MALCOM	SON	The Atrium, Shamrock Plaza, Green Lane, Carlov
An Bord Pleanála, 64 Marlborough Street, Dublin 1. DO1 V902	AN BORD PLEANÁLA         LDG	<ul> <li>T: +353 (0) 59 913 1745</li> <li>F: +353 (0) 59 914 3695</li> <li>E: info@mlaw.le</li> <li>W: www.mlaw.le</li> <li>DX: 18 005 Carlow</li> </ul> 12 <sup>th</sup> June 2020
An Bord Pleanála Case I Planning Authority Refe Appellant:		

Dear Sir / Madam,

In response to the submission made by AKM Design dated the 15<sup>th</sup> of April 2020 on behalf of Mauro Fiorio Pla and Giorgia De Maio, we wish to make the following observations:

## **Residential Amenity**

a) In relation to paragraph 1.1.1 of the submission of Mr Kim, the author considers it noteworthy that Condition 14 contains no restriction in relation to what he describes as "future exempted development". However, the legislation providing for exemption was not in place in 1987 when the relevant permission was granted. This being so, it is misleading for Mr Kim to conclude that no such restrictions were intended. The Condition clearly provides that "*no windows shall be provided, now and in the future, other than where indicated,*" a condition which is explicitly oriented towards the future in its application. As a matter of law, development cannot be considered exempt if it would contravene a condition attached to a planning permission<sup>1</sup> and this applies to permissions granted under the 2000 Act and also includes a permission granted under the Planning and Development Act 1963.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Article 9(1)(a)(i) of the *Planning & Development Regulations 2001* states that:

"Development to which article 6 relates shall not be exempted development for the purposes of the Act - a) If the carrying out of such development would – (i) contravene a condition attached to a permission under the Act or be inconsistent with any use specified in a permission under the Act"...

<sup>2</sup> Article 3(4) of the *Planning and Development Regulations 2001* which provides:

"In these Regulations, any reference to a permission under the Act shall include a reference to a permission under the Act of 1963, and any reference to conditions to which a permission is subject shall be construed accordingly."

		MARGON
SORD PLEANÁLA 15 JUW 2020 Type: 	AN E LDG- ABP- Fee: € Time:	
AFP-306873-20 ice: 0942730 Choice Cleary		ka Bard Pasa la Uzer A Plandag Autorrig Ret- Apallanti

and N an mail

Li response to the adomission mode on AKN, its spycified tao 15<sup>m</sup> of A**p**ro 1670 on behall of stremo Franko Pla-ood Chargin De Maro, we wish to a sky the following disear atoms:

### via and hits his

a) In relation to paragraph 1.1.1 of the rabinisation of Mr Kim, the author considers a noneworthy that Condition 14 contains no restriction is relation to whether describes as "future exempted leveloptions" (Conserver, the level that no extended) for examption was not in place in 1987 when the relevant permission we granted. This being such is initialization detected in 1987 when the relevant permission we granted. This being such is initialization and in the describes as initialization and in the formation to consider and permission we granted. This being such is initialization and in 1987 when the relevant permission we granted. This being such is initialization and in the tended to the form of the data data is a specification and the form of the form of the initialization and the matches that no back matches in the form of the initialization and the matches that no back matches in the form of the form of the form of the form of the initialization and the matches that no back matches in the form of the form of the form of the form of the initialization and the initialization of the form of the initialization of the form of the form of the form of the initialization of the initializatio

Arriade for the Planning on Decalopment for plate the plate of Mill of selling and

<sup>1</sup> In these Registrations, and references in a permission surface this are solution methods as reference on a prevention worker the start of 1963, and any references are could to work to whether responsion is subject shall be conversely accountingly.

Line (1940) Santa David Markov Santavid Takin Finish Takin Santavid Santavi

so rich (C) (a),() if the Ubarchip & Dynafopawar is guidhoid. Hold states that

It is submitted, therefore, that such a restriction on exemption does not have to be specified, nor could it have been given that the exempted development legislation was not commenced until 2000, over a decade later. This being so, the purpose of the Condition is key to its construction/interpretation.

### **Purpose of the Condition**

b) In 1.1.2, Mr Kim purports to deal with the purpose of the Condition. He submits that *"planning condition 14 is clear, concise and directional."* It is submitted that Mr Kim has either deliberately overlooked the reason for the Condition (in the interests of residential amenity) and/or he misunderstands the reason for the Condition. The author writes:

"The wording states "in the indicated blank facades of the new residential blocks i.e. this is clearly referring only to the development as applied for and permitted by An Bord Pleanála decision 290572471. This is the clear purpose of Condition 14."

If Mr Kim's literal interpretation were to be applied, the reason given for the Condition would have to be completely disregarded. To do so would be contrary to the well established principles of the Superior Courts in relation to the determination of the meaning of all documents affecting legal rights and obligations. The Courts have held that the appropriate method of construction of such documents is to consider the text in context. This was held in the recent decision of the Supreme Court in *Lanigan v Barry*. <sup>3</sup> In that case, the Court stated that the "*text in context*" approach requires the Court to consider the text used in the context of the circumstances in which the document concerned was produced including the nature of the document itself.

Similarly, in the earlier case of *Kenny v Dublin City Council*<sup>4</sup>, Mr Justice Clarke stated that in relation to the construction of a planning permission, the method of construction appropriate to the determination of the meaning of documents affecting legal rights and obligations was to look at the "*text in context*". In that case, the Supreme Court adopted a purposive approach to a planning condition which on its face, required the omission of a first floor "*in the interests of visual amenity*". The Supreme Court rejected a literal interpretation of the Condition and held that the purpose of the condition was the reduction in the height of the building and this was achieved by the removal of any floor and not just the first floor. It is submitted that this decision demonstrates the importance of the true meaning of a condition which must be ascertained from its context in the planning process.

The Appellant submits that a purposive approach should be adopted to the construction of the subject permission and the principles established by the Superior Courts applied.

Absence of Precedent	AN BORD PLEANÁLA	
	LDG	
	ABP	l
<sup>3</sup> [2016] IESC 46 (27 <sup>th</sup> July 2016) Clarke J stated	at para 3.11 that; JUN 2020	
₄ [2009] IESC 19 (Judgment of the 5 <sup>th</sup> of Ma	Eff 2009) Type.	2
	Time: By:	l.

ה ההספרי אה עד את ההסוג לאור היה היה את היא ההסוגה האת האחר האותר היה האותר היה האותר האותר את היה לא יקאסי להידי לאמי מילולם ההלהלים סבלה בלילול להיא לאחר לא המקריבו את הלה אומנים האת לאלים אינה לה להמנעיר היה האפר לה לה ההילול האומנים לאמרך אנללים.

### an include of the history of the

In (1.1) Is a subsequence of a subsequence of the set film of films (1.2) and (1.2)

• Mit Marin have the presenter were a braught of the Structure contact products and product and product and products and the Structure and Products and Produc

Suminary, other access on our formus of the profile of the control of the next the formation of the sector of the next to the control of the control of the next to the control of the control o

The importance subarity in the property of approach change is the spiral of the constraint of the spiral sector In the context constraints of the property will be calculated from the context of Calculations of the spiral of

AN BORD PLEANÁLA	
ABP	n an
Eess 6 State Type	alaha iki caki na sina ka shika
Time: By:	

c) In paragraph 1.2, Mr Kim relies on houses numbers 10, 14 and 23 within Oakley Square as precedent for the subject extension. The author omits to refer to the location of these properties in the square. The properties referred to by Mr Kim are on the North side (No. 23) and the South side of the square (No.s 0 and 14) respectively and are not overlooked by the houses on Charleston Avenue. There are no extensions to any of the properties on the West side of the square. The West side is the only side of the square which runs parallel to Charleston Avenue and is the only side of the square overlooked by Charleston Avenue. It is submitted that Condition 14 is directly concerned with the properties on the West side of the square and the Appellant has not and does not argue that it is relevant to the North or South sides of the square.

Without prejudice to the foregoing, it is submitted that it is a misrepresentation to describe the precedents referred to by Mr Kim as "similar dwellings". The structures to the rear of the said properties are small conservatories which are totally different in character and function to the subject extension. It is submitted that the subject extension is a substantial construction – in relative terms - comprising an open plan kitchen/dinging area with floor to ceiling glazing. It is in no way comparable to the small conservatories to the rear of the said properties at 10,14 and 23.

## **Inconsistency of Appearance and Character**

d) In relation to paragraph 1.3 of Mr Kim's submission, he fails to address the specifics of the glazing contained in the doors to the rear of the west facing properties in Oakley Square. The doors in question are standard sliding doors  $(2m \times 2m = 4m^2)$  and there are no windows. The scale of this glazing in the context of the façade means that the doors appear dark and overlooking is effectively non-existent. It is submitted that this fulfils the purpose of Condition 14. The subject extension has glazing of 4.6m x 2.2m =  $10.1m^2$ . This level of glazing, spanning the entire façade of the extension, completely exposes the kitchen and dining area of number 18 and all movement within it to plain sight, both during the daytime and particularly at night.

## **Shortcoming of Planners Section 5 Decision**

e) In paragraph 1.5, Mr Kim submits that none of the cases referred to by the Appellant can be considered comparable to this domestic referral case and he appears to be of the view because the cases referred to involved larger sites, they are not relevant. There is no legal authority relied on by Mr Kim to support his contention that the legal principles established by the Superior Courts should effectively be disregarded due to the nature of the development. It is respectfully submitted that principles of law established by the Superior Courts are binding on the lower courts and quasi judicial bodies. The established principles apply in equal measure to a small scale development as much as a large development and the principle of stare decisis should be respected.

## Failure to Provide Reasons

f) In relation to paragraph 1.6, the Appellant reiterates the point made previously (in the appeal submission dated 09/03/2020) that the arguments advanced by the Appellant in the Section 5 reference were not addressed by the Planner. The only reason provided by the Planner was a bald statement to the effect that the Planner of the believe that the extension contravened Condition 14.

Time: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_

3

In performance to the barrier of the construction of the second s

When a projection of the largening of invaluated that it is a anarchic solution to be a the second solution of the

## teroquestes ex al Anne assess and Encoderer

(2) In fieldation is provide part of a first function in the second methods and the second first properties in order to the second s

## The second starts and a start start start

<sup>1</sup> In paragraph 1.5. Muchain valuation in the average of the events to need to by dar Appediant can be constrained constantile to this accordance to the constrained constantile to this accordance to the data the unpersonantic last of a view because the case. In feared to havelved angle' state, they are not to be all and to my subsequent to be all a view because the case. In feared to havelved angle' state, they are not to be all and to my subsequent to be all a view because the case. In feared to havelved angle' state, they are not to be and to be an order of the case. In feared to havelved angle' state, they are not to be and the case of the

### tal mode provide three the

3. An elabora or paragraph continue Annellian LGC appeal entantiscion dated (PETE-2020) that LGC the Section Correlevance wate not address by the Pilenner water chaid state ment to the oth the externation or taken of the differential.

AN BORD PLEANÁLA
LDC- ABP-
e effect that \$9 JUN 2020 d her helle
Fee: € Type:
Тіте. Ву.

The Planner did not give any reason in his report for his failure to respond to and/or address the submissions made on behalf of the Appellant in her Section 5 application. The only observation made by the Planner was, "Condition 14 of An Bord Pleanála decision PL29/5/2471 does not relate to the subject extension." The Appellant submits that the Planning Authority failed in its duty as a decision making authority to consider the Applicant's submissions and/or to identify the reasons for not accepting those arguments.

## Section 5

g) In relation to paragraph 2.1, Mr Kim states that the Appellant has requested the Board to set aside the Section 5 decision under 0005/20. This is not correct. The only request made by the Appellant in relation to the previous determination (Ref. 005/20) was that the Board might <u>consider</u> that determination. The context of the invitation to the Board to consider same is temporal. The determination in relation to 18 Oakley Square was made on the 21<sup>st</sup> of January 2020 (005/20) and the determination in relation to the Appellant's Section 5 reference (0042/20) was made on the 14<sup>th</sup> of February 2020.

Yours faithfully

Mr Terry Doyle Malcomson Law Solicitors, The Atrium, Shamrock Plaza, Carlow.

AN LDG ABP	I BORD PLEANÁLA
Fee: € Time:	1 5 JUN 2020 Type: By:

(internative consistence) with a construction of the constructi

### P. mittak



## Lisa Quinu

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Appeals2 Wednesday 15 April 2020 22:32 Lisa Quinn; Lita Clarke FW: Appeal ABP - 306870-20 ABP Reply - ABP306870-20.pdf 1

From: Bord <bord@pleanala.ie> Sent: Wednesday 15 April 2020 18:56 To: Appeals2 <appeals@pleanala.ie> Subject: FW: Appeal ABP - 306870-20

From: Jong Kim <<u>jong@akmdesign.ie</u>> Sent: Wednesday 15 April 2020 17:22 To: Bord <<u>bord@pleanala.ie</u>> Subject: Appeal ABP - 306870-20

Dear Sir / Madam,

I refer to above ABP appeal of Cliona Cleary (An Bord Pleanala case reference is 306870-20).

I wish to make this submission to the appeal on behalf of Mauro Fiorio Pla & Giorgia De Maio of 18 Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6.

There is no appeal fee in this instance.

Can you please send me an acknowledgement of our submission.

Regards Jong

Jong Kim BA MSc TP MIPI Town Planner Director of Planning



AKM Design Architectural Design & Planning Unit 4 Orchard Business Centre, 2009 Orchard Avenue,

## Citywest, D24 D24FF86

## P: +353 1 4796234 E: jong@akmdesign.ie W: www.akmdesign.ie

## Architectural Design – Town Planning – Chartered Engineers – Development Consultants – Building Surveyors

The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and is for the addressee only. Reading, copying, disclosure or use by anybody else is not authorized. The contents may not represent the opinion of AKM Consulting Ltd. trading as AKM Design or any of its affiliates except to the extent that it relates to their official business. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete this message and any attachments and advise the sender by return e-mail.

An Bord Pleanala 64 Marlborough Street Dublin 1 D01V902

15/04/2020

DCC Ref.: EXPP 0042/20 Address: 18 Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6 ABP Ref.: 306870-20

Dear Secretary,

P: +353 1 479 6234 E: info@akmdesign.ie W: www.akmdesign.ie

**Orchard Business Centre** 

**Citywest Buisness Campus** 

2009 Orchard Avenue

I refer to above appeal lodged by Malcolmson Law Solicitors on behalf W: www.akmdesign.in of Cliona Cleary (hereinafter referred to as 'appellant'). The An Bord Pleanala case reference is 306870-20 and the appeal was lodged on 11/03/2020.

I wish to make this submission to the appeal on behalf of Mauro Fiorio Pla & Giorgia De Maio, who are owners of 18 Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6 in accordance with Section 129 of the Planning and Development Act 2000.

I ask the Bord to consider our submission and I ask that you please send back an acknowledgement. There is no fee in this instance.

## 1.0 Grounds of Appeal

The appellants grounds of appeal are stated as follows:

- Contravention of Planning Condition no. 14 in ABP Ref. 29/5/72471,
- Absence of precedent,
- Inconsistency of appearance and character,
- Observations from 18 Oakley Square,
- Shortcoming of Planners Section 5 Decision,
- Failure to provide reasons.

I reply and comment on each of the issues raised by the appellant in separate sections below.

## 1.1 Contravention of Planning Condition no. 14 in ABP Ref. 29/5/72471

It is the argument of the appellant that the rear extension to 18 Oakley Square conflicts with condition 14 of ABP Ref. 29/5/72471 (parent planning permission of the Oakley Square housing scheme). Condition 14 states:

"No windows shall be provided, now or in the future, in the indicated blank facades of the new residential blocks, save where such are shown on the lodged plans. Reason: In the interests of residential amenity."

I consider there is no conflict with condition 14. I ask the Bord to review my examination of the reason and purpose of condition 14 below.

## 1.1.1 Residential Amenity

'*In the interest of residential amenity*' is the stated 'reason' for condition no. 14. I ask the Bord to review that dwellings in Oakley Square have very short separation distances between houses. The front elevation of all dwellings (including 18 Oakley Square) have doors / windows

Architectural Design | Town Planning | Civil & Structural Engineering | Development Consultants | Building Surveying



AKM Design Unit 4

Dublin 24

4

on the ground floor and windows on the first floor overlooking the central square. There is barely a 3-metre separation distance between houses 17 & 18 and 14 & 15. We ask the Bord to review 18 Oakley Square faces the side gable wall (blank facade) of 17 Oakley Square. It is my firm view that the primary function of the condition 14 is to protect the residential amenity of dwellings within Oakley Square from each other, given their very short separation distances.

## 1.1.2 Purpose of the Condition

Planning condition 14 is clear, concise and directional. It is easily understood, unambiguous and it clearly only refers to the original buildings as set out in the submitted plans under the original planning application and subsequent appeal - An Bord Pleanala Decision 290572471 (planning authority reference 1369/86).

The wording states "*in the indicated blanks facades of the new residential blocks*" i.e. this is clearly referring <u>only</u> to the development as applied for and permitted by the An Bord Pleanala Decision 290572471. This is the clear purpose of the condition 14. It is also important to have regard to the clear absence of any restriction, within the conditions attached to the parent planning permission, with regard to future exempted development. The clear interpretation of the planning permission, as per the principles applicable, does not restrict the development of the rear extension.

