



Inspector's Report

PL-500640-WD-26

Development	Partial demolition and a proposed, two storey extension to the side and rear of an existing dwelling.
Location	1 Curraghmore Terrace, Dunmore East, Co. Waterford
Planning Authority	Waterford City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460750
Applicant(s)	Louis and Mairead Ronan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Patrick Clegg Tom O'Regan Trevor & Valerie Walsh Breda & John Battles
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	7 th April 2026
Inspector	Suzanne Kehely

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	5
4.0	Planning History.....	8
5.0	Policy Context.....	9
6.0	EIA Screening.....	12
7.0	The Appeal	13
8.0	Assessment	15
9.0	AA Screening.....	22
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	22
11.0	Recommendation.....	22
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	23
13.0	Conditions.....	23
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	28

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site relates to a visually prominent end of terrace dwelling dating from c 1835 and located in the centre of Dunmore East. The house has an irregular shaped plot with an extensive side garden bound by a low rendered wall along the street frontage from which there is pedestrian access. There is low hedging to the east. The site is visible from the public realm being visible from the street and from the adjacent public lands which include a public toilet block and open space and coastal path overlooking Dunmore Strand to the east. The side of the house that faces toward the strand comprises the original two storey blank gable end that has been extended to the rear at ground level and which includes a ground floor window in this later extension.
- 1.2. The house is modest being a one and half with a single half dormer to the front upper level. It is one of a terrace of five houses with a step mid terrace. The facade is simple and architectural features include a gable ended pitched roof with chimney, a rendered finish with profiled quoins, timber door, timber sash windows and timber detailing in the gabled dormer. These elements are substantially retained in the terrace façade with the exception of the addition of porches in 3 of the houses. The other end-of-terrace house has been extended to the side and has a vehicular access whereas the other 4 houses retain the original metal gated pedestrian accesses with some modifications to gate piers and style. There is no footpath along the street frontage and clearway road markings front the pedestrian gates. At time of inspection cars were parked on-street alongside the boundary walls.
- 1.3. All houses appear to have been extended to the rear in the Curraghmore Terrace and adjacent Terrace to the west as is evident when viewed from the higher road to the rear of the terrace.
- 1.4. The site is adjoined to the south by some thatched houses on higher ground. The terrace backs onto the regional route R684 (the High Road) which is the main access to the town and links to the coastal route and Dock Road to the southeast. The

property appears vacant and in need of repair and decoration while the garden is overgrown.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. It is proposed to demolish the single storey extension of c.14 sq.m. and extend the original house of 46.26sq.m. (after demolition of extension) with a new single storey and two storey extension of c.154.22 sq.m. with a total proposed gross area of 200.43sq.m. as set out in revised plans submitted to the planning authority on 6th November 2025.

2.2. Elements include

- Reinstatement of the original gable end profile (of the house and terrace) with the insertion of a new gable window at first floor.
- A new extension behind the original building line where it is proposed to extend deeper and wider than the existing house to its rear.
- The two-storey element is in the form of a traditional gable ended return with matching pitched slate clad roof and is confined to the rear (not protruding to the side of the original gable end. The first floor includes the addition of a wide side dormer to the side slope of the return and this provides for patio doors to the side roof terrace partially extending over the ground floor extension.
- The single storey is irregular in plan following the site boundary and incorporating a flat roof which includes a screened terrace to the side over the kitchen area with access from the first floor living area.
- Overall accommodation provides for 3 bedrooms and kitchen dining area and ancillary areas at ground level and a bedroom and living space at first floor level.
- Private open space amounts to 77.3m² (24 m² at first floor roof terrace and 53.3 m² at ground floor level).
- New vehicular entrance: In revised plans this is repositioned along the northern boundary, and the on-site parking area has been increased in size to facilitate off-street car-parking and turning as requested under Further Information. A swept path analysis is included.

2.3. Drawings and images of the proposed extension include site layout, floor plans, elevations, sections, contiguous elevations, photomontages and massing diagrams. Sewer route details are also included.

