



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-319854-24

Development	Joining No. 1 and No. 2 Martello Terrace into a single dwelling with all associated site works.
Location	Nos. 1 & 2 Martello Terrace, Sutton Strand, Sutton, Dublin 13
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F24A/0249
Applicant(s)	Gilliane Quinn.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission subject to conditions
Type of Appeal	First Party v. Conditions
Appellant(s)	Gilliane Quinn.
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	10 th October 2024
Inspector	Catherine Hanly

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Planning History	6
4.1. Planning History for the Site	6
5.0 Policy Context	7
5.1. Development Plan	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	8
5.3. EIA Screening	9
5.4. Grounds of Appeal	9
5.5. Revised Proposal	12
5.6. Planning Authority Response	12
5.7. Observations	12
6.0 Assessment	12
7.0 AA Screening	18
8.0 Recommendation	18
9.0 Reasons and Considerations	18
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site contains nos. 1 and 2 Martello Terrace which forms part of a terrace of a former coastguard station and coastguard cottages. The cottages were originally built in the middle of the 19th century and the completed terrace contained 8no. houses with access through a central gateway between nos. 2 and 3. This central gateway still remains, whilst each dwelling in the terrace is also served by its own individual entrance. A variety of pedestrian and vehicular entrance designs and surface treatments on parking areas serve the 8no. dwellings. The surface treatments and entrance designs of the parking areas along Martello Terrace include concrete, concrete paving slabs, cobbles, an electric wooden gate, block paving, gravel and paving stones. The dwellings at Martello Terrace have large front gardens and small courtyards to the rear. The site is part of the Martello Terrace Sutton – Martello Terrace, Strand Road Architectural Conservation Area.
- 1.2. The subject site has a stated area of 0.98ha and is located on the eastern side of Strand Road. Nos. 1 and 2 Martello Terrace consist of 2no. single-storey terraced cottages, with no. 2 being mid-terraced and no. 1 containing a two-storey tower element and a two-storey extension at the corner of the site at the bend on Strand Road. The existing 2no. properties have a total floor area of 189 m².
- 1.3. The site consists of No. 1 Martello Terrace in the southern end of the site and No. 2 Martello Terrace to the northern end of the site. The site abuts no. 3 Martello Terrace to the north and the grounds of a dwelling known as Sealawn to the eastern rear.
- 1.4. Vehicular access to no. 2 is located to the western front of the dwelling off Strand Road. Pedestrian access to no. 2 is via stone piers and metal gates located to the front of nos. 2 and 3. I note that this pedestrian entrance is not within the site area of the application. Vehicular and pedestrian access to no.1 is located to the southern side of the site off Strand Road, at the other side of the bend in Strand Road and close to where Strand Road meets Shielmartin Road.
- 1.5. Strand Road is served by the no. 6 bus route which is operated by Dublin Bus. The bus route operates between Abbey Street Lower and Howth Station. The bus stop is located opposite the entrance to no. 1 Martello Terrace.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development includes:

- The joining of house nos. 1 and 2 Martello Terrace into a single residential dwelling.
- The demolition of the existing rear return and an external shed to the rear of no. 2
- The construction of a single storey rear extension to no. 2
- Internal alteration and connections
- A rooflight to the rear roof slope
- A stepped patio to the front of nos. 1 and 2 with new planting and hedge
- Enlargement of the existing vehicular parking area in the front garden outside no. 2
- All associated works

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Notification of the Decision to Grant Permission subject to 8 no. conditions issued on 9th May 2024. Condition nos. 3(a) and (c) are relevant to this appeal. Conditions nos. 3(a) and (c) are as follows:

3. The developer shall comply with the following requirements of the Planning Authority:

(a) The driveway and proposed enlarged parking area to the front of no. 2 Martello Terrace shall be omitted.

(c) Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority plans, sections, and drawings at an appropriate scale indicating the closure of the vehicular entrance and driveway to the front of no. 2 Martello Terrace. These shall indicate the retention and extension/ reinstatement of the historic stone wall across the

front boundary, the use of materials, methods, and finishes in keeping with the historic stone boundary wall and gate pier, and boundary treatments and landscaping within the site as appropriate.

