



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-PL-500146-WW

Development

Works to a Protected Structure (RPS Ref. B14). Retention planning permission for the removal of a portion of the garden wall and granite steps, and for works to change a window opening to a door opening at the rear elevation. Planning permission for the construction of a single storey extension to the rear, provision of a door in the enlarged window opening, removal of cementitious render and replacement with lime render, replacement of guttering and water goods, widening of gate to rear garden, renovation and reinstatement of front boundary railing, and installation of solar panels on south facing roofs. Landscaping works to front and rear gardens.

Location

4 Florence Terrace, Florance Road,
Bray, Co. Wicklow

Planning Authority

Wicklow County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560606
Applicant	Keith and Donna Finaly
Type of Application	Retention Permission & Planning Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Retention Permission and Planning Permission with Conditions.
Type of Appeal	Third Party Appeal
Appellants	Ian and Angela Denver Denis O'Sullivan
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	13 January 2026
Inspector	Sinéad O'Connor

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	6
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	7
3.1. Decision	7
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	8
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	9
3.4. Third Party Observations	10
4.0 Planning History.....	10
5.0 Policy Context.....	12
5.1. Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028	12
5.2. Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018-2024	14
5.3. Architectural Heritage Protection - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011)	14
5.4. Natural Heritage Designations	15
6.0 The Appeal	16
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	16
6.2. Applicants Response	18
6.3. Planning Authority Response	19
7.0 Assessment	19
7.1. Principle of Development	19
7.2. Impact on Built Heritage.....	20
7.3. Construction Phase Impacts	27
7.4. Miscellaneous	29
8.0 Environmental Impact Assessment.....	32

9.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	32
10.0 Water Framework Directive	33
11.0 Recommendation	34
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	34
13.0 Conditions	34
Appendix 1 – Form EIA Pre-Screening	38

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site of 0.053 hectares (ha) is located on Florence Road, in the east of Bray, County Wicklow. The site is within 150 metres of Bray Train Station and within 250 metres of Bray Seafront (Strand Road).
- 1.2. The site adjoins existing residential development on all sides and currently has a pedestrian entrance from Florence Road to the south and a vehicular entrance from Stable Lane to the North.
- 1.3. The subject site accommodates No. 4 Florence Terrace, which is a 2-storey over lower ground floor, 3-bay dwelling of 308 sqm. The roof of the dwelling comprises of 2 no. parallel gable roofs. The dwelling forms part of a terrace of 13 no. Protected Structures of the similar age, design and proportion. The dwelling has a substantial front garden with metal railings and a matching pedestrian gate onto Florence Road. To the rear is a private garden that is accessed from the lower ground floor and is split across two levels. A section of the existing rear garden wall has been removed to provide the vehicular access from Stable Lane.
- 1.4. Up until 2024, No. 4 Florence Terrace was in commercial use and was operating as The Suburban Club. The current applicants achieved planning permission for the change of use of No. 4 Florence Terrace from commercial to residential under **Reg. Ref. 2460310**.
- 1.5. Under the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH), 4 Florence Terrace (Reg. No. 16301203) is dated between 1865-1875 and is rated as being of regional importance. The Categories of Special Interest of the dwelling are: Architectural, Artistic, Social. It is stated the No. 4 Florence Terrace forms part of Bray's most complete and impressive 19th Century groupings.
- 1.6. No. 4 Florence Terrace has existing connections to public water infrastructure.
- 1.7. At the time of the site visit, works were being undertaken inside the dwelling (floors being sanded).

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development as submitted comprises works to No. 4 Florence Terrace, which is a Protected Structure (RPS Ref. B14).
- 2.2. Retention planning permission is sought for the removal of part of the rear garden wall and for the removal of granite steps in the rear garden. At the time of the site visit I noted that the stones removed from the garden wall and the granite steps have been retained by the applicant and are currently being stored in the rear garden of the property. Retention permission is also sought for the replacement of an existing lower ground floor window opening with a door opening. These works did not increase the width of the opening, and comprised the removal of the lower windowsill and wall to bring the opening to ground level.
- 2.3. To the rear of the property, it is proposed to construct a single storey extension of 40 sqm to accommodate an office, storage and a sauna. The proposed extension is irregular in shape and is built into the split level of the garden. Where it attaches to the rear elevation of the house, the rear extension immediately adjoins the shared boundary to the east and incorporates part of the existing garden/retaining wall. Beyond the existing garden wall, the rear extension steps 0.9 metres away from the boundary wall. High level windows are proposed on the northern elevation of the rear extension, which overlook the higher northern portion of the rear garden. At the lower ground floor level, the extension has a parapet height of 3.35 metres and in the northern portion of the garden the parapet height is 1.75 metres. The proposed rear extension has a green roof.
- 2.4. It is proposed to reinstate the granite steps along the western elevation of the proposed rear extension, to provide access from the lower ground floor level to the northern portion of the rear garden. It is proposed to reinstate parts of the rear stone wall and to provide a new enlarged entrance to the rear garden from Stable Lane. This entrance will have a timber vehicular and pedestrian gate. It is proposed to install a new door into the former window opening, described above in Section 2.2.
- 2.5. It is proposed to remove all the existing cementitious render on the building and to replace it with lime render. Permission is also sought to remove the existing guttering, downpipes and soil vent pipes, and to replace these with modern cast iron

equivalents. It is proposed to install solar panels on the 2 no. southern (front) facing roofs of the house.

2.6. Landscaping works are proposed to the front and rear garden. In the front garden it is proposed to create a 5.2 x 4 metre terrace at front façade of the dwelling to the immediate west of the entrance stairs and the lower ground floor entrance. It is also proposed to remove, renovate and reinstall the railings in the front garden along Florence Road.

2.7. The Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment (AHIA) Report submitted with the application refers to internal works that are not listed in the public notices of the application and are not shown in the application drawings. These works do not form part of this current application, and I have undertaken no further assessment of these works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. On the 28 September 2025, Wicklow County Council issued a notification of their decision to grant retention permission and planning permission for the development subject to 13 no. conditions. I consider that the following conditions are notable:

- Condition 3. requires that the rear boundary wall is set back 1 metre from the existing boundary line. This condition also requires that the proposed gates open inwards only.
- Condition 4. States that site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Fridays inclusive, between 08:00 to 14:00 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.
- Condition 5. requires the submission of a construction management plan for written agreement with the PA.
- Condition 7. states that the proposed office shall be for private domestic use only.
- Condition 11. requires the submission of a report to the PA within 12 months of the permission to confirm that the works have been completed in accordance with

Table 6.1 and Section 7 of the Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment submitted with the application.