It is my view that by examining the purpose and stated reason for the condition, it is clear that the rear extension to 18 Oakley does not conflict with condition 14.

I ask the Bord to concur that condition 14 places no restrictions on future 'exempt development rights' of 18 Oakley Square. It is my view that the rear extension to 18 Oakley Square is restricted in any way by condition 14.

## 1.2 Absence of Precedent

The appellant states that there is no precedent for similar development on the west side of Oakley Square (page 3). There is unequivocal planning precedent in Oakley Square for similar development. I ask the Bord to consider there are 3 similar dwellings in Oakley Square that have extended to the rear garden (10, 14, 23) in a very similar fashion to 18 Oakley Square. The Bord should review the fact that none of properties (10, 14, 23) sought planning permission, as the rear extensions are unambiguously 'exempt development'.

## 1.3 Inconsistency of Appearance and Character

The appellant states the rear extension to no. 18 Oakley Square is inconsistent with the appearance and character of surrounding structures. The appellant states the rear extension is 'inconsistent with the entire west facing line of Oakley Square whose glazing is strictly restricted by the above mentioned planning permission' (page 3).

I disagree with the appellants argument that the rear extension to no.18 is inconsistent with the entire west facing line of Oakley Square (houses 15, 16 17). I ask the Bord to review that these 3 dwellings (houses 15, 16 17) that make up the west facing block of houses have large windows / doors at ground floor level that face west to the appellants dwelling. The appellant misunderstands the purpose of condition 14 in this regard.

I ask the Bord to consider that the rear extension to no. 18 is very comparable in shape, size, materials and context to other rear extensions noted at 10, 14 and 23. I therefore consider that the rear extension at 18 Oakley Square is fully consistent in appearance and character with adjoining development in this regard.

## 1.4 Observations from 18 Oakley Square

The appellants state that the AKM submission on the appellants Section 5 (0042/20) fails to address arguments set out by the appellant. I disagree with the appellant and I ask the Bord to review our submission.

The appellant also makes reference to a Section 5 (0005/20) submitted by Mauro Fiorio Pla & Giorgia De Maio and claims that the application form was not filled in correctly in relation to 'planning history'. I ask the bord to review the Section 5 application and at the time of the Section 5 application 0005/20 was submitted on the 03/01/2020, there was no planning history on the subject site at '18 Oakley Square'. It is my opinion that the form was correctly filled in by the applicants. I stand over my submission to the planning authority.

## 1.5 Shortcoming of Planners Section 5 Decision

The appellants states that their arguments were not adequately addressed or responded to by the planner who determined the Section 5 (0042/20). I consider the planning issues in this case are not complex and are very straight forward. I have reviewed the assessment by the planning authority and I consider that all the relevant planning issues were comprehensively assessed. I do not see any deficiencies in the Section 5 assessment by the planning authority as alleged by the appellant.

The appellants make reference to 7 legal cases. While voluminous, I ask the bord to acknowledge that none of the cases referred to by the appellant can be considered comparable to this domestic referral case. The majority of cases referred to involve much larger sites and more complex planning issues and are not relevant.

## 1.6 Failure to Provide Reasons

The appellant states the planners Section 5 assessment (0042/20) fails to provide reasons and fails to respond to the arguments made by the appellant. As stated already I do not see any deficiencies in the Section 5 assessment by the planning authority. The planner makes full reference to the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, *Schedule 2, Part 1 Exempted Development - General - Development within the Curtilage of a House Class 1.* It is simple fact that the planner has reviewed the Section 5 application by the appellant and has made the correct decision to determine that the rear extension to 18 Oakley Square is 'exempt development' with regard to the planning and development regulations.

The planner makes a thorough appraisal of the entirety of the appellants Section 5 application. The planners report (0042/20) confirms he has fully reviewed the application form, cover letter, site plans, photos and all summitted appendices by the appellant.

The planner also clearly makes reference to Article 9 (1) (a) of the Planning and Development Regulations Restrictions on Exemptions where works (i) *Contravene a condition attached to a permission under the Act or be inconsistent with any use specified in a permission under the Act.* I ask the Bord to refer to the planners assessment that states as follows:

"The above condition (no. 14) does not limit glazing within future extensions nor does it remove exempt development rights for rear extensions. I therefore consider the subject extension would not contravene the above condition".

The planning authority has properly assessed the Section 5 application and has given clear reasons for its decision. It has fully considered the appellants views and has provided clear

direction on the decision to declare the works 'exempt development'. I concur with the planning authorities decision on the rear extension.

## 2.0 Other Appeal Issues

The appellant raises a number of other items in this voluminous appeal. I wish to comment on the following matters below.

## 2.1 Section 5 (0005/20)

The appellant requests that the Bord reconsider and set aside the Section 5 decision under 0005/20 by the planning authority. While it is noteworthy that the planning authority came to the same conclusion in respect of both section 5 applications, the appellant is restricted from making such a request of the Bord.

The proper avenue for the challenging of that decision is by way of the Judicial Review process and certainly not in the indirect fashion in which it has been brought here, on the back of an appeal regarding a separate and distinct decision of the planning authority. The appellant is precluded from reagitating this issue before this forum. Furthermore, this planning matter has therefore been fully determined by the planning authority and procedurally cannot be set aside by An Bord Pleanala.

I ask the Bord to dismiss the appellants request.

## 2.2 Oral Hearing

I am surprised that an Oral Hearing has been requested by appellant on this referral. This a simple planning matter for determination. I am not aware that an Oral Hearing has ever been granted by An Bord Pleanala for a Referral regarding an exempt extension. I ask the Bord to refuse the appellants request for an oral hearing.

## 2.3 Exempt Development Rights

The appellant is notably silent on other fundamental planning matters including the exempt development rights of Mauro Fiorio Pla & Giorgia De Maio. The parent planning decision 290572471 did not contain any planning condition that 'de-exempts' future development at 18 Oakley Square. The rear extension is considered to be 'exempt development' and is not restricted by condition no.14.

## 3.0 Conclusions

I consider the single storey rear extension to 18 Oakley Square to be 'exempt development'. I consider the rear extension meets all of the conditions and limitations of Class1 of Schedule 1, Part 1 of the Planning and Development Regulations.

The planning authority have now made 2 determinations on this planning matter. On both occasions the planning authority has considered that the rear extension to 18 Oakley Square is 'exempt development'. I ask the Bord to concur with our view that is the consistent view of the planning authority.

The planning authority has properly assessed the appellants Section 5 application (0042/20) and has given clear reasons for its planning decision. It has fully considered the appellants views and has provided clear direction on the decision to declare the works 'exempt development'.

The subject site is not a protected structure and there are no planning restrictions or environmental sensitivities regarding this domestic development.

A wide range of legal cases has been raised by the appellant in this Section 5 referral. I consider the majority of the planning cases referred by the appellant are not comparable to this case.

I ask the Bord to dismiss the appellants appeal and determine that the rear extension to 18 Oakley Square is development, and is 'exempt development' within the meaning of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

Jong Kim MIPI AKM Design



×



Time: **Planning Appeal Form** 

ANBO

LDG.

Fee: €\_2

STOS PLEANÁLA

MAR 2020

## Your details

	(a) Name	Cliona Cleary	
	(b) Address	26 Charleston / Ranelagh	Avenue
		Dublin 6	
		D06HW31	AN BORD PLEANÁLA
	4		1 1 MAR 2020
Agei	nt's details		LTR DATED FROM LDG
2.	Agent's details (	if applicable)	ABP
	If an agent is acti	ng for you, please <b>als</b>	o provide their details below. If you
are not using an agent,		agent, please write "N	ot applicable" below.
		ne Terence Doyle	



chaisb uoY



(b)	Agent's address	Malcomson Law Solicitors	
		The Atrium	
		Shamrock Plaza	
		Green Lane	
		Carlow	

AN BO	RD PLEANÁLA
1	1 MAR 2020
LTR DATED	FROM
LDG-	
ABP	



		1.55			
No. of Street, St	•				::-11
A	ANÁL	PLE	ORD	وي الم	
				~1 \$ 15 A	
		AR 20	MIT		
				(DATED	
			and a state of the state of the		
		THE CLEAR AND IN		-E	LD

Planning Annual Form

Page 2 of 6

## Postal address for letters

and the second

3. During the appeal we will post information and items to you or to your agent. For this appeal, who should we write to? (Please tick ✓ one box only.)

You (the appellant) at the	The agent at the address in	1	
address in Part 1	Part 2		

## Details about the proposed development

- 4. Please provide details about the planning authority decision you wish to appeal. If you want, you can include a copy of the planning authority's decision as the appeal details.
- decision as the appeal details. (a) Planning authority (for example: Ballytown City Council) Dublin City Council 1 1 MAR 2020 LTR DATED FROM (b) Planning authority register reference number (for example: 18/0123) 0042/20 (c) Location of proposed development (for example: 1 Main Street, Baile Fearainn, Co Ballytown) 18 Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6.

## Postal address for letters

During the appeal would get information and figms on you on to your agent if or this optical, who chould we write to? (blease this viole nor only.) You (the appeliant) at the [1] The apprix at the address to

## Details about the proposed coveragement

Prosesse provide datalis adout the purmon antihority carbonar solvershifts opposit. If you want, you as month is a for the provider of the second costing restrict exclearising as the appaper of adis.

> (a) **Planning** auth-olby (for azampia: Bali town 13, Council <sup>1</sup> Dublin Dity Downii

> > Planning authority register (sfored)
> >  (for example, 18/9123)
> >  (04.7/20)

(a) Lacentique of peccaused invertence (a)

jonesarinte'n Mair Skoek Barb Procum. Co Skryto Le Godin Schare, Faller, In Bublin

AN BORD PLEANALA

## **Appeal details**

to see a se

5. Please describe the grounds of your appeal (planning reasons and arguments). You can type or write them in the space below or you can attach them separately.

Please find the grounds of the appeal in the attached cover letter titled: RE: REFERRAL OF SECTION 5 DECLARATION - DUBLIN CITY COUNCIL REG REF 0042/20 - 18 OAKLEY SQUARE, RANELAGH, DUBLIN 6.

AN BO	RD PLEANÁLA	
	11 MAR 2020 FROM-	
LTR DATE LDG		

## Appeal details

6. Please describe the grounds of your appeal questions and reasons and argumentat. You can type on write their in the appace below of you get attach them repairbles.
Please find the grounds of the appeal in the appact below of you get please find the grounds of the appeal in the attached cover letter titled provide the grounds of the appeal in the attached cover letter titled provide the grounds of the appeal in the attached cover letter titled provide the grounds of the appeal of the attached cover letter titled provide the grounds of the appeal of the attached cover letter titled provide the grounds of the appeal of the attached cover letter titled provide the grounds of the appeal of the attached cover letter titled.

AN BORD PLEAWALA AN BORD PLEAWALA II MAR 2020 FROM LTR DATED ROM

## Supporting material

and the second second

- If you wish you can include supporting materials with your appeal.
   Supporting materials include:
  - photographs,
  - plans,
  - surveys,
  - drawings,
  - digital videos or DVDs,
  - technical guidance, or
  - other supporting materials.

# Acknowledgement from planning authority (third party appeals)

7. If you are making a third party appeal, you must include the acknowledgment document that the planning authority gave to you to confirm you made a submission to it.

## Fee

 You must make sure that the correct fee is included with your appeal.
 You can find out the correct fee to include in our Fees and Charges Guide on our website.

AN BORD PLEANÁLA
1 1 MAR 2020
LTR DATED FROM
LDG

## Supporting malerial

6. If you wish you that include supporting materials with your appear.

anger joludo -

Acknowledgement from planning authorit

7 If you are matering a triffet performance or unor to the termination of a sector of the termination of termination of the termination of termination

907

. You must meter sure tout the connect the initial or with your appear. You can and aid the follows the to include in our Cass and Change's Guide.

RO PLEANÁLA	AN BO
1 MAR 2020	1
MORE	LTR DATED
Recommendance and a second second	LDG
	ABP-

## Oral hearing request

A. State of the

**9.** If you wish to request the Board to hold an oral hearing on your appeal, please tick the "yes, I wish to request an oral hearing" box below.

Please note you will have to pay an **additional non-refundable fee** of €50. You can find information on how to make this request on our website or by contacting us.

If you do not wish to request an oral hearing, please tick the "No, I do not wish to request an oral hearing" box.

Yes, I wish to request an oral hearing

No, I do not wish to request an oral hearing

AN BORD PLEANÁLA	7
1 1 MAR 2020 LTR DATED FROM LDG	
	DIa

NALA has awarded this document its Plain English Mark



Last updated: April 2019.

## Oval hearing raques

the second states of the secon

If you wish to request the Doard to haid an each loading on your represent mease tick the "year I wish correctorst appoint nearing" (or here).

Fruado ante you wili hava to ray du addianzo, dom-refundatura poziti. Stur, You ean Jud Information on how is marka this reduced on not waterer of the certiacting us.

If you no intervent o request an and ne strog please tok the 14 s, too name wish to normest an aral Insang" cos

priment land the teaupor of field Leave

to hot not was in to request on both on the last

NÁLA	ORD PLEA	AN B	
	1 MAR 2020	G-	



NALA has awarded this decement its Plam English Mark

Planieno sepaal Fom April 2019



The Secretary, An Bord Pleanála, 64 Marlborough Street, Rotunda, Dublin. D01 V902

9<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Our client: Cliona Cleary, 26 Charleston Avenue, Ranelagh, Dublin 6

Dear Sir/Madam,

## RE: REFERRAL OF SECTION 5 DECLARATION – DUBLIN CITY COUNCIL REG REF 0042/20 – 18 OAKLEY SQUARE, RANELAGH, DUBLIN 6

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

We act on behalf of Ms Cliona Cleary who wishes to appeal against Dublin City Council's Declaration of 14<sup>th</sup> February 2020 deeming that that the construction of an extension to 18 Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6, is exempted development, a property bounding the Appellant's residence at No. 26 Charleston Avenue, Ranelagh.

The question is whether the recent extension which includes large windows at the western elevation to the western façade of 18 Oakley Square constitutes development and, if so, is it exempted development having regard to condition 14 attached to a previous permission, ABP Ref. 29/5/72471 which is appended herewith (Appendix 2).

Please be advised that the planning status of the development is currently under legal challenge by the Appellant pursuant to Section 160 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 and an interim injunction has been granted by the Circuit Court. In the circumstances, we request that the Board determine this Referral/Appeal at its earliest convenience. Please also note that an earlier section 5 application was submitted by the owners of the subject property (Dublin City Council Ref. 0005/20). That section 5 differs substantially from the Section 5 application made by the Appellant. The question asked in the previous application was however different from that made in this referral. The question asked in the Section 5 application submitted on behalf of the Appellant (dated 17/01/2020) was as follows:

Whether the recent extension which includes large windows at the Western elevantion to the Western façade of Oakley Square constitutes development having regard to planning Condition 14 attached to a previous planning application Ref ANB 29/05/2471. (Appendix 2)

The question asked in the Section 5 application submitted by the owners of 18 Oakley Square was as follows:



ano ana aray Ali, Baal Marana Ali Marana ang Saraa Kalan Sa Dablar Gaa Mata

distant maps and

a filming define of the second state of the second state of the second state of the second state of the second s

mark the good

1671 - 4813 (16712) 전 국민감압상 고환(21748)(1678) (1688) (1688) (1797) (1797) 9627 (1795) (1797) 전환교환) 전조가 조건값 복합(제, 2018)

Constructions in a construction of the set of the construction of the set of the set

(b) a property of the fragment of the statestistic within a function of angle week-device fail the fragment of the fragment of the statestistic of the statestistic

(a) the state of the first of the state o

אלשה לעדיייוק בעריסית הגבעייי עברה אירה את הההלשיי השלומי לשימה ויירייוייויייישייאלא היום אוריישייויים או יישאלא ע עם לא כלל אירה היות מקרעה היון היה המלגור לעיר ביר בינהרא השניים לאמרלה השעירה היושעי ארקייוייל לה מירה בלקין להמצלאותיים היון אלשהורישי להיון אם האמנותיין אלגעריקי העיריה הקצלעתה להקראלוי היו איניילי אירים הנגרויה ערובי היולי היום

die een daar oor ook ta the teele een oppeel oor sekstenteel oor geweeren sijn soor ideg. Noor oor oo oo geweere Single storey flat roof extension to the rear of the house totalling 26.5 sqm. (Appendix 3)

The Application Form in relation to the previous referral was signed by one Nicola da Ponte on behalf of the owners of 18 Oakley Square. Mr Da Ponte replied "No" to the specific question asked in relation to whether there were previous applications on the site. That is incorrect, insofar as the existing house at No. 18 Oakley Square was authorised by ABP Ref. 29/5/72471. The Planner's Report on the previous section 5 application (dated 17/01/2020) also states under the heading 'Planning History': "no relevant planning history".

The Planner's Report (dated 4<sup>th</sup> February 2020) in relation to the Appellant's referral (Ref. 0042/20) does however acknowledge that there is a previous planning permission on the site namely Ref. PL 29/5/72471.

