a traditional 2 storey structure with single storey contemporary wings. A visual impact assessment was also submitted with 3D rendered drawings. The key design features are as follows:

- A two-storey traditional core building with windows of vertical emphasis
- Two single storey wings encapsulated with local natural limestone.
- A garage connected to the main dwelling by a walkway.
- The house to have a total floor area of 395m<sup>2</sup>
- The plateau of the site is to be reduced by 1m such that the finished floor level is approximately the same as the neighbouring dwelling.

7.3.2. The appellant contends that the submitted design does not harmonize with the historical context and unique character of the area. The design incorporates a blend of architectural elements without a clear, consistent design identity. Moreover, the choice of materials is vague and open to interpretation, raising concerns about the potential use of low-quality materials that could result in subpar finishes. The absence of a specified list of material suppliers is also noted. The drawings provided present a skewed perspective of the proposed and existing finished floor levels. The proximity to neighbouring dwellings is inaccurately represented due to the absence of dimensions.

7.3.3. The applicant indicates that the original design was for a contemporary approach which was not accepted by the planning authority and revised design detail was requested. Following discussions with Mayo County Council a revised design was proposed which took inspiration from the adjacent dwelling “Marine Villa”. The design principles were agreed with Mayo County Council prior to formal response to the further information request. A visual impact assessment was submitted and the planning authority report sets out that the revised design detail is respectful of its setting and the landscape impacts will be localised and consistent with the established character of the area.

7.3.4. The Mayo County Development Plan sets out a Landscape Protection Policy Areas for the County, the site lies within an area identified within Policy Area 2 - Lowland Coastal zone. Map 10.2 of the Development Plan indicates that the site is visible from a scenic route with a designated view from the south of the site. The landscape sensitivity matrix indicates the construction of a dwelling would have a medium potential to create a negative impact on the surrounding area due to its high scenic value. A visual impact assessment was submitted as part of a further information

response to the local authority. A site survey was carried out to assess the visibility of the site along the scenic route to the south and surrounding areas. The existing dwelling is visible along the scenic route for approximately 400m when travelling east towards Westport. The existing house on site has a finished ridgel level of 5m, the proposed dwelling has a ridge height of 6.9m. A 3D rendered image of the dwelling and adjacent houses was created to provide a context for the development proposal. The 3D renders are taken from a number of different viewpoints from the south and south east. The 3D renders indicate a continuity of design in the area. I consider the visual assessment to be comprehensive and that it gives a strong indication of the impact of the dwelling on the scenic route and surrounding areas. The key mitigation in terms of visual impact is the design of dwelling and a submitted landscape plan. The visual impact will be localised, and I consider the development to not have any significant negative impacts visually on the wider landscape following the implementation of mitigation measures stated.

7.3.5. I consider the design proposal for the dwelling at this location to be appropriate. The design has strong central core with a traditional emphasis. The two contemporary single storey wings offer a contrast and reduce the scale and bulk of the building on site. Having regard to the site layout, the development sits on a natural plateau which will be reduced by 1m. This should also reduce the impact of the development. The site is large with an existing bungalow dwelling, having regard to the size and scale of neighbouring units, I do not consider the design to be obtrusive or out of character with the area. The design principles are strong and I consider the development is capable of satisfactory assimilation into the historic character of the landscape.

7.3.6. The third-party appeal sets out that the development proposal would result in a significant loss of privacy due to the proposed overlooking from balconies and other first floor windows which are within 10 meters of site boundaries. The appellant also states the drawings lack clear details in terms the OS mapping used which are inherently inaccurate.

The applicant response to the appeal is that there are no longer any balconies proposed in the design proposal. All the drawings submitted are indicated to scale and are correct. There are no first-floor windows within 10m of any boundary. Measurements are provided from the proposed dwelling to all neighbouring

boundaries. The Mayo County Development Plan or Mayo Rural Design Guidelines does not set out any specific requirements regarding set back from boundaries.

I do not consider the proposal will give rise to significant overlooking. There are no balconies associated with the development. The site is well screened from all boundaries through extensive mature planting. Mitigation is proposed in the form of additional screen planting on site boundaries to the east and west. The site is a significant at .48ha. The proposed new dwelling house would sit over 14m from neighbouring boundary to the south and 12m from neighbouring boundary to the northeast. The existing and proposed landscaping on site would mitigate against any further potential overlooking. The proposed dwelling would sit further back on site than the dwelling to south. However, owing to the site layout, screening and the design of the dwelling there is no direct line of sight into the rear of that property.

#### 7.3.7. Flood Risk

The third party contends that the proposed development will increase the potential for flooding as a result of the reduction in finished floor level by 1m. I have reviewed the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which was prepared as part of the Mayo County Development Plan and Floodmaps.ie and I note that the appeal site is not located within an area which is indicated as being at risk of flooding. In my opinion the proposal would not result in flooding of the proposed new build, the neighbouring properties or the local road network.

### 7.1. **Appropriate Assessment**

#### 7.1.1 Stage 1 Screening

7.1.2 The applicant submitted an Appropriate Assessment Screening at further information stage. The report was prepared by MSED. There are 8 no. European sites within a 15km zone of influence of the appeal site. The applicant's Stage 1 Appropriate Assessment Screening report was prepared in line with current best practice guidance and provides a description of the proposed development and identifies European Sites within a possible zone of influence of the development. Having reviewed the document, I am satisfied that the information allows for a complete examination and identification of any potential significant effects of the development, alone, or in combination with other plans and projects on European sites.