Reason: In the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety, and to protect and enhance the character of the Architectural Conservation Area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The Planning Officer noted that subject to conditions, the development would not adversely impact the special character of the cottages and watchtower.
- The Planning Officer further stated that the development has the potential to enhance the character of the Architectural Conservation Area through restoring lost features such as appropriate fenestration, subject to condition. The Planning Officer stated that this could be achieved through the reinstatement of the stone wall and the closure of the driveway outside no. 2 Martello Terrace.
- The Planning Officer recommended the requirements set out under condition no. 3 (a) and (c).

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Transportation Planning Division: No objection subject to condition.
- Conservation Officer Section: No objection subject to condition.
- Engineering Department Drainage Division: No objection subject to condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Planning History for the Site

No.1 Martello Terrace

- **F14B/0294**: Planning permission **granted** on 29th June 2015 for a one and two storey extension (area 63m²), to the rear of the existing house, also internal and external alterations to the house including (a) reinstatement of original slate to roof of tower (replacing tiled roof covering) and (b) altered ground levels and paving to south of the building.

No. 2 Martello Terrace

- **F16A/0231**: Planning permission **refused** following third party appeal to An Bord Pleanála on 27th March 2017 for the demolition of the existing non-original single storey extension and lean-to shed to the rear of the dwelling house and the construction of a rear extension of 32sq.m. over two levels in an Architectural Conservation Area.

Planning permission was refused for the following reason:

Having regard to the nature and two-storey scale of the proposed development, and its close proximity to neighbouring site boundaries, the Board is not satisfied that the proposed development would not be overbearing in effect or would not result in overshadowing of neighbouring rear amenity space to the north, or diminish daylight to the rear rooms of neighbouring dwellings. The proposed development would, therefore, seriously injure the visual and residential amenities of neighbouring property, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. I note the following policies and objectives of the *Fingal County Development Plan 2023 – 2029* (herein referred to as the *Fingal CDP*):

- The site is subject to land use zoning 'RS' (Residential), which has the objective to *"provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity"*.
- The site is located in the Sutton – Martello Terrace, Strand Road Architectural Conservation Area (herein referred to as the *ACA*).
- The site's landscape character is identified as coastal and highly sensitive.
- The site is located in the Howth Special Amenity Area Buffer Zone.
- There is a specific objective to preserve views along Strand Road.
- Strand Road is part of the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan.
- Policy SPQHP41 - Residential Extensions, which states *"support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities"*.
- Objective SPQH045 – Domestic Extensions, which states *"encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area"*.
- Section 14.10.2.3 – Ground Floor Extensions (Rear)
- Policy HCAP14 – Architectural Conservation Areas, which states *"protect the special interest and character of all areas which have been designated as an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). Development within or affecting an ACA must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting wherever possible. Development shall not harm buildings, spaces, original street patterns, archaeological sites, historic boundaries or features, which contribute positively to the ACA"*.
- Policy HCAP15 – Character of Architectural Conservation Areas which states *"Support and encourage the sympathetic and appropriate adaptive reuse, refurbishment, and upgrading of protected structures and buildings or*

structures that contribute to the character of an Architectural Conservation Area ensuring that their special interest, character and setting is retained. Prohibit development that seeks the demolition of a Protected Structure or buildings that contribute to the character of an ACA in almost all circumstances”.

- Objective HCAO24 – Alteration and Development of Protected Structures and ACAs which requires *“proposals for any development, modification, alteration, extension or energy retrofitting affecting a Protected Structure and/or its setting or a building that contributes to the character of an ACA are sensitively sited and designed, are compatible with the special character, and are appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, architectural treatment, layout, materials, impact on architectural or historic features.”*
- Objective DMSO186 – Retention of Existing Building Stock within an ACA which seeks to *“retain the existing building stock within an ACA where possible and ensure that any new development or alteration of a building within or adjoining an ACA positively enhances the character of the area and is appropriate in terms of the proposed design, including: scale, mass, height, proportions, density, layout, materials, plot ratio, and building lines.”*
- Objective DMSO187 – *“Planning Applications within an ACA, which states that all planning applications for works in an Architectural Conservation Area shall have regard to the information outlined in Table 14.24.”*
- Table 14.24 – Direction for Proposed Development within Architectural Conservation Areas
- Policy CSP23 – Howth SAAO which seeks to *“protect the Howth Special Amenity Area Order, including the Buffer zone, from residential and industrial development intended to meet urban generated demand.”*

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The site is located approximately 4.9m to the east of the North Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (site code 000206) and approximately 13.5m to the east of

North Bull Island Special Protection Areas (site code 004006). The site is also located approximately 9.6m to the east of the Howth Head Proposed Natural Heritage Area (site code 000202) and approximately 14.7m to the north of the Howth Head Special Area of Conservation (site code 000202).