The grounds for appeal are set out hereunder and the following appendices are enclosed:

- Appendix 1: A copy of Dublin City Council's Declaration dated 14<sup>th</sup> February 2020 issued to the Appellant together with Planner's Report;
- Appendix 2: Section 5 application of the Appellant dated 17/01/2020 together 0 with enclosures: a) Photographs of the development at 18 Oakley Square; b) Planning Permission ABP Ref: 29/05/2471; c) Composite drawing and report prepared by Stephen Tierney Architect; d) Extracts from Dublin City Council Development Plan 1980; e) Site location map.
- Appendix 3: A copy of the Section 5 application of the owners of 18 Oakley 0 Square - Mauro Fiorio and Giorgia de Maio - dated 02/01/2020 together with the Planner's Report.
- Appendix 4: Submission made by Nicola Da Ronte and AKM Design on behalf 0 of the owners of Oakley Square in relation to the application of Chona Cleary, the Appellant.

LDG-

1 1 MAR 2020 LTR DATED \_\_\_\_\_ FROM .

#### 2.0 **GROUNDS OF APPEAL**

The Appellant challenges the Planning Authority Declaration that the development is exempted development the grounds of appeal are summarised hereunder. The Appellant also relies on the arguments including legal submissions made in the Section 5 application and in the within appeal and a booklet of the relevant legal authorities is enclosed herewith.

#### Contravention of planning condition 14 in ABP Ref. 29/5/72471: 2.1

The development conflicts with and/or is contrary to a condition attached to a previously implemented permission relating to development of Oakley Square, which includes 18 Oakley Square (and extends to the garden of 18 Oakley Square upon which the extension has been constructed). The Appellant shares a boundary fence with 18 Oakley Square and the rear of the Appellant's property faces the development the subject of this appeal. The Condition which is germane to the within appeal is Condition 14 of the said permission. Condition 14 provides as follows:

"No windows shall be provided, now or in the future, in the indicated blank facades of the new residential blocks, save where such are shown on the lodged plans.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity."

"나는 나는 것이 가지 않고 아니는 것이 하나요~ 이 것이 가지 않아요. 한 것이 가지 않는 것이 가지 않아요. 이 같은 것이 가지 않는 것이 가지 않아요? 이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같이 하는

18. An example the product them must prove the set of the product of the set of the product of the set of t

1 bits Phorease is deep care as the set "Reference to all for interchalium is due. Appendiced with instrucrated distance. "All down associated at the control of the result for a filler of the provided devices of a sector fait day. Mark 194, 201, 72,475.

reservations for approximation of the contract state in flowings appears we are included over the second second second states in the second states of the second states

Consectors in the computation of entry with transmuce exciption Appendixed at the computation of an Appelian date of 200 Characteristics at the order of a Constant Statistics of the order of a constant of 200 Characteristics Plant and Constant Constant Statistics of the order of a constant of 200 Characteristics are constant on the Constant Statistics of the order of a constant of 200 Characteristics are constant on the Constant Statistics of the order of the order of the Constant are constant on the Constant Statistics of the Statistics of the Constant of the Constant are constant on the Constant Statistics of the Statistics of the Constant Statistics of the Constant are constant on the Constant Statistics of the Statistics of the Constant Statistics of the Constant Statistics of the Constant are constant on the Constant Statistics of the Statistics of the Constant Sta

A grave N. F. C. A. K. (100 S. F. end f. Geologikanski at the endorse of New 124 er. Marine (New Scherner, U. F. egile & Nodo) - Material (C. e. S. et al., geology 2018).

> roman an sie bahmmerkennenenseries ster 1995 - Die einer eine Schill 1995 in 1991 – Die 1 2005 - Netsan Joef

ALA	ND PLEAN	NA BOR
	MAR 2020	
		LTR DATED LOG- ABP-

#### 1.1897년 (1.1977년 - 1817년) - 1817년 (1.1977년) 1917년 - 1917년 - 1817년 (1.1977년) - 1817년 (1.1977년) 1917년 - 1817년 (1.1977년) - 1817년 (1.1977년) - 1817년) - 1817년 (1.

4. A public and solve the Reader of ABC (ABC) and the set of th

#### 4.244 Contraction of the average contraction of the Active Contract

For a first destruction with a solution of entropy of the entropy of the entropy of the test of the entropy of the entropy

". We want an indexe open of the store conditions of states on the lower reach code, here being of the states of the states of the store of the states of the store of the sto

A THE REAL MODEL OF MALE AND A

The basis for asserting that the development contravenes this Condition is detailed in the documents attached to the Section 5 application to which the Board is respectfully referred.

In summary, the stated purpose/reason for the inclusion of Condition 14 in the permission was to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, and those same considerations apply now. The glazed façade extension would adversely impact the amenity and privacy of the Appellant's property and depreciate its value. It would give rise to close line-of-sight views from the kitchen and dining area of 18, Oakley Square into two bedrooms, a bathroom and landing at 26 Charleston Avenue. The Appellant resides with her husband and children in the said property. It is submitted that the development would lead to unwanted overlooking from the Appellant's property to a fully exposed kitchen and dining area, typically the area of highest activity in the home. It would also lead to noise exposure via the sliding-glass door, when open.

It is contended that an extension which includes floor to ceiling glazing on the western façade is contrary to the letter and purpose of Condition no. 14 and is therefore not exempted development pursuant to Article 9 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001.

### 2.2 Absence of precedent

There is no precedent for similar development on the West facing side of Oakley Square. There are no extensions to the properties adjacent to 18 Oakley Square which run parallel to Charleston Avenue. Along this side of Oakley Square are houses 15, 16, 17 and 18 (the subject of this referral); none have extensions, windows or doors that contravene Condition 14. The house at No. 18, Oakley Square is a corner unit located where two sides of Oakley Square meet.

There is one property on the North side of Oakley Square which has a small conservatory extension but this property does not back onto any other dwellings and is not visible from any neighbouring property. It does not therefore impact the amenity of any neighbouring property and is not an extension of a blank façade. This conservatory/extension does not therefore constitute a precedent upon which the owners of 18 Oakley Square are entitled to rely.

## 2.3 Inconsistency of appearance and character

Section 4 (1) (h) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 provides that certain types of development do not require planning permission including:

"development consisting of the carrying out of works for the maintenance, improvement or other alteration of any structure, being works which affect only the interior of the structure or which do not materially affect the external appearance of the structure so as to render the appearance inconsistent with the character of the structure or of neighbouring structures"

The Appellant's Section 5 reference (Ref 0042/20) outlines that this development involves the installation of large floor to ceiling glazing over the full extent of the extension of the blank western façade where no windows exist at present and is entirely inconsistent with the materiality of the western façade prior to its extension, that being a window-less wall of plain white render. Indeed, it is inconsistent with the entire west-facing line of Oakley Square whose glazing is strictly restricted by the above-mentioned planning permission.

It is also inconsistent with the character of surrounding structures on the terrace and an objective bystander looking at the pre-construction and post construction photographs of the western elevation of no. 18 could not fail to notice the significant differences between the shape, form, materials and construction of the pre-existing and post extension structure.

## 2.4 Observation from the Owners of 18, Oakley Square

	1 1 MAR 2020	
LTR DATED	FROM	
LDG-		
ABP		-3-

tige, for specifier, exacts and a finite state. To first a feb error "be state, specific error in Analys", on te Antemposite interAnsion marske dom e applic, as a north state to specific a specifical code error.

an encode as "Second" to prove the description of the test point of the encoder of the constraint of the second of the second

It is conversed, but do estamate inductor from to accuracy datases on the second part of a new issued and the second confrom of C addition in the land is marked to new solid datasets mean providing to Aria. If of disc are as second second responses Repairement, and

#### Rederated as rade to

bards is de Piccolori de Simoni deseivement multo. Nois in oni sito eff diffette a monthe de arcs or extensions de line in operation obtainent to de Caldey Superior adde de la conduct de Chartston fecture de constant de superior addes de motor de fentiste de la conduct de la conduct de efficiente unit anticipate solar solar a de constant de conduction conduction de la Calde de la conbarres at tracais de la constant de superior de la constant de conduction de la Calde de la Calde de la conbarres at tracais de la constant de la constant de constant de conduction de la conduction de la Calde de la conbarres at tracais de la constant de la constant de la constant de conduction de la conduction de la Calde

events in our propagation the North Schemer Of Section and Schultz Brown of Decembers and the complete sector and the subtractly distance in the basis of the and the subtractly distance in the basis of t

#### Million alla international applituing internation in 19

Second a directory take all simuland breakspaces in 1000 consistences execution operator.

je nadorjuman som selvarje of tike somenelje od of verotoje (a som tostali to ser ordjenovometit or attike somerski ar od naj orazivni se ugi nadski i "to attika" (alvedit, m. sto af tike orijerski ar od bisk mat attike nakon tike o fela da ofan sere od do smerime so an ar oso ser it venjasovano o balconstitute o fela da ofan sere of da ar sam e ar o toolog object constances

Frage Share a second relation of Ref (0.42%) containes of a second mean invalue of a relation of the stage lines in group given provide the link data of the estimation of the blank reasons income where the warders of all if prime and the and the mean shear with of plane anticertifies of the version regards prior in the extension mean form, a wardow level with the whiteau ther balance of a transmission with the entire was fourned in a factor. Showly Square where end income structure to be the store of a factor of the entire was fourned by the officer whiteau structure of a factor of the transmission of the entire was fourned by the officer of the construction of the transmission of the entire production.

I at also accordent to the Collective result served information (CARESORD PLEANALA) served to both and a superpresentation and next reading to the transport permanent for western decares method, fairs with not built a concentre significant diffication diffications for some fire darps form; many orbits in the articulum of the onesse little and passes defined in the darps form;

#### 4. Observation (Formula) (Contrastilla Oaklas Legita

MORT FROM	LTR
President and a second state and we are a state of a state of the stat	
	ABP-

The owners of No 18 Oakley Square submitted an Observation on the Appellants' Section 5 reference (Ref 0042/20), which includes a report by AKM and a report by Nicola De Ponte (Appendix 4). Neither of those reports address the arguments set out in the Appellants' Section 5 Cover Letter or the supporting case law.

Nicola De Ponte's report also refers to a Section 5 Declaration (EXPP 0005/20) issued on foot of the application made by the owners of 18 Oakley Square. That application was prepared and signed by Nicola Da Ponte. The said Mr Da Ponte replied in the negative to a question asking *"Were there previous planning applications on this site?"*. Mr Da Ponte replied *'No'*. Further, in the Planners Report in respect of the Declaration issued to the owners, the Planner stated under the heading 'Planning History' *"No relevant planning history"*. The owner's reference therefore appears to have been determined without reference to ABP Ref. PL 29/5/72471.

In addition, in the report prepared by AKM', in quoting Condition No. 14, does not refer to the reason for the attachment of the condition which is "*interest of residential amenity*".

## 2.5 Shortcomings of Planner's Section 5 Decision

The Appellant's arguments were not addressed or responded to by the Planner who determined the Appellants' Section 5 reference. The Planner's Report (Appendix 1) gives no indication that they were even considered. It should be noted that:

- Although the Planner agreed that the western side elevation of No. 18 Oakley Square is one of the aforementioned blank facades "It would appear the western side elevation of No. 18 Oakley Square is one of the aforementioned blank façade..." (Planner's Report 04/02/2020 p. 3) the Planner did not address the Appellant's assertion that the development is an expansion of 18 Oakley Square involving the enlargement of the West-facing façade, and that via this extension of the blank façade it is therefore caught by the scope of the Condition.
- There is no evidence that the Planner considered the purpose of the reason for Condition 14, which was "*in the interest of residential amenity*". In this regard, the Supreme Court judgment in *Kenny v Dublin City Council* [2009] IESC 19 should be noted. In that case, the Supreme Court held that it is appropriate to adopt a purposive approach to interpreting planning conditions.
- The Planner failed to consider or attach due weight to the principles applying to interpretation of a planning permission. In this regard, the Supreme Court case of *Lanigan v Barry* [2016] IESC 46 should be noted. The said decision emphasises a "text in context" approach to interpretation of planning permissions. The Court held that "...the 'text in context' approach requires the Court to consider the text used in the context of circumstances in which the document concerned was produced including the nature of the document itself" [para 3.11 of judgment].
- The Planner failed to engage in any analysis of and/or address the context in which the original western façade of No. 18 was to be windowless *in the interests of residential amenities*". As the Site Payout Plan drawings prepared by Tierney Haines Architects make clear, the extension to the façade is located no farther from the rear of the house at No. 26 Charleston Avenue than the original façade.

		11	MAR	2020		
	LTR DATED					
	LDG-		-	FROM	-	
8	ABP-		a and a subscription of the later of	the second second		
	Contract of the second s	Milain .	ALL CARDIN	No. of Concession, Name		

4

(a) a construction of a second construction of the standard of the construction of the second const

a a de la service (setent par sea d'hanne a service service) en service de la service de la service. Seten territori de la servici da service dan companya de la service de la service de la service.

1.0 SPUST for the participation of the second se

6 1 2 3

الاستان معرب بالمحمد من الأسرار متبلغان حيمان عار العربية معرفان من المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد معرب إراضا بلا منازل لا تعريف المحمد الم المحمد المحمد الحمد المحمد الحمد المحمد المحمد

Court Fresher, and det Setterde en staat beine section. Exact is all op it was prised in the "station on a station production of this could." In Supermit Local Setter in State in the Comp Check of Set 46 deviat the follow of the set of Setter rappinginginging as the Comp Check of Set 46 deviat the follow of the set of Setter rappinging and the Comp Check of Set 46 deviat the following follow of the state of the set of the Comp Check of the Set 46 deviat the following follow of the state of the set of the Set 46 deviation of the set of the set of the state of the set of the Set 46 deviation of the set of the the set of the the set of the s

	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 State 1 Stat	
a ha cui di kadaga Mult	CALMAN CAL	de seus-	
ID PLEANALA	AN BOR		
et - Course data			
- 1005 STM	11	1. · · ·	
	LTR DATED		
	ABP.		
• The Appellant's assertion, that the development should not be considered exempted development due to its material impact to the character of both the structure itself and that of its neighbouring structures, was not addressed by the Planner.

In the circumstances, it is submitted that the development of windows on the extension to the façade is contrary to the purpose of the planning Condition and it seems clear that at the time of attaching the Condition the Board was satisfied that the inclusion of windows was contrary to local residential amenities.

## 2.6 Failure to provide reasons:

No reasons are given by the Planner in his report (or in the Declaration) for his failure to respond to and/or address the submissions made on behalf of the Appellant in her Section 5 application. The only observation made by the Planner was : "Condition 14 of An Bord Pleanala decision PL 29/5/2471 does not relate to the subject extension."

The arguments advanced by the Appellant are not addressed however and no reasons are given for the rejection of those arguments other than a bald statement to the effect that the Planner did not believe that the extension contravened Condition 14. This being so, it is submitted that the decision of the Planning Authority is deficient having regard to decision of the Supreme Court in *Balz v An Bord Pleanala* [2019] IESC 90. That case concerned judicial review proceedings in relation to a decision of An Bord Pleanala allowing the erection of wind turbines in County Cork. The Appellants argued that the Inspector and therefore the Board, had failed to consider material which had been submitted by the Appellants in relation to specific guidelines regarding wind energy. The Supreme Court held that the arguments should have been addressed and Mr Justice O'Donnell stated:

"It is a basic element of any decision-making affecting the public that relevant submissions should be addressed, and an explanation given why they are not accepted, if indeed that is the case." (para 57)

The above decision was applied by Mr Justice McDonald in *Sliabh Luachra v ABP* [2019] IEHC 888. That case concerned proceedings challenging the development of a wind farm and in considering the obligation of a decision making authority to consider submissions made by a given party in a planning application, the Court stated:

"What seems to me to be crucial is that the points made in the submissions should be addressed. In circumstances where there will frequently be an overlap between submissions made by one observer and another it seems to me that it would not be necessary to address every submission by name so long as the substantive points made in the submission of appropriately-addressed." [Para 38]

It is submitted that the Planning Authority failed in its duty as a decision-making authority to consider the Applicant's submissions and on to its duty as a decision-making accepting those arguments. The Planning Astronomical appears to have disregarded the significance of the prior planning permission relevant to 18 Oakley Square and appears ABP-

5.4 g 1-4. .....

n Tables and the card of the Card State AN BORD PLEANALA

and the sense of the sale is produced in a and get in sheet, of the device of survival CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR OF THE LTR DATED TO ABP.

to have disregarded the impact of the development on neighbouring properties notwithstanding the restriction on windows attached to 18 Oakley Square.

#### 3.0 CONCLUSION

1 1 1

For the reasons outlined above it is submitted that the extension to the western façade of the property at 18 Oakley Square constitutes development and is not exempted development, as it contravenes a condition attaching to ABP REF. PL 29/5/72471. The Appellant submits that the decision of the Planning Authority should be set aside and the Appellant invites the Planning Authority to consider also the prior Section 5 determination (dated 21/01/2020) having regard to inter alia, the temporal proximity of both determinations. It is submitted that purpose of Condition 14 is to regulate development "now or in the future" affecting the western blank façade/elevations on the site. The extension to the property clearly involves an extension to the western façade and it would be illogical to prevent the installation of windows in one part of the Western façade and at the same time to allow the installation of windows in another part of the Western façade.

The Appellant requests an Oral Hearing as part of the process as this might serve to assist the Board in determining the matter. A cheque for €270 representing the fee for processing this Referral and a Request for an Oral Hearing is enclosed.

We will be happy to provide any clarification of further information as may be desired by the Board.

