



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-319950-24

Development

Demolition of an existing single-storey extension for the construction of a two-storey extension with internal and external alternations to the dwelling and all associated site works.

Location

Red Cottage, Killiney Hill Road, Killiney, Co. Dublin, A96 WR67.

Planning Authority

Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

D23A/0740.

Applicant(s)

Patrick Redmond & Edel McDermott.

Type of Application

Planning Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant with conditions.

Type of Appeal

Third Party.

Appellant(s)

Ross & Yvonne Barrett.

Observer(s)

Darragh Breathnach.

Date of Site Inspection

11th day of December, 2024.

Inspector

Patricia M. Young.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.4. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.5. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History	7
5.0 Policy Context	9
5.1. Development Plan	9
5.4. Natural Heritage Designations	12
5.5. EIA Screening	12
6.0 The Appeal	13
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	13
6.2. Applicant Response	13
6.3. Planning Authority Response	14
6.4. Observations	14
7.0 Assessment	15
8.0 AA Screening	28
9.0 Recommendation	29
10.0 Reasons and Considerations	29
11.0 Conditions	30
Appendix 1 - Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	
Appendix 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. 'Red Cottage' the appeal site, is a rectangular in shape site with a stated 0.054ha area and it contains a detached red brick Arts and Crafts part single as well as part two-storey in height dwelling with later single storey rear addition. The site is located circa 165m to the south of Victoria Road and circa 162m to the north of St. George's Avenue, in the south Dublin suburban area of Killiney.
- 1.2. The front building line of Red Cottage is setback from the eastern side of Killiney Hill Road. Behind its roadside boundaries its decorative pyramidal shaped roof structure over which contains two decorative chimney stacks, and its southern side recessed timber porch are its main visible features.
- 1.3. The setback area is overgrown with some mature hedge planting behind the surviving lime rendered roadside boundary wall. On its northernmost side it contains a raised concrete plinth which links to its vehicle entrance which is located on the northernmost side of the Killiney Hill Road boundary. This plinth is in a poor repair and is elevated above the main front garden area and the ground levels running alongside the eastern elevation of Red Cottage.
- 1.4. The roadside boundary also contains two period brick pillars that align with and are connected by a pedestrian pathway to the recessed timber porch entrance. This pathway also provides a link to the southern and rear areas of this site with the changes in ground levels linked by steps. Like the main site area, the southern side garden is overgrown and unkempt. The site levels continue to slope towards the easternmost boundary of the site where there is a recessed sunken area in the south eastern corner. This area contains a glass house structure that is in poor repair and accessed via steps.
- 1.5. Bounding the eastern elevation of Red Cottage there is a sunken shed/ancillary building. The boundaries between the adjoining properties to the north and south of the site are generally low with high levels of overlooking between the two. The rear boundary is more dense and provides a visual screen between the rear garden area and the adjoining property to the east which occupies much lower ground levels.
- 1.6. The roadside carriageway contains double yellow lines and contains no pedestrian footpath. The road alignment curves in a southerly direction and views from the

existing pedestrian and vehicle entrance are restricted, particularly in a southerly direction. During inspection there was a steady flow of traffic on both carriages.

- 1.7. The adjoining vernacular in style period single storey cottage which has been extended to the rear is situated on more elevated ground levels. Whereas the property to the south is similar in architectural style and materials.
- 1.8. This appeal site forms part of a periods residential in character streetscape containing a mixture in different architectural styles and period. They form part of the Killiney Architectural Conservation Area. Many of these properties have panoramic views towards the coast to the east and the Wicklow Mountains to the south.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for the following proposed development to the property referred to as 'Red Cottage':

- Demolition of existing single-storey extension to rear.
- Construction of a two-storey extension to rear including roof terrace and privacy screen at upper ground floor level.
- Alterations to existing driveway, including widening of existing vehicular access.
- Replacement of non-original asbestos roof to outhouse structure at lower ground floor.
- New bike store in front garden.
- Repointing of original brickwork and necessary repairs to brick chimneys and existing timber joinery.
- New double-glazed windows to match existing.
- All associated site works.

- 2.2. According to the accompanying planning application form the gross floor area of the existing detached part Arts and Crafts period as well as later additions is 116m², with 86.1m² to be retained, 25.3m² to be demolished and the gross floor area of works proposed is given as 118.4m². It is accompanied by an 'Architects Design Report'.