2.4. An Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by a Conservation Grade 2 architect (RIAI) supports the application. The report concludes that:

This proposed addition to No 1 Curraghmore Terrace provides a modern interpretation of the historic 1835 terrace houses and bookends this five dwelling terrace successfully, while carefully referencing the historical building elements of the terrace. The careful use of contemporary and contrasting materials with the play of volumes to the south and west elevations complement the existing building, massing of the streetscape and adjoining streetscapes in the Architectural Conservation Area. It steps back from the existing original end of terrace dwelling in deference to its historic status and reflects its profile in a contemporary and modern manner.

2.5. A Planning Statement sets out how the proposal:

- Accords with the Waterford County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- Addresses the previous refusal on this site by reducing the bulk, scale and massing. This includes a comparative schedule of proposed floor areas with existing and previously proposed. (p.16)
- Will appropriately integrate within the Architectural Conservation Area in terms of its visual appearance.
- Will not have any material adverse impact on neighbours.
- Does not require a stage 2 Appropriate Assessment.

3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. **Decision**

3.1.1. By order dated 15th December 2025, the Planning authority issued notification of its decision grant permission subject to 11 conditions.

3.1.2. **Conditions**

- Condition 1 - restricts vehicular access to temporary construction access only.

- Condition 2 - requires 1.8m high screen along the southern boundary of the terrace at first floor level to protect residential amenity.
- Condition 3 - underground services to be completed in accordance with details of 6th Nov 2025 and survey details to be submitted within 3 months of completion of works
- Condition 4 - includes specific requirements for interface with public road.
- Condition 5 - requirement for written agreement for details of materials colours textures of external finished
- Condition 6 - avoidance of overhang/trespass
- Condition 7 - Construction and Demolition Resource Waste Management Plan
- Conditions 8, 9 and 10 relate to construction and waste interest of amenities and environmental protection

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports (10/2/25): Further information was sought in respect of

- Built heritage: scale and massing of the proposed development, insubordination and visual dominance, and impact on character of building and streetscape in an ACA.
- Vehicular entrance details regarding sightlines, swept path and boundary related issues
- Protection of underground foul drainage infrastructure

3.2.2. Planning report on FI (12/12/25)

- Built Heritage: It is considered that the applicant has made significant design amendments to address concerns and it is considered that the proposed extension will not have a negative impact on the streetscape, nor will the first-floor terrace negatively impact on any neighbouring property. The existing extension to the rear of the house to the west is also noted. The revised details are considered to be acceptable in this instance.

- **Vehicular Access:** Revised plans are noted to address the issues raised by the District Roads Engineer, with a revised site layout plan and revised entrance details which indicate sightlines of 49m, at a point 2.4m back from road edge, indicated in both directions. It is noted that the sightlines traverse over elements of low-lying wall in front garden areas of houses both at the application site and at neighbouring properties to the west. The comments of the District Roads Engineer are noted and appropriate conditions regarding the entrance can be attached to any grant of permission.
- **Drainage:** The applicant has submitted revised details including proposals to encase the underground pipe in concrete for protection and Water services conditions of permission are noted in this regard.

3.2.3. Other Technical Reports

- **District Roads Engineer:** On review of the FI details submitted, the details as submitted are not acceptable as the sightlines have not been adequately demonstrated. The entrance should act as a temporary construction entrance only and future access may be feasible pending resolution of access and parking.
- **Water Services of Environment Section** have reviewed the details and indicate that the revised proposals are acceptable subject to conditions regarding protection and maintenance of pipework in addition to a cctv survey of drainage network to be submitted on completion of works.
- **Conservation Office: Report of 10/12/25)** The issues of scale and massing, the basis for the refusal of permission by the Board on appeal has not been overcome. Accordingly, refusal of permission is recommended on the basis that the proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for similar developments to modest historic dwellings within ACAs. From a conservation perspective the works as proposed would adversely impact on the streetscape in a very prominent location with the Dunmore East ACA in the CDP. It is considered that the proposed development contravenes Built heritage Policies and Objectives of the CDP