Yours faithfully,

Mr Terry Doyle Malcomson Law Solicitors The Atrium Shamrock Plaza Carlow

AN	BORD PLEANÁLA	
LTR DATED . LDG ABP	1 1 MAR 2020 FROM	

N. 1. 1. 1.

#### The second s

Encrité dans de calificación de la sina contra la calificación la traventes de calificación of the fideren en al fillo de la contra de la sina data de la serie de la contra de la contra de de de la serie de la contra de la contra de la contra de la serie de la contra de la contra de de la serie de la contra de de la serie de la contra de la contra

Flore Acquellant: Acquering and the officer of part of the measures as university of the second control of

Wegelen by human amplitanian office a conflict in the Elizabeth according to a constraint of the constraint of Beneficial

With a second sec

t in the begins of the second se

	ORD PLEANAL	ANB
A	OND PLEANAL	
	1 MAR 2020	
		GETAU MIJ
		-00-
		.98/
		.98

# **APPENDIX 2:**

1

Application for Declaration dated (dated 17/01/2020) with accompanying submission together with enclosures : a) Photographs of the development at 18 Oakley Square; b) Planning Permission dated 10<sup>th</sup> February 1987; c) Composite drawing and report prepared by Stephen Tierney Architect; d) Extracts from Dublin City Council Development Plan 1980; e) Site location map.

AI	N BORD PLEANÁLA
LTR DATE LDG ABP	1 1 MAR 2020 DFROM

#### 计注意问题

Apranautikov – e technikas alezaie drugo 1900 protine od oraz aprano granovni stranovnice. esta ovoči vanov – a vijetnoj ovočeno od eno 20 sejanda algar (je 20 algar objeta algar od 19 algar 20 algar Bornato (mjet dost information – 1943) og e anaroa (v torv hig, and 1970) og etna 10 algar 20 alg Turnato (ambieta), se diversi a store fightar v tij Gasna drži Sectorenaja (je 1994).

Γ	BORD PLEANALA	AN
	11 MAR 2020	
	MORF	LTR DATEC
1		990

PLA
DECLARATION ON DEVELOPMENT & EXEMPTED DEVELOPMENT
SECTION 5 APPLICATION FORM
NAME OF APPLICANT: CLIONA CLEARY
ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 26 CHARLESTON AVE NUE
RANELAGH DUBLING
EMAIL ADDRESS: <u>ccleary@lawlibraryiie</u>
TELEPHONE NO. Day 087 9871930 Mobile: 087 9871930
NAME OF AGENT AND AGENT'S ADDRESS: TELLY DOYLE
MALLEDNSON LAW THE FIRIUM, LOURS BLACE, CARLOW
TELEPHONE NO. Day: 059 9131745 Mobile:
TELLI HONE NO. BUY.
ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE (if different from above)
LOCATION OF SUBJECT SITE: 18 OALLEY SANDONS
RANELAGH DUBLIN 6
Is this a Protected Structure or within the curtilage of a Protected DATED MAR 2020
If yes has a Declaration under Section 57 of the Planning & Development Act
2000 been requested or issued for the property by the Planning Autosity?
Please provide details of works (where applicable) or proposed development.
(Note: only works listed and described under this section will be assessed under this section 5 application. Use additional sheets if required.)
Whather the recent entension
which inducties laway windows at
the laberteren elevation to the
Whatern facule of 18 Oaklen
VVVQSSTATE
Square constitutes development
VVVQSSTATE

1

-14--

AN BORD PLEANALA DSOS RAM 11 OSTADATED ABA ringer, Les a Sectorition anner Sector S7, LE e Planning

WOYLE NAME OF AGENT AND AGENT'S ADDRESS: TE CAN ILT BLACE. CARLOW ARUM MALCONSON LAN TELEPHONE NO. Day: 059 9131745 Mobile: ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE (if different from above) SQUARE LOCATION OF SUBJECT SITE: 18 OALL OUBLIN RANEHAGH Is this a Protected Structure or within the curtilage of a Protected Structure? NO If yes, has a Declaration under Section 57 of the Planning & Development Act 2000 been requested or issued for the property by the Planning Authority? Please provide details of works (where applicable) or proposed development. (Note: only works listed and described under this section will be assessed under this section 5 application. Use additional sheets if required.) CA - Cel Przevia ORD MA 1.1 MAR 2020 LTR DATED FROM

List of plans, drawings etc. submitted with this application the Photographs dere ð١ Ard ouparte Du Develyour Re 18 Oak -15 · 12 Please state Applicant's interest in this site: Ouner of If applicant is not owner of site, please provide name & address of owner: 18 MAURE FLORID& GIORGIADE MAIO Oakle RANGUAGH Are you aware of any enforcement proceedings connected to this site? If so please supply details: NO Where there previous planning application/s on this site? YES If so please supply details: 2020 Date Signed NOTES Application shall be accompanied by 2 copies of site location map with site clearly outlined in red and a fee of €80.00. Please submit 2 copies of any additional plans/reports etc. you may wish to include as part of the application. Application shall be forwarded to: Dublin City Council, Planning Registry Section, Block 4, Floor 9, Civic Offices, Wood Quay, Dublin 8. Contact Details E Phone: 01 222 2149 Fax: 01 222 2675 AN BORD 11 MAR 2020 TR DATED

AB

Senior Executive Officer **Planning Department Dublin City Council Civic Offices** Wood Quay Dublin 8

Dear Sir/Madam,

AN BORD PLEANAL Re: Section 5 Reference in respect of adortension to the western façades of No. 18 Pakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6

#### INTRODUCTION 1.0

#### **Purpose of Application** 1.1

I<sup>1</sup> act on behalf of Adrian Wrixon and Cliona Cleary the owners of 26 Charleston Avenue, Ranelagh, Dublin 6 whose property is located to the west of No. 18 Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6.

Friday 17th January 2020

The owners of No. 18 Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6 are carrying out development at their property at present comprising of an extension to the western facade of their property which includes large floor to ceiling windows facing towards the rear of my client's property and damages the residential amenity of the parties' property at 26 Charleston Avenue. Photographs taken from the said bedroom windows showing the extent of the development are attached at Appendix A.

It is considered that the development does not come within the scope of the planning exemptions in the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 on the basis that the development includes windows on an extension of/to the western blank façade of No. 18 Oakley Square and that is contrary to a planning condition attaching to a previous permission regulating development "now or in the future" affecting the western blank façade/elevations on the site.

It is also considered that the development does not come within the scope of section 4 (1) (h) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as it comprises of a substantial (c. 26 sq m) extension that will substantially alter the character of the structure and is inconsistent with the character of the adjoining property at Oakley Square which does not have any extension.

No planning permission has been sought for the development.

Further the owner(s) of 18 Oakley Square submitted an application for a Section 5 Declaration in respect of the same property on or about 3rd January 2020. The application form for that Declaration states, in reply to the question:

"Where there previous planning application/s on this site? 'NO'."

This is incorrect; there is a previous planning application on the site.

Pursuant to the relevant regulations, my client is not entitled to make any observations on the Section 5 reference submitted by the owners of 18 Oakley Square and in these circumstances, I have been instructed to request a Declaration from Dublin City Council seeking clarity on whether the recent extension (which includes large-windows at the western elevation) to the western façade of 18 Oakley Square constitutes development and, if so, is it exempted development having regard to planning condition 14 attached to a previous planning application

<sup>1</sup> Terry Doyle, Malcomson Law Solicitors, The Atrium, Shamrock Plaza, Green Lane, Carlow

relating to the site (granted by the Board by Order dated 10<sup>th</sup> February 1987 Ref. 1369/86 / ABP Ref. 29/5/72471)?

## 2.0 STATUTORY PROVISIONS

The key relevant statutory provisions relating to the proposed development are set out below. Please note that any extracts/references to the *Planning and Development Act, 2000* or the *Planning and Development Regulations, 2001* in this document mean the *Planning and Development Act, 2000* as amended (where it has been amended), and the *Planning and Development Regulations, 2001* as amended (where the regulations have been amended).

### 2.1 Planning and Development Act

LTR DATED

Section 2 (1) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 states, inter alia, that:

"alteration" includes -(a) plastering or painting or the removal of plaster or stucco, or (b) the replacement of a door, window or roof, that materially alters the external appearance of a structure so as to render the appearance inconsistent with the character of the structure or neighbouring structures"

"works" includes any act or operation of construction, excavation, demolition, extension, alteration, repair or renewal and, in relation to a protected structure or proposed protected structure, includes any act or operation involving the application or removal of plaster, paint, wallpaper, tiles or other material to or from the surfaces of the interior or exterior of a structure."

"use", in relation to land, does not include the use of the land by the carrying out of any works thereof"

"exempted development" has the meaning specified in section 4"

"unauthorised use" means, in relation to land, use commenced on or after 1 October 1964, being a use which is a material change in use of any structure or other land being development other than – (a) exempted development (within the meaning of section 4 of the Act of 1963 or section 4 of this Act), or b) development which is the subject of a permission granted under Part IV of the Act of 1963 or under section 34, 37G or 37N of this Act, being a permission which has not been revoked, and which is carried out in compliance with that permission or any condition to which that permission is subject"

"unauthorised works" means works on, in, over or under land commenced on or after 1 October 1964, being development other than – (a) exempted development (within the meaning of section 4 of the Act of 1963 or section 4 of this Act), or (b) development which is the subject of a permission granted under Part IV of the Act of 1963 or under section 34 Which 37N of this Act, being a permission which has not been revoked, and which is carried out in compliance with that permission or any condition to which AN BOR that permission is subject"

Section 3(1) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 provides that 'development' means:

"... except where the context otherwise requires, the carrying out of any works on, in, over or under land or the making of any material change of use of any structures or other land."

Section 4 (1) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 provides that:

"the following shall be exempted development for the purposes of this Act -..."

Section 4 (1)(h) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 provides that:

"development consisting of the carrying out of works for the maintenance, improvement or other alteration of any structure, being works which affect only the interior of the structure or which do not materially affect the external appearance of the structure so as to render the appearance inconsistent with the character of the structure or of neighbouring structures"

Section 4 (2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 provides that:

"(a) The Minister may by regulations provide for any class of development to be exempted development for the purposes of this Act where he or she is of the opinion that – (i) by reason of the size, nature or limited effect on its surroundings, of development belonging to that class, the carrying out of such development would not offend against principles of proper planning and sustainable development, or (ii) the development is authorised, or is required to be authorised, by or under any enactments (whether the authorisation takes the form of the grant of a licence, consent, approval or any other type of authorisation) where the enactment concerned requires there to be consultation (howsoever described) with members of the public in relation to the proposed development prior to the granting of the authorisation (howsoever described).

(b) Regulations under paragraph (a) may be subject to conditions and be of general application or apply to such area or place as may be specified in the regulations.

(c) Regulations under this subsection may, in particular and without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (a), provide, in the case of structures or other land used for a purpose of any specified class, for the use thereof for any other purpose being exempted development for the purposes of this Act"

Section 4 (3) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 provides that:

"A reference in this Act to exempted development shall be construed as a reference to development which is -(a) any of the developments specified in subsection (1), or (b) development which, having regard to any regulations under subsection (2), is exempted development for the purposes of this Act."

Section 5 (1) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 provides that:

"If any question arises as to what, in any particular case, is or is not development or is or is not exempted development within the meaning of this Act, any person may, on payment of the prescribed fee, request in writing from the relevant planning authority a declaration on that question, and that person shall provide the planning authority any information necessary to enable the authority to make its decision on the matter."

LDG

ABP.

ana

2.2 Planning and Development Regulations, 2001

Article 3(4) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 states that.

"In these Regulations, any reference to a permission under the Act shall include a reference to a permission under the Act of 1963, and any reference to conditions to which a permission is subject shall be construed accordingly."

Article 6(1) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 states that:

"Subject to article 9, development of a class specified in column 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 shall be exempted development for the purposes of the Act, provided that such development complies with the conditions and limitations specified in column 2 of the said Part 1 opposite the mention of that class in the said column 1."

Article 9(1)(a)(i) of the Planning & Development Regulations 2001 states that:

"Development to which article 6 relates shall not be exempted development for the purposes of the Act - a) If the carrying out of such development would – (i) contravene a condition attached to a permission under the Act or be inconsistent with any use specified in a permission under the Act" ....

#### 3.0 DISCUSSION

LDG

NB'

# The Extension to the Blank Western Façades/Elevation Constitutes Development

As outlined above Section 3(1) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, defines 'development', except where the context otherwise requires, 'as the carrying out of any works on, in, over or under land or the making of any material change in use of any structures or other land'.

Section 2(1) of the Act defines "works" as including: '... any act or operation of construction, excavation, demolition, extension, alteration, repair or renewal and, in relation to a protected structure or proposed protected structure, includes any act or operation involving the application or removal of plaster, paint, wallpaper, tiles or other material to or from the surfaces of the interior or exterior of a structure.

The development in this case includes the installation of large floor to ceiling windows on an extension of the blank façade/western elevation of 18 Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6, which constitutes an act or operation of construction, extension, alteration, repair or renewal and therefore, constitutes development.

# Exempted Development under the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001

Development is Contrary to a Previous Condition Attaching to a Permission

Article 9 of the Nanning and Development Regulations, 2001 states that development to which article o relates shall not be exempted development for the purposes of the Act - a) If the wing out of such development would - (i) contravene a condition attached to a permission under the Act or be inconsistent with any use specified in a permission under the Act.

AN BORD P In this ease, the development contravenes and/or is inconsistent with the use of the property specified in a condition attached to the Board's Decision of 10th February 1987 (DCC Ref. 1969/867 ABP Bet. 29/5/72471 (Copy at Appendix B)) in respect of a development at Oakley Square, which includes no. 18 Oakley Square on the following basis:

> Oakley square was constructed pursuant to a planning permission granted by Decision of An Bord Pleanala dated 10th of February 1987 whereby the Board granted permission for

development for the erection of a two-storey development comprising twenty six units around landscaped gardens and the demolition of numbers 15, 16, and 17, at 15, 16, 17 and 18 and the rear of 13 and 14, Oakley Road, Ranelagh, Dublin. That document records that the permission was granted "for the said development in accordance with the said plans and particulars, subject to the conditions specified in the second schedule hereto, the reasons for the imposition of the said conditions being as set out in the said Second Schedule and the said permission is hereby granted subject to the said conditions". It was therefore a requirement that the authorized works would be carried out strictly in accordance with the plans submitted with the planning application save where modified by planning conditions.

Condition 14 of the permission provided that:

"no windows shall be provided, now or in the future, in the indicated blank facades of the new residential blocks, save where such are shown on the lodged plans. Reason: In the interests of residential amenity"

My client's architect, Stephen Tierney, has inspected the planning file relating to that planning application in Dublin City Council's Planning Archives and based on his interpretation of the drawings, the permitted west elevation/facade of what is now known as 18 Oakley Square, Oakley Road, Ranelagh, Dublin 6, is a blank façade containing no windows. He has prepared a drawing and a report in this regard (attached at Appendix C) which shows, inter alia, what was proposed and what was permitted at the western elevation/facade of Block F (which is now known as No. 18 Oakley Square). That drawing also shows that a two storey return to the rear of the same western elevation with windows at the ground floor level at first level was proposed but was omitted in the permitted scheme.

This seems to be consistent with the "*lodged*" planning drawing number 8415/PP5 titled 'Elevations' dated July 1986 and date stamped 17<sup>th</sup> July 1986 which shows no windows at the western elevations of the façade of Block F save for windows on a two storey return. I understand that that drawing shows the western façade of No. 18 Oakley Square as initially proposed in the planning application to Dublin Corporation.

• It also seems consistent with drawing number 8415/PP1/BBL... titled 'Site Plan' and dated July 1986 and date stamped 14<sup>th</sup> December 1987, which according to a letter from Edmund Burke and Partners to Dublin Corporation (date stamped 14<sup>th</sup> December 1987) appears to have been submitted as part of compliance prior to commencing of development as that drawing indicates that the two storey return was omitted. Therefore, I understand that no windows were permitted on the western elevation/facade of Block F, "now or in the future" which faces toward my client's property, "in the interest of residential amenities".

Insofar as the initially proposed two storey return (which included windows at ground and first floor levels) to the western elevation was omitted in the permitted development, I note that the current extension to the western facade includes even larger windows than those previously rejected along the subject western blank facade.

My client's property was also zoned 'Objective A' to protect and/or improve residential amenities' on Map 9 of the *Dublin City Development Plan 1980* which I understand was in effect at the time the planning application was granted by An Bord Apenala (relevant extracts at Appendix D).

ABP.