- Condition 12. requires the omission of the solar panels on the southern slope of the roof. It is stated that solar panels can be erected on the rear facing roof or mounted in the rear garden.
- Condition 13. states that the applicant shall submit proposals for the repurposing of the granite steps to the rear garden.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planning Report dated 28 September 2025 assessed the proposed development with reference to the Development Plan and submissions from prescribed bodies, discussed in Section 3.3 of this report. I consider that the following matters raised in the Planners Report are of relevance:

- The renovation of the existing dwelling is welcomed on the basis of its Protected Structure status and with reference to the heritage objectives of the County Development Plan.
- An AHIA was submitted with the application, and the works and extension are considered acceptable.
- The AHIA Report submitted with the application lists and assesses works that the author considered to be exempted development. These works were reviewed as part of the application and are considered acceptable.
- The proposed rear extension will not impact upon the character of the Protected Structure and is considered acceptable.
- The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (DoHLGH) sought the relocation of the proposed solar panels from the front elevation owing to the impact these would have on the character of the structure and the precedent it would set. The PA considered this acceptable and included a condition to this effect.

- Under **Reg. Ref. 06/630304**, the rear walls of Nos. 5-8 Florence Terrace were set 1-metre back from the rear boundaries to provide sufficient sightlines onto Stable Lane. A similar set-back should be provided at the subject site.
- To address the issues raised by the observers in respect of noise and dust, a condition should be applied requiring works to be undertaken during standard working hours. A construction management plan should be provided to address the concerns of the observers.
- One of the observers refers to impacts on the front boundary wall between No. 4 and No. 5 Florence Terrace. No works are proposed to this wall.
- The observers raise concerns regarding the commercial use of the proposed office. This matter can be addressed by condition to state that the office shall not be used for commercial purposes.
- No development contributions are payable on the basis that the proposed rear extension is 40 sqm and the first 40 sqm of development are exempt from development contributions.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- None received.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

DoHLGH: Report dated 04 September 2025: The key points raised in this submission are summarised below as follows:

- Overall, the Department considers the proposed development will protect and enhance the character and integrity of the protected structure.
- The works described in the conservation report accord with good conservation practice.
- The proposed extension is modest in scale and of good architectural quality.
- The provision of solar panels on the front elevation would have a detrimental effect on the character of the protected structure and the terrace. They would set an undesirable precedent and should be omitted by condition.

- There is no objection to the provision of solar panels on the rear roofs or mounted on the ground at the rear garden.
- The removal of the rear granite steps has a low impact on the building. These should be maintained on site and incorporated into the development in some way. They could be utilised in the future to repair the front granite steps.
- All works shall be carried out in accordance with Section 7 of the Conservation Report submitted to the PA, and under the supervision of the Conservation Architect, or similar. Detailed written and photographic records shall be maintained by the architect and these shall be submitted to the PA on the completion of the works.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

Observations were made in respect of the application by the Appellants, Ian and Angela Denver of No. 5 Florence Terrace, and Denis and Mary O'Sullivan of No. 3 Florence Terrace. Planning issues raised in these submissions that are in addition to the grounds of appeal are summarised below:

- Negative impacts on residential amenity from construction works.
- Works have been undertaken at the site without planning permission.
- Indemnity should be provided by the applicant for damages to adjoining properties during construction works.
- The works will increase traffic on Stable Lane.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. The planning history of the site can be summarised as follows:

- **PA Reg. Ref. 24/60310 (ACP PL27.320583):** On 04 September 2024, planning permission was granted for the change of use of No. 4 Florence Terrace from commercial use to residential use. This decision was appealed to ACP however, the appeal was found to be invalid. 2 no. conditions were attached to this grant of planning permission, of note is condition no. 2 which states that the building shall be used as a single housing unit.

- **PA Reg. Ref. 15/396 (ACP Ref. PL27.245094):** On 22 October 2015, the PA's decision was upheld and outline planning permission for the construction of a residential unit to the rear of No. 4 Florence Terrace was refused. The ACP order states they could not make a decision on this case on the basis that Article 21 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, precludes the making of an application for outline permission in respect of works to a protected structure.

4.2. The PA assessment refers to an adjoining planning permission in respect of setting a precedent for setbacks from Stable Lane to the rear of Florence Terrace. For reference, I have summarised the relevant permissions below.

- **PA Reg. Ref. 06630304:** Lands to the rear of Nos. 5, 6, 7 & 8 Florence Terrace, to the west of the subject site: On the 15 March 2007, permission was granted subject to 7 conditions for the provision of off-street car parking from Stable Lane at each of these dwellings. Condition no. 3 required that the continuous rear boundary wall be set back 1 metre from Stable Lane.

- **PA Reg. Ref 05630299.** Nos. 5, 6, 7 & 8 Florence Terrace, to the west of the subject site. On 05 April 2006 permission was granted to change the use of the existing nursing home to 4 no. individual dwellings. None of the conditions are of note.

4.3. The Third-Party appeals refer to applications on Florence Terrace that set precedents relevant to the subject development. For completeness and for reference, I have summarised these applications below.

- **PA Reg. Ref. 21954:** On 16 May 2022, the PA decided to grant planning permission for the construction of a 2-storey 2-bedroom mews dwelling to the rear of Slieve Na Mon, Florence Road, to the west of the subject site. Condition 8 of this permission states that works shall be carried out only between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 Monday to Friday, between 08.00 and 14.00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.

- **PA Reg. Ref. 08630212:** On the 03 December 2008, the PA decided to refuse planning permission for the construction of a 2-storey office building at the rear of No. 12 and 13 Florence Terrace, to the west of the subject site. 3 no. reasons for refusal were given. These relate to; impacts on surrounding amenities as a result of

overlooking, overbearing and visual obtrusion, the creation of a traffic hazard, and lack of provision for refuse and recyclable storage.