5.3. EIA Screening

- 5.3.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of this report.

5.4. Grounds of Appeal

- 5.4.1. A first party appeal has been lodged in relation to Condition Nos. 3 (a) and (c) of the Planning Authority's Notification of the Decision to Grant Permission. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

Existing Entrances

- Both nos. 1 and 2 Martello Terrace each have their own vehicular entrance and parking areas which have existed before the Planning and Development Act of 1963.
- There is an existing access passage located between house Nos. 2 and 3 which was the original shared access to all the houses on the terrace. The passage is no longer in shared use and is outside the boundary of the application.

Proposal

- The application proposed for the enlargement of the parking area to house No. 2 in order to allow for turning of a car and forward exit from the site.
- A revised drawing has been submitted with the appeal in response to the Planning Authority's concerns (Proposed Site Plan RevB – Drawing No. GA02) which reduces the proposed parking to a single space outside house

no. 2. The revised proposal proposes steps leading to the terraced patio which would lead to the original front door.

- The proposed parking area outside No.2 will have a gravel surface finish and will be screened from the public road by proposed boundary hedging and planting.

Pattern of Development

- There is a pattern of development along Martello Terrace for car parking for 6 of the 8no. houses along Strand Road.
- The existing entrance to no.2 is one of the more discreet entrances and the proposal to provide additional hedge screening will conceal it further.

Pattern of Use

- The location of the existing carparking area for No. 1 at the side of the house is inconvenient and has resulted in the side patio door becoming the primary entrance.
- The proposed location of the carparking to the front of the house and directly to the front of the original door will allow for the front door to return as the primary entrance serving the joined houses.

Architectural Conservation Area

- The applicant intends to comply with the other conditions of the planning permission and has engaged Dermot Nolan who is a Conservation Architect to review the existing entrances.

Future Use

- Removing the existing carparking serving house no. 2 will reduce the possibility of ever converting the houses back into individual dwellings. This will have a negative impact on the adaptability of the houses.

Car Parking Standards

- The joining of the two existing houses will result in a larger single house with 4no. double bedrooms and is deemed more appropriate to have 3no. car

parking spaces. It is requested that there is a relaxation in the parking standards set out in table 14.19.

- The enlargement of the hard standing area would have only the slightest impact on the character of the buildings, their curtilage and the public realm.

Heritage Report

- A Heritage Report prepared by Dermot Nolan, Conservation Architect is included in the grounds of appeal.
- There was originally a single entrance in the centre of the initial terrace of 4 no. houses. There are now 7no. vehicular entrances and 3 no. pedestrian entrances. This has resulted in a loss of character.
- The inclusion of condition no. 3 seeks to reverse the present arrangement to that which applied before the publication of the ACA.
- The proposed hard standing finish of gravel will improve the impact on the public realm.
- The removal of the opening would prejudice the possibility of reverting the development back to 2no. houses.
- Condition no.3 has the effect of uniting the 2no. houses to achieve an outcome which is not recommended in the ACA.
- The ACA does not state that the breaching of the boundary wall should be reversed.
- It is not known if the breaches in the perimeter wall have planning permission.
- The enlargement of the parking bay will not have any affect on the stability of the wall.
- The building owner would accept a condition requiring that details of any proposed works required to ensure the continuing stability of the boundary wall be submitted to the Local Authority for approval.
- The enlargement of the hard standing area will have only the slightest impact on the character of the buildings, their curtilage and the public realm.

5.5. Revised Proposal

- 5.5.1. The applicant has submitted a revised drawing (Proposed Site Plan RevB – Drawing No. GA02) with the first party appeal. The applicant proposes to reduce the extent of the proposed parking area, from that originally proposed, to a single space outside house No. 2. The revised proposal proposes steps leading to the terraced patio which would lead to the original front door.