- In light of this and having regard to the "lodged plans" the phrase "no windows shall be provided, now or in the future, in the indicated blank facades of the new residential blocks, save where such are shown on the lodged plans" objectively and based on a reasonable person's interpretation means that "the façade is not to have windows except where indicated".
- The extension is an extension of the western blank façade and is therefore subject to the planning condition.
- Therefore, when read objectively and in its planning context the development of large windows on the extension of the blank façade is contrary to the purpose of Condition No. 14.
- Further, the Condition may arguably be a condition that regulates "now or in the future", the residential use of No. 18; the impact of the use on the privacy of neighbouring properties to the west is controlled by the planning condition and the development of windows along the western façade or any extension to the façade is inconsistent with the permitted residential use of the building.
- The purpose of the condition was stated to be 'in the interests of residential amenity'. It seems clear that this relates to the residential amenity of adjacent residences (as removal of windows could not be said to be in the interests of the amenity of the owners/occupants of No. 18 Oakley Square). It will be recalled that the Condition was not time limited and forbade windows 'in the indicated blank facades' 'now or in the future'.
- With regard to this I am advised by Counsel that the following Court Decisions of relevance:
  - A) In the Supreme Court case of *Lanigan v Barry* [2016] IESC 46 (27<sup>th</sup> July 2016) Clarke J stated at para 3.11 that:

"The principles applicable to the construction of a planning permission are, of course, well settled and were described by McCarty J. in the oft-quoted passage from In re. XJS Investments Ltd [1986] IR 750 as requiring the Court to construe planning documents not as complex legal documents drafted by lawyers but rather in the way which ordinary and reasonably informed persons might understand them. It might, in passing, be appropriate to note that this was, perhaps, an early example of the move towards what has been described as the "text in context" method of construction appropriate to the determination of the meaning of all documents potentially affecting legal rights and obligations. This approach has now become well established. The "text in context" approach requires the Court to consider the text used in the context of circumstances in which the document concerned including the nature of the document itself."

B) in the Supreme Court case of Kenny v Dublin City Council [2009] IESC 19 (judgment of 5<sup>th</sup> March 2009) the Supreme Court adopted a purposive approach to a planning condition that on its face required the omission of a first floor "in the interests of visual amenity holding that the purpose of the condition was the reduction in the height of the building and this was achieved by the removal of any floor (and not the first floor). In this

AN BORD PI

context in pursuit of the true meaning of a condition, the Supreme Court was prepared not just to look beyond the literal wording of a condition but to allow the doing of something which was entirely contrary to the literal wording of a condition:

35. The principle does not resolve the problem [then before the Supreme Court] which, as I explain later, arises in respect of Condition No. 2, namely that the condition is, itself, contradictory or, at least, ambiguous. The Gregory case shows that the court does not confine itself to a purely literal interpretation of a condition. It will seek to ascertain its true meaning from its context in the planning process.

'37. Condition No. 2 required that building No. 3 on the Dartry Road elevation be "reduced in height by the omission of the first floor...". The reason for the condition was the "interest of visual amenity."

38. It is common case that Trinity omitted a floor other than the first. The condition was interpreted by the Council as requiring that the overall height of the building be reduced by one floor....

43. Condition No. 2 presents a problem of interpretation. It is clear from the terms of the condition itself that the purpose of the removal of the first floor was the reduction of the height of the building....[Yet [t]]he Inspector's report did not recommend the removal of any floor....

44. This means that there was a contradiction or ambiguity at the heart of the condition. Condition No. 1 required the development to be carried out in accordance with the plans submitted except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Compliance with Mr Kenny's proposed literal interpretation of Condition No. 2 would lead to inconsistency with Condition No. 1 by altering the façade. I do not agree with the submission made on behalf of Mr Kenny that it is plain and unambiguous. I am satisfied that the true objective of Condition No. 2 was the reduction in the height of the building..."

For the above reasons, it is submitted that the development is contrary to Condition No. 14 and/or is inconsistent with the permitted use of the building and the owner of the site cannot rely on the classes of exempted development, for example, Class 1 of *Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001,* which relates allows for extensions to properties, in circumstances where the development of windows on the extension contravenes Condition No. 14.

## Exempted Development under the Planning and Development Act, 2000

Section 4 (1) (h) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 provides that certain types of development do not require planning permission including:

"development consisting of the carrying out of works for the maintenance, improvement or other alteration of any structure, being works phich affect only the interior of the structure or which do not materially affect the external appearance inconsistent with the character of the structure or of neighbouring structures"

ARP

19 QRI

BMA

The development in question comprises of a 26 sq m flat roof single storey excension comprises of a 26 sq m

It does not comprise of works for the maintenance etc. of the structure. It is a large extension to the structure.

Number 18 Oakley Square is a two-storey square structure that forms part of a line of terraced houses. The development materially affects the external appearance of the structure and is inconsistent with the character of the structure in that it transforms the structure from a square two storey building (which forms part of a terrace) with a pitched roof to a part two part one storey, part pitched, part flat roofed, part (but not quite) rectangular structure.

The development also involves the installation of large floor to ceiling glazing on the extension of the blank western façade where no windows exist at present and is inconsistent with the material used on the western façade prior to its extension which is constructed of nontransparent material rather than transparent material (large floor to ceiling windows) in the extension of/to the western facade.

Further the development is inconsistent with the character of surrounding structures on the terrace insofar as it is larger than any existing extensions to those properties; an objective bystander looking at the pre-construction and post construction photographs of the western elevation of no. 18 could not fail to notice the significant differences between the shape, form, materials and construction of the prior to and post extension structure.

I am also advised by Counsel that in the High Court case of  $McCabe \ v \ CIE$  [2006] IEHC 356 Mr Justice Herbert noted that the mere fact a development structure and the post-development structure is used for the same purpose does not mean that the character of the structure has not been materially affected.

Further, in *Cronin (Readymix) Ltd v An Bord Pleanala* [2017] IESC 36 the Supreme Court considered the scope of the exemption under s 4(1)(h). O'Malley J held that the extension of the structure in that case was not a development that came within the exemption. In so finding O'Malley J held that:

"one must bear in mind the overall framework and scheme of the Act" and that "it is manifestly unlikely that the intention was to render exempt all works carried out on any existing structure, including unlimited extensions in size, subject only to considerations of visual appearance (and subsequent considerations arising from any intensification of use)...

In my view the interpretation placed on s.4(1)(h) of the Act by the High Court was incorrect. I accept the arguments of the Board as to its true meaning, and consider that an extension is a development that does not come within the exemption. In the incumstances I would allow the appeal."

AN BORD Pln these circumstances, to hold that a development of this type and scale comes within the scope of section 4(1)(h) would be contrary to the judgment in Cronin (Readymix) Ltd v An Bord Pleanale [2017] IESC 37.

# 3.0 CONCLUSION

For the reasons outlined above it is submitted that the extension to the western façade of the property comprises of development and is not exempted development.

Dublin City Council is respectfully invited to agree with this assessment.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require any further information.

Yours faithfully,

Carlow.

Π

Π

Π

Π

Π

Π

Π

 $\left\lceil \right\rceil$ 

Mr Terry Doyle Malcomson Law Solicitors The Atrium Shamrock Plaza

> AN BORD PLEANÁLA 11 MAR 2020 LTR DATED \_\_\_\_\_ FROM \_\_\_\_\_ LDG-\_\_\_\_\_ ABP-\_\_\_\_\_

9

AN BORD PLEANALA AN BORD PLEANALA 11 MAR 2020

# APPENDIX A: PHOTOGRAPHS OF DEVELOPMENT AT 18 OAKLEY SQUARE

5 1









		11	MAR	2020			
LTR D	ATED.		120	FROM .	11		
LDG-			MO	<b>a</b> a		031/	a m
ABP-							-00
A CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR	and the second second	- 1619-1819	No. 1	and some		AND LEASE ST. C.	.95





Edroom # 2 Chiles



ABP-



AN	BORD PLEANÁLA	
LTR DATED	A. 网络角白、网	
LDG- ABP-	FROM	0









Allman

11 MAR 2020

#### Re: Appeal against Section 5 Declaration Ref 0042/20

**Appellant: Cliona Cleary** 

#### Appendices

- 1. Appendix 1: A copy of Dublin City Council's Declaration dated 14<sup>th</sup> February 2020 issued to the Appellant together with Planner's Report;
- Appendix 2: Section 5 application of the Appellant dated 17/01/2020 together with enclosures: a) Photographs of the development at 18 Oakley Square; b) Planning Permission ABP Ref: 29/05/2471; c) Composite drawing and report prepared by Stephen Tierney Architect; d) Extracts from Dublin City Council Development Plan 1980; e) Site location map.
- 3. Appendix 3: A copy of the Section 5 application of the owners of 18 Oakley Square Mauro Fiorio and Giorgia de Maio dated 02/01/2020 together with the Planner's Report.
- 4. Appendix 4: Submission made by Nicola Da Ponte and AKM Design on behalf of the owners of Oakley Square in relation to the application of Cliona Cleary, the Appellant.

AN	BORD PLEANÁLA
LTR DATED LDG ABP	1 1 MAR 2020 FROM

The A start against Section of the A start A 194222.

The sector barries of

#### And the second

- Apparelos I., A como et Dabel ar Cier, Connelli a B. Sandirra dated 1.65.1. Second 2015 reservables (en Aspeliant Equation with Plander a Poples I).
- Approxity 2: Notice Suppliered of the Appelian Unled Chork Monochers and out tests - 11 formation of the development of 2 and in the sector Planting Periodation (MPPle) 29/15/24 and to development the most sector respond by Neoles Discover 1 of the cost had take been before a first Development Date Discover 1 of the other of the test.
- (quarted to A. A. Guom edular Signation on quite allow and play means work of the signal region. A bituate pharmacian (withing on the File) on quark and effect (C. A. ang mean with the File methy Automatic
- Argenandos Robellandevias andaletes Carlle Francis (1993). Militario en en 1995 al que reveners of Califer Squar de activita nora en polícia en Califeren Carno des Neve Tana

ALA	NA319 OF	and the second
	anne Chil	1
	MAR 2020	TR DATED
C. P. C. B. C. L.	No.JTV 1	-90
	and the second se	.96

# **APPENDIX 1:**

Π

1

A copy of Dublin City Council's Declaration dated 14<sup>th</sup> February 2020 issued to the Appellant together with Planner's Report

AN BORD PLEANÁLA 1 1 MAR 2020 LTR DATED \_\_\_\_\_ FROM LDG-ABP.

ak in de an de de bester in de la stander ditte biel de la son an en la de la son an en la de la secondar en e energiase en antener de peuvente de tespesé

AN BORD PLEANALA 11 MAR. 2020 LTR DATED FROM ABP.

Terry Doyle, Carlow

# Comhairle Cathrach **Chaile Átha Cliath Dublin City Council**

An Roinn Pleanála & Forbairt Maoine, Bloc 4, Urlár 3, Oifigí na Cathrach, An Ché Adhmaid, Baile Átha Cliath 8.

Planning & Property Development Department, Block 4, Floor 3, Dublin City Council, Civic Offices, Wood Quay, Dublin 8.

T: (01) 222 2288

E. planning@dublincity.ie

14-Feb-2020

Malcomson Law Solicitors The Atrium. Shamrock Plaza, Green Lane,

Application Number Application Type
Registration Date
Decision Date
Decision Order No.
Location
Proposal

0042/20 Section 5

23-Jan-2020 14-Feb-2020 P2399 18, Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6 EXPP: Whether the recent extension which includes large windows at the western elevation to the western facade of 18 Oakley Square constitutes development having regard to planning condition 14 attached to a previous planning application Ref ABP 290572471. Cliona Cleary PLEANALA

Applicant

#### If you have any queries regarding this Decision, please contact the number shown above

#### Note:

Any person issued with a declaration on development and exempted development, may, on payment of the prescribed fee, refer a declaration for review by A Bord Pleanála within four weeks of the date of the issuing of the declaration.

#### NOTIFICATION OF DECLARATION ON DEVELOPMENT AND EXEMPTED DEVELOPMENT

In pursuance of its functions under the Planning & Development Add DOC an mended, Dublin City Council has by order dated 14-Feb-2020 decided to issue a Declaration that the above proposed development is EXEMPT from the requirement to obtain planning permission under Section 32 of the Planning & Development Acts 2000 (as amended).

		1 1 MAR 2020
	LTR DATED. LDG	FROM
Ŀ	ABP-	

Ceannolitig, Okiaí na Cathrach, An Ché Adhmaid, Bhaile Alha Cliath S, Éire Head Office, Civic Offices, Wood Quay, Dublin 8, Ireland



#### **Reasons & Considerations:**

The construction of the proposed extension to the rear of No. 18 Oakley Square, meets the conditions and limitations of Class 1 of Schedule 2, Part 1 and Article 9 (1) (a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. It is recommended therefore that a declaration be issued to the applicant informing them the development constitutes exempted development.

Signed on behalf of Dublin City Council

for Assistant Chief Exe Lutive

#### Note:

Any person issued with a declaration on development and exempted development, may, on payment of the prescribed fee, refer a declaration for review by an Bord Pleanála within four weeks of the date of the issuing of the declaration.



Ceannoifig, Oifigí na Cathrach, An Ché Adhmaid, Bhaile Átha Cliath 8, Éire Head Office, Civic Offices, Wood Quay, Eublin 8, Ireland An Roinn Pleanála & Forbairt Maoine, Bloc 4, Urlár 3, Oifigi na Cathrach, An Ché Adhmaid, Baile Átha Cliath 8.

Planning & Property Development Department, Block 4, Floor 3, Dublin City Council, Civic Offices, Wood Quay, Dublin 8.

T: (01) 222 2288

E. planning@dublincity.ie

25-Feb-2020

Terry Doyle, Malcomson Law Solicitors The Atrium, Shamrock Plaza, Green Lane, Carlow

Application Number 0042/20 Application Type Section 5 **Registration Date** 23-Jan-2020 **Decision** Date 14-Feb-2020 Decision Order No. P2399 Location 18, Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6 Proposal EXPP: Whether the recent extension which includes large windows at the western elevation to the western facade of 18 Oakley Square constitutes development having regard to planning condition 14 attached to a previous planning application Ref ABP 290572471. Applicant Cliona Cleary

# If you have any queries regarding this Decision, please contact the number shown above

#### Note:

Any person issued with a declaration on development and exempted development, may, on payment of the prescribed fee, refer a declaration for review by A Bord Pleanála within four weeks of the date of the issuing of the declaration.

## NOTIFICATION OF DECLARATION ON DEVELOPMENT AND EXEMPTED DEVELOPMENT

In pursuance of its functions under the Planning & Development Acts 2000 (as amended), Dubit Ch Council has by order dated 14-Feb-2020 decided to issue a Declaration that the above proposed development is EXEMPT from the requirement to obtain planning permission under Section 32 of the 1 1 MAR 2020 Planning & Development Acts 2000 (as amended).

#### Reasons & Considerations:

The construction of the proposed extension to the rear of No. 18 Oakley Square, meets the conditions and limitations of Class 1 of Schedule 2, Part 1 and Article 9 (1) (a) of the Planning and Development. Regulations 2001, as amended. It is recommended therefore that a declaration be issued to the applicant informing them the development constitutes exempted development.

'R DATED

FROM

All with the US offer a linear particular in the second s second sec

na na serie e construction de managemente protected protected and the series of the se

881 - C. M. H. H.

#### Signed on behalf of Dublin City Council

#### for Assistant Chief Executive

Note:

ANE

IAHAE IN LIMAR 2020

LTR DATED

ABP.

Any person issued with a declaration on development and exempted development, may, on payment of the prescribed fee, refer a declaration for review by an Bord Pleanála within four weeks of the date of the issuing of the declaration.

31.28

righte her op daar word al in die oor een trak het goend word word alter einen 'n welkgen oor in ein on take her weer die de reeper of enterneer word of one bezig for eer ook ender die her oor seere van die die of oor ook wi die die krijkenoor

NOTED AT LODIES METAL OF A DEVICE AND A DEVI

the state of the s
## Dublin City Council

## **Declaration on Development and Exempted Development**

Section 5 of the Planning and Development Act 2000

**EXPP:** 0042/20

Location: 18, Oakley Square, Dublin 6

Date Received: 23-Jan-2020

Decision Due Date: 19-Feb-2020

### Development

No. 26 Charlestown Road requests a declaration on whether a single storey extension which includes large windows at the western elevation to the rear of No. 18 Oakley Square constitutes development.

### Site Description

No. 18 Oakley Square is a two storey end-of-terrace property located within an infill development in Rathmines.

The site is zoned Z2 in the 2016-2022 Dublin City Development Plan, with the objective 'To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.' There are no specific objectives in the Development Plan or in any Local Area Plan, designating the site as an area of archaeological, geological, historical, scientific or ecological interest. The site is not a protected structure or national monument.

### **Planning History**

Planning Reference 0005/20 granted a Section 5 for a single storey flat roof extension to the rear of the house totalling 26.5 sqm.

The applicant has provided documents relating to Planning Reference 1369/86 (ABP Reg. Ref. PL 29/5/72471). This application permitted subject to conditions 26 No. 2-storey dwellings, one of which is the subject dwelling No. 18 Oakley Square. Condition 14 of this application states:

No windows shall be provided, now or in the future, in the indicated blank facades of the new residential blocks, save where such are shown on the lodged plans.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

#### **Enforcement History**

None on file.

**Relevant Legislation** 

AN E	BORD PLEANÁLA
LTR DATED_ LDG ABP	1 1 MAR 2020 FROM

fines of while added

Decision on Dass parameterid and Examples Investopment

Saction & of the Pianning may Development Art 2005

X 문화는 실험 사람이 걸 위에 있는 것

Listabori 🥂 🖓 Ordey Squala 🕅 n.im 6

Usia nel 11 (Devising) sie 0

Teolinus Date Date: 1-1 en 2020

#### Development

L. 25 Constitution To concentrates a devision on outprotect in on growing the states when the variable processing angle of indows. In one cases also done to the mean of Mon. 20, stability. Equipment to metalolistic development.