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

No submissions

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. A number of residents in the terrace including the adjoining neighbour are opposed to the development as initially proposed and as revised. The issue were considered by the planning authority and matters related to:

- Overdevelopment of the site and impact on the architectural character of the terrace, streetscape and wider area including sensitive viewpoints.
- Insertion of large gable window and excessive glazing.
- While an extension is understandable, it is considered disproportionate to the site house and terrace.
- Concerns about boundary treatment and drains.
- Overlooking and nuisance due to terrace and windows.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. An Bord Pleanála 314375 (file attached) refers to a refusal of permission for a two-storey extension to the side and rear on the same site. The reason states:

Having regard to the specific design proposed and the resultant scale, massing and bulk of the proposed development, to the small scale of the existing dwelling on this prominent corner site, at the end of an historic terrace located proximate to the seafront and to the centre of Dunmore East, the Board is not satisfied that the proposed development would not adversely impact on the special character of Dunmore East Architectural Conservation Area and would, therefore, materially contravene the Built Heritage Policy BH05 of the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4.2. An Bord Pleanála PL93.244976 refers to a refusal of permission in 2015 for Retention of change of material in rear elevation, installation of hot tub, plant room in

lieu of previously granted garden store and associated site works at no. 5 Curraghmore Terrace. The reasons state:

- 1) Having regard to the higher finished floor level of the elevated decking area and hot tub to be retained and completed relative to the level of the amenity space of the adjoining properties to the east and west, and to the use of the former permitted garden store as a plant room associated with this hot tub, it is considered that the development proposed to be retained would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking and would, therefore, seriously injure the residential amenities of the adjoining properties and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 2) In relation to the change in material on the rear elevation, it is considered that the amendment applied forms part of an overall elevation and any application made in this regard should include full details and particulars in accordance with the statutory provisions for making such an application. Accordingly, it is considered that it would be inappropriate for the Board to consider the grant of a permission for the development proposed to be retained in such circumstances.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. Dunmore East:

Dunmore East is classed as Urban Town between Large Urban Town and Rural Village. The site is within the centre of Dunmore East where it is an objective to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity.(GZT) (Volume 4 Maps.) In Volume 2 specific objectives DM-1-16 are listed for the town centre village core in terms of improving pedestrian facilities, access to the beach and respecting contours and retain architectural design features in the village.

- DMDO9It is an objective of the Council to protect the vistas and settings of protected structures and the streetscape by the retention of vernacular houses such as those on Wellington Terrace, Glenville Terrace, Curraghmore Terrace,

Emerald Terrace and Queen's Terrace. Other features worthy of protection include rubblestone walls, free-standing water pumps and post boxes as identified on the NIAH survey.

5.1.2. Built Heritage:

Chapter 11 sets out policy and objective for Built Heritage. There are 20 Architectural Conservation Area and one of these includes centre of Dunmore East Volume 4 (Maps) of the CDP delineates the ACA. Volume 2 section 10 describes the ACA and includes 19th Century Curraghmore Terrace as part of the summary of Special character. Section 11.3 applies to ACAs, and the site is within this area. The following objectives are relevant.

- BH05 It 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

- BH06 Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment may be required if proposed development considered by the planning authority to have a significant impact.
- BH07 Promoting our Architectural Heritage: It is the policy of the Council to identify and implement measures for promoting the character of the historic cores of the city, towns and villages their unique identity and their architectural, archaeological, historical and cultural, social interest and diversity
- As part of retaining character and uniqueness the following objective applies.
- BH08 Reusing our Heritage Buildings. Encourage sympathetic development while not adversely detracting from the building or its setting... Any proposal shall respect features of special architectural and historic character by appropriate design, materials, scale and setting.
- Other related objectives:
 - BH11 Maintaining and Enhancing Special character
 - BH12 Settings and Vistas
 - BH24 Maintaining and Enhancing our Vernacular Buildings
 - BH29 Extensions and Alterations

5.1.3. House extensions

Section 4.9 of the Appendices in Volume 2 - Development Management Standards states extension should respect and follow the pattern of the existing building as much as possible and where contemporary designs are proposed, proposal should not detract from the visual amenities of the main dwelling or neighbouring properties. The design and layout of extensions to houses should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards sunlight, daylight and privacy. The character, scale and form of the existing building and site should be respected.

