



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323413-25

Development

Consists of 1) Demolition of single storey extension. 2). Demolition of existing conservatory at rear (west) and replacement with single storey extension. 3). Internal alterations to the existing house (Protected Structure) 4). Blocking up of existing non-original window to front elevation (east). 5). Construction of new site boundary retaining wall (south-west) and all associated site works

Location

'The Lodge on the Green', The Square, Stradbally, Co. Waterford

Planning Authority

Waterford City and County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

25/60200

Applicant(s)

Bill and Nessa Casey

Type of Application

Planning Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission with conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s) Sadhbh Ni Fhloinn

Observer(s) None

Date of Site Inspection 7th November 2025

Inspector Phillippa Joyce

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
4.0 Planning History.....	9
5.0 Policy Context.....	9
6.0 The Appeal	12
7.0 Planning Assessment	18
8.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	26
9.0 Water Status Impact Assessment.....	26
10.0 Recommendation	27
11.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	27
12.0 Conditions	28
Appendix 1: Environmental Impact Assessment – Pre-Screening	32

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at the 'Lodge on the Green', The Square, Stradbally, Co. Waterford. The site is rectangular in configuration, with an area indicated as measuring 0.098ha.
- 1.2. The site accommodates a semi-detached, two storey, three bay dwelling house. Adjoining the northern side of the subject dwelling is the other semi-detached dwelling, which is of a similar design. A single storey garage structure extends from the southern side of the subject dwelling. To the front (east) of the property is a surface parking area, access to which is gained from the north via the front area of the attached dwelling (indicated as a right of way). To the rear (west) of the dwelling, the property is served by a long back garden.
- 1.3. Stradbally is a historic village, with the development of The Square indicated as dating from the early 19th century (also referred to as The Green in documentation on the case file). The Square is a landscaped area of public open space, formed at a T junction in the centre of the village (intersection of two local roads, L3028 and L3025).
- 1.4. The site is located on the western side of The Square, and the semi-detached pair of dwellings face onto same. The site is separated from The Square by a hedgerow boundary. To the north and east of The Square are terrace rows of historic buildings forming the main thoroughfare in the village.
- 1.5. The dwelling at the site is designated as a protected structure and included in the national inventory of architectural heritage. The site is also located within the architectural conservation area designation for the village.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the following:
 - demolition of existing single storey side garage (south) and replacement with single storey extension.
 - demolition of existing conservatory at rear (west) and replacement with single storey extension.

- internal alterations to the existing house.
- blocking up of existing non-original window to front elevation (east).
- construction of new site boundary retaining wall (south-west) and all associated site works.

2.2. The floorspace of the existing building is indicated as c.203sqm, the floorspace to be demolished as c.50qm, the floorspace to be retained as c.140sqm, and the new floorspace as c.70sqm. The extended floor area comprises new dining and living space, a guest bedroom and ensuite bathroom.

2.3. During the assessment of the application, Further Information (FI) was requested by the planning authority (see Section 3.0 below for details). In response to the FI request, the applicant revised the proposed development. Key revisions to the proposed extension include changes to the design of the front elevation and associated changes to the floor plan.

2.4. I consider there to be planning merit in the revisions made to the proposed development at FI response stage and recommend to the Commission that regard is had to same in the assessment of this appeal.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Summary of Decision

3.1.1. The application was lodged to the planning authority on 1st April 2025. The proposed development was subject of a further information request on 22nd May 2025, the response to which was received by the planning authority on 26th June 2025.

3.1.2. The planning authority granted permission for the proposed development on 22nd July 2025, subject to seven conditions. This is a third-party appeal against the planning authority's decision to grant permission.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planner's Reports

Initial Assessment

- No objection to the demolition of the existing garage adjoining the southern gable in order to facilitate the proposed extension.
- Concerns expressed regarding the design of the proposal, considered to jar with that of the existing dwelling.
- States consideration is open to a contemporary design.
- However, considers the external finishes, window/ door proportions and overall aesthetic detracts from the character of the existing dwelling.
- Refers to similar positions expressed in the Conservation Officer report and third party observation.
- Further information requested on/ for:
 - A revised design proposal which harmonises better with the existing dwelling (window/ door opening arrangement and external finishes, e.g. render and aesthetically pleasing window proportions).
 - The extent of external wall removal of the historic building fabric (not comply with Objective BH 29 Extensions and Alterations).
 - An updated Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment (AHIA) outlining the physical implications of wall removal to the historic protected structure, and the visual impact of the proposed finishes and design on the character of the main building and within the wider context (i.e., Village Square and Stradbally ACA).