#### no man a la sula

42. "De Caskay Siguata 13. D. 1970 archite meter e satare ar baser e collecte en anne en milite. Gestaumme a la Rachitekee

This work is in real 22 at 040 0000 - 322 60000 (Sty Bay , Inner) Plan Witt the object of the second s

#### Plante Fluxing

his shagi ketara ang 1905/20 gi salasi ni salation (, tari pisripis giprini, fisi ang synatan la ma pari shine mohisi tubat na 15 6-salati

The applicant has provided in dimensional Labor to Planning Neterine (20086) for an angle of the second states and the sources of the sources of the sources and the sources of the source

No ordenses shell be denoted to early the orden of a county of the instrument basins familiar in the test of states his basis of metal outly are sharing on the first gad phois.

distants of polyments are under an ar rouges

Enforcement history

el las nel

Retrivatif Loc slation

AN BORD PLEANÁLA	
1 1 MAR 2020 TR DATED FROM	
-9	AB

A DESCRIPTION OF A DESC

This application will be assessed under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), and under the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) to check whether it is exempted development. Schedule 2 Part 1 Exempted Development-General - Development within the Curtilage of a House - Class 1 is the part that specifically addresses extensions to houses, and whether they require planning permission or not.

I also note Article 9 (1) (a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) refer to Restrictions on Exemptions where works would (i) Contravene a condition attached to a permission under the Act or be inconsistent with any use specified in a permission under the Act.

## Observations/Submissions:

A submissions was received from No. 18 Oakley Square which is summarised in the following bullet points.

The subject rear extension already has already received a Section 5 declaration from Dublin City Council. Condition No. 14 of An Bord Pleanála decision PL 29/5/72471 does not relate to

1 1 MAR 2020

LTR DATED

subject extension.

## Appraisal

## Submitted Documents

- Site Plans .
- A cover letter by Malcomson Law Solicitors dated 17th January 2020
- Appendix A Photos of development at No. 18 Oakley Square
- Appendix B -- Decision notice of Planning Reference: ABP 290572471
- Appendix C Composite Drawings and Report by Tierney Haines Architects
- Appendix D Extracts from Map 9 of the Dublin City Development Plan 1980 •

# Assessment against the Regulations

The relevant parts of Schedule 2 Part 1 Exempted Development- General - Development within the Curtilage of a House - Class 1 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) states:

The extension of a house, by the construction or erection of an extension (including a conservatory) to the rear of the house or by the conversion for use as part of the house of any garage, store, shed or other similar structure attached to the rear or to the side of the house.

1. (a) Where the house has not been extended previously, the floor area of any such extension shall not exceed 40 square metres.

The proposed extension would be 26.5 sqm in area.

2. (a) Where the house has been extended previously, the floor area of any such extension, taken together with the floor area of any previous extension or extensions constructed or erected after 1 October 1964, including those for which planning permission has been obtained, shall not exceed 40 square metres.

The property has not been previously extended.

AN BORD PLEANALA

FROM

OSOS RAM I I

- stepar na fill hag anno utick provou presento pro 1289 1977 (num) Argenti uno 128 kuro di Dinarra Anciu Mignari y Centro Hanan Guinerga

4. (a) Where the rear wall of the house does not include a gable, the height of the walls of any such extension shall not exceed the height of the rear wall of the house

The height of the highest part of the roof of the proposed extension would not exceed the height of the highest part of the roof of the dwelling.

5. The construction or erection of any such extension to the rear of the house shall not reduce the area of private open space, reserved exclusively for the use of the occupants of the house, to the rear of the house to less than 25 square metres.

The rear amenity space would not be reduced to less than 25 sqm by the proposed extension.

(a) Any window proposed at ground level in any such extension shall not be less than 1 metre from the boundary it faces.

All proposed windows would be located more than 1 metres away from any neighbouring boundary it would face.

I also note Article 9 (1) (a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) requires all exempted development does not contravene a condition attached to a permission or be inconsistent with any use specified in a permission.

The parent permission for the 26 dwellings on Oakley Square including the subject property (ABP Planning Reference: PL 29/5/72471) included condition 14, which states:

No windows shall be provided, now or in the future, in the indicated blank facades of the new residential blocks, save where such are shown on the lodged plans.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity

It would appear the western side elevation of No. 18 Oakley Square is one of the aforementioned blank facades. The subject single storey rear extension has glazing in its western elevation. The above condition does not limit glazing within future extensions nor does it remove exempted development rights for rear extensions. I therefore consider the subject extension would not be contravene the above condition.

## Conclusion

An extension to the rear of a house can only be exempt from the requirement to seek planning permission if it meets all the relevant conditions and limitations numbered above, copied from the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. This proposed extension meets all these conditions and limitations. The proposed extension is therefore exempted development, and does not require planning permission.

### Recommendation

The extension as described is development, and is exempted development, within the meaning of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

The construction of the proposed extension to the rear of No. 18 Oakley Square, meets the conditions and limitations of Class 1 of Schedule 2, Part 1 and Article 9 (1) (a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. It is recommended therefore 2020 at a

LDG. ABP. FROM .

nali na adalemiti a da mining kana ana mining kana kana ana baha sa mining kana na mining kana sa mining hari Mana kana na mining kana mining mangan na mining kana sa sa kana mining kana sa mining kana sa mining kana sa m

en besar of energies and the set of a second of the set of a set of the set of the set of the said sing. Polish of the hyperset the set of the set of each set the g

een graguits op omprimer in transmittic is one is in the original states of the particle and the providence page Derivity of the the the the Solar

er de la free versen d'al a de la free en la contra de la session en lessa enfantes de la caracteria de la cont Palace de 11 de la relation de la 11 dense d'al de la contra de la contra de la free de la contra de la contra A 11 deben de la contra de la caracteria de la contra de la contra de la contra de la free de la contra de la c

(a) Statistical and the setting of the states for any substitution. It is a substitution of the substitution with the states of the states.

그 같은 그 생각 가슴 같이 가지 않는 것 같아. 가슴 가지 않는 것 같아. 가슴 다 가지 않는 것 같아.

ידי אין היה האספעיק היה האלייה באלה האינטריין או לאחרים היה לא לאחרים אין איני אין בארוחי אורה או היה איני איי איינארא עירוני איינגע איינגע ליינגע היא איינגע א איינגע איינגע

#### neisne D

יים אין בירואסיק להיהה היאיראה היה האת האת מיקורעה באקשיורין ואדה היא אפקה המייאירה בהכפין קוריה ההיה מעוד להכירור היה עפרים היה לא אייצע היה אשרייש שהיון ומין ההומנטי איתואליינט שלאפין הראשי היה להנו ליכר לאוריר עריכו לאפיראליגטי אפען פאירורה היה היה קור מאום ליכל לא ואי אועלינטי להומיי אפרי היה היה היה היה לא היה לא היה היה היה היה היה היה היה אוני אוני מאון לא איינט אועלינטי להי לאוריי איר היה אוני היה היה לא היה לא היה היה היה היה היה היה היה אוני אוני היה אוני אוני אוני אוני אוני אוני איינט לא

#### (Page 1 1, 219, 50, 67)

a ha shekara ka baba ka baba a ƙwalar ƙwala. Wasar ƙwalar ƙwalar ƙwalar ƙwalar ƙwalar ƙwalar

(i) A set of the se

AN BORD PLEANÁLA 11 MAR 2020 LTR DATED \_\_\_\_\_FROM\_\_\_\_\_FROM\_\_\_\_ declaration be issued to the applicant informing them the development constitutes exempted development.

Robert Breveton

Robert Brereton Assistant Planner 4<sup>th</sup> February 2020

K Summer

-

-

Π

Π

1

Π

Π

Π

 $\bigcap$ 

Π

Π

5-2-20

AN BORD PLEANÁLA 1 1 MAR 2020 LTR DATED \_\_\_ FROM LDG-ABP.

. 1997 – 2월 1998 – 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1977 - 1997 및 드립 가지 (Constituting Constituting Constituting Constituting 1997 – 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997

n meneral meneral se internet meneral se final general se internet

AN BORD PLEANALA 11 MAR 2020 LDG LDG ABP





Edroom # 2 Chilles



AN BO	RD PLEANALA	AN BI
	1 MAR 2020 RAM 1	
LTR DATED	FROM	LTR DATED
ABP-	· endenter eterneterinte .ven eau	A8P.







AN BORD PLEANALA DSDS SIAM I I MORA -ABP.



J. Ammer 11 BORD PLEANÁLA 1 1 MAR 2020 LTR DATED\_ LDG-FROM\_ ABP.





AN BORD PLEANALA 1 1 MAR 2020 LTR.DATED LDG. ABP. MORT



Edroom # 2 Chilles

Π

Π

Π

Π

Π

 $\square$ 



AN BORD PLEANÁLA 1 1 MAR 2020 LTR DATED \_\_\_\_\_ FROM \_ LDG-ABP.







#### PLANNING PERMISSION

PL 29/5/72471

#### AN BORD PLEANALA

## LOCAL GRIVE ISLAGENY (PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT) ACTS, 1963 TO 1983

#### Qualin County Borough

## Planning Register Reference Number: 1369/86

APPLAL by Belgrave Residents Association, of Rathmines and Ranclagh, care of Noy Atkinson, 5 Belgrave Place, Dublin, and by Tom Hefferon, Director, formite Limited, Elenater, Cairnshill, County Sliga, against the decision made on the 16th day of September, 1986, by the Right Honourship the Lord Mayor. Aldermon and Burgesses of Dublin, to grant subject to conditions a permission to the said Tom Hefferon, for the erection of a two-storey development comprising twenty six units around landscaped gardens and the demolition of numbers 15, 16, and 17, at 15, 16, 17 and 18 and the rear of 13 and 14, Dukley Road, Romelagh, Dublin, is scruttered with plane and particulars ladged with the said Corporation:

DECISION: Pursuant to the Local Government (Planeing and Development) Acts, 1963 to 1963, it is hereby decided, for the reason set out in the first Schedule hereto, to grant permission for the caid development in eccentance with the said plane and particulars, subject to the conditions operified in the Second Schedule hereto, the reasons for the imposition of the suid conditions being as set out in the said Second Schedule and the sold permission is hereby granted subject to the sold conditions.

## FIRST SCHEDULL

It is considered that, sobject to compliance with the conditions set out in the Second Schedule herounder, the proposed development would be in accordance with the proper planning and development of the area.

#### SECOND SCHEDULL

 Unit 11 in black C, 12 in black D, 20 in block F, 21 in black G and 25 in block 8, shall be amilted.

Reason: To provide for an adequate standard of residential amenity for toth existing and proposed declings.

 Blocks C and D, and blocks F and G, shall be joined to fate two betraces.

Remnon: In the informal of orderly development.

 Block H (unit 26) and block J (unit 26) shall be terraced by arithing the padestrian route. Alternative pedealeran access arrangements shall be provided to the south of unit 26 to the satisfaction of the planning unitority.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.



## 2. SECOND SCHEDULE (CONTD.)

4. The frant blocks A and B shall be suck 1 metre lower than indicated on submitted Grawings. The front elevations of these blocks shall be modified so as to provide two separate and distinct access docrways and fenlights to units 1 and 2 in block A and to usits 5 and 6 in block B. Details indicating compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to the planning automity for their apresent.

Reason: In order to integrate the development into the existing streetscape.

5. Off-struct car packing space mumber 70 shall be waitted.

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenity of the adjacent oroperty.

b. All car parking spaces and internal welkways shall be paved in decorative bricks or paviors of contrasting colours. Trees and/or strate, of opecies suitable for an urban environment, shall, where practicable, be placked at the entrance at every other parking space. A protective kerb and grid around the base of each tree and/or mirub shall be provided.

Reason: In the interests of residential and viewel amenity.

7. All boundar: walls to the rear of the Dakiny Road front building line shall be a minimum of two motres in height. A new wall shall be precised along the possibler boundary of the development. Details of this wall shall be accelted to the planning subscript for compliance with their requirements prior to the connencement of development.

Reason: is the interests of orderly development.

8. The proposed residential accumudation shall be used for residential purposes only. No part of the provises shall be used for medical or related cursuiting roose, offices or trade purposes.

Remnon: To protoct the residential amonities of the ores.

9. Details of colour and texture of external well and roof finishes of the proposed structures whall be submitted to the planning authority for their written agreement prior to the commencement of development. Details of the new front boundary provagements to the public read, incorporating a low store well and callings shall be provided. Bailings and gates shall match period callings in the area. Her wall/railing treatment shall be returned to the front and of gables alway the entrance readway.

Reeson: In the interosts of visual amenity,

	11ALA	
	N BORD PLEANALA	
AIANALA	DIROB MA AN BORI	
A second s	FROM	
M. 2020	TR DATED	
	ABP - Đaj -98A 12	



## 4. SECOND SCHEDULE (CONTD.)

17. Prior to the commencement of development, a proposal for dealing with fuel storage and refuse storage and removal shall be inside on plan and scontiled to the planning authority for their written agreement. Collection points for refuse shall be clearly indicated.

Reason: In the interests of orderly development,

18. The ground floor fensetration to unit  $\frac{9}{2}$  in block C shall be as indicated on submitted plans and not so in the submitted elevations.

Remon: In the interests of residential evenity.

Senser of An Bard Pleansis duly authorized to authenticate the seal of the Board. Dated this  $10^{10}$  day of FelfMann

AN BORD PLEANÁLA SAM 1 1 1 1 MAR 2020 LTR DATED FROM LDG ABP.

1987.



#### SECOND SCHEDULE (CONTD.)

3.

10. The site shall be landscaped and planted in accordance with a scheme to be explaited to the planning authority for its agreement prior to the commencement of development.

Accorn: In the Interests of visual amenity.

It. The treatment of the Front boundary, gendens and not back, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the planning authority prior to the occupation of any of the proposed units.

Reason: In the interests of orderly development.

12. The development shall concily in full with the requirements of the planning authority in relation to water supply and sewage disparal.

Reason: In the interests of public health.

13. The indicated road widening line at Gakley Road shall be addited to a line parallel with the existing front facade line of house numbers 14 to 20, Oakley Road. The line chall be 4.5 metres forward of the front facede. Front gardana and steps layout to be altered as necessary. The area between the existing and proposed road boundary lines shall be payed to a contour and in a menner to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

Reagon: In the interests of orderly development.

14. No windows chall be provided, now or in the future, in the indicated blank facades of the new residential blocks, mave where such arm shown on the lodged plana.

Reason: In the interests of residential esenity.

15. The developer shall enter into a management spreement with all future owners and occupiers to carry out works of maintenance and repairs of all lands within the curtilege of the sile, west of the rear of the new footpaths along Oakley Road. This agreement shall cover roads, footpaths, our parks and all services both under and overground together with isofacaping, hard and saft, which is not the direct responsibility of individual owners/accupiers.

Reason: In the interests of the proper planuing and development of the area.

16. The rear garden wall of mamber 18, Dakley Road whall be provided directly at the rear of car parking spaces 7, 8 and 9. It shall be 2 metres in height and finished to match adjoining screen weiling.

Research in the intersets of residential emenity.

	ALAMA AN BORD PLEANALA
	D PLEAN
CHER COM	BORD
	ALAMA AN BOUND
	MORE RAM I & 11 MAR 2020 MORE RAM I & 11 MAR 2020
	USTS RAM I FROM
l	USA TED CHIMAN
-	LTRDAIL
	LOG
	ABP
	Contraction of the second s

## **APPENDIX C:**

Π

1

1

Π

COMPOSITE DRAWING AND REPORT PREPARED BY STEPHEN TIERNEY





Registered VAT number £ \$557534

Friday 13\* December 2019

#### Opinion on exempted development status at 18 Oakley Square.

Tierney Haines Architects have been asked by Adrian Wrixon and Cliona Cleary of 26 Charleston Avenue to provide an opinion on whether an extension which is currently under construction to the rear of 18 Oakley Square, Dublin 6 is an exempted development.

#### Qualifications

Stephen Tierney BA, BSc. Arch, Dip.Arch, MArch, MRIAI, Conservation Grade 3. Stephen has been a registered architect since 2003. Stephen has been in private residential practice in Dublin with his wife since 2005, Tierney Haines Architects.

#### Situation

26 Charleston Avenue is situated directly to the west of 18 Oakley Square. The two properties share a 20 metre long boundary.

18 Oakley Square and 26 Charleston Avenue are classed as zone Z2 in Dublin City Coucil's Development plan 2016-2022. The objective of this zoning is "To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas".

26 Chorleston Avenue, owned by Adrian Wrixon and Cliana Cleary and which is directly adjacent to 18 Oakley Square is a protected structure. [Record of Protected Structures Reference number 1399]. 18 Oakley Square is not a protected structure.

#### Documents

I have inspected Dublin City Council's planning register and found no supervening planning permissions (post dating the one our client is relying on – Planning ref. 1369/86) at 18 Oakley square.

I have inspected the hord copy drawings relating to the relevant planning application at Dublin City Archives, please find enclosed the relevant drawings.

I have inspected a compliance document on the planning file indicating that the developer agreed to Condition 14 prior to commencement of the development. [Edmand Burke and Partners Architects letter to Brendon O'Dea, Planning Department, Dublin Corporation, date stamped 14,12, 1987]

Based on my inspection and interpretation of the drawings I have prepared a composite drawing showing the Tierrey Malake Architects, 284 Brankville Park, Machinek, Dablie, 7, 00283 85 (504783, stoppongliarsophalmer, com

ÁLA ]	A.E.AN	NBORD	PLEANÁLA	
	<sup>9</sup> 202	M 1 1 1 MAA	AR 2020	
	LTR	DATED	-001	
	LDG-		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	

TIERNEY HAINES

initially proposed and the permitted west and northern elevations together with the currently under construction structure with windows as we understand they may be fitted.