5.2. **Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines**

5.2.1. The Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (2011)

Section 13.8 provides guidance on assessing development in ACAS.

5.3. **Built Heritage Designations**

5.4. No.1 and no. 2 Curraghmore are included in the in National Inventory of Architectural Heritage - National Built Heritage Service inventory records Reg No 22817013 It is described having Regional Rating and it category of special interest is Architectural Historical and Social with a building date of 1830-40.. the record describes it as:

- Appraisal: An appealing, well-composed, small-scale house, built as one of a terrace of five identical units, which is of particular importance in the locality having been sponsored by Lord Waterford (n. d.) as accommodation for his servants during visits to the locality. Relatively well maintained, the house retains its original form and massing, together with a range of important salient features and materials, which enhance the historic quality of the site, while a later range has been discreetly planned so as not to impinge negatively on the appearance of the original portion. The house, together with the remainder of the terrace (22817014, 72/WD-27-17-14, 72), forms an attractive feature in the street scene in the centre of the strand area of Dunmore East.

5.5. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The nearest sites are:

- Hook Head Special Area of Conservation - Site Code 000764.
- River Barrow and River Nore Special Area of Conservation - Site Code 002162
- Tramore Back Strand Special Protection Area - Site Code 004027

6.0 **EIA Screening**

6.1. 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 Act).

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. Four parties have submitted an appeal against the decision to grant permission for the proposed development. The case made against the development can be summarised as:

- Adverse Impact on Architectural Heritage as recognised in publications and notably the National Building Heritage Survey Inventory in which it is described as an appealing and well composed house and part of terrace in the Dunmore East ACA. Dunmore East is singled out in the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines as being a picturesque, designed village.
- Careful planning is required and due regard to the Conversation Report of the planning authority is requested.
- Policy Objectives for Built Heritage are referenced such as BH05, BH11, BH24 and BH29 as not being complied with as extension does not respect vernacular or preserve character and visually detracts from original structure and terrace and streetscape.
- The extension is disproportionate and excessive for the house and site. It will upset symmetry of terrace and it is not subordinate. and the 11sq.m. does not address this. In the words of the conservation office, the original house is subordinate contrary to BH29 (extensions and alterations).
- As viewed from the east such as the seawall/Lawlor's Strand, it will be overwhelming contrary to BH12 and will intrude on sea views from higher road to south.
- The large glazing and terrace in the east elevation is inappropriate, and the overall design is not in keeping with grain of the terrace or streetscape.
- The design does not comply with the criteria in section 4.9 for house extensions.
- The concerns raised in the objections to the planning authority have not been fully regarded.
- The garden area will be in shade and increase reliance on the roof terrace.

- The use of the roof terrace for entertainment will be a source of nuisance by reason of Overlooking, noise and light spill. This is compounded by the expansive glazing doors. This would be contrary to protecting residential amenities. Refusal is recommended by reference to refusal of raised leisure spaces in the case of PL93.244976 at no.5 in the same terrace.
- Concerns about boundary features and services as raised with the planning authority remain issues.
- Permission will set an undesirable precedent for this ACA and other ACAs in the county.

7.2. Applicant Response to 3rd Party Appeals

- The applicant in a detailed response emphasizes how the design has been modified and that the original gable wall will be a prominent feature. The criticisms of design are disputed on the basis of being subjective whereas the design is cognisant of the site prominence and context of a much wider site and has been informed by a conservation architect.
- Privacy has been addressed by the layout and design and relationship with adjacent property, and this is accepted by the planning authority and further addressed by the condition 1.8m screen. Although it is pointed out that the drawings already refer to frosted glass in a privacy screen.
- The contemporary design approach is best practice and will make a significant positive contribution.