- **PA Reg. Ref. 05630006:** On the 01 March 2005, the PA decided to refuse planning permission for the construction of 3 no. 2-storey townhouses at the rear of No. 12 and 13 Florence Terrace, to the west of the subject site. 2 no. reasons for refusal were given. These relate to impacts on surrounding amenities as a result of overlooking, overbearing and visual obtrusion, and the inadequate provision of private open space and car parking.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.1.1. The proposed development in Bray is subject to the provisions of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028. The Plan has been the subject of a Ministerial Direction and variations, none of which impact upon the subject site.
- 5.1.2. The Development Plan does not prescribe land uses zoning objectives for Bray. The larger towns in the County were subject to their own Local Area Plans separate to the Development Plan. Wicklow County Council is in the process of preparing new plans and varying the County Development Plan to take into account the land use zonings and mapped objectives.
- 5.1.3. Under Section 4.2 'County Wicklow Settlement Strategy', Bray is described as a Level 1 'Metropolitan Key Town' and is stated to be the largest town in County Wicklow.
- 5.1.4. **Built Heritage**
- 5.1.5. Appendix 4 'Record of Protected Structures' of the Plan lists No. 1-13 Florence Terrace, Florence Road as Protected Structures under Ref. B14. Under the Record of Protected Structures (RPS), the structures and railings on Florence Terrace are protected. The RPS does not refer to the interiors of the structures at No. 1-13 Florence Terrace.
- 5.1.6. Section 8.3.1 'Record of Protected Structures (RPS)' states that structures are placed on the RPS to ensure that their character and interest is maintained. It is stated in

Section 8.3.1 that the key to protecting individual or groups of Protected Structures is to protect their physical integrity and maintain their viability into the future. Under the Plan, there is a presumption in favour of the active use of Protected Structures, including where this requires modern intervention.

5.1.7. Relevant Policies and Objectives in respect of works to Protected Structures include the following:

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

5.1.8. **Appendix 1 ‘Development & Design Standards’**

5.1.9. Section 1.4.6 ‘Construction Management’ of the Plan states that all construction sites will be managed to control environmental emissions. It is stated that Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMP) will be required and enforced for larger projects or developments in ecologically sensitive areas.

5.1.10. Section 9.2.1 ‘Record of Protected Structures’ states that proposed works to a Protected Structure will be assessed by the PA to ensure the following:

- Alterations and interventions do not detract from the significance or value of the structure;
- Original features of architectural and historic interest are retained and that new features are not presented as original or older features;

- Extensions are appropriately scaled, complement and are subsidiary to the main structure;
- The special interest of the structure is not compromised when adhering to the requirements of Building Regulations. Regard should be had to the Advice Series on historic buildings published by the Architectural Heritage Advisory Unit of the DAHG.

5.2. **Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018-2024**

- 5.2.1. The Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018 – 2024 will be replaced by the Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2025, which is at the pre-draft stage. The policies contained in the Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018 – 2024 have no significant bearing on this case.
- 5.2.2. The zoning at the site under this LAP, 'TC – Town Centre', lists residential development as generally acceptable.

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

- 5.3.1. Condition 9 of the PA's decision states that all works shall be carried out in accordance with the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011). For ease of reference, I have summarised relevant sections of these Guidelines below.
- 5.3.2. The Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines were published by the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht in 2011. Chapter 7 'Conservation Principles' states that entry into the Record of Protected Structures does not mean that the structure should be forever frozen in time. It is stated that structures need to adapt and evolve to meet changing needs while retaining their special character and interest.
- 5.3.3. Section 6.8.1 'Extensions' of the Guidelines acknowledges that it is often necessary to permit extensions to historic buildings to make them fit for modern living and to keep them in viable use. As per Section 6.8.2, works should involve the smallest possible loss of historic fabric, and the works should not damage or obscure important features. Such works should not adversely affect the primary façade of the structure. In respect of works to the gardens of historic buildings, Section 6.8.6

states that the historic alignment of surviving plot-divisions should be respected in new development.

- 5.3.4. In Section 8.4.10 it is stated that where a building is covered in inappropriate cementitious render, the opportunity could be taken to replace it with a more appropriate coating. In advance of this process, it is stated that testing and assessment should be undertaken in case the removal of the render would damage the material below.
- 5.3.5. I note that the Guidelines do not give specific guidance in respect of the provision of Solar Panels. Section 8.5.7 'New items fixed to the exterior of the building' states that permission should only be given for fixtures that respect the architectural design and do not detract from the appearance of the structure. It is stated that fixings can cause degradation to certain materials and that care should be taken to minimise their visual impacts.
- 5.3.6. In respect of ironwork, Section 12.4.6 states that where it is proposed to repair historic ironwork, a condition should be attached requiring that as much of the existing material as possible should be retained rather than replaced.

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is not within or immediately adjacent to any designated or Natura 2000 sites. The closest designated or Natura 2000 sites to the subject area are as follows:

- Bray Head Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (Site Code 000714) is located 1.2 km to the south of the subject site.
- Ballyman Glen SAC (Site Code 000713) and Ballyman Glen proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA) (Site Code 000713) are located 2.6 km to the west of the subject site.
- Knocksink Wood SAC (Site Code 000725) is located 4.6 km to the west of the subject site.
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 003000) is located 4.9 km to the north of the subject site.

- Wicklow Mountains Special Protection Area (SPA) (Site Code 004040) and SAC (Site Code 002122) is located 8 km to the west of the subject site, as its nearest point.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

Two Third Party Appeals were made against the PA Decision. The appeal from Ian and Angela Denver and the appeal from Denis and Mary O’Sullivan were submitted 24 October 2025. The appeal submission made by Denis and Mary O’Sullivan is accompanied by submissions signed by Eleanor and Yolanda Ryan, 13 Florence Terrace, and James Doyle, 10 Florence Terrace. I have summarised the issues raised in the appeals together below;

Construction Impacts

- Condition No. 4 of the PA allows works at the site up to 7pm, which is too late in the evening.
- Recent planning permission in the vicinity of the subject site (**Reg. Ref. 21/954**) had shorter evening working hours than that stated in Condition 4 of the PA decision.
- Condition 4 should be amended to allow works between 08.00-18.00 Monday to Friday, 08.00-14.00 Saturdays, and not at all on Sundays or public holidays.
- A construction management plan (CMP) with details in respect of noise, vibration, and dust control should be provided. This CMP should include a schedule of the works to give neighbouring residents sufficient notice of potential disruption.
- The CMP should prohibit the use of Stable Lane for construction phase parking or storage as the lane is a private right of way. I note that this issue was raised by Eleanor and Yolanda Ryan and Jame Doyle, whose comments were appended to the appeal made by Denis and Mary O’Sullivan.
- Any conditions in respect of site management should be enforced.