Further Information Assessment

- States that the design has been somewhat modified in the FI response.
- Newly proposed window and door openings in the façade of the extension are projecting.
- The external finishes have not been revised. Considers these will fit in discreetly as the extension is set back 900mm from the front façade of the existing house.
- Design revisions not considered to necessarily improve the overall aesthetic of the proposal.

- Recommends that the windows should be revised to the original proposal, and all opes in the front elevation shall be flat fronted.
- Notes that the structural design has been amended such that the position of the original wall is now identified by way of a drop down beam.
- The small window in the front elevation of the dwelling (formerly a door) from where the post office was run (initially proposed to be closed) is now to be retained.
- Notes the Conservation Officer's report requirement that non-original window opes in the front elevation are to be closed up/ omitted.
- An updated AHIA has been submitted which sets out the physical implications of the proposed development on the existing structure.
- A Design Impact Statement assesses the visual impact of the proposal on the property and in the context of the Village Square and Stradbally ACA.

Recommendation

- Extension set back behind the front elevation of the dwelling and is modest in scale.
- External finishes are anticipated to present better in reality.
- Recommends conditions be attached requiring that the windows in the front elevation of the extension revert back to the original proposal, the height of the overall extension be reduced to match the existing garage currently on site, and non-original window opes in the front elevation be omitted (i.e., as per the original proposal).

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Conservation Officer: Initial report requests FI. Subsequent FI report

3.2.3. Conditions

The seven conditions attached to the grant of permission include bespoke Condition 2, as follows:

2. Prior to the commencement of any development revised drawings illustrating the following shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority:

(i) The windows serving the guest bedroom shall have a pronounced vertical emphasis in accordance with submitted drawings date-stamped 1st April 2025. All windows and doors in the front elevation of the extension permitted herein shall be flat fronted and shall be of hardwood timber.

(ii) The overall height of the extension when viewed from the front elevation shall be lowered to match the highest point of the existing garage roof as indicated on drawing PL-07 date stamped 1st April 2025.

(iii) The opes to the existing house and the proposed extension shall be in accordance with Drawing no. PL-07 as submitted on 1st of April 2025.

(iv) Windows in the existing house shall be of timber construction with historically correct pane, glazing bar, sash and frame detail.

Reason: *In the interests of architectural protection, proper planning and sustainable development.*

The remaining conditions are more standard in nature and relate to undertaking works to a protected structure (Condition 3), no overhanging (Condition 4), no separating the extension from the main dwelling unit (Condition 5), construction phase times (Condition 6), and surface water drainage (Condition 7).

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. No prescribed body reports on the case file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. The planning authority indicates one third-party submission was received during the assessment of the application, and summarises the key issues raised.

3.4.2. I have reviewed the submission on the case file (by the appellant) and confirm several of the issues raised therein form the basis of the appeal case, which are outlined in detail in Section 6.0 below.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

No planning history.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.1.1. The applicable development plan for the appeal case is the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028 (CCDP). The CCDP contains map-based designations and written based policy which establish the context for the proposed development.
- 5.1.2. The relevant CCDP map-based/ mapped designations include:
- The site is zoned as RV 'Rural Village' which seeks to '*Protect and promote the character of the Rural Village and promote a vibrant community appropriate to available physical and community infrastructure.*' (Vol 4, Settlement and Zoning Maps).
 - No Specific Development Objectives (STDs) apply.
 - The site contains Protected Structure: WA750199, RPS: 199, Townhouse, 'Semi-detached three-bay two-storey house, c.1800. Renovated, c.1975' (also NIAH Number: 22811025) (Vol 4, Built Heritage Map).
 - The site is located within the Architectural Conservation Area for Stradbally village (Vol 4, Built Heritage Map).
 - The site is located within the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) including Record of Monuments and Places (RMP), Zone of Notification, Settlement Cluster (SMR No. WA032-012, Zone ID: R131537) (Vol 4, Built Heritage Map).
- 5.1.3. The relevant CCDP policy and objectives include:
- Chapter 11: Heritage (Vol 1, Written Statement)
 - Objective BH 05: Architectural Conservation Areas

It is the policy of the Council to:

- Achieve the preservation of the special character of places, areas, groups of structures setting out Architectural Conservation Areas (ACA).
- Protect the special heritage values, unique characteristics and distinctive features, such as shopfronts within the ACA from inappropriate development which would detract from the special character of the ACA.
- Prohibit the demolition of historic structures that positively contributes to the distinctive character of the ACA.
- Encourage the undergrounding of overhead services and the removal of redundant wiring/ cables within an ACA and to assess all further cable installations against its likely impact on the character of the ACA as the cumulative impact of wiring can have a negative impact on the character of ACAs.
- Provide guidelines on appropriate development to retain its distinctive character; and protect elements of the streetscape such as rubble stone boundary walls, planting schemes and street furniture such as paving, post boxes, historic bollards, basement grills, street signage/plaques, etc. which make a positive contribution to the built heritage.
- Retain or sensitively reintegrate any surviving items of historic street furniture and finishes such as granite kerbing and paving that contribute to the character of an ACA.