Attachments

- Photomontages of site with extension as viewed from the street to the west and the strand to the east. These were prepared by CSC (photography consultants) and state a 50mm lens with a HView angle of a nominal 40 degrees.
- Site Layout as submitted to PA on 6th November,

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- Matters raised in the third-party appeals were substantially raised in the submissions already considered by the planning authority as part of its robust appraisal.

7.4. **Observations**

None

7.5. **Further Responses**

7.5.1. All appeal parties submitted further response to the applicant response. Many points are reiterated in so far as the applicant is not considered to have addressed the substantive issues by reference to criteria in the built heritage objectives of the development plan. Points emphasised include:

- Clarification of vulnerable viewpoints and landmarks from where the expansive width of the extension will be visible. The viewpoints are busy focal points.
- The excessive scale of the extension is indisputable and constitutes overdevelopment which dwarfs the original house and cannot be described as subordinate.
- It is a disproportionate extension relative to other extensions providing modern accommodation in the terrace.
- It is an unwarranted extension as a holiday home.
- The photo images in the response are distorted in perspective.
- Expansive glazing remains of concern.
- The previous reason for refusal remains applicable.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. **Issues**

8.1.1. This appeal relates to a large single and two storey extension to a domestic terraced dwelling of architectural and historical value in an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). Having examined the application details, the reports of the planning authority, and having inspected the site and environs, while also having regard to the relevant development plan policies and statutory guidance, I consider that the substantive issue arising from the grounds of appeal relates to **impact on an Architectural Conservation Area** due to impact on the house, the terrace and streetscape. There are also issues relating to **impact on residential amenity** of adjacent residents and

future occupants of the site. Other matters relate to boundary treatment and vehicular access.

8.2. **Impact on an Architectural Conservation Area - Impact on House and Terrace**

- 8.2.1. The subject site, as part of Curraghmore Terrace, is intrinsic to the Dunmore East ACA character as in reference in the Summary of special character of this in area in Appendix 10 of Volume 3 of the Waterford City and County Development Plan (page 21) and the dispute centres on the scale, massing and style of the design of the proposed large extension to this end of terrace house which is also included in the NIAH.
- 8.2.2. The existing house is in a prominent and relatively exposed location as it relates to the public realm and coastal road in the centre of Dunmore East and as part a designated ACA is subject to a comprehensive range of built heritage policy objectives as cited and which are aimed at protecting the character of such properties and areas. There is, accordingly, a strong policy basis to protect the character of both the house and the terrace. For example, Policy objective BH 29 provides specific guidance for extensions and alterations of such vernacular properties and states that it is 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.' More specifically the Development Management Standards based on the assessment of special character for Dunmore East (appendix 10) requirement retention fo particular features such as rendered finishes, roofscapes, original profiles, traditional panelled doors and sliding sash multi-paned timber windows, half-dormers. New build should contribute to visual enhancement while respecting physical character, respecting eaves, pitches and building lines in the streetscape. Loss of original walls discouraged and undergrounding of services will be sought where opportunities arise.
- 8.2.3. In terms of precedent, I have examined the previous design that was refused permission on appeal (file attached) at this location and note in this case that the

design as revised is considerably different in terms of layout, massing and scale and relationship with the existing dwelling and terrace. I consider the issue of scale and massing have been addressed and that the previous reason for refusal is not applicable to the current proposal. In appraising this I have examined the elements of the house that contribute to its architectural interest and have appraised the design in this context having regard to the submissions and by reference to the development plan and Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, as cited.

8.2.4. In terms of the key features, I note the house is described in detail in the NIAH and reflects the elements detailed in the ACA character summary. It is described as:

- End-of-terrace two-bay single-storey house with half-dormer attic, c.1835, retaining original fenestration. Renovated and extended, c.1985, comprising single-bay single-storey lean-to return to south-west. One of a terrace of five. Pitched (shared) slate roof (gabled to half-dormer attic) with concrete ridge tiles, rendered (shared) chimney stack, rendered coping, square rooflights to rear (south-west) pitch, and cast-iron rainwater goods. Lean-to slate roof to return with plastic rainwater goods on timber eaves. Unpainted replacement cement rendered walls, c.1985, with rendered quoins. Square-headed window openings with limestone sills (concrete sill to return), and 2/2 timber sash windows (timber casement window to return). Square-headed door opening with tongue-and-groove timber panelled door. Set back from line of road in own grounds with lawns to site having rendered boundary wall to front with hedge over.