Structural Impacts

- The proposed development will have structural impacts on adjoining walls and dwellings at No. 3 and 5 Florence Terrace.
- Works undertaken to date at the subject site have impacted on the structural integrity of No. 3 Florence Terrace.
- An engineer's structural method statement should be submitted in respect of works close to adjoining structures.

Commercial Use

- Concerns raised regarding the potential commercial use of the proposed office.
- Previous commercial uses at the site had significant negative impacts on residential amenity.

Previous development and Future Works

- The council were notified about the ongoing works at the subject site, and no action was taken.
- The proposed terrace in the front garden should not have any above ground structures such as gazebos, canopies or awnings.
- All works, finishes and materials should be consistent with the character of Florence Terrace.

Precedents

- A previous application made by the Suburban Club at the subject site was refused planning permission.
- Applications for works at No. 12 and 13 Florence Terrace were also refused planning permission.
- For reference, I have summarised these applications in Section 4.0 of this report.

Other

- The lands of the subject site are not registered to the applicant.
- One of the appellants has suffered ill health because of stress caused by the occupiers of No. 4 Florence Terrace.

6.2. Applicants Response

The Applicants submitted a response to the appeal on the 10 November 2025. I consider that the key points of this submission are as follows:

- The applicant purchased No. 4 Florence Terrace to create a family home.
- The property was in need of significant repairs.
- An Engineer with conservation accreditation and a Grade 3 Conservation Architect have been engaged to ensure that works will be done to the highest conservation standards.
- The PA's condition no. 3, to demolish the remainder of the rear boundary wall, would result in the removal of historic fabric and the definition of the plots as constructed in 1854.
- The 1-metre setback will not significantly improve sightlines onto Stable Lane and is not necessary given the nature of the laneway.
- There is an existing telegraph pole at the entrance that would be destabilised if the wall were removed.
- To the east of the subject site there is an existing garage and apartment that are built up to the property boundary, therefore, the request 1-metre set back will not significantly improve sightlines in this direction.
- The widening of Stable Lane will allow cars to travel faster, which will have a negative impact on pedestrian safety.
- The applicant would accept an amended condition regarding the working hours at the subject site.
- No works are proposed to or in the immediate vicinity of the wall to the front of No. 5 Florence Terrace.
- Stable Lane is not a private Right of Way. This lane is taken in charge by Wicklow County Council. The applicant has ensured that access through Stable Lane is maintained.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

The PA have not submitted a response to the appeal or the applicant's response.

7.0 **Assessment**

I have read the entire contents of the file, visited the subject site and its surroundings, reviewed the planning history, and having had regard to planning policy as well as the issues raised in the appeals and the response submitted, I consider the critical issues in determining the current application and appeal before the Coimisiún are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on Built Heritage
- Construction Phase Impacts
- Miscellaneous

7.1. **Principle of Development**

- 7.1.1. Section 8.3.1 'Record of Protected Structures (PRS)' of the Plan states that there is a presumption in favour of the ongoing active use of Protected Structures. To achieve this, the Development Plan recognises that modern interventions and works are often required to ensure that Protected Structures do not fall out of use and into disrepair or dereliction. In this regard, it is evident from the planning history and from my site visit that several of the structures on Florence Terrace have been the subject of changes of use and/or renovation works. In this way, there is a strong precedent for renovation and modernisation works to the structures on Florence Terrace.
- 7.1.2. Drawing from the provisions of the Development Plan, and the precedent established by the existing dwellings on Florence Terrace, I consider that the works to renovate No. 4 Florence Terrace and to create a modern family home are acceptable in principle.
- 7.1.3. The proposed rear extension, to accommodate an office, sauna, and storage, is ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling. On this basis, I consider that the proposed rear extension is acceptable in principle.

7.2. Impact on Built Heritage

- 7.2.1. The structures and railings of no. 1 to 13 Florence Terrace, inclusive, are listed on the Record of Protected Structures. Under the NIAH, No. 4 Florence Terrace is stated to be of regional important.
- 7.2.2. For ease of reference, I have assessed the subject works under 3 no. broad categories as follows; works to historic building, modern interventions, and works to the rear garden and boundary.
- 7.2.3. **Works to the Historic Building**
- 7.2.4. The works to the historic fabric of the Protected Structure itself comprise turning an existing rear window at lower ground level into a door, removal of the cementitious render and replacing it with lime render, replacing the guttering, downpipes and soil vents with modern metal versions, and the renovation of the front railing.
- 7.2.5. The PA assessment states that the works to the Protected Structure have been appraised by the Wicklow County Council Heritage Officer and were considered acceptable. The submission from the DoHLGH to the PA, dated 04 September 2025, states that the proposed works accord with good conservation practice and that the works overall will protect and enhance the character and integrity of the Protected Structure.
- 7.2.6. The application to the PA was accompanied by a Conservation Report prepared by Feargal Kenny, which was submitted with Reg. Ref. 24/60310 in respect of the change of use of the structure from commercial to residential. Section 5 of this report states that No. 4 Florence Terrace had not been repaired or maintained in previous years and was in urgent need of complete refurbishment.
- 7.2.7. The application to the PA was also accompanied by an Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment (AHIA) prepared by MPBA Architects (accredited in Conservation Grade 3). Section 6.1 'Description of the Proposed Works/Building' states that the works to the rear window to create a door opening had a "medium/generally reversable" conservation impact, the works to replace the external render will have a "positive" impact, the replacement of the gutters, downpipes and soil vents will have a "low/positive" impact, and the restoration of the front railings will have a "low/positive" impact.