#### Opinion

It is my view that the under construction window openings in the new extension at 18 Oakley Square are not exempted, condition 14 reads - "No windlows (sic) shall be provided, now or in the future, in the indicated blank facades of the new residential blacks, save where such are shown on the lodged plans. <u>Beason</u>. In the interests of residential amenity."

My understanding of conditions of this type is that they are expressly designed to protect the future privacy of adjoining properties from future development. When there is even a grey area an such an issue it is normal to submit a planning application. The reason for such a condition in these circumstances is clear from an inspection of the site and adjoining buildings, Charleston road properties (protected structures) have a pattern of private gardens.

26 Charleston Avenue enjoys considerable privacy to the rear of the property, both to its rear garden and the rear elevation, the under-construction extension to 18 Oakley Square will have an adverse effect on the amenity of privacy of the rear of 26 Charleston Avenue. There is direct line of sight views into the under-construction extension at 18 Oakley Square from 2 No. bedrooms, the stairs and the fomily bathroom of 26 Charleston Avenue.

## Stephen Tierney MRIAI

13.12.2019

ierzey Heines Architects, 28z Brookville Perk, Blackrock, Dublin, 7. 00353 65 1504763, stapkanötiernsyheines.tom

17

AN BO	A JANAS IN	LA
LTR DATED	1 MAR 2020	TT.
ABP-	MORA	LTH DATED







Π

Π

	N BORD PLEANÁLA	
LTR DAT LDG ABP	1 1 MAR 2020 ED FROM	-

18

AN BORD PLEANALA

I I MAR 2020 LTR DATED FROM LDG-FROM

26 Charleston Ave Ranelagh, Dublin 6.

27 January 2020

To whom it may concern,

I attach an image from my architect just for clarity (or to hopefully avoid confusion). The Land Registry website shows the wrong address for 18 Oakley Sq.: the address given on the map is16 but the address given in the top right when the property is highlighted is correctly shown as 18.

Kind regards,

Adrian Wrixon.









## 28/01/2020

Application No.	EXPP 0042/20
Applicant	Cliona Cleary
Registration Date	January 2020
Location	18, Oakley Square, Dublin 6

# Re: Recent extension and large windows to western facade

## Dear Sir/Madam,

Please be advised that an application for a Declaration under Section 5 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) was submitted to the planning authority on 23rd January 2020

It is noted that you may have an interest in the subject site to which this application relates. The planning authority would like to provide you as the owner/occupier of the site, the opportunity to submit views or comments on the application.

Any comments or views you may wish to submit shall be submitted by close of business on 5th February 2020.

A full copy of the application is available for viewing at the Public Counter, Dublin City Council, Planning Department, Monday to Friday, 9.00a.m. – 4.30p.m.

Should you require any clarity on this matter please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number,

Yours sincerely,

Mary Hee A M Bourke. For Executive Manage	AN Br
AN BORD PLEA	NALA LTR DALAN LDG- ABP-
	FROM

Cecnnoiñg, Oirigí na Cathrach, An Chá Achmaid. Bhaile Átha Ollath 8, Éire Head Office, Civic Offices, Wood Quay, Dublin 8, Iraland

T. 01 222 2222 W. www.dublincity.ie
#### SECOND SCHEDNLE (CONTD.)

٦.

10. The alte shall be landscaped and planted in accordance with a scheme to be subsitted to the planeing authority for its agreement prior to the commencement of development.

Heapon: In the interasts of visual amonity.

11. The treatment of the Front boundary, gendens and set back, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the planning suthersty prior in the occupation of any of the proposed units.

Reason: In the interests of orderly development.

12. The development shall comply in full with the requirements of the planning authority in relation to water supply and cowage disponent.

Reason: In the interests of public health.

13. The indicated road widening line at Gakley Road shall be addified to a line parallel with the existing front facade line of house numbers 14 to 20, Oakley Road. The line shall be 4.5 metree forward of the front facente. Front gardens and steps layout to be altered as necessary. The area between the existing and proposed road houndary lines shall be paved to a contour end in a memory to the satisfection of the planning authority.

Reamon: In the interests of orderly development.

14. No windows chall be provided, now or in the Future, in the indicated blank facudas of the new residential blacks, save where such are shown on the lodged plane.

Reason: In the interests of residential emenity.

15. The developer shall enter into a management agreement with all future owners and occupiers to carry out works of maintenance and repairs of all leads within the curtilege of the site, west of the rear of the new fostpaths along Oskley Road. This agreement shall cover roads, fostpaths, cor parks and all services both under and overground together with leadersping, hard and east, which is not the direct responsibility of individual owners/occupiers.

Remains in the interests of the proper planning and development of the area.

16. The rear gouden wall of number 18, Bakley Road aball be provided directly at the rear of ter parking spaces 7, 8 and 9. It shall be 2 metres in height and finished to match adjoining screen weiling.

Reason: In the interests of residential menity.

	AN BORD PLEANÁLA
	USUS RAM 11 MORT
LTR D/	1.1 MAR 2020 DETAG RTJ
ABP-	TON



#### 4. SECOND SCHEDNLE (CONTD.)

17. Prior to the commencement of development, a proposal for dealing with fush storage and refuse storage and removal shall be indicated on plan and submitted to the planning authority for their written agreement. Collection points for refuse shall be clearly indicated.

Reason: In the interests of orderly development,

18. The ground floor fenestration to unit 9 in block & shall be as indicated on submitted plans and not as in the submitted elevations.

Reasons In the interests of residential amenity.

Member of An Bord Pleanálm duly authorimed to sufferniicate the seal of the Board.

Dated this 18 th way or February

1987.



14

#### APPENDIX C:

-

X C: COMPOSITE DRAWING AND REPORT PREPARED BY STEPHEN TIERNEY





Registered VAT number IE 95575389

Friday 13" December 2019

#### Opinion on exempted development status at 18 Oakley Square.

Tierney Haines Architects have been asked by Adrian Wrixon and Cliona Cleary of 26 Charleston Avenue to provide an opinion on whether an extension which is currently under construction to the rear of 18 Oakley Square, Dublin 6 is an exempted development.

#### Qualifications

Stephen Tierney BA, 8Sc. Arch, Dip.Arch, MArch, MRIA), Conservation Grade 3. Stephen has been a registered architect since 2003. Stephen has been in private residential practice in Dublin with his wife since 2005, Tierney Haines Architects.

#### Situation

26 Charleston Avenue is situated directly to the west of 18 Oakley Square. The two properties share a 20 metre long boundary.

18 Oakley Square and 26 Charleston Avenue are classed as zone Z2 in Dublin City Coucil's Development plan 2016-2022. The objective of this zoning is -"To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas".

26 Charleston Avenue, owned by Adrian Wrixon and Cliona Cleary and which is directly adjacent to 18 Oakley Square is a protected structure. [Record of Protected Structures Reference number 1399]. 18 Oakley Square is not a protected structure.

#### **Documents**

t have inspected Dublin City Council's planning register and found no supervening planning permissions (post dating the one our client is relying on – Planning ref. 1369/86) at 18 Oakley square.

I have inspected the hord copy drawings relating to the relevant planning application at Dublin City Archives, please find enclosed the relevant drawings.

I have inspected a compliance document on the planning file indicating that the developer agreed to Condition 14 prior to commencement of the development. (Edmund Burke and Partners Architects letter to Brendon O'Dea, Planning Department, Dublin Corporation, date stamped 14,12,1987)

Based on my inspection and interpretation of the drawings I have prepared a composite drawing showing the Timmer Metzee Architector, 256 Brookville Paris, Blackrock, Deblie, 7, 00223 85 1504783, stephen@timmertalmes.com





initially proposed and the permitted west and nonhern elevations together with the currently under construction structure with windows as we understand they may be fitted.

#### Opinion

It is my view that the under construction window openings in the new extension at 18 Oakley Square are not exempted, condition 14 reads - " No windlows (sic) shall be provided, now or in the future, in the indicated blank facades of the new residential blocks, save where such are shown on the lodged plans. <u>Reason</u>: In the interests of residential amenity."

My understanding of conditions of this type is that they are expressly designed to protect the future privacy of adjoining properties from future development. When there is even a grey area on such on issue it is normal to submit a planning application. The reason for such a condition in these circumstances is clear from an inspection of the site and adjoining buildings, Charleston road properties (protected structures) have a pattern of private gardens.

26 Charleston Avenue enjoys considerable privacy to the rear of the property, both to its rear garden and the rear elevation, the under-construction extension to 18 Oakley Square will have an adverse effect on the amenity of privacy of the rear of 26 Charleston Avenue. There is direct line of sight views into the under-construction extension at 18 Oakley Square from 2 No. bedrooms, the stairs and the family bathroom at 26 Charleston Avenue.

#### Stephen Tierney MRIAI

13.12.2019

AN BORD PLEANÁLA 1 1 MAR 2020 LTR DATED LDG ABP.

BORD PLEAWAL

Tierney Haiwas Architects, 280 Brockvilla Park, Blackrock, Duklin, T. 00353 85 1504763, senatoristicrocyhaiwes.cr









26 Charleston Ave Ranelagh, Dublin 6.

27 January 2020

To whom it may concern,

I attach an image from my architect just for clarity (or to hopefully avoid confusion). The Land Registry website shows the wrong address for 18 Oakley Sq,: the address given on the map is16 but the address given in the top right when the property is highlighted is correctly shown as 18.

Kind regards,

Adrian Wrixon.

	AN BC	RD	PLEA	NÁL	A
1	1	1 MAI	R 2020		
.TR D .DG-	ATED 1	MAS	FROM	909	HA
BP-		0S/K	RAM I		
-		MORT			AO AT.
mount					Đaj

SET HERBARD, KARDER, A. AREA TRINE, BERRER, A. AREA HARDER, M. BERRER, MATTER HARDER, MERISTRA, MATTER, SANKER, MARKER HARDER, MERISTRA, WARNARD, DWW, MARDER, MERISTRA, WARNARD, DWW, MARDER, MERISTRA, WARNARD, DWW, MARDER, MERISTRA, MARDER, DWW, MARDER, MERISTRA, MERISTRA, MARDER, DWW, MARDER, MERISTRA, MERISTRA, MARDER, DWW, MARDER, MERISTRA, MERISTRA, MERISTRA, MERISTRA, MARDER, MERISTRA, MERISTRA, MERISTRA, MERISTRA, MARDER, MERISTRA, MERIST





28/01/2020

Application M	
Application No.	EXPP 0042/20
Applicant	Cliona Cleary
Registration Date	January 2020
Location	18, Oakley Square, Dublin 6

# Re: Recent extension and large windows to western facade

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please be advised that an application for a Declaration under Section 5 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) was submitted to the planning authority on 23rd January 2020

It is noted that you may have an interest in the subject site to which this application relates. The planning authority would like to provide you as the owner/occupier of the site, the opportunity to submit views or comments on the application.

Any comments or views you may wish to submit shall be submitted by close of business on 5th February 2020.

A full copy of the application is available for viewing at the Public Counter, Dublin City Council, Planning Department, Monday to Friday, 9.00a.m. – 4.30p.m.

Should you require any clarity on this matter please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number,

Yours sincerely,

Mary A M Bourke

A M Bourke. For Executive Manager

> Ceannoifig, Olifigí na Cethrach, An Chá Adhmaid, Bhaile Átha Cliath &, Éire Head Office, Civic Offices, Wood Cluay, Dublin 8, Ireland

> > T. 01 222 2222 W. www.dublincity.ie

AN BOF	RD PLEANA	LA
11	MAR 2020	
LTR DATED	FROM	
LDG-		
ABP-		96 × 4

# **APPENDIX 3:**

Π

A copy of the application of Mauro Fiorio and Giorgia de Maoi dated 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2020 the owners of 18 Oakley Square together with the Planner's Report

AN BORD PLEANÁLA 11 MAR 2020 LTR DATED LDG-- FROM ABP.

AN BORD PLEANALA

#### DECLARATION ON DEVELOPMENT & EXEMPTED DEVELOPMENT

÷.,

Π

Π

Γ

	- Matternation	eentu	14 2 14P	PPLICAT		SA B.	1		
Compare Bhais Át Dubin City		SECIN	JN 5 AI	PLICAT	TION FO	irkivi	La parte		
		MAURO			(B) (1) (1)	-			
		ANT: 18	OAK	LEY	SQUA	RE,	RAN	JELAGH	
	PX73	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	5.3	380	35	1 6		-3	
email ad	DRESS: M	AURO_	FIOR			The strategy of the state of th			-
TELEPHO	NE NO. Day	9 <u>-2-4-6-6</u>	2010	Mobile	e: 087	4 77.	8440	33	
NAME OF	AGENT AN	) AGENT'S A	DDRES	s: ARC	CH. N	ICOLA	DA	PONTE	
40 St	LOHER	A VILLA	14E,	DUN	SHAU	GHC	INC	SUSINE	SS PARK
TELEPHC	NE NO. Day	01 825 1	5688	Mobile	9.		o <del>,</del>		
ADDRESS	SFOR CORF	ESPONDEN	CE <u>(if di</u>	fferent fro	<u>m above</u>	)			
						the for		sedare t	
							¥		
LOCATIO	N OF SUBJE	CT SITE:	18 (	DAKL	EY	SQU	ARE	, 006	2
2000 be Please ( (Note: o	as a Declar en request provide deta only works li	JO ation unde ed or issue ils of works sted and des cation. Use o	d for th (where	e prope applicabl under thi	rty by th	posed on will be	ning Au	nthority? [	
Singi	E Sto	rey fi	AT	roof	EXT	ENS	ION	TO TH	
REAR	of the	HOUSE	: 70	TALL	ING ;	26,5	sau	ection, B	2
							_		
				geen.	Renal Street, or other	AN	BOR		
	k				AIA	MAR	102 .00		ANÁLA
				1		the basely	- Not 3	N BOP	A 1
				1.1					R
						DATE	11 N	IAR 2020	
					LTR LDG-	DATED	111	IAR 2020	
					LTR LDG- ABP-	0702	11N	IAR 2020	
					LUG-	0702	11N	IAR 2020	HIJ.
					ABP.	0702	11N	IAR 2020	

2, 10.	SITE	PLANS						
	GROON	D FLOO	R PLANS	, ELE	VATION	JŞ		
17 15	3D VI	ews a	STIR AC					
É	\$0.00	fee	CHECK	······································				
1	14.11.313		2 11 2	12601		46. I		
Please st	ate Applica	nt's interes	st in this site:	OWNE	R			
			ease provide n			ər:		
			Will an	ALL CIT	4. 1 Deg			
			1997 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 - 1984 -	123		Diata Ce		
			54.					
in you a	95 CRIC CE CE 23	alle	ent proceeding	iga conne		Siler		
ir so pieas	e supply det	ano.						
ir so pieas	ə supply det							
	200.000							
Where the	200.000	s planning	application/s	on this site	»;      M	0	2020 Registered Archi	isoct
Where the If so please Signed	ere previous	s planning	application/s	on this site Date	»? [] N 02/01	0	2020 Registered Archi RIA	isect I
Where the If so please Signed	ere previous	s planning	application/s		»? []N	120	2020 Registered Archi RIA Nicola Da Por	
Where the If so please Signed A NOTES	ere previous e supply deta W H shall be acc	s planning ails: Loy Q companied e of €80.00	application/s	Date_ site location	OZ 01	20		
Where the <i>f so please</i> Signed <u>NOTES</u> Application plans/repor Applicatio Section, B	shall be acc red and a fe ts etc. you n n shall be f	s planning ails: companied e of €80.00 nay wish to forwarded to for 0, Civic o	by 2 copies of Please subm	Date site location it 2 copies t of the app y Council, I Quay, Du	map with s of any additi lication. Planning R ublin 8.	2. iite clearly		
Where the If so please Signed A NOTES Application outlined in in plans/report Application Section, B Contact De	shall be acc red and a fe ts etc. you n n shall be f lock 4, Floc etails: F	s planning ails: companied e of €80.00 nay wish to forwarded to pr 0, Civic ( Phone: 01 2	by 2 copies of Please subminclude as parto: Dublin Cit Offices, Wood	Date site location it 2 copies t of the app y Council, I Quay, Du	map with s of any additi lication. Planning R ublin 8.	2. iite clearly		
Where the If so please Signed A NOTES Application outlined in in plans/report Application Section, B Contact De AN BOE AN AN A	shall be acc ed and a fer ts etc. you n n shall be f lock 4, Floc etails: F	s planning ails: Companied e of €80.00 nay wish to forwarded to phone: 01 2 NALA	by 2 copies of Please subminclude as parto: Dublin Cit Offices, Wood	Date site location it 2 copies t of the app y Council, I Quay, Du	map with s of any additi lication. Planning R ublin 8.	2. iite clearly		

AJI

1.00

# Comhairle Cathrach Bhaile Átha Cliath **Dublin City Council**

An Roinn Pleanála & Forbairt Maoine, Bloc 4, Urlár 3, Oifigi na Cathrach, An Ché Adhmaid, Baile Átha Cliath 8.

Planning & Property Development Department, Block 4, Floor 3, Dublin City Council, Civic Offices, Wood Quay, Dublin 8.