8.2.5. The proposal in this case seeks to remove the later extension to the rear, restore the façade retaining its key features and the extension design, as revised, is confined to the rear of the house proper. I accept that the extension, in the order of 154sq.m. is considerable relative to the original modestly scaled cottage, however I note in particular the depth of the two-storey extension in the adjoining property, and I consider the proposed layout and design approach to mitigate its impact in its end of terrace setting. For example, the proposed two-storey element is traditional in profile and mimics the rear extension in the adjoining dwelling to the west in terms of overall depth, height and form in so far it includes a gable ended pitched roof and is set into the original rear slope - it does not breach the original roof ridge or eaves. Most

significantly, it does not breach the original gable end of the terrace as viewed from the street directly to the front of the terrace. In this way the upper level is harmonious, and it could not I consider be described as visually distorting the form or massing of the original terrace. The demolition of the extension and reinstatement of the gable end form is I consider a significant and positive element in terms of articulating the original terrace form consistent with the CDP criteria. The setting back of the ground level extension to behind the original rear building line and use of a flat roof allows for a more discrete extension at this level.

- 8.2.6. I consider the extensive side garden as compared to the adjoining narrow deep plots provides for a different context to the adjacent terraced dwellings and allows for an extension to the side while the proposed site layout, with setting back and low profiled flat roof which retains views of the thatched cottage to the south on elevated ground, allows for the scale of development while also articulating the original form and mass.
- 8.2.7. In terms of architectural details, all key features are to be retained in the façade and roof, and this extends to the front lawn and pedestrian footpath and gate. In terms of the house proper, all key external features as they presently relate to the streetscape will be retained and, in some respects, enhanced and in this way, I consider, it cannot be seen to detract from the house, the terrace or the wider streetscape of which it forms a part.
- 8.2.8. In terms of the criticism of contemporary styling, I would describe the proposed extension design type as a modern styling of traditional form at the more prominent upper level and as a simple rationalised contemporary style at ground level. I concur with the applicant that the contemporary and rationalised design which provides a clear distinction between old and new as viewed from the street is an accepted best practice design approach in such a setting – while new windows do not match in proportion, the new window in the original gable is vertically proportioned and its insertion can I consider be absorbed in this gable end as it visually maintains a high solid to void ratio. I concur with the applicant that it animates the elevation and do not consider it unduly incongruous. Overall, the design approach is not architecturally confusing and, in a manner, serves to highlight the original terrace. In this way I consider it constitutes a visual enhancement and meets with the development

management criteria for this ACA. The palette of materials incorporating slate and render with grey metal cladding in the new extension as is presented in the drawing and photomontages, bridges the mix of styles. The articulation of the new gable window in metal and contemporary detailing again distinguishes the new from old.

- 8.2.9. I consider the contemporary design approach to be substantially in accordance with Criteria for Assessing Proposal within an Architectural Conservation Area as set out in section 3.10 of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines. Accordingly, I do not consider the objections in relation to the contemporary design to be a reasonable basis to refuse permission.
- 8.2.10. The appellants are concerned about the extent of glazing and in this regard, the use of upper-level glazing in the side dormer in the east elevation will I accept be highly visible, however, given the length of the roof and its central position below the ridge, and articulation in lead type cladding, it has been minimised. This could be further broken down by dividing the glazed opening with cladding rather than window frames or by reducing the overall glazing width by about a quarter. The use of planting would also soften the aspect and aid assimilation into the woodland backdrop. This could be addressed by a condition of permission.
- 8.2.11. In terms of a wider amenity issue, I consider the passive surveillance provided over a central open space area and public accessible utilities area to accord with good planning. I furthermore consider that the stepped terrain with elevated housing to the south allows for assimilation of a roof terrace and that this would not be an unduly incongruous feature.
- 8.2.12. On balance, I do does not consider the design and nature of openings and glazing and impact on Architectural Conservation Area constitutes grounds for refusal of permission.
- 8.2.13. Accordingly in overall terms I consider that the proposed site layout in its context, is such that the extension, in terms of its scale, massing, design and use of materials, can be absorbed in the site while retaining the intrinsic character of the house and terrace. In this way it respects the intact elements and fey features of the terrace and streetscape. I am satisfied it complies with the criteria in both built heritage policy objectives such as BH29 and area specific development management criteria in Appendix 10 within the framework of section 4.9 of the Development Management