- 7.2.8. In respect of the works to change the window opening to a door opening, I note that the AIHA states that the width of the opening has been retained. In this way, the general proportion of the openings on the rear façade remain unchanged, in my opinion. The works occur to the rear of the property at the lower ground floor level and, therefore, are not visible from Stable Lane. Drawing from the above, I consider that the works do not negatively impact on the special character of the structure or adjoining structures. It is my opinion that the provision of a door directly to the garden will greatly improve the residential amenity value of the property for future residents. In this way, I consider that these works are acceptable.
- 7.2.9. In respect of the works to the external render, Section 6.1 of the AIHA states that a portion of the existing cementitious render has already been removed to enable their assessment of a structural crack in the building. It is further stated that the removal of the cementitious render will improve the condition of the material behind the render and will reduce the potential for issues with damp and water at the property. I agree with the findings of the AIHA in this regard. I consider that these works are necessary for the ongoing stability of the Protected Structure and are, therefore, acceptable.
- 7.2.10. Section 6.1 of the AIHA states that the existing gutters and downpipes are not original to the structure, and that the soil vents have been inappropriately plastered thereby trapping moisture in the structure. It is proposed to replace these elements with modern metal equivalents. I note the importance of suitable rainwater goods to maintaining the structural integrity of the buildings, as stated in the AIHA. These works will not remove any of the original fabric from the building. In this way, I do not consider that the provision of metal rainwater goods and soil vents will negatively impact upon the visual appearance or special interest of the structure. Drawing from the above, I consider that these works are appropriate in this instance.
- 7.2.11. In respect of works to the proposed front railings, Drawing No. 193.PL.0001.REV.01 'Site plan and existing plans and elevations' states that the railings will be removed, cleaned and replaced by a specialist company. Section 12.4.6 of the Guidelines states that where works are proposed to historic ironwork a condition should be attached to require that as much of the material as possible is retained rather than replaced. In this way, if the Coimisiún is minded to grant planning permission for the

development, I recommend that a condition is attached to ensure the preservation of as much of the historic material as possible.

7.2.12. **Modern Interventions**

- 7.2.13. The proposed rear extension has a stated area of 40 sqm and is single storey in height. From the drawings submitted, I note that the extension is built into the level change across the site such that it is 3.35 metres in height from the lower ground floor level and only 1.75 metres higher than ground level at the northern part of the garden.
- 7.2.14. The PA report dated 28 September 2025 and the DoHLGH submission to the PA dated 04 September 2025 both state that the proposed rear extension is acceptable.
- 7.2.15. The proposed rear extension has a simple modern design, which clearly distinguishes it from the historic building, in my opinion. As per the provisions of the Guidelines, the proposed extension is to the rear of the structure and, therefore, does not detract from the visual appearance of the dwelling or Florence Terrace when viewed from Florence Road. I consider that the incorporation of the existing garden wall into part of the extension, as opposed to its demolition, accords with the general principles of the Guidelines to retain as much historic fabric as possible. Drawing from the above, I consider that the proposed rear extension is acceptable.
- 7.2.16. The submission made by the DoHLGH to the PA dated 04 September 2025 requests that the proposed south facing solar panels are omitted from the development on the basis that they would have a negative impact on the character of the dwelling and the terrace and would set an undesirable precedent for these types of works. Drawing from this submission, Condition 12 of the PA's decision states that the solar panels shall be removed from the south facing roof. It is further stated solar panels may be erected on the rear (north) facing roof or mounted on the ground in the garden.
- 7.2.17. Contrary to the above, Section 6.1 'Description of the Proposed Works/Building' of the AHIA submitted to the PA states that the proposed solar panels would have a 'Low' conservation impact on the Protected Structure on the basis that the solar panels will reduce the overall carbon footprint of the dwelling.

- 7.2.18. Neither the Development Plan nor the Guidelines give specific guidance in respect of the provision of solar panels on Protected Structures. I note that Section 8.3.1 of the Development Plan does refer to modern interventions to Protected Structures and the need for such works to prevent structures from being preserved in the past. Section 8.5.7 of the Guidelines states that permission should only be given for new items fixed to the exterior of a structure where it does not detract from the appearance of the structure and respects the architectural design of the structure. It is also stated that care should be taken in fixing external items to Protected Structure to avoid permanent damage.
- 7.2.19. The proposed solar panels are only shown in the 'Site Plan Proposed' drawing in Drawing No. 193.PL.0002.REV01 'Site Plan and existing plans and elevations'. The solar panels are not shown in any of the other drawings. I note that Drawing No. 193.PL.003.REV.1 'Proposed plans and elevations' states that the South 'Front' elevation is unchanged as part of the proposed development. The drawings do not contain any details in respect of the dimensions of the panels or the angle at which they will be mounted. No details are provided in respect of how the structures will be mounted to the roof, or how the historic fabric of the structure might be impacted by these works. Drawing from the above, I do not consider that there is sufficient information provided in the drawings to facilitate an assessment of the impacts of the proposed solar panels on the character or visual appearance of the Protected Structure. In this way, it is my opinion that the solar panels should be omitted from the development. If the Coimisiún is minded to grant planning permission for the subject development, I recommend that a condition be attached to omit the proposed solar panels.
- 7.2.20. In respect of Condition 12 of the PA decision, it is my opinion that the placing of solar panels on a north facing elevation or in a north facing garden would cause the solar panels to be inefficient and, potentially, technically unviable. I consider that future residents should have the benefit of producing energy from renewable sources and should not be unduly limited as to where in the property the necessary structures are placed. If the Coimisiún is minded to grant planning permission for the subject development, I do not consider that a condition should be attached to strictly limit the placement of domestic scale renewable energy technology at the site.

7.2.21. The proposed development includes the provision of a sun terrace at the front of the dwelling, at lower ground floor level. I note that there is an existing level change at the front façade of the dwelling with steps provided from the front garden to the entrance door at lower ground floor level. It is proposed to increase the width of the lower level to create a seating area that is useable for the future residents. No works are proposed to the boundary wall at No. 5 Florence Terrace or to the existing steps at the front façade of No. 4 Florence Terrace. During the site visit I noted that excavation works may have already occurred to expand the area of the garden at the lower ground floor level. At that time, this area looked unkempt and was used for construction waste storage.