○ Objective BH 06: Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment

It is the policy of the Council when considering development which may have a significant impact on a protected structure, its setting or curtilage or have an impact on an ACA, that the proposal be accompanied by an Architectural Heritage Impact assessment (AHIA) detailing the potential impact of the development on the architectural heritage. The report should be compiled in accordance with the details set out in Appendix B of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, Department of the Environment.

○ Policy in Section 11.6: Design

The design of any proposed new development in a historic core should respect the existing character of its setting and blend in harmoniously sited and designed sympathetically so as not to detract from the setting. New developments should consider the existing building heights, vertical and horizontal lines, window size and fenestration in the vicinity, building materials and elevations of the existing structures. In some cases, high quality contemporary design can be acceptable.

- Objective BH 10: Building Adaptation

It is the policy of the Council to facilitate appropriate, high-quality design solutions for adaptations of Protected Structures and historic buildings in an ACA that carefully consider the design, height, scale, massing, and finishes of adjacent buildings.

- Objective BH 11: Maintaining and Enhancing Special Character

It is the policy of the Council to protect structures and curtilages included in the RPS or historic structures within ACA, from any works which would visually or physically detract from the special character of the main structure, any structures within the curtilage, or the streetscape or landscape setting of the ACA.

- Objective BH 12: Settings and Vistas

It is the policy of the Council to ensure the protection of the settings and vistas of Protected Structures, and historic buildings within and adjacent to ACAs from any works which would result in the loss or damage to their special character.

- Objective BH 29: Extensions and Alterations

It is the policy of the council to ensure that where it is proposed to extend an existing vernacular house/ building, the design, scale, footprint and materials should be sympathetic to the existing building and its setting. Extensions should:

- generally, be located to the rear and not obscure the form or layout of the existing building.
- substantial removal of walling should be avoided.

- connecting the existing building and extension should minimise the number of new openings and ideally use existing openings; and,
- Where feasible outbuilding contiguous to a dwelling can sometimes be successfully incorporated.
- Section 11: Zoning and Land Use (Vol 2, Development Management Standards)
 - Table 11.2 Zoning Matrix, 'dwelling/ principal private residence' is permitted in principle under the RV zoning objective.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The appeal site is not located in or immediately adjacent to a European Site, a Natural Heritage Area (NHA) or a proposed NHA (pNHA).
- 5.2.2. The pNHA designations in proximity to the appeal site include:
 - Stradbally Woods pNHA (001707) is c.355m to the southeast.
 - Ballyvoyle Head to Tramore pNHA (001693) is c.705m to the southeast.
- 5.2.3. The European site designations in proximity to the appeal site include (measured at closest proximity):
 - Mid-Waterford Coast SPA (004193) is c.705m to the southeast.
 - Glendine Wood SAC (002324) is c.8.4km to the west.

5.3. Environmental Impact Assessment 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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination (see Appendix 1 of report).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. This is a third-party appeal against the decision of the planning authority to grant permission for the proposed development.

6.1.2. The appeal grounds can be summarised as follows:

Background

- Appellant does not give an address in Stradbally but indicates they have a long-standing association and familiarity with County Waterford.
- Appellant has a deep appreciation for the vernacular character and architectural heritage of Waterford County.
- Appeal objects, in particular, to Condition 2(i) and the proposed front elevation treatment of the extension to the subject dwelling.

Further Information Response

- FI request based largely on the appellant's submission on the application.
- Response by the applicant did not address, in any way, the FI request.
- Response by the applicant was to resubmit the same material treatment to the elevation (pre-patinated copper) and alter the window arrangement to a single bay type window, bay type door and smaller side window.
- Rejects the applicant's justifications for same that the external material is in keeping with other house fronts, the window and door opes are more in keeping with other windows in the façade, and the loss of historic related fabric is not substantial.
- Notwithstanding the FI request and the applicant's FI response, the planning authority permitted application now includes Condition 2(i).
- Condition 2(i) requires the applicant to revert to the original treatment and window proportions of the proposed extension.

Design and Layout

- Applicant's contention that the proposed material, a metal finish, is in keeping with the rendered house fronts on Main Street is simply not a viable argument.
- The bay style arrangement of the windows could not be said to be in keeping with the existing windows in the façade of the house under any circumstances.