Guidelines of the Development Plan in respect of house extension design which states: 'where contemporary designs are proposed, proposal should not detract from the visual amenities of the main dwelling or neighbouring properties...The character, scale and form of the existing building and site should be respected.' I consider the proposed extension as revised has satisfactorily addressed the issues raised by the Conservation officer and I do not consider permission for the development in this case, which is informed by a Conservation Architect, would serve to undermine the preservation of the special character or the Dunmore East ACA or detract from the visual amenities of this scenic coastal area. I do not therefore consider permission would contravene the Built Heritage Policy Objectives as contained in chapter 11 of the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028.

8.2.14. As a matter of detail, I consider a condition agreeing a hard and soft landscaping plan would be appropriate in this visual sensitive and prominent site.

8.3. Impact on residential amenity

- 8.3.1. The grounds of appeal raise concerns about the impacts of the roof terrace by reason of overlooking, noise and light spill. In this case, the roof terrace I note, is to the east of the two-storey extension and set back from the rear building line as it is enclosed by privacy screens - the provision of which is restated in the conditions of permission. I concur with the planning authority that given its juxtaposition with the adjacent dwelling in the terrace, it is not likely to give rise to overlooking. The elevated level of the adjacent thatched cottage also inhibits overlooking to the south and it otherwise overlooks the public realm. I do not consider light spill or noise generated in the screened terrace to be materially different to the ordinary use of private garden space. The roof terrace also affords some privacy as compared to the low level boundary of the curtilage. I also note that the adjacent private open space within the curtilage of the adjacent thatched cottage is elevated and accordingly a roof terrace is not unduly incongruous with the surrounding pattern of development.
- 8.3.2. As the extension mirrors that which it adjoins to the west, there is no basis for overshadowing. There is some concern about the first-floor window in the rear extension. This could be controlled by condition so that it is not used as a sliding patio type door with access to the roof.

- 8.3.3. On balance I consider the provisions of section 4.9 have been met in terms of addressing impact on neighbouring residents. I refer to section 4.9 which states: 'The design and layout of extensions to houses should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards sunlight, daylight and privacy.'
- 8.3.4. In terms of the amenities of the future occupants, there is criticism of the adequacy of open space. A total area of 77.3m² of Private Open Space is proposed and this comprises 24 m² at first floor roof terrace and 53.3 m² at ground floor level which exceeds the minimum requirement of 75m² for 4 beds+ in Volume 2 Development Management Standards which is higher standard than in the Compact Settlement Guidelines. I consider the provision of private open space to be appropriate and acceptable and not to constitute grounds for refusal of permission.

8.4. **Other matters**

- 8.4.1. In terms of drainage details and concerns about existing drainage infrastructure within the site curtilage and serving the terrace, I note the site layout indicates rerouting of the drains and that the planning authority has no issue subject to compliance with its requirement to including cctv surveys and submit details on completion. I consider this matter can be addressed by condition and does not constitute grounds for refusal of permission.
- 8.4.2. I note that the Roads Engineer of the planning authority has concerns about the proposed vehicular entrance (of 3.986m in width) and achieving sightlines and that there may be a conflict with retaining the original boundary wall, although future access is not ruled out subject to circumstances. As a consequence, vehicular access has been omitted in condition 1 save for temporary construction access. Other than boundary details, off-street car parking was not of notable concern to appellants. I consider the provision of off-street parking in this village centre would be of benefit to the area and consider the details of the entrance in the 14m wide frontage which would permit retention of most of the conglomerate stone render wall could be agreed with the planning authority and co-ordinated with a landscape plan so as not obstruct views as well as protecting visual amenities along the streetscape.