7.2.22. The PA assessment raised no concerns in respect of this proposed sun terrace.

7.2.23. The proposed sun terrace is located immediately adjoining the front façade of the dwelling and is situated below the level of the front garden. In this way, I do not consider that the proposed sun terrace will be unduly visible from Florence Road or elsewhere in the public realm. The works will not impact upon the adjoining boundary wall or stairs, therefore, the historic fabric will be maintained and protected. During my site visit I noted that some of the neighbouring properties had tables and chairs outside of their dwellings at lower ground floor level, which did not detract from the appearance of the structures, in my opinion. I note that the front gardens on Florence Terrace are subject to high levels of overlooking from Florence Road. In this way, these gardens have lower levels of privacy and reduced residential amenity value. The proposed sun terrace will be shielded from overlooking by the landscaped embankment and will be south facing. In this way, the proposed sun terrace will be of high residential amenity value for future residents, in my opinion. On the basis that the character and integrity of the Protected Structure will not be impacted and that the works will improve residential amenity, I consider that the proposed sun terrace is an appropriate addition to the dwelling.

7.2.24. Drawing from the above, I consider that the modern interventions to No. 4 Florence Terrace are acceptable.

7.2.25. **Works to the Rear Garden and Boundary**

7.2.26. Retention permission is sought for works to widen the rear entrance to the site from Stable Lane and permission is sought to install a new vehicular gate and pedestrian

gate in this rear wall. Drawing No. 193.PL.0003 REV 1 'Proposed plans and elevations' shows that the entrance to be retained and the proposed entrance are 4.8 metres wide. I note that the proposed vehicular gate and a pedestrian gate will open inwards. It is proposed to rebuild part of the rear boundary with the original stones. During the site visit, I noted that stones from the rear wall were being stored within the rear garden of the site.

7.2.27. From the documentation submitted, it is not clear how wide entrance to the site from Stable Lane was prior to the works. Figure 10 of the Conservation Report submitted with this application and the previous application (**Reg. Ref. 24/60310**) shows a temporary wooden fence at the rear boundary of the site.

7.2.28. In their assessment of the proposed entrance, the PA raised no concerns regarding the retention of the works to widen the entrance from Stable Lane. In respect of the proposed entrance, the PA refers to the planning permission under Reg. Ref. 06630304, which required that the rear boundaries of No. 5-8 Florence Terrace (inclusive) be set back 1-metre from the boundary with Stable Lane. The PA found that the proposed entrance should be similarly set back 1-metre from its current position to facilitate adequate sightlines onto Stable Lane.

7.2.29. In their response to the Appeal, the applicant states that setting the rear boundary wall back from Stable Lane would result in the removal of historic fabric and loss of the original boundary delineation at the site. It is stated that sightlines would not be improved by relocating the boundary wall as there is an existing structure on the boundary to the immediate east at No. 3 Florence Terrace. It is stated that the works would widen Stable Lane, which would allow cars to travel faster and would have a negative impact on pedestrian safety. The works would also destabilise a telegraph pole at the boundary.

7.2.30. Section 6.1 of the AIHA submitted to the PA states that the removal of a portion of the rear boundary wall and the widening of the access have a 'Low/generally reversible' conservation impact. It is stated that the rear wall will be retained on both sides of the gate recess, to preserve the historical boundaries and materials.

7.2.31. In respect of the works to be retained, I acknowledge that the previous entrance may have needed to be widened to gain access to the site. These types of works are often necessary as part of the renovation of historic structures and are generally

acceptable, in my opinion. I note that the materials removed have been retained at the site for reuse in rebuilding the wall, which I consider acceptable. These works have occurred at the rear of the dwelling and, therefore, have not impacted the front façade of the structure. It is my opinion that the works have not negatively impacted on the visual appearance or character of the Protected Structure. I consider that these works are acceptable in this instance.

7.2.32. In respect of the proposed works, I consider that this gate is appropriately sized with reference to the width of the plot. I consider that the proposal to rebuild the rear wall using the original stones is appropriate to retain as much of the original fabric as possible. As the gates open inwards, I do not consider that they will unduly negatively impact upon pedestrian or vehicular traffic on Stable Lane. Drawing from the above, I consider that the proposed rear entrance is acceptable.

7.2.33. I have concerns regarding the 1-metre set back sought under Condition 3 of the PA's decision. Section 6.8.6 of the Guidelines notes the importance of plot divisions and states that the historic alignment of plots should be respected. I note that the rear boundaries at several of the dwellings on Florence Terrace have been heavily modified such that No. 4 Florence Terrace may be one of only 2 no. dwellings on Florence Terrace that retain their original plot delineation and stone boundary walls. I consider that the removal and relocation of the boundary would cause inappropriate degradation of the curtilage of the Protected Structure and would reduce the historical legibility of Florence Terrace.

7.2.34. In respect of sightlines onto Stable Lane, I note that existing structures at the adjoining sites would limit the potential benefits of relocating the rear boundary. At the site boundary with No. 5 Florence Terrace to the west, I note that part of the adjoining garden wall extends the full length of the boundary wall at No. 4 Florence Terrace. In this way, it would not be possible to remove part of the wall at No. 4 Florence Terrace without either destabilising the adjoining landowners wall or demolishing this section. The adjoining wall is not under the control of the applicant and, therefore, works to demolish part of the wall at No. 5 Florence Terrace cannot be required by condition. To the east of the subject site there is a 2-storey garage and dwelling at the rear boundary of No. 3 Florence Terrace. Similarly to the above, this structure cannot be removed. On the basis that the sightlines at No. 4 Florence Terrace would be truncated by structures that are not under the control of the

applicant, I do not consider that the relocation of the rear boundary would significantly improve sightlines at this location.

- 7.2.35. Drawing from the above, I do not consider that the potential for increased sightlines outweighs the importance of maintaining the historic plot delineation and curtilage of the Protected Structure. In this way, if the Coimisiún is minded to grant planning permission for the proposed development I do not recommend that a condition be attached to relocate the rear boundary of the site.
- 7.2.36. As per the documentation submitted to the PA, the granite steps in the rear garden of No. 4 Florence Terrace have been removed. Retention planning permission is sought for these works. As part of the proposed development, these steps will be reinstated within the rear garden to provide access from the lower ground floor level to the higher northern portion of the site.
- 7.2.37. The submission from the DoHGLH to the PA dated 04 September 2025 states that the removal of the steps has a relatively low conservation impact and, therefore, they do not object to these works. The submission recommends that the steps are to be maintained at the site or incorporated into the development in some way.
- 7.2.38. Section 6.1 of the AIHA states that the steps were removed to facilitate access and to protect them during construction. At the time of my site visit, I noted that the steps were being stored in the rear garden.
- 7.2.39. Owing to their location in the rear garden, I do not consider that the removal of the garden steps has impacted on the appearance or character of the Protected Structure. I consider that the reuse of the steps in the garden aligns with the conservation principles outlined in the Guidelines. Drawing from the above, I consider that these works are acceptable.
- 7.2.40. In summary, I consider that the works to be retained and the proposed works at the rear boundary and rear garden of the subject site are acceptable.