- The permitted window proportions, being narrow and vertical, are even less sympathetic to the existing façade than those of the bay window.
- No such materials or window proportions exist in any of the façades of the houses/ shops surrounding the Green.
- The proposed inappropriate façade treatment would negatively impact the historic protected structure and the character of the town.
- The responses to the FI requests are not in accordance with the objectives of the development plan nor do they adhere to the objectives contained in the 'Architectural Heritage Protection - Guidelines for Planning Authorities'.

Protected Structure

- The garage wall forms part of the façade of the protected structure and the façades of both protected structures to form a continuous rendered façade to the Green.
- Proposal to remove part of the façade of the protected structure for the sole purpose of setting a new front wall back from the existing façade so as to be subservient is unnecessary and damages that part of the protected streetscape.

Stradbally Architectural Conservation Area

- The treatment of the extension to the protected structure in no way harmonises with its setting within Stradbally ACA.
- The use of metal standing seam cladding for the front elevation to the extension is wholly unsympathetic to the architectural heritage of Stradbally.
- The proposed treatment and colour to the new extension is in stark contrast to the existing surrounding buildings/ facades on the Green, which facades being, for the most part, render and pebbledash.
- The proposed material and window proportions are not sympathetic within the wider context of the Green but are features which detract from and will have a detrimental effect on the character of the village as a whole.

- The development plan outlines the planned estate village of Stradbally is centred on the Green and describes the surrounding terraces dating from circa 1780 to the 1800's as rendered and painted facades.
- It is further stated that the Green formalises and contributes to the character of the village, the village centre has not changed and remains strongly linked to its planned layout.
- The development plan states that the ACA of Stradbally is of historic, social and architectural merit.
- The description of Stradbally ACA notes that the majority of buildings within the ACA have a rendered finish. The Development Management Standards state these original historic external finishes should be retained.
- The garage wall forms an intrinsic part of the protected structure (photographic evidence indicates its presence from 1940s), is therefore an intrinsic part of the character of the ACA of Stradbally and the design of the extension should respect this.

Conclusion

- The proposal would be detrimental to the character of structure, would negatively impact the setting within the ACA and create an undesirable precedent.
- It should be possible to retain the garage wall and insert aesthetically pleasing window/ door proportions as a more sympathetic approach.
- The removal of parts of protected structures in piecemeal fashion reduces the overall importance of the built heritage and detracts from its designation within an ACA.
- If ACA and protected structure policies are to have any significance in the overall context of our built heritage, then meaningful limits must be set for contemporary interventions.
- Requests that permission is refused for that part of the application as it relates to the proposed front façade treatment of the protected structure.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. The applicant has responded to the third party appeal and key issues can be summarised as follows:

Overview

- All the structures on The Square are two-storeys in height with slated roofs, timber windows and façades rendered/ painted throughout (except the police barracks, which is three storeys).
- The structures either side of the main street marked as Protected Structures. (though the garage is not so marked).
- Refers to a 1926 OS Map which indicates a structure in the location of the side garage which is set back from the dwelling's front wall.
- At some stage in the 1960's, it would appear that the garage was formed on top on the existing retaining concrete and random rubble walls.
- Proposed extension will have a flat sedum roof and profiled metal facade with a pre-patinated finish, contrasting with the rendering elsewhere but in keeping with the variety of colours of the painted front facades.

Further Information Response

- The window proportions were changed from a narrow vertical proportion to a more sympathetic size and shape.
- The internal wall layout was changed to minimise the loss of historic fabric and with downstand beams where walls sections were removed to indicate their previous existence.
- The AHIA was updated to justify the removal of wall sections and the visual impact of the proposed finishes, that the variety of façade colours in Irish towns is wide and can include colours such as that proposed.

Grant of Permission and Condition 2

- Conditions 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are not at issue.
- Applicant has accepted that the amendments required by Condition 2 would be made.

Response to Appeal Grounds

- Applicant identifies four appeal grounds and gives responses to same.
 1. Removal of the Garage Wall – front garage wall is a modern intervention (historic maps and photos provided) and has no "special interest" as set out in Section 57 of the Planning & Development Act (as amended).
 2. Treatment and Colour of the Extension – materials and colours are contemporary, of their time and alternatives might be regarded as pastiche. They contrast with the surrounding finishes and colours, and do not have a negative impact on the Square, streetscape or the ACA in general.
 3. Window Proportions – notes the original proposal, the revised design in the FI response, and the decision to revert to the more vertical window proportion. Comments that they are different, but of their time.
 4. Loss of Historic Fabric – the internal layouts were revised in the FI response to reduce the loss of historic fabric. The wall of the garage cannot be regarded as historic fabric.