5.6. Planning Authority Response

- 5.6.1. The Planning Authority's response to the grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:
- The Planning Authority noted that both vehicular entrances have substandard sightlines. The Planning Authority had regard to the Development Plan car parking standards and noted that the car parking requirements could be met at the existing driveway to no. 1 Martello Terrace. Given the substandard sightlines at the vehicular entrance to the front of no. 2, it is considered that the requirements of condition no. 3 are justified and in the interests of traffic safety.
 - The Planning Authority also considered that condition no. 3 would provide for the restoration of the historic boundary and would enhance the character of the ACA.

5.7. Observations

None received.

6.0 Assessment

- 6.1. This is a first party appeal against Condition Nos. 3 (a) and (c) as attached to the Planning Authority's Notification of the Decision to Grant Planning Permission. Condition No. 3 (a) requires that the driveway and proposed enlarged parking area to the front of no. 2 Martello Terrace is omitted. Condition No. 3 (c) requires that prior to the commencement of development, that the applicant submits for the written agreement of the Planning Authority plans, sections, and drawings indicating the

closure of the vehicular entrance and driveway to the front of no. 2 Martello Terrace. The condition requires that the plans indicate the retention and extension/ reinstatement of the historic stone wall across the front boundary, the use of materials, methods, and that the wall is finished in keeping with the historic stone boundary wall and gate, and that the boundary treatments and landscaping within the site are appropriate. The reason for this condition is stated as being in the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety, and to protect and enhance the character of the Architectural Conservation Area.

6.2. Following my examination of the planning file and grounds of appeal, I am satisfied that the proposed development is in accordance with the zoning for the site.

Furthermore, I consider that the works to the 2no. dwellings, including the joining of the dwellings, the demolition work, the rear extension, provision of a rooflight and stepped patio in the front garden would not seriously affect the setting of the ACA. I therefore consider it appropriate that the appeal should be confined to Condition No. 3(a) and Condition No. 3(c) only. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the determination by the Board of this application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and that the Board should determine that matters raised in the appeal only in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

6.3. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the reports of the Planning Authority, and inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local policies and guidance, I consider the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Traffic Safety
- Parking
- Conservation

6.4. **Traffic Safety**

6.4.1. Regard is had to the report from the Fingal County Council's Planning Officer which highlights that both entrances have substandard sightlines that are not in accordance with Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets for a 50km/hr speed limit. The Transportation Planning Report from Fingal County Council states that

improvements could be made to the access to no. 1 to improve sightlines, however the report notes that this would have an impact on the existing stone wall. The report further states that a car approaching the access to No. 1 on the nearside traffic lane would be travelling slower as they come around the bend.

- 6.4.2. I note the first-party states that it is not proposed to make any interventions into the boundary walls in order to improve sightlines.
- 6.4.3. The Fingal County Council's Planning Officer report accepts that the continued use of an existing driveway is acceptable in terms of traffic safety given that the development would reduce car parking through the removal of car parking outside no.2 by way of condition.
- 6.4.4. Following my site inspection, I conclude that a vehicle approaching the entrance to no. 1 when travelling south, would approach at a slower speed, than when it reaches no. 2, due to the presence of the bend on Strand Road before the entrance to no. 1. As such, whilst the sightlines are substandard at both vehicular entrances to nos. 1 and 2, I consider that there is a better provision of sightlines at the entrance to no.1 than no. 2.
- 6.4.5. In addition, I consider that the location of the vehicular entrance for no.1 to be in a less visually intrusive location than no.2, given that it is positioned at the side of the dwelling and around the bend on Strand Road. As such, noting the sightlines and the positioning of the driveways, I therefore consider that the provision of parking solely outside no. 1 to be appropriate.
- 6.4.6. As noted above under section 5.5, the appellant proposes to reduce the extent of the proposed parking area, from that originally proposed, to a single space outside house No. 2. I note however, that the appellant still proposes to increase the extent of the parking area outside no.2 to incorporate a turning area. Having regard to the substandard sightlines and the bend in the road as Strand Road meets Shielmartin Road, I consider that the enlargement of the parking area outside no. 2 would represent an intensification of an entrance with substandard sightlines and as such would negatively impact traffic safety. Having regard to the parking provision outside no. 1, the positioning of the entrance to no. 1 in a less visually intrusive location in comparison to no. 2 and the substandard sightlines, I consider that the closure of the vehicular entrance outside no. 2 will improve traffic safety. Thus, I consider that

condition no. 3(a) is reasonable in this instance and that the dwelling will be adequately served by 2no. parking spaces outside no. 1 Martello Terrace.