- 2.3. The applicant submitted their further information response to the Planning Authority on the 30th day of April, 2024. The revised design sets back the proposed extension by 1m from the northern boundary with No. 23 Killiney Hill Road; a reduction in overall height of 465mm and an offset of 350mm from the existing wall and chimney. It includes a shadow study setting out the existing, the original proposal lodged and the proposal as revised impacts on properties in its immediate setting.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Permission was **granted** subject to 9 no. standard conditions. Of note are the requirements of the following conditions:

Condition No. 2: Limits the width of the vehicle entrance to a maximum of 3.5m in order for it to comply with Section 12.4.8.1 of the Development Plan.

Condition No. 4: Sets out details for disposal of surface water in the interests of public health.

Condition No. 5(a): Seeks measures to avoid conflict between construction traffic activities and road users in the interests of orderly development.

The notification to grant permission is accompanied by a number of advisory notes including but not limited to that the development shall accord with the requirements of Irish Water and bringing to the developer's attention states that: *'a person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under this section to carry out any development'*.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The **final Planning Officer's report** (24.05.2024) is the basis of the Planning Authority's decision. They considered that whilst the revised design would give rise to minor degree of overshadowing of the property to the north it would not be detrimental to this property's residential amenity. They also considered that the revised design

would give rise to minor visual overbearance. Overall, they were satisfied that the applicants further information response addressed their concerns with the proposed development as lodged. This report concludes with a recommendation to grant permission, subject to safeguards.

The **initial Planning Officers report** (19.01.2024) concluded with a request for **further information** on the following matters:

Item No. 1: Alternative design sought to deal with the overshadowing and overbearance from the proposed extension to No. 23 Killiney Hill Road.

It also seeks that the proposed extension is setback from the northern boundary and the preparation of a sun shadow analysis to support any re-design.

Item No. 2: Sets out the concerns of the Planning Authority's Conservation Division. In particular it seeks a reduction of the proposed extension height to below the eaves line of the host dwelling.

3.3. Other Planning Authority Technical Reports

3.3.1. Conservation Reports (undated):

The **final report** (07.05.2024) includes the following comments:

- The overall height in the revised design decreases the height by a negligible amount.
- The revised design attempts to respond to the existing eaves level of the original cottage by adding brick detailing at this level on the proposed extension. In addition, they have stepped back the proposed extension from the northern boundary with No. 23 Killiney Hill Road.
- The revised design results in the upper ground floor portion of the revised design now protruding past the building line at the southern elevation which the proposed extension as lodged did not.
- They still have concerns in relation to the visual impact of the proposed extension when viewed from the street and on the character of the ACA.

- In the event of a grant of permission it is recommended that the width of the vehicle entrance is reduced to 3.5m. This would accord with the requirements of Section 12.4.8.4 of the Development Plan.

The **initial report** concludes with a request for a revised design.

3.3.2. **Transportation (17.01.2024):** This report includes the following comments:

- The proposed 4.1m wide vehicle entrance does not accord with Section 12.4.8 and 12.4.8.1 of the Development Plan. This matter could be dealt by way of condition.
- Recommends a number of mainly standard in nature measures relating to surface water drainage and the public road.

3.3.3. **Drainage (17.01.2024):** No objection, subject to standard safeguards.

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.4.1. None.

3.5. **Third Party Observations**

3.5.1. Both the Third-Party Appellants and Observers in this appeal case submitted observations to the Planning Authority. Having read these submissions I consider that the main concerns raised correlate with those raised in their submissions to the Board which I have summarised under Section 6 of this report below.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. **Site – Recent & Relevant**

4.1.1. None.

4.2. **Setting – Recent & Relevant**

4.2.1. **‘Hill Cottage’ No. 23 Killiney Hill Road, adjoining property to the north.**

- **P.A. Ref. No. D13A/0316:** Permission was **granted** for development consisting of the construction of a small single-storey extension at the rear at lower ground floor level; associated internal modifications; changes to the fenestration at the rear; minor additions to the existing balconies at the rear; the relocation of the existing garage at

the side; and all ancillary site and boundary works above and below ground. Decision date: 15.08.2013.