Conclusion

- There is no heritage value (little of "special interest") in the garage.
- There is minimal loss of historic fabric in the overall proposal.
- The ensemble of The Green and streetscape has significance, but the proposal does not adversely affect this.
- The choice of colours and materials proposed to the front wall of the extension contrasts with the existing, in line with current best conservation practice.
- Highlights that the height of the extension will not exceed that of the existing garage as required by Condition 2.
- Confident the proposal does not negatively impact on the character and significance of the Protected Structure, streetscape and Architectural Conservation Area.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. No response has been received from the planning authority on the appeal.

6.4. Observations

6.4.1. None.

7.0 Planning Assessment

7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. Having reviewed the appeal, examined the documentation on the case file, inspected the site, and had regard to the relevant policy context, I consider that the main issues in the appeal to be as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Layout
- Architectural Heritage
- Other Matters

I propose to address each item in turn below.

7.2. Principle of Development

Zoning Objective

7.2.1. In the CCDP, the appeal site is zoned as RV 'Rural Village' which seeks to 'Protect and promote the character of the Rural Village and promote a vibrant community appropriate to available physical and community infrastructure'.

7.2.2. I consider the proposed development, an extension to an existing dwelling, to come within the scope of 'dwelling/ principal private residence' which is permitted in principle under the RV zoning objective.

7.2.3. In the event of a grant of permission, I recommend the attachment of a condition requiring the extension and main dwelling house be jointly occupied for residential purposes. Accordingly, no issues arise on terms of the principle of use class.

7.3. Design and Layout

7.3.1. As outlined in section 3.0 of this report above, the proposed development, as initially submitted was subject to FI request, the design was revised accordingly, and

Condition 2(i) and (iii) of the planning authority's decision in effect grant the proposed development as initially submitted.

- 7.3.2. For the Commission's clarity I provide an overview of the key items of the proposed development as initially submitted and as revised in the FI response (the Commission is directed to the applicable floorplans, elevations, and section drawings for details).

Floor Plans

- 7.3.3. As initially submitted, at ground floor level the proposed development comprises the demolition of the side garage and rear conservatory, and the construction of a new single storey extension accommodating a bedroom, ensuite bathroom, utility room and extended living/ dining space in the main dwelling. The front building line of the extension is set back from that of the dwelling by 0.90cm. The side and rear walls of the extension are within the extent of the site, with the existing southern and southwestern boundary walls are indicated as remaining unchanged.
- 7.3.4. The demolition of the rear conservatory and provision of extended living space involves the removal of original wall fabric from the southwestern corner of the dwelling. Other works include the removal of internal room walls, widening of a door ope (serving the lounge), creating an internal door ope, and blocking up door and window opes (including a window in the façade wall serving the dining room). At first floor level, the removal of internal room walls, creating a door ope, and blocking up a door ope are indicated.
- 7.3.5. At the FI response stage, the ground floor plan layout remains relatively unchanged. The main differences include the retention of the original wall downstand of the southwestern corner of the main dwelling (at 2.1m soffit above the finished floor level and installing a steel column and beam support over), a reduction in the widening of door ope (serving the lounge) and not blocking up the window in the façade wall (referred to above). No revisions were made to the first floor plan in the FI response.

Elevations and Sections

- 7.3.6. As initially submitted, the front elevation drawing of the extension indicates three window opes and a door ope. The windows are narrow with a strong vertical emphasis, two match the door in height (serving the bedroom). The windows and

door are flat/ flush with the extension's front building line. The external finish on the front and rear elevations of the extension is stated as being of pre-patinated zinc standing seam.

- 7.3.7. The extension has a butterfly roof (apparent in first floor plan and section drawings) which has the appearance of a flat roof in viewing the front/ rear elevations. The roof is indicated as being of sedum.
- 7.3.8. With regard to the main dwelling, the front elevation indicates the blocking up of a small ground floor level window (as referred to above). Front and rear elevation drawings also indicate the replacement of all existing pvc windows with hardwood sliding sash type windows.
- 7.3.9. At the FI response stage, revisions made to the front elevation of the extension include the replacement of the two rectangular windows (serving the bedroom) with one square window (c.1.2m width x height), and a reduced-sized window (serving the utility room). The square window and door marginally project from the extension's front building line (estimated as c.15cm). The external finish is specified as being of a (specific brand) green standing seam cladding.