6.5. Parking

- 6.5.1. As part of the appeal, the first-party appellant proposes to reduce the extent of the proposed parking area, from that originally proposed, to a single space with turning area outside house No. 2. This would bring the proposed parking more in line with the Development Plan requirements. In the interests of clarity, this assessment is based on the revised proposal unless otherwise indicated.
- 6.5.2. The first-party appellant outlines that the expansion of the parking area will provide visitor parking and will assist in providing access to the front door which will be the primary entrance to the house.
- 6.5.3. I note that the site is not located close to a major public transport node and that in accordance with table 14.18 in the *Fingal CDP*, the site is located in zone 2. In accordance with table 14.19 in the *Fingal CDP*, the car parking standard for a 4-bedroom house in zone 2 is 2no. parking spaces plus 1 no. visitor space per 5 no. units. The *Fingal CDP* states that this parking standard is the norm, which refers to the number of spaces that will generally be permitted unless specific changes are considered necessary to ensure the proper planning and sustainable development of a proposed development.
- 6.5.4. The Transportation Planning Report further states that the vehicular access to no. 2 should be closed as there is no longer a requirement for a vehicular access, given that sufficient parking is provided for the site.
- 6.5.5. As discussed above under the traffic safety section, I note the first-party states that it is not proposed to make any interventions into the boundary walls in order to improve sightlines.
- 6.5.6. Noting the parking provision at no. 1 and the parking standards set out in the *Fingal CDP*, I consider that the enhancement of parking at no. 2 is not required in order to ensure that the dwelling is adequately served by parking. In addition, I consider that additional parking for visitors, located to the front of no.2, is not required, would fail to accord with table 14.19 of the *Fingal CDP* and would represent an intensification of

use of a substandard entrance with insufficient sightlines. Furthermore, I consider that the omission of car parking outside no. 2 will in no way inhibit the use of the front door from the parking area outside no. 1 which can be accessed via the pedestrian pathway. As such, I consider that the closure of the vehicular entrance at no.2 is an appropriate measure to improve pedestrian and vehicular safety, whilst ensuring that the dwelling is still served by parking at the entrance to no. 1. I therefore consider that the imposition of condition no. 3 (a) and (c) by Fingal County Council is reasonable.

6.6. Conservation

- 6.6.1. The site is located within the Martello Terrace, Strand Road, Sutton ACA. The Statement of Character for the ACA outlines that whilst the houses are modest terraced cottages, the overall uniformity of design gives the area its distinctive character. The Statement of Character further states that *“the creation of individual driveways and front garden areas has resulted in different boundary treatments, which detract from the original built form of the terrace due to the variety of materials used.”*

In considering the foregoing, I note Policy HCAP14 in the *Fingal CDP*, which seeks to *“protect the special interest and character of all areas which have been designated as an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). Development within or affecting an ACA must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting wherever possible. Development shall not harm buildings, spaces, original street patterns, archaeological sites, historic boundaries or features, which contribute positively to the ACA”*.

From my site inspection, I noted the visibility of the front garden on the subject site when viewed from the road, due to the gradual rise in levels from Strand Road at the west up to the dwelling to the east, and up to Shielmartin Road to the southeast. As such, in my opinion, any expansion works to the existing driveway outside No. 2 will be highly visible, notwithstanding the proposed boundary planting. Following a site inspection, and having regard to Policy HCAP14 in the *Fingal CDP*, the site location, topography and proposed drawings, I consider that the proposed expansion works to the driveway outside no. 2 will not enhance the character of the ACA. Instead, I

consider that the proposed driveway expansion will further detract from the uniformity of design that gives the ACA it's unique character and distinctiveness. As such, I consider that the expansion of the driveway fails to accord with Policy HCAP14 of the *Fingal CDP*. I therefore consider that the omission of the driveway expansion by condition no. 3 (a) is reasonable in this instance.