- **ABP Ref. No. PL06D.228179 (P.A. Ref. No. D07B/0993):** On appeal to the Board planning permission was **refused** for a development consisting of the replacement of the existing roof with a new roof (ridge level approximately one metre higher than the existing) incorporating provision for two new bedrooms and bathroom at first floor level for the following stated reasons:

- “1. *Having regard to the character and quality of the subject property and the streetscape, the proposed development would represent an unduly intrusive form of development detrimental to the appearance of the original house and character and appearance of the streetscape. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
2. *It is considered that, by reason of the siting of the dormer windows on the south elevation, the proposed development would result in the direct overlooking of the adjoining property causing an unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupants. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area”.*

Decision date: 10.03.2008.

4.2.2. **Whitestacks, Killiney Hill Road, Killiney, Co. Dublin.**

ABP Ref. No. PL06D.310459 (P.A. Ref. No. D21A/0224): On appeal permission was **granted** for development consisting of demolition of existing three storey, four-bedroom house and the construction of a three story, five-bedroom house, a roof terrace and a garage, and all associated site works. Decision date: 05.08.2022.

4.2.3. **No. 2 Hill Cottages, Hill Road, Killiney, County Dublin.**

ABP Ref. No. 243800 (P.A. Ref. No. D14B/0211): On appeal to the Board permission was **granted** for the demolition of rear extension and erection of extension on two levels to rear and external terrace to existing lower garden.

Decision date: 08.04.2015.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, 2022-2028, is the statutory development plan for the area, under which the site and its setting is zoned Objective 'A'. The land use objective for such lands is: *'to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities'*. Residential development is listed within the 'Permitted in Principle' category of this zoning objective.
- 5.1.2. The site lies inside of the Killiney Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). Section 11.4.2.1 Policy Objective HER1 of the Development Plan in relation to such areas states that it is a policy objective to:
- i. *'Protect the character and special interest of an area which has been designated as an Architectural Conservation Area'.*
 - ii. *'Ensure that all development proposals within an ACA be appropriate to the character of the area'.*
 - iii. *'Ensure that any new development alteration of a building within an ACA or immediately adjoining an ACA is appropriate in terms of the proposed design, including scale, height, mass, density, building lines and materials'.*
 - iv. *'Seek a high quality, sensitive design for any new development(s) that are complementary and/or sympathetic to their context and scale whilst simultaneously encouraging contemporary design which is in harmony with the area'.*
 - v. *'Ensure street furniture is kept to a minimum, is of good design and any redundant street furniture removed'.*
 - vi. *'Seek the retention of all features that contribute to the character of an ACA'.*

This section of the Development Plan also states in relation to ACA that: *"while the purpose of ACA designation is to protect and enhance the special character of an area, it should not be viewed as a means of preventing new development but rather to help guide and manage change to ensure developments are sympathetic to the special character of the ACA"*.

5.1.3. Section 11.4.3 of the Development Plan sets out that “*some urban and suburban areas within the County contain groupings of nineteenth and twentieth century buildings that are recognised for their distinctive planned layout and collective interest, as determined by the Planning Authority*”. Section 11.4.3.2 Policy Objective HER20 of the Development Plan seeks to:

- Retain, where appropriate, and encourage the rehabilitation and suitable reuse of existing older buildings/structures/features which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and streetscape in preference to their demolition and redevelopment.
- Encourage the retention and/ reinstatement of original fabric of our historic building stock.

5.1.4. Ensure that appropriate materials are used to carry out any repairs to the historic fabric Section 12.3.7 of the Development Plan which deals with additional accommodation in existing built-up areas and Section 12.3.7.1(ii) deals specifically with extensions to the rear of dwellings. In relation to ground floor rear extensions, it indicates that they: “*will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining*” and “*the extension should match or complement the main house*”. In relation to first floor rear extensions, it sets out that these will be considered on their merits on the basis that they have the potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties. It states that these: “*will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities*”. It also provides the following factors for the consideration of rear extensions:

- ‘*Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries*’.
- ‘*Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability*’.
- ‘*Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries*’.
- ‘*External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing*’.

5.1.5. Section 12.2.1 of the Development Plan indicates that: “*the Planning Authority will encourage and promote the repair, retrofitting and reuse of buildings in preference to their demolition and reconstruction where possible*”. Section 3.4.1.2 Policy Objective

CA6 of the Development Plan also states that it is a policy objective: *“to require the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings rather than their demolition and reconstruction where possible recognising the embodied energy in existing buildings and thereby reducing the overall embodied energy in construction”*.