Comments on the Planning Authority Assessment

- 7.3.10. The planning authority's initial assessment of the proposed development expressed concerns regarding the design of the proposal, considered it to jar with that of the existing dwelling, and that the external finishes, window/ door proportions and overall aesthetic detracted from the character of the existing dwelling.
- 7.3.11. In its assessment of the FI response, the planning authority noted that the newly proposed window and door opes in the front of the extension are projecting, the revisions do not improve the overall aesthetic of the proposal, and while the external finish has not been revised, on balance, it is considered acceptable. It is recommended that the windows should be revised to the original proposal, and all opes in the front elevation shall be flat fronted.
- 7.3.12. To this end, I note Conditions 2(i) and (iii) permit the front elevation of the extension in a design and finish as initially submitted (including the blocking-up of the ground floor window). Condition 2(ii) requires the overall height of the extension to be

lowered to match the highest point of the existing garage roof. Condition 2(iv) relates to the finishes of the windows in the existing dwelling.

7.3.13. In the appeal grounds, the appellant is highly critical of the design and external finish of the extension, both as initially submitted and revised in the FI response. The appellant is critical of the planning authority's decision to revert back to the initially submitted design through Condition 2(i). The appellant submits that the permitted window proportions, being narrow and vertical, are even less sympathetic to the existing façade than those of the bay window.

7.3.14. In the response to the appeal, the applicant states that they have accepted that the amendments required by Condition 2. Of the nature of the designs, the applicant notes the decision to revert to the more vertical window proportion and comments that the designs are different, but of their time.

7.4. Architectural Heritage

7.4.1. In the previous subsection, I provided an overview of the proposed development as initially submitted, revised in the FI response, and permission granted for. An understanding of which is necessary to allow a consideration of the impact of same on the architectural heritage of the building, site and receiving area.

7.4.2. I identify the key architectural heritage issues in the appeal case to relate to the architectural heritage value of the existing side garage, the most appropriate design and finish for the extension, the impact of the works on the protected structure, and the impact on the architectural conservation area. I propose to address each in turn.

Heritage Value of the Existing Garage

7.4.3. The appellant submits that the existing garage wall is an intrinsic part of the protected structure, and therefore an intrinsic part of the character of the ACA of Stradbally. The appellant submits the proposed extension fails to respect this and recommends a design whereby the garage wall is retained and a more sympathetic approach with aesthetically pleasing window/ door proportions is provided for.

7.4.4. In response, the applicant submits that the garage is not marked as a protected structure in the mapped records (the main dwelling and structures on the main street are), possibly dates from the 1960s (formed on top on the existing retaining

concrete and random rubble walls), and is a modern intervention with no special architectural heritage interest.

- 7.4.5. In response to the appellant's reference to there being a garage wall at the subject site in photographic evidence from 1940s, the applicant refers to a 1926 OS Map which indicates a structure in the location of the side garage which is set back from the dwelling's front wall.
- 7.4.6. I note that the planning authority (reports of the Planning Officer and Conservation Officer) did not raise any issue about or objection to the demolition of the garage structure so as to facilitate the proposed extension. It is apparent from the planning authority reports that a Section 57 declaration does not exist for the subject property.
- 7.4.7. In having undertaken my site inspection, which included entering the original dwelling house, side garage, rear conservatory, front and rear garden areas, I confirm the nature of the garage construction and structural condition as indicated in the applicant's AHIA. It is evident that the garage is of recent construction and contributes little to the architectural heritage value at the site.
- 7.4.8. I am satisfied that the Commission can rely on the technical expertise and positions of the applicant's Grade 1 Conservation Architect and the planning authority's Conservation Officer on this matter. Therefore, I find that the demolition of the garage structure is acceptable in principle.

Appropriate Design and Finish for the Extension

- 7.4.9. The appellant strongly opposes the elevational design and choice of external finish for the proposed extension. As I outlined in subsection 7.3 Design and Layout above, the appellant submits that the design as initially submitted (window proportions), and for which permission is granted, is less sympathetic to the existing façade than those of the bay window in the FI response. On this matter, I agree with the appellant.
- 7.4.10. I also concur with the planning authority's assessment of the initially submitted design (Planning Officer's description of the proposal as jarring and detracting from the character of the existing dwelling, and the Conservation Officer's finding that the window/ wall/ door ratio was not acceptable). Having reviewed the plans and

particulars, including the applicant's Design Statements and AHIA, I consider that the proposed development as revised in the FI response to be the most appropriate design solution for the extension.