T: (01) 222 2288

21-Jan-2020

#### E. planning@dublincity.ie

Nicola Da Ponte 18, Oakley Square Dublin 6

ola Da Ponte Oakley Square blin 6	AN BORD PLEANALA
Application Number Application Type Registration Date Decision Date Decision Order	Section 5
No. Location Proposal Applicant	18, Oakley Square, Dublin 6 EXPP: single storey flat roof extension to the rear of the house totalling 26.5 sqm. Mauro Fiorio PLA & Diorgia De Maio

#### If you have any queries regarding this Decision, please contact the number shown above

#### Note:

Any person issued with a declaration on development and exempted development, may, on payment of the prescribed fee, refer a declaration for review by A Bord Pleanála within four weeks of the date of the issuing of the declaration.

### NOTIFICATION OF DECLARATION ON DEVELOPMENT AND EXEMPTED DEVELOPMENT

In pursuance of its functions under the Planning & Development Acts 2000 (as amended), Dublin City Council has by order dated 21-Jan-2020 decided to issue a Declaration that the above proposed development is **EXEMPT** from the requirement to obtain planning permission under Section 32 of the Planning & Development Acts 2000 (as amended)?

#### **Reasons & Considerations:**

The extension as described is development, and is exempted development, within the meaning of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

Ceannoilig, Oirigí na Cathrach, An Ché Adhmeid, Bhalle Átha Cliath 8, Éire



The construction of the proposed extension to the rear of No. 18 Oakley Square, meets the conditions and limitations of Class 1 of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. It is recommended therefore that a declaration be issued to the applicant informing them the development constitutes exempted development.

Signed on behalf of Dublin City Council

for Assistant Chief Executive

#### Note:

Any person issued with a declaration on development and exempted development, may, on payment of the prescribed fee, refer a declaration for review by an Bord Pleanála within four weeks of the date of the issuing of the declaration.

NOTES ATION OF SECONDARY TON OF ST

LEAL PROPERTY (L. ) & DODE (M. )

he extension as described as recommend and in each righted donalogitant. Initial Structurearenant he Province of the Assessory And 2020, as an centry f

AN BORD PLEANAL

LTR DATED -

11 MAR 2020

Ceannoilly, Oifigí na Cathrach, An Ché Adhmaid, Bhaile Átha Cliath 3, Éire Head Oirice, Civic Offices, Wood Quay, Dublin 8, Ireland

## **Dublin City Council**

## **Declaration on Development and Exempted Development**

#### Section 5 of the Planning and Development Act 2000

**EXPP:** 0005/20

Location: 18, Oakley Square, Dublin 6

Date Received: 03-Jan-2020

Decision Due Date: 30-Jan-2020

#### Development

The applicant requests a declaration on whether a single storey flat roof extension to the rear of the house totalling 26.5 sqm is or is not development, and is or is not exempted development.

#### Site Description

No. 18 Oakley Square is a two storey end-of-terrace property located within an infill development in Rathmines.

The site is zoned Z2 in the 2016-2022 Dublin City Development Plan, with the objective 'To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.' There are no specific objectives in the Development Plan or in any Local Area Plan, designating the site as an area of archaeological, geological, historical, scientific or ecological interest. The site is not a protected structure or national monument.

### Planning History

No relevant planning history.

#### Enforcement History

None on file.

### **Relevant Legislation**

AN BORD PLEANÁLA	
ecolemed top ploaw scale offendra is	
aboscophic 1.1. MAR: 2020 and contraining	
LTR DATED FROM	
LDG-	5
ABP	

This application will be assessed under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), and under the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) to check whether it is exempted development. Schedule 2 Part 1 Exempted Development-General - Development within the Curtilage of a House - Class 1 is the part that specifically addresses extensions to houses, and whether they require planning permission or not.

### Appraisal

Submitted Drawings

Site Plan

- 3D views
- Demolition Plans
- Scheme Plans
- External 3D, Finishes and Elevations

#### Assessment against the Regulations

The relevant parts of Schedule 2 Part 1 Exempted Development- General - Development within the Curtilage of a House - Class 1 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) states:

The extension of a house, by the construction or erection of an extension (including a conservatory) to the rear of the house or by the conversion for use as part of the house of any garage, store, shed or other similar structure attached to the rear or to the side of the house.

1. (a) Where the house has not been extended previously, the floor area of any such extension shall not exceed 40 square metres.

The proposed extension would be 26.5 sqm in area.

2. (a) Where the house has been extended previously, the floor area of any such extension, taken together with the floor area of any previous extension or extensions constructed or erected after 1 October 1964, including those for which planning permission has been obtained, shall not exceed 40 square metres.

The property has not been previously extended.

4. (a) Where the rear wall of the house does not include a gable, the height of the walls of any such extension shall not exceed the height of the rear wall of the house

The height of the highest part of the roof of the proposed extension would not exceed the height of the highest part of the roof of the dwelling.

5. The construction or erection of any such extension to the rear of the house shall not reduce the area of private open space, reserved exclusively for the use of the occupants of the house, to the rear of the house to less than 25 square metres.

The rear amenity space would not be reduced to less than 25 sqm by the proposed extension.

(a) Any window proposed at ground level in any such extension shall not be less than 1 metre from the boundary it faces.

All proposed windows would be located more than 1 metres away from any neighbouring boundary it would face.

## Conclusion

An extension to the rear of a house can only be exempt from the requirement to seek planning permission if it meets all the relevant conditions and imitations numbered above, copied from the Planning and Development Regulations 2001. This proposed extension meets all these conditions and limitations.

This means that the proposed extension is exempted development, and does not require planning permission.

## Recommendation

The extension as described is development, and is exempted development, within the meaning of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

The construction of the proposed extension to the rear of No. 18 Oakley Square, meets the conditions and limitations of Class 1 of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. It is recommended therefore that a declaration be issued to the applicant informing them the development constitutes exempted development.

Robert Broreton

Robert Brereton Assistant Planner 17<sup>th</sup> January 2020

17-1-20.

AN BORD PLEANÁLA 11 MAR 2020 LTR DATED \_\_\_\_\_\_FROM \_\_\_\_\_ LDG- \_\_\_\_\_ ABP-

Les constitues de calificient nos services de la la fair de la servicient de la COLULE de la control des constitues de la constituit de la Collega de la constitue popular de la constitue de la control de la departementa de la constitue de la control de la departementa de la constitue des natives de la constitue de la departementa de la constitue de la native de la constitue de

AN BORD PLEANÁLA I I MAR 2020 LTR DATED FROM LDG- **APPENDIX 4:** Submission made by Nicola Da Ponte and AKM Design on behalf of the owners of Oakley Square in relation to the Section 5 Application of the Appellant.

Π

AN	BORD PLEANÁLA
LTR DATED . LDG ABP	1 1 MAR 2020 FROM

anotis in the kinds of a state or advecting. Note that the the line of the term of edge was not needed with the Income the company of the term of the term for the three here the company of the company.

ALA	ORD PLEAN	AN BC
	MAR 2020	TR DATED
		.9

COSUR VVI GAMIARD

Mr Robert Brereton Planning Department Dublin City Council Block 4 Civic Offices Dublin 8 **By Direct Courier** 

Our ref: AMH/DEM1/2

Your ref:

EXPP 0042/20 Date: 4 February 2020

Our clients: Mr Mauro Fiorio Pla and Ms Giorgia De Maio of 18 Oakley Square, Dublin 6 Re: Application EXPP 0042/20 Applicant: Cliona Cleary Location: 18 Oakley Square, Dublin 6

#### Dear Sirs,

We refer to your letter to our clients dated 28 January 2020 (copy attached) in relation to an application for a Declaration under Section 5 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) which was submitted by Cliona Cleary on 23 January 2020.

By way of reply to same our clients would like to submit the following:

- 1. Submission of Nicola Da Ponte, Architect of Shomera Architecure dated 31 January 2020
- 2. Submission of Jong Kim of AKM Design dated 3 February 2020

We would be grateful if you could please confirm safe receipt of same.

	AN BORD PLEANÁLA
Yours faithfully,	1 1 MAR 2020 LTR DATEDEBOM
Cosgrove Gaynard Solicitors	LDGFROM ABP
ORD PLEAMALA	
MORD MORD	ana

Address: 39, Waterloo road, Dublin 4

none: 01 234 0044 | Fax: 01 234 0047 Email: info@cgsolicitors.ie | Web: www.cgsolicitors.ie Susan Cosgrove, LLB, Dip Prop Tax, Dip TEP, Dip Aviation F & L

Aidan Callaghan, LLB, MA (Law), Dip Finance, Dip Management Siobhan Carty Dip IT, Dip LS Legal Executive: Melissa Cowman

# Comhairle Cathrach Bhaile Átha Cliath

Dublin City Council Planning and Property Development Department. Dublin City Council, Block 4, Floor 0, Civic Offices, Wood Quay, Dublin 8

> An Roinn Pleanála & Forbairt Maoine, Comhairle Cathrach Bhaile Átha Cliath Bloc 4, Urlár 0, Oifigí na Cathrach, An Ché Adhmaid, Baile Átha Cliath 8

> > T: (01) 222 2149 / F: (01) 222 2675

Mr. Mauro Fiorio PLA & Ms.Diorgia De Maio, 18. Oakley Square, Dublin 6

#### 28/01/2020

Application No.	EXPP 0042/20
Applicant	Cliona Cleary
Registration Date	January 2020
Location	18. Oakley Square, Dublin 6

# Re: Recent extension and large windows to western facade

#### Dear Sir/Madam,

Please be advised that an application for a Declaration under Section 5 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) was submitted to the planning authority on 23rd January 2020

It is noted that you may have an interest in the subject site to which this application relates. The planning authority would like to provide you as the owner/occupier of the site, the opportunity to submit views or comments on the application.

# Any comments or views you may wish to submit shall be submitted by close of business on 5th February 2020.

A full copy of the application is available for viewing at the Public Counter, Dublin City Council, Planning Department, Monday to Friday, 9.00a.m. – 4.30p.m.

Should you require any clarity on this matter please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number.

Yours sincerely AN BORD PLEANALA Mary A M Bourke 11 MAR 2020 For Executive Manager LTR DATED and the second se



# Re: EXPP 0042/20 and earlier EXPP 0005/20 Recent extension to 18 Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6, D06 PX73

I Nicola Da Ponte am an Architect having qualified in as such in the year of 1999 at the Istituto Universitario di Venezia – Italy, being registered as Member of the Albo degli Architetti, Pianificatori, Paesaggisti e Conservatori della Provincia di Venezia with no. 2859 in year 2000 and currently registered Member of the Royal Institute of Architects in Ireland with no. 17112.

I am a member of staff at Shomera, retained by Giorgia DeMaio & Mauro Fiorio Pla of 18 Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6, D06 PX73 to provide architectural design & build services to the address above.

#### Situation

The Premises is part of a multi-unit development erected in accordance with Planning Permission ref. 1369/86 and subsequent Conditions imposed by An Board Pleanala decision ref. 29/5/72471. The current development comprises of a single storey 26,50 sqm flat roof single-storey extension to the rear of the Premises, on its northern elevation. The extension is of a timber frame construction with rendered external finish similar to existing house and is fully complaint with current Building Regulations.

I attach copy of EXPP 0005/20 Section 5 Application relating to 18 Oakley Square, Ranelagh, Dublin 6 submitted by me on Jan. 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2020.

#### Opinion

It is my opinion that the proposed extension at 18 Oakley Square, is exempted from planning permission under Schedule 2 Part 1 Class 1 of the Planning & Development Regulations 2001 (S.I. No. 600 of 2001). This opinion was confirmed by Dublin City Council on Jan. 21<sup>st</sup>, 2020.

This is in keeping with precedent as other houses in the development have added glazed extensions within the house owners' Statutory entitlement under exempted development (at least three of the properties).

ORD

LTR DATED

LDG-

ABP.

Head Office Dunshaughlin Business Park Dunshaughlin, Co. Meath

01 825 8288 info@shomera.ie 01 825 8289 www.shomera.ie AN BORD PLEANÁLA HousX Limited Company Registration Number: 518360 VAT Registration Number: 33444961H

1 1 MAR 2020

- FROM

An objection raised by neighbours suggests that the extension breaches condition 14. of Conditions set by An Board Pleanala decision ref. 29/5/72471 in the original planning consent for the development. As per the condition, no window(s) have been provided in the indicated blank facades of the house.

In fact it is my opinion that the condition has no bearing on the exempted entitlement being exercised by our client. I hold this opinion, in particular, because there are no restrictions on exempted development provisions in original conditions of planning for the development. We have come across developments where a condition of planning is included that restricts the normal provision of exempted development from taking placing without a formal planning application and subsequent consent being issued by the local authority. This condition did not form part of the planning consent for this development.

2020 **Registered** Architect Nicola Da Ponta Member No. 17112 31 January, 2020

Signed:

Nicola Da Ponte, MA Arch, PGCert DAER, MRIAI



Robert Brereton Planning Department Dublin City Council, Block 4, Civic Offices, Dublin 8.

03/02/2020

Re:EXPP 0042/20Address:18 Oakley Square, Dublin 6

Dear Robert,

I refer to above Section 5 application by Cliona Cleary – reference 0042/20 lodged 23/01/2020.

I wish to make this submission on behalf of Mauro Fiorio Pla & Giorgia De Maio, who are owners of 18 Oakley Square, Dublin 6. The following question has been asked by the applicant:

"Whether the recent extension which includes large windows at the western elevation to the western facade of 18 Oakley Square constitutes development having regard to planning condition 14 attached to a previous planning application Ref ABP 290572471".

### 1.0 Subject Extension

I have reviewed the single storey extension built to the rear of 18 Oakley Square, Dublin 6.

I consider the single storey extension to be 'exempt development'. I consider the rear extension meets all of the conditions and limitations of Class1 of Schedule 1, Part 1 of the Planning and Development Regulations.

The single storey extension was only recently constructed (started in late 2019) and remains unfinished externally. Please refer to enclosed photos.

The applicant specifically makes reference to ' large windows' in the western façade of 18 Oakley Square in the application. The said 'windows' do not exceed or breach any the conditions and limitations of Class1 of Schedule 1, Part 1 of the Planning and Development Regulations.

#### 2.0 Decision ABP 290572471

The applicant makes reference to condition no. 14 of An Bord Pleanala Decision 2905 10 10 LEANALA (reference 1369/86). This decision relates to the original construction of the Oakley Square LEANALA housing scheme. I ask the Planning Authority to refer to wording of the condition.

Condition no. 14 states:

No windows shall be provided, now or in the future in the indicated planks Alendes of the new 020 residential blocks, save where such are shown on the lodged plans.

Architectural Design | Town Planning | Civil & Structural Engineering | Development Consultants | Building Surveying

 ANM Consultants Ltd. Trading as AKM DesignRegistered in Ireland. Company No.: 1547402.
Registered Office: Unit 4, Orchard Business Centre, 2009 Orchard Avenue, Citywest Business Cempus, D24 Directors: P. Andrews, J. Kim, B. McCormack. AKM Consultants Ltd. VAT No. 3279518FH



AKM Design Unit 4 Orchard Business Centre 2009 Orchard Avenue Citywest Buisness Campus Dublin 24

P: +353 1 479 6234 E: info@akmdesign.ie W: www.akmdesign.ie This planning condition is clear, concise and directional. It is easily understood, unambiguous and it clearly only refers to the original buildings as set out in the submitted plans under the original planning application and subsequent appeal An Bord Pleanala Decision 290572471 (reference 1369/86).

The wording states "*in the indicated blanks facades of the new residential blocks*" i.e. this is clearly referring <u>only</u> to the development as applied for and permitted by the An Bord Pleanala Decision 290572471.

Planning decision 290572471 does not contain any planning condition that 'de-exempts' future development that is considered 'exempt development'.

#### 3.0 Conclusion

The subject site is not a protected structure and there are no planning restrictions or environmental sensitivities regarding this domestic development.

I have reviewed the site and I consider the single storey rear extension is 'exempt development'.

I trust this clearly letter sets out my position in relation to the matter.

Can you please send an official reply to the submission to our citywest office.

Yours sincerely,

Jong Kim MIPI





View showing the exterior of the single storey extension.

 $\cap$ 

1

Î

Î

 $\left[ \right]$ 

Inforcement Histor

	AN BORD PLEANÁLA
(A) B (A)	pdated in Post Book:
RAM I I	1 1 MAR 2020 LTR DATED FROM LDG ABP
11	

EXPP APPLICATION
EXPP APPLICATION NO: 0042/20
Location Address: 18, Oakley Square
Ranelagh
JUBIAN C
Area: <u>D</u> <u>Deieder</u> <u>O</u> <u>Reilly</u>
Date Received: 23.01.2020
Date Due: 19.03.2020
Applicant's Legal Interest in Site: <u>Neighbour</u>
Protected Structure: no RPS No.: NIA
Planning History: 0005 20 Exp
Enforcement History: <u>None</u>
Updated in Access:
AN BORD PLEANALA
Updated in Post Book:
Underted LTR DATED LAR 2020
AJAMAELSO OROB MA Updated in Post Book: Updated in APAS:
Updated in APAS:
S:\plregist\PLANNING FORMS - TEMPLATES 2012-16\EXPP coverance.deta
S:\plregist\PLANNING FORMS - TEMPLATES 2012-16\EXEP coverancet.de

Þ