5.1.6. Section 12.4.8.4 of the Development Plan in relation to ACA states that: *“boundary features such as walls, railings and gardens contribute to character and setting of Protected Structures and those areas which have been identified as ACAs”... “poorly designed off-street parking which involves the removal of boundary walls, gate piers, railings and gates can have an effect on the setting and appreciation of the building, groups of buildings and the wider streetscape and will not generally be permitted”*. It sets out the following considerations for off-street parking and entrances:

- Minimise loss of original boundary treatment.
- Retain a significant amount of soft landscaping and use planting to reduce the visual impact of the parked car.
- The vehicular entrance and hard-standing area should not dominate a property's forecourt or result in the loss of traditional finishes.
- Provide surface treatments of a high quality.
- Where favourable site conditions exist minimum intervention, integration and reuse of materials will be the key considerations.
- The provisions set out under Section 12.4.8 shall also apply.

5.1.7. This site forms part of the lands subject to Specific Local Objective No. 130 (SLO 130).

5.2. Regional

5.2.1. **Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) for the Eastern and Midland Regions, 2019 to 2031.**

Section 9.7.1 of RSES on the matter of built heritage assets states that they: *“are a non-renewable resource that contribute to our understanding of our past, and the well-being and quality of life of our current citizens and also represent an opportunity for sustainable economic development”* and that: *“the repair and reuse of historic buildings is an integral part of sustainable development. Design consideration should promote the regeneration of historic buildings to provide contemporary family homes”*.

5.3. **National**

- Project Ireland 2040 - National Planning Framework (NPF), 2018-2040.
- Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2011.
- Sustainable Residential Development & Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, (2024).
- Places for People – the National Policy on Architecture, 2022.
- Climate Action Plan, 2024.

5.4. **Natural Heritage Designations**

5.4.1. None within the zone of influence. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are:

- Rockabill to Dalkey Island Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 003000) is located circa 1.6km to the east of the site.
- Dalkey Islands Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004172) is located circa 1.9km to the north east of the site.

5.5. **EIA Screening**

5.5.1. See Appendix 1 – EIA Pre-Screening Form attached.

5.5.2. Having regard to the modest nature, scale and extent of the development proposed, the site's location outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and consisting of a brownfield site that is located within an established built-up suburban area to the south Dublin city which is served by an existing connections to public infrastructure, the nature of the receiving environment, the existing pattern of development in the vicinity, and the separation distance from the nearest sensitive location, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development.

5.5.3. Conclusion: The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required in this case.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. The grounds raised by the Third-Party Appellant in their appeal submission to the Board are summarised as follows:

Planning Authority Decision

- The Board is sought to overturn the decision to grant permission.

Further Information Response

- The revised design will still give rise to adverse overshadowing and visual overbearance on their property.
- The changes made do not satisfactorily address the Planning Authority's further information request.

Compliance with Local Planning Provisions

- The proposed developments resulting adverse residential amenity impacts on their property would be contrary to the local planning provisions.

Built Heritage

- This development has not been sensitively designed for its architectural conservation area setting and would diminish its visual amenities.
- Removal of hedgerow planting from the roadside boundary would result in the proposed development being more visible.
- The proposed development would adversely dominate the host dwelling.

Other

- This development would result in a diminishment of their property value.

6.2. Applicant Response

- 6.2.1. The Applicants response can be summarised as follows:

Planning Authority Decision

- The Board is requested to uphold the Planning Authority's decision.

- There is no substantive planning concern that would support a refusal of permission.

Residential Amenity Impact

- Regard should be had to the stepped topography of the houses on the eastern side of Killiney Hill Road and the pattern of two storey extensions to the rear of them.
- The resulting overshadowing change arising from the proposed development on the appellants property would be minor and would not be out of context with other similar developments along Killiney Hill Road.

Built and Visual Amenity Impact

- It is not accepted that the proposed development would dominate the existing structure or that it would be an inappropriate addition in its architectural conservation area setting.
- The original cottage needs significant investment to prevent further deterioration.

Local Planning Provisions

- This proposal is compliant with all relevant local planning provisions.

Other Matters

- This proposal would remove an existing structure that has an asbestos roof over.
- The only hedgerow to be removed relates to the works around the entrance.
- The proposed development includes a contemporary extension that would contribute to a more energy efficient dwelling.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- 6.3.1. The Planning Authority's response considers that the grounds of appeal give rise to no new issues which would justify a change of attitude towards the proposed development.