- 7.4.11. I consider the design, proportions, and siting of the windows and door opens in the front elevation of the extension to be subtle, streamlined and non-intrusive. I concur with the applicant and find that the proportions of the windows are more consistent with and complementary to those in the existing dwelling.
- 7.4.12. The planning authority and appellant are critical of the projecting nature of the window and door. However, on review of the plans and elevation drawings, I note that the front wall of the extension is set back c.0.90m from that of the dwelling, and the extent of the projection is minor in scale (c.15cm). I consider the projecting window and door add visual interest to the proposed extension, reflect the extension's contemporary date and modern context, and have no adverse impact on the existing façade of the main dwelling.
- 7.4.13. Also, importantly, I find the internal layout of the extension in the FI response retains a greater amount of original wall fabric than that of the initially proposed design. It is apparent that the extent of loss of original fabric from the dwelling was a key concern to the planning authority's Conservation Officer.
- 7.4.14. In respect of external finish, similarly, the appellant strongly opposes the proposed use of a pre-patinated metal cladding for the extension. I note the Conservation Officer (initial report) accepted that quality contemporary materials can be suitable and raised no objection to the use of the cladding (subsequent FI response report). I concur with the position of the applicant and am of the opinion that the proposed finish to the extension is a modern architectural expression that is complementary to the original rendered wall finish of the dwelling.
- 7.4.15. In respect of building height, I note that the planning authority requires the overall height of the extension to be lowered to match the highest point of the existing garage roof (Condition 2(ii)). In the appeal response, the applicant advises that the height of the extension will not exceed that of the existing garage. I have compared the relevant elevation drawings and note there to be a minor difference between the heights. I consider that the proposed height of the extension when viewed from the front elevation and its relationship with the main dwelling are acceptable.

7.4.16. In the event of a grant of permission, I recommend the omission of Condition 2 of the planning authority's decision. I consider that the design, external finish, and height of the proposed extension as revised in the FI response to be the most appropriate design solution for the subject site. I recommend that appropriate conditions should be attached requiring agreement with the planning authority on final external finishes.

Impact on the Protected Structure and Architectural Conservation Area

7.4.17. Above, I have outlined the reasons why I consider the demolition of the garage, the range of interventions (internal and external) to the dwelling, and the design, finish and height of the proposed extension (i.e., that of the FI response) to be acceptable. For the same reasons, I find there to be no adverse impact on the character of the protected structure at the site or to the wider architectural conservation area.

7.4.18. I note comments by the Conservation Officer regarding a lack of specific details and/or information on the works proposed. I have reviewed the applicant's documentation including the initial Brief Design Statement, AHIA, revised Brief Design Statement, and the appeal response. I consider the documents and associated plans to be sufficient to allow a determination on the substantive issues in the appeal case.

7.4.19. However, the proposal does involve several interventions to, of and in the protected structure (as I outlined in subsection 7.3 Design and Layout above). To accord with best conservation practice, CCDP and planning guidelines requirements, in the event of a grant of permission, I consider that An Coimisiún Pleanála conditions should be attached to manage the demolition and construction process.

7.4.20. These include requiring a full architectural and photographic survey of all elements of the structure proposed for demolition, partial demolition, blocking-up etc to be undertaken; a detailed method statement for the works proposed (including the recommendations of the planning authority relating to the main dwelling house, i.e., refilling the non-original front elevation window and replacing all pvc windows with timber single glaze sliding sash windows; and ensuring that all works are monitored and undertaken by suitably qualified personnel.

Conclusion

7.4.21. In conclusion, I consider that the proposed extension is of an appropriate design and scale for the main dwelling, which is a modern architectural expression that is complementary to the character of the protected structure and, for the same reasons, to that of the wider architectural conservation area in the village. I find the proposed development to comply with the range of applicable CCDP policies and objectives, including those relating to the protection of protected structures (Objectives BH 10, BH 11, BH 12, and BH 29) and those relating to ACAs (Objectives BH 05, BH 10, BH 11, BH 12, and Policy in 11.6). Subject to conditions, I do not anticipate any adverse impact on the architectural heritage of the site and area.

7.5. Other Matters

- 7.5.1. In respect of other matters, I identify access to services and utilities, environmental assessments, archaeological heritage, and other planning conditions not previously discussed.
- 7.5.2. The proposed development, an extension to an existing serviced residence, indicates connection into the existing public water supply and wastewater and surface water drainage systems (application form details). There is no internal drainage section report on the case file. I note there is a condition attached addressing surface water runoff to be disposed of within the site's curtilage, and I recommend that the standard ACP condition be attached.
- 7.5.3. The site comprises a brownfield village location with no evidence of environmental sensitivities. The River Tay is the closest watercourse, located c.558m to the south of the site, flowing in an easterly direction through Stradbally Woods to Stradbally Cove at the coast. There is no direct hydrological connection between the site and any watercourse or surface water body. Environmental assessments relating to appropriate assessment and water status impact assessment can both be reasonably screened out.
- 7.5.4. While located within the archaeological zone associated with the settlement cluster (SMR No. WA032-012), I note that this zone applies to the majority of the village. No archaeological issues are raised within the case file, and as the majority of the proposed works relate to an existing developed area, there is no real likelihood of archaeological impact. Therefore, a planning condition is not deemed to be

necessary in this instance (archaeological heritage being protected under another legislative code).