9.0 AA Screening

Having regard to the nature and scale of the development and to the nature of the receiving environment and separation distance from the nearest designated site, no appropriate assessment issues arise, and it is considered that the development would be unlikely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on any European sites.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive.
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.
- 10.3. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive.
- 10.4. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that the decision of the planning authority be upheld and that permission granted for the proposed development.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the siting and design of the extension wherein the two-storey extension is confined in width and depth to the rear of the original dwelling and the original terrace gable wall profile is reinstated as a visible component in the eastern façade, the site width and configuration and pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the scale, form and mass of the proposed development would not unduly detract from the form and massing of Curraghmore Terrace, would not adversely impact on the streetscape or visual amenities of area and would not therefore detract from the special character of the Dunmore East Architectural Conservation Area as delineated as identified in Appendix 10 and protected by the Built Heritage Policy Objectives as contained in the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028. Furthermore, having regard to the pattern of development and positioning of roof terrace to the east of the extension, it is considered that the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential amenities of property in the vicinity at this location, by reason of overlooking, noise or disturbance and that the proposed development would, therefore, be 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 and as amended by revised plans and particulars submitted to the planning authority on 6th November 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. (i) The proposed dormer window on the east elevation shall be modified by way of narrowing the width of glazing by 1.5m, in accordance with details which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

(ii) The proposed rear facing gable opening shall be a window only and not designed as patio type doors and details of opening shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

3. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed extension and existing dwelling shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in an Architectural Conservation Area.

4. A 1.8m high privacy screen in accordance with plans shall be provided and maintained along the southern side of the roof terrace.

Reason: In the interest if residential amenity.

5. The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of hard and soft landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This scheme shall include a plan to scale of not less than 1:500 showing –

(a) Existing trees, hedgerows, original boundary walls, specifying which are proposed for retention as features of the site landscaping

(b) The measures to be put in place for the protection of these landscape features during the construction period

(c) Details of screen planting at ground and terrace level which shall not include cupressocyparis x leylandii.

(d) Details of roadside and boundary planting

(e) Hard landscaping works, specifying surfacing materials,

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

6. (a) Details of the vehicular entrance which shall be separate to the existing pedestrian access and which shall include details of gate design, interface with public road and boundary detail with minimal interference with original wall, shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Any interference or damage to the public road caused during the construction works shall be made good, by, and at the expense of the developer.

- (b) Parking for the development shall be provided in accordance with a detailed parking layout which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The layout shall provide for

- (i) Parking of two cars and turning area
- (ii) A hard and soft landscaping plan in keeping with condition 4 of this permission which shall incorporate SuDs.

Reason: in the interest of traffic safety and orderly development in Architectural Conservation Area.

7. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of property in the vicinity.

8. Prior to the commencement of development on the applicant/developer shall submit for the written agreement of the planning authority a specification and method statement, covering all works to be carried out, to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with good conservation practice.

Reason: In the interest of the protection of architectural heritage (in accordance with the provisions of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities).

9. (a) Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements, in writing where necessary, of the planning authority for such works and services.

(b) The underground infrastructure within the site shall be protected in accordance with revised details submitted to the planning authority on 6th November 2025. Within 3 months of completion of all works the developer shall submit a survey of the drainage network to the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

10. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development. Any existing over ground cables shall be relocated underground as part of the site development works.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

11. Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity

12. Prior to commencement of development, a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) shall be prepared and submitted to the planning authority for written agreement. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times.

Reason: In the interest of reducing waste and encouraging recycling.

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.”

Suzanne Kehely
Senior Planning Inspector

24th April 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	500640- WD-26
Development description	Domestic extension and vehicular access
Development Address	1 Curraghmore Terrace, Dunmore East
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(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)	
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. No Screening required.	

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
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: _____