6.4. Observations

- 6.4.1. The Third-Party Observation received by the Board indicates that they share and support the concerns raised by the Appellant in their appeal submission. They note

that while they do not object to the general principle of the provision of an extension to the subject property, however, they do not accept that the revised design has gone far enough to address residential and visual concerns. They contend that the proposed extension could be further revised to achieve a more meaningful reduction in height. The revised design is still detrimental to the neighbouring property to the north and to its architectural conservation area setting. It therefore requests that the Board overturn the decision of the Planning Authority for these reasons.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. Having examined all the documentation on file, including all of the submissions and observations received by the Board in relation to this subject appeal, alongside having carried out an inspection of the site and its setting as well as having had regard to relevant local through to national planning provisions and guidance, I consider that the key issues that arise in this appeal are:

- Principle of the Proposed Development
- Built Heritage, Visual and Residential Impact
- Other Matters Arising

7.1.2. The matter of 'Appropriate Assessment' also requires examination.

7.1.3. For clarity purposes my assessment below is based on the proposed development as revised by the applicant's further information response which was received by the Planning Authority on the 30th day of April, 2024. This is on the basis that I consider that it results in a modestly more subservient in height extension to the rear of this Arts and Crafts period dwelling's envelope that forms part of the Killiney Architectural Conservation Area. It is also on the basis that I consider that the additional 1m setback of the revised rear extension when taken together with the reduction in the overall height of the two-storey portion would result in less residential amenity impact on the adjoining property to the north. Further, I consider that the increased setback of the revised extension by 350mm from the existing rear of this Arts and Crafts property roof structure, in particular its easternmost decorative brick chimney stacks which is one of

its key design features allows the original envelope of this period dwelling to be more legible in the round.

- 7.1.4. Additionally, I note that in relation to other components of the proposed development sought under this application I am satisfied that the alterations proposed to the existing driveway which includes an increased width of the entrance to 4.1m which is in conflict with Sections 12.4.8.1 and 12.4.8.4 of the Development Plan which sets out a maximum width of 3.5m for such works. I concur with the Planning Authority despite the restricted views particularly in a southerly direction would give rise to a safer access onto a heavily trafficked road.
- 7.1.5. Also, I consider that when taken together with the improvements to the setback area proposed as part of this application to accommodate off-street car parking for occupants of this dwelling that they would give rise to modest road safety improvements for vehicles accessing and egressing from this site as well as road users of Killiney Hill Road.
- 7.1.6. Further, at the time of inspection I observed that the roadside boundary that would be modified is in a poor state of repair and the modifications to the roadside boundary proposed as part of the widening of this entrance are not inconsistent with the roadside boundaries that would be retained or with other roadside boundaries along either side of Killiney Hill Road.
- 7.1.7. Moreover, I consider that the reduction in width of the proposed widened existing vehicle entrance from 4.1m to 3.5m would also be consistent with the provisions of Section 11.4.2.1 Policy Objective HER1 of the Development Plan which seeks the retention of all features that contribute to the character of Architectural Conservation Areas. In this regard it would retain more of this property's original surviving roadside boundary treatment.
- 7.1.8. I note that the Planning Authority as part of a transportation division included the reduction of the vehicle entrance under Condition No. 2 of the Planning Authority's notification to grant permission with the reason given as compliance with the requirements of Section 12.4.8 of the Development Plan. Should the Board be minded to grant permission I recommend that it include a similar revision to the proposed development by way of condition.

- 7.1.9. In relation to other ancillary works proposed as part of this application for clarity, I raise no substantive issues with the provision of a new modest in overall size bike store and its positioning in the front garden which I consider is a suitable location where it is standalone from the period dwelling at a location where natural and physical features will result in it being of limited visibility from the public domain of Killiney Hill Road as well as properties in its vicinity. As a safeguard the Board if it is minded to grant permission could include a condition requiring agreement of external materials, finishes and treatments to ensure that these are of an appropriate quality as well as sensitivity to their sensitive to change setting. Moreover, within the immediate streetscape context there are ancillary shed type structures visible from the public domain.
- 7.1.10. Further, in relation to the proposed repointing of the original brickwork, the repairs to the brick chimneys and the repairs to the original exterior timber detailing of this Arts and Crafts I consider that they accord with Section 11.4.2.1 Policy Objective HER13. This policy seeks to protect the character and special interest of Architectural Conservation Areas. These works would positively contribute to safeguarding this period building for future generations through to enhancing its surviving visual integrity and authenticity as appreciated from its Architectural Conservation Area streetscape scene of Killiney Hill Road.
- 7.1.11. Moreover, these works would be consistent with Section 11.4.3.2 Policy Objective HER20 of the Development Plan which specifically relates to buildings that include the Arts and Crafts period. This policy includes but is not limited to encouraging the appropriate development of exemplar nineteenth and twentieth century buildings, ensuring that their character is not compromised through to encourages the retention and reinstatement of features that contribute to their character.
- 7.1.12. In this regard, I consider that the restoration works to the red brick and timber detailed exterior alongside the repairs of the decorative chimney stacks over which together contribute to the special and intrinsic character of the host dwelling accord with local planning provisions and are in a context where the original exterior envelope of this Arts and Crafts building is in my considered opinion in a poor state of condition.
- 7.1.13. I also consider that subject to appropriate safeguards which can be provided by way of appropriately worded conditions which would include that these works are carried