- 7.5.5. I note that the proposed development works are indicated as being contained within the curtilage of the development site and consider that Condition 4 of the planning authority's decision is not necessary. With regard to development contributions, I note that the planning authority reports same is not applicable for the appeal case.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

8.1. Screening Determination for Appropriate Assessment

- 8.1.1. In accordance with section 177U(4) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended (2000 Act), and on the basis of objective information, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. It is therefore determined that Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) under section 177V of the 2000 Act is not required.

- 8.1.2. This conclusion is based on:

- Nature, scale and location of the proposed development.
- Qualifying interests and conservation objectives of the European sites.
- Absence of any meaningful pathways to any European site.
- Distances from European sites.
- Standard pollution controls and project design features that would be employed regardless of proximity to a European site and the effectiveness of same.

- 8.1.3. No measures intended to avoid or reduce harmful effects on European sites were taken into account in reaching this conclusion.

9.0 Water Status Impact Assessment

9.1. Screening Determination for Water Impact Status Assessment

- 9.1.1. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) which seek to protect

and, where necessary, restore surface water and ground waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.

9.1.2. I conclude that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any waterbody (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively, or on a temporary or permanent basis, or otherwise jeopardise any waterbody in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

9.1.3. This conclusion is based on:

- Nature, scale and location of the proposed development.
- Objective information presented in the case file and from verified sources.
- Absence of/ proximity to closest surface watercourses.
- Lack of any meaningful hydrological connection to any waterbody.
- Use of best practice construction practices during construction phase.

10.0 Recommendation

Following from the above assessment, I recommend that permission is GRANTED for the development as proposed due to the following reasons and considerations, and subject to the conditions set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

The Commission considers that, subject to conditions, the proposed development would be consistent with the applicable RV Rural Village zoning objective and other policies and objectives of the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028, would be an appropriately designed and scaled extension to the protected structure, would not adversely affect the setting of the architectural conservation area, would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of property in the vicinity, and would be acceptable in terms of pedestrian and traffic safety and convenience. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application to the planning authority, as amended by the further information plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 26th day of June 2025, 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit, for the written agreement of the planning authority, a full architectural and photographic survey of all elements of the building proposed for demolition, partial demolition, blocking-up or any other such intervention, and drawings (of an appropriate scale of not less than 1:50) and photographs indicating details of same.

Reason: To facilitate the preservation by record and/ or recording of the architectural heritage of the site.

3. Prior to the commencement of development on the protected structure, the applicant shall submit, for the written agreement of the planning authority, a detailed method statement covering all works proposed to be carried out, including:
 - (a) a full specification, including details of materials and methods of works, to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with current Conservation Guidelines issued by the Department of Arts, Heritage & the Gaeltacht,

- (b) methodology for the recording and/ or retention of concealed features or fabric exposed during the works,
- (c) details of features to be temporarily removed/ relocated during construction works and their final re-instatement,
- (d) details of features to be protected in-situ protection during the construction works,
- (e) materials/ features of architectural interest to be salvaged,
- (f) details (including timeline for completion) of the removal of the non-original window (ground floor, front elevation of the main dwelling), and refill/ reinstatement process which shall be undertaken so that the works match the original existing wall rendered finish,
- (g) details (including timeline for completion) of the replacement windows in the main dwelling house which shall be of timber construction with historically correct pane, glazing bar, sash and frame detail.

Details to be accompanied by drawings of an appropriate scale of not less than 1:50.

Reason: In the interest of the protection of architectural heritage.

4. Prior to the commencement of development on the protected structure, the applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the planning authority confirmation that:
 - (a) the development will be monitored by a suitably qualified architect with conservation expertise and accreditation, and
 - (b) competent site supervision, project management and crafts personnel will be engaged, suitably qualified and experienced in conservation works.

Reason: In the interest of the protection of architectural heritage.

5. Prior to the commencement of development, details, specifications and/ or samples of all external materials shall be submitted to and agreed in writing

with the planning authority. No uPVC/ PVC material shall be used on/ in the exterior of the building. All works shall be carried out in accordance with this written agreement.

Reason: the interest of the protection of architectural heritage.

6. The existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity.

7. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

8. 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 or public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

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.

Phillippa Joyce

Senior Planning Inspector

24th November 2025

Appendix 1: Environmental Impact Assessment – Pre-Screening

1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA?	
(“Project” means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2.	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, no further action required.	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3.	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/ exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/ exceeds the threshold.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Proceed to Q4.	
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____