7.3. Construction Phase Impacts

- 7.3.1. The appellants have raised concerns regarding the residential amenity impacts arising from the construction works at the subject site. The issues raised relate noise, dust, vibration, parking and storage and structural impacts on adjoining

structures. The appeals request that the allowable working hours at the site are reduced so that works finish by 6pm Monday to Friday, inclusive.

- 7.3.2. The PA addressed these issues in their report dated 28 September 2025. The report states that a standard condition would be attached in respect of working hours. Issues regarding noise, vibration would be addressed via condition requiring the submission of a construction management for the site. Condition 4 of the PA's decision provides for works between 0700 to 1900 Monday to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Condition 5 relates to the submission and agreement with the PA of a construction management plan for the site, with particular reference to the construction programme, hours of operation, noise and dust mitigation, and construction lighting.
- 7.3.3. Construction noise, dust and vibration can have a negative impact on adjoining residents, particular those located in close proximity, as is the case in this instance. These impacts are, however, temporary in nature and will change during the construction phase as works progress across the site. These impacts can also be managed, in accordance with best practice, to mitigate some of the effects arising. I agree with the PA's assessment that the adherence to an agreed construction management plan would prevent undue nuisance arising from noise, dust and vibration arising from the site. I consider that this matter can be addressed by condition. If the Coimisiún is minded to grant planning permission for the proposed development, I recommend that a condition be attached requiring the applicant to agree a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) with the PA for implementation at the site.
- 7.3.4. In respect of the working hours stipulated in Condition 4 of the PA's decision, I note that the Development Plan does not appear to include a development standard in respect of working hours. The subject site forms part of a terrace of dwellings, therefore, construction phase impacts will be closely felt by those adjoining dwellings as there is no separation or buffer from the site. The appellants have asked that the working hours be reduced to 6 pm on a Monday to Friday, just 1 hr less than the 7pm finish time stipulated by the PA. I consider that this request is reasonable. I consider that this can be addressed by condition. In this way, if the Coimisiún is minded to grant planning permission for the proposed development, I recommend

that a condition be attached to limit the working hours from 0700 and 1800 hours Monday to Friday only, and between 0800 and 1400 hours on Saturdays only. No works shall be carried out on Sundays or bank holidays.

- 7.3.5. The appeal submitted by Denis and Mary O'Sullivan raises concerns regarding the use of Stable Lane for construction phase parking and storage. The appeal states that Stable Lane is a private Right of Way, whereas the applicant has responded to say the Stable Lane is taken in charge by the Local Authority. The PA has not responded to confirm the ownership of Stable Lane. Notwithstanding the above, I note that the applicant's response to the appeal states that Stable Lane will remain unobstructed throughout the construction phase. It is my opinion that it is typical in urban areas for some level of construction waste (skips) and parking to be provided on the adjoining roads where domestic works are being undertaken. These do not cause undue negative impacts on traffic or residential amenity where they are managed to ensure that roads and paths remain unobstructed. I consider that this matter can be addressed in the CEMP discussed in Section 7.3.3 of this report.
- 7.3.6. The appellants raise concerns in respect of potential impacts of the construction works on the structural stability of the front wall at No. 5 Florence Terrace, and the dwelling at No. 3 Florence Terrace. In respect of these issues, the PA report states that no works are proposed to the front garden wall at No. 5 Florence Terrace. Given the historic character of the subject dwelling and adjoining dwellings, I consider that there is potential for construction works to impact on the adjoining structures. It is my opinion that the implementation of standard site practices will prevent any such impacts arising. I consider that this matter can be addressed in the CEMP discussed in Section 7.3.3 of this report.
- 7.3.7. Drawing from the above, I consider that, subject to conditions, the construction phase of the development will not have undue negative impacts on residential amenity or the stability of adjoining structures.

7.4. Miscellaneous

7.4.1. Use of the Development

- 7.4.2. The appellant to the east of the site raises concerns regarding the potential commercial use of the proposed rear extension. The appeal states that issues have arisen in the past in respect of commercial uses at the site.
- 7.4.3. The PA report states that, for the avoidance of any doubt, a condition can be attached to the permission to ensure that the proposed home office is not used for any commercial purpose.
- 7.4.4. Drawing No. 193.PL.0003 REV 1 'Proposed Plans and Elevations' submitted to the PA shows that the proposed office will have an area of circa 16.5 sqm. The office area will be accessible from the utility room at the rear of the dwelling and from proposed double doors that open from the office area into the courtyard space between the rear façade of the dwelling and the proposed rear extension. The proposed sauna will be accessed directly from the proposed office.
- 7.4.5. It is my opinion that the proposed office area is suitably sized for use ancillary to the dwelling. I do not consider that the office is large enough to accommodate several desks or visiting members of the public, as would be typical of a commercial space. I note that it is increasingly common for residential properties to have home offices either within the envelope of the dwelling or in the rear garden. Home offices are now a typical part of modern homes, in my opinion. Drawing from the above, I do not consider that the proposed home office will have any impact on the adjoining properties.
- 7.4.6. I agree with the PA assessment in respect of the proposed office, and I consider that a similar condition limiting the use of the office to domestic use would be appropriate. If the Coimisiun is minded to grant planning permission for the proposed development, I recommend that a condition be attached to state that the proposed office area shall not be used for commercial purposes and shall not be leased or sold separate to the dwelling.
- 7.4.7. **Existing and Future Works**
- 7.4.8. The appellants raise concerns in respect of works that have already been undertaken at the site, and future works that may occur. The appellant at No. 3 Florence Terrace states that they informed the Local Authority of works being undertaken at No. 4 Florence Terrace and that nothing was done by the Local Authority. In respect of future works, the appellants at No. 5 Florence Terrace

request that no structures such as gazebos, canopies or awnings are placed at the proposed sun terrace. The appellants states that all works, finishes and materials should be consistent with the character of Florence Terrace.