out in manner that accords with best practice and expertise. With this encompassing seeking appropriate outcomes for the provision of double glazing which I note is also sought as part of the proposed development, that this component of the proposed development gives rise to no adverse impact on this period buildings surviving visual appearance or built fabric loss. In this regard I note that the provision of double glazing does not necessitate the use of PV or Alu clad frames which would in my view be a material that is visually inappropriate in a building where period joinery includes in its windows is a key feature.

- 7.1.14. In relation to other matters such as surface water drainage, agreement of materials, management of general demolition and construction phases of the proposed development sought including their associated nuisances I am generally satisfied that they can be appropriately dealt with by way of standard conditions. For clarity, this conclusion excludes the matter of asbestos. Which I note to the Board that the proposed development includes permission for the replacement of non-original roof to outhouse structure at lower ground floor which includes this hazardous carcinogenic material.
- 7.1.15. Whilst I consider the general principle of the removal of such a hazardous to public health materials from the site is a welcomed part of the proposed development works sought for this site under this application. Notwithstanding, I consider that whilst it is not raised as a concern by parties to this appeal or the Planning Authority, it would be appropriate as a precaution in my view to provide comment on this element of the proposed development. I therefore propose to address this matter under the broad heading of 'Other Matters Arising' at the end of my assessment below.
- 7.1.16. I note the concerns raised in the appeal that the Third-Party issues raised in observations submitted to the Planning Authority were not considered when deciding on this planning permission. The Board does not have an ombudsman role, and their remit is the "*de novo*" consideration of this appeal case. That is to say that the Board considers the proposed development having regard to the same planning matters to which a Planning Authority is required to have regard when deciding on a planning application in the first instance. This includes consideration of all submissions, interdepartmental reports through to all relevant local, regional, and national planning provisions as well as guidelines. It also includes any revised details submitted as part

of further information requests through to any accompanying appeal submissions and any relevant planning history relating to the site as well as its setting.

- 7.1.17. I am satisfied that the information on file together with inspection of the site and setting that there is adequate information available for the Board to consider this appeal case.

7.2. Principle of the Proposed Development

- 7.2.1. Red Cottage, the host dwelling, forms part of a larger parcel of suburban land that is zoned Objective 'A' under the Development Plan, the objective for which is to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting existing residential amenities, subject to safeguards. Within this land use zone residential developments are generally deemed to be acceptable in principle, subject to safeguards including consideration against the developments potential impact on the host dwelling which is a surviving Arts and Crafts detached dwelling that positively contributes to its setting as part of the Killiney Architectural Conservation Area through to the site is subject to Specific Local Objective No. 130. Against this context I am of the view that the proposed development should be assessed on its merits.

7.3. Built Heritage, Visual and Residential Amenity Impact

- 7.3.1. The main components of the proposed development sought under this application in my view is the demolition of an existing single storey extension to the rear and the construction of a two-storey extension which includes roof terrace and a privacy screen at the upper ground floor level. The Third-Party Appellant and Observer in this appeal case substantive concerns relate to the resulting extension as revised. I propose to the main components of the proposed development as follows:

7.3.2. Demolition

In order to facilitate the proposed contemporary part single and part two storey rear extension permission to the main envelope of this period dwelling permission is sought for the demolition of an existing single storey extension to the rear and demolition of ancillary structures located to between the eastern elevation and the northern boundary of the site. The accompanying documentation indicated that the demolition would total 25.3m² with the existing host dwelling having a given modest 116.6m² gross floor area.