7.1.3 The proposed development comprises the demolition of an existing dwelling and associated outbuildings and construction of a new dwelling house and associated outbuildings. There is no surface water runoff from the site and collected rainwater is discharged to soak pits on site. Wastewater shall be discharged to the wastewater network through the existing public sewer connection.

7.1.4 A summary of European Sites that occur within a possible zone of influence of the proposed development is presented in Table 7.1. I note that the applicant included a greater number of European sites in their initial screening consideration, with sites within 15km of the development site considered. There is no ecological justification for such a wide consideration of sites, and I have only included those sites with any possible ecological connection or pathway in this screening determination.

**Table 7.1 - Summary Table of European Sites within a possible zone of influence of the proposed development.**

European Site (code)	List of Qualifying interest /Special conservation Interest	Distance from proposed development (Km)	Connections (source, pathway receptor)	Considered further in screening Y/N
Clew Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 001482)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]</li> <li>• Coastal lagoons [1150]</li> <li>• Large shallow inlets and bays [1160]</li> <li>• Annual vegetation of drift lines</li> <li>• Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220]</li> <li>• Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic coasts [1230]</li> <li>• Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima) [1330]</li> </ul>	c. 6 metres south of appeal site	The site is completely outside of the SAC. The site is a brownfield site, surface water shall be managed on site and wastewater shall be discharged to the public sewer. There will be no direct effects as the project footprint is located entirely outside of the designated site.	<b>N</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Embryonic Shifting dunes 2110]</li> <li>• Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophila arenaria [2120]</li> <li>• Machairs (*in Ireland) [21A0]</li> <li>• Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles [91A0]</li> <li>• Vertigo geyeri (Ceyer's Whorl Snail) [1013]</li> <li>• Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355]</li> <li>• Phoca vitulina (Harbour Seal) [1365]</li> </ul>			
Brackloon Woods SAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles [91A0]</li> </ul>	c. 2.9km south of appeal site	This SAC is located on the opposite side of Clew Bay and entirely outside the boundary of the proposed development. The SAC is designated for terrestrial woodland. No pathway for indirect effect on the terrestrial habitats for which the site has been designated exists.	<b>N</b>

7.1.5 The proposed development was considered in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended. Having regard to the nature and limited scale of the proposed development, connection into the public sewer and the lack of a hydrological or other pathway between the site and European sites, it is considered 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 European site.

## 8.0 Recommendation

8.1. Having regard to the above it is recommended that permission is granted based on the following reasons and considerations and subject to the attached conditions.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to:

- (a) The design, scale and layout of the proposed development,
- (b) The pattern of development in the area,
- (c) The provisions of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028,
- (d) The proposed development connecting into existing public wastewater treatment network

it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not be seriously injurious to the amenities of the area or the residential amenities of properties in the vicinity and would not adversely impact the built heritage of the area. The proposed development would, therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the plans and particulars received on the 11<sup>th</sup> July 2023 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 surface water generated within the site boundaries shall be collected and disposed of within the curtilage of the site. No surface water from roofs, paved areas or otherwise shall discharge onto the public road or adjoining properties.</p> <p>(b) The access driveway to the proposed development shall be provided with adequately sized pipes or ducts to ensure that no interference will be caused to existing roadside drainage.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and to prevent pollution.</p>
3.	<p>(a) The roof shall be covered in blue-black, or dark grey slates. The colour of the ridge tile shall be the same as the colour of the roof.</p> <p>(b) The external walls of the two-storey element of the build shall be finished in neutral colours such as grey or off-white. The proposed finishes for single storey elements shall consist of natural local stone, full details shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>(c) Windows to the 2 storey element shall be a traditional sliding sash type</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity</p>
4.	<p>(a) The landscaping scheme shown on drawing no. S-02, as submitted to the An Bord Pleanála on the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023 shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works. In addition to the proposals in the submitted scheme, the following shall be carried out:</p> <p>(b) Additional Screen planting of native tree and hedge species shall be provided along the northern and southern boundaries. These species shall comprise predominantly native species such as mountain ash, birch, willow, sycamore, pine, oak, hawthorn, holly, hazel, beech or alder.</p> <p>(C) All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others</p>

	<p>of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.</p>
5.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall enter into water and wastewater connection agreements with Irish Water.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of public health.</p>
6.	<p>The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network;</li> <li>b) Details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels;</li> <li>c) Off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste</li> <li>d) Details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil;</li> <li>e) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains.</li> </ul> <p>A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan shall be kept for inspection by the Planning Authority. The developer shall provide contact details for the public to make complaints during construction and provide a record of any such complaints and its response to them, which may also be inspected by the planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of amenities, public health and safety.</p>
7.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation</p>

	<p>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 amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
8.	<p>All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of visual and residential amenity.</p>
9.	<p>(a) The garage shall only be used for storage purposes and purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwelling and shall not be used for commercial or habitable purposes.</p> <p>(b) The external finishes of the proposed garage including roof slates, shall be the same as the dwelling in respect of colour and texture.</p> <p>Reason - In the interest of visual amenity, residential amenity and the orderly development of the area</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.

---

Darragh Ryan

Planning Inspector

14th of November 2023