7.4.9. In respect of the works already undertaken at the site, this is a planning enforcement matter and falls within the remit of the Local Authority. I note that the subject development includes works for retention, which I have assessed alongside the proposed works in Section 7.2 of this report.

7.4.10. Under Section 57 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, the exempted development provisions for Protected Structures are limited. In this way, any future works at the dwelling shall only be exempted development if the works do not affect the character of the structure or any element that contributes to the structure's special interest. I consider that the character of the structure is sufficiently protected under this section of the Act. In this way, I do not consider it necessary to include any conditions to limit future works at the site.

7.4.11. **Planning Precedent**

7.4.12. The appellant at No. 3 Florence Terrace makes reference to planning refusals at the site and elsewhere on Florence Terrace. The appeal does not give the planning references for these refusals.

7.4.13. Having reviewed the online planning register (10 February 2026) I consider that the appellant may be referring to the planning applications under **Reg. Refs. 08630212 and 05630006** at No. 12 and 13 Florence Terrace, which relate to the construction of 2-storey office and to the construction of 3 no. townhouses, respectively. At the subject site, the appeal is likely referring to **Reg. Ref. 15/396**, under which outline permission was refused for a residential dwelling on the basis that outline permission cannot be granted at a Protected Structure.

7.4.14. I consider that these applications are fundamentally different from the subject development in their nature and scale and, therefore, do not provide a directly applicable planning precedent. I have assessed the subject development on its individual merits with reference to the provisions of the Development Plan and relevant Guidelines.

8.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

8.1.1. Refer to Appendix 1 – Form EIA Pre-Screening.

8.1.2. Domestic extensions and minor works are not listed as classes of development for the purposes of EIA under Part 2 of Schedule 5, within the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 (as amended). In this regard, a requirement for preliminary examination or EIA would not arise.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment

I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located circa 1.2 km to the north of the Bray Head SAC (Site Code 000714), 2.6 km to the east of the Ballyman Glen SAC (Site Code 000713), 4.6 km to the east of the Knocksink Wood SAC (Site Code 000725), 4.9 km to the south of the Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 003000), and 8 km to the east of the Wicklow Mountains SPA (Site Code 004040) and SAC (Site Code 002122).

The development comprises the retention of works to the existing structure and boundary wall, and proposed works to renovate the existing building and associated features, landscaping of the front and rear gardens, and the construction of a single storey rear extension of 40 sqm. The existing dwelling is connected to existing public water infrastructure, and no works are proposed to change these connections. The proposed development will not significantly increase the quantity of hand standing at the subject site.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal or by the PA in their assessment.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no significant risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The urban nature of the site and its existing connections to public water infrastructure,

- The relatively small size of the rear extension and its proposed green roof,
- The fact that the works, both proposed and to be retained, relate to an existing structure,
- The lack of a direct connections to any European Sites,
- Taking into account the appropriate assessment undertaken by the PA.

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, 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.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reasons for this conclusion are as follows:

- The urban character of the site with existing connections to public water infrastructure.
- The lack of direct hydrological connections from the site to surface water bodies.
- The small scale of the works and their character as works to an existing structure.

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

11.0 Recommendation

11.1.1. I recommend that retention permission and planning permission be granted, subject to conditions, for the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1.1. Having regard to the nature and character of the works and the subject site, provisions of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028, and the submissions received, it is considered that, subject to conditions, the proposed development and development to be retained would not have any adverse impact on the character or integrity of No. 4 Florence Terrace or adjoining Protected Structures, and would not seriously detract from surrounding residential amenities. The proposed development is, therefore, in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 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 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. The proposed solar panels shown on the roof of the dwelling in Drawing No. 193.PL.0002 REV01 'Site Plan and existing plans and elevations' shall be omitted from the development.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

3. Works to renovate the front railings of No. 4 Florence Terrace shall retain as much of the original material as possible.

Reason: To protect the historic fabric of the Protected Structure.

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

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

5. The office shall be used for private domestic use only and shall not be used for any commercial purpose.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of adjoining properties.

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0700 and 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 and 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

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

7. 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:

- (a) Location of the site and materials compounds including areas identified for the storage of construction refuse;
- (b) Location of areas for construction site offices and staff facilities;
- (c) Details of site security fencing and hoardings;
- (d) Details of on-site car parking facilities for site workers during the course of construction;
- (e) Details of the timing and routing of construction traffic to and from the construction site and associated directional signage, to include proposals to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads to the site;
- (f) Measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network;
- (g) Measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network;
- (h) Alternative arrangements to be put in place for pedestrians and vehicles in the case of the closure of any public road or footpath during the course of site

development works;

- (i) Details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels;
- (j) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater;
- (k) Off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste and details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil;
- (l) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains.
- (m) A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be available for inspection by the planning authority;

Reason: In the interest of amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection

8. (a) All works to the Protected Structure shall be carried out in accordance with best practice and under the supervision of a qualified professional with specialised conservation expertise (Royal Institute of Architects Ireland Grade 2).

(b) Within 3 months of the completion of works, the applicant shall submit a report to the Planning Authority, to demonstrate that all works have been carried out in accordance with Table 6.1 and Section 7 of the Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by MPBA Architects submitted to the Planning Authority on the 07 August 2025.

Reason: To secure the preservation of the protected structure and to ensure that the works are carried out in accordance with conservation practice.

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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Sinéad O'Connor
Planning Inspector

26 February 2026

Appendix 1 – Form EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500146-WW
Proposed Development Summary	Works to a Protected Structure (RPS Ref. B14). Retention planning permission for the removal of a portion of the garden wall and granite steps, and for a door to replace a window at the rear elevation. Planning permission for the construction of a single storey extension to the rear, removal of cementitious render and replacement with lime render, replacement of guttering and water goods, widening of gate to rear garden, renovation and reinstatement of front boundary railing, landscaping works to front and rear including reinstatement of granite steps, and installation of solar panels on south facing roofs.
Development Address	No. 4, Florence Terrace, Florence Road, Bray, County Wicklow.
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, “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 type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2.
	<input checked="" 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. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<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. No Screening required.	Domestic scale extensions and works to renovate an existing structure are not classes of use listed in Part 2, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)	

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)?

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: 26.02.2026