During my site inspection, I noted the importance of the stone wall in adding to the distinctive character of the ACA. I further noted the variation in boundary and surface treatments at the entrances to Nos. 1 – 8 Martello Terrace. In my view, the variation of materials and design which is present in the front driveways of Nos. 1 – 8 negatively impacts on the uniformity of the ACA, which in my opinion is an important element of its character. This is emphasised in the Statement of Character for the ACA.

The first party states in the Heritage Report that the closure of the driveway to No.2 prejudices the ability of Nos. 1 and 2 to revert to separate dwellings in the future. It is noted that there is no planning history for any of the existing vehicular entrances along Martello Terrace. The Statement of Character for the ACA notes that the majority of properties along the terrace created private off-street parking spaces prior to the ACA designation. As the ACA is currently in place, I consider that the subject application must examine the impact of the development on the ACA and consider the elements subject to the current application which seek to join 2no. dwellings.

Noting the positioning of the driveway to No.2 at a visible location, as Shielmartin Road descends to meet Strand Road, in addition to the Planning Authority's Reports and the Statement of Character for the ACA, I consider that the requirements of condition No. 3 (c) seeking the reinstatement of the historic stone wall across the front boundary at No. 2 Martello Terrace to be warranted in this instance. In my view, the reinstatement of the stone wall will *enhance the character of the ACA in line with Policy HCAP14 and table 14.24 of the Fingal CDP* which seeks to restore original features that have been lost.

Thus, in conclusion, I am satisfied that the application of Condition Nos. 3(a) and 3(c) are necessary and reasonable in this instance and serve to protect the character of the ACA.

7.0 AA Screening

- 7.1. Having regard to the development proposed being alterations to 2no. existing dwellings in a serviced urban area, I consider that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that Condition Nos. 3(a) and 3(c) be attached to the Planning Permission.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 9.1. It is considered that sight visibility lines from nos. 1 and 2 Martello Terrace are seriously substandard due to their proximity to an acute bend on Strand Road. Having regard to the alignment of Strand Road at this location, the absence of a public footpath adjoining the site and the proximity of the existing driveway of no. 2 Martello Terrace to an acute bend in the road, it is considered that the amalgamation of dwelling nos. 1 and 2 would facilitate the closure of the driveway to no. 2, thereby enhancing traffic safety in the area. The attachment of Condition No. 3(a) is therefore considered in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The proposed development, seeking the expansion of the parking area outside no. 2 Martello Terrace, would exceed the parking standards set out in table 14.19 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029, in an area served by public transport and would enlarge a parking area at an entrance with insufficient sightlines. Thus, the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan standards and would set a precedent for similar development in the area, which would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and would negatively impact traffic safety. Furthermore, the expansion of the parking area outside no. 2 Martello Terrace would adversely affect the setting of the Martello Terrace, Strand Road, Sutton Architectural Conservation Area. As such, the attachment of Condition No. 3(c) is considered to accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and will provide for the reinstatement of the

historic stone wall across the front boundary at No. 2 Martello Terrace which will enhance the character of the Martello Terrace, Strand Road, Sutton Architectural Conservation Area in line with Policy HCAP14 and table 14.24 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029, which seeks to restore original features that have been lost.

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.

Catherine Hanly
Planning Inspector

7th November 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála	319854-24		
Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary	<p>The joining of house nos. 1 and 2 Martello Terrace into a single residential dwelling, the demolition of the existing rear return and an external shed to the rear of no. 2, the construction of a single storey rear extension to no. 2, internal alteration and connections, a rooflight to the rear roof slope, a stepped patio to the front of nos. 1 and 2 with new planting and hedge, enlargement of the existing vehicular parking area in the front garden outside no. 2 and all associated works.</p>		
Development Address	Nos. 1 & 2 Martello Terrace, Sutton Strand, Sutton, Dublin 13		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			
No	X		Proceed to Q.3

3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?

		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)	Conclusion
No	X	N/A		No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes				

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No	X	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: Catherine Hanly Date: 7/11/2024