The main demolition elements relate to non-original built fabric, primarily a later addition which I consider is of no architectural or other merit. It also includes modest demolition of original built fabric and limited new partitions within the surviving interior space of this surviving Arts and Craft as part of its modernisation. With the juxtaposition between the host dwelling and the new proposed extensions building layer seeking to use the existing openings in order to sensitively integrate the original interior spaces of this Arts and Craft property to a contemporary in design new rear extension.

The resulting extension as revised would sit behind the original rear elevation and as such could be considered as a largely reversible building layer. This is in contrast with the original proposal which included a slight overwrap onto the easternmost end of the northern and southern side elevations of the host dwelling. Thus, giving rise to a circumstance where only the principal elevation was unaffected by the proposed new additions.

I consider that the retention of the original Arts and Crafts period alongside minimising the floor area and built fabric to be lost by way of demolition works which is helped by the designs sensitive use of its existing internal spatial layout is consistent with various provisions set out in the Development Plan. In particular, I consider this approach accords with Sections 11.4.2; 11.4.3; 12.2.1 and Policy Objective CA6 of the Development Plan. These local planning provisions in a collective manner support the retention of such period buildings and keeping them in viable use, preferably their original use, as opposed to their demolition. With this including buildings that positively contribute to an Architectural Conservation Area setting. The Development Plan also supports the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings as far as practical thereby reducing the overall embodied energy in construction.

I therefore concur with the Planning Authority including their Conservation Officer that the proposed demolition element of the development sought under this application gives rise to no substantive concerns that would merit a refusal of permission. For clarity purposes, however, I note that this is outside of the matter of asbestos which could be considered a 'new issue' in the context of this appeal which as said previously in this assessment I propose to comment upon below.

7.3.3. Construction of a two-storey extension

In relation to the revised design for the resulting part single and part two storey rear extension I note that it has a gross floor area of 118.4m². If permitted, this would give rise to the host dwelling having a retained and new floor area of 202.5m². Though this is almost doubling the existing floor area it is not exceptional in the context of its setting. I also consider it is not exceptional in the context of the site's a stated site area of 0.054ha despite the architectural, built heritage through to visual sensitivities of its setting.

In terms of the design approach, I do not consider the First Party's choice of a contemporary architectural resolution that is legible of its time and that is distinguishable as such is inappropriate against the definite architectural Arts & Crafts period expression of this property and also in the context of an Architectural Conservation Area, subject to safeguards.

On this point I note that within the Killiney Architectural Conservation Area, while there are other examples of Arts & Crafts period properties, there also a collection of other in architectural styles present. Together they create a unique sense of place and visual interest.

Both local planning provisions through to national planning guidance on developments within Architectural Conservation Areas through to guidance on period properties, are supportive of such a design approach, subject to safeguards.

For example, Section 3.10.1 of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2011, in relation to new development in such Architectural Conservation Areas states: *"where there is an existing mixture of styles, a high standard of contemporary design that respects the character of the area should be encouraged"*. Additionally, Section 11.4.2.1 Policy Objective HER13 (iv) of the Development Plan which also relates to development in Architectural Conservation Areas states that the Planning Authority will seek: *"high quality, sensitive design for any new development(s) that are complementary and/or sympathetic to their context and scale whilst simultaneously encouraging contemporary design which is in harmony with the area"*.

Within the setting of the site I also observed that there is a pattern of rear extensions and ancillary structures particularly in the vicinity of the site includes a wide variety of architectural design solutions of varying quality. They include examples of more

contemporary in design resolution extensions that stand apart from their period host dwellings. There are also more traditional examples of extensions that in the case of the rear extension for which demolition is sought poorly integrates with special character of the host dwelling and is neither a successful of its time architectural example or a well-considered extension that sits sensitively alongside the host dwelling.

With the examples of extensions being of variable designs and variable quality but seeking to integrate additional habitable space into the sloping nature of their sites. In the case of the eastern side of Killiney Hill Road the difference in ground levels is such that it provides a potential for the provision of a two-storey rear building elements where the host dwelling may present as single storey to its streetscape scene. Therefore, within the vicinity of the site there is an established pattern of part single and part two storey rear additions to period dwellings along both sides of Killiney Hill Road. With this pattern also being evident in the examination of planning history of residential plots to the north and south of this appeal site.

In relation to the site and the proposed development I note that the accompanying drawings show that the northern side of the site at its highest point has a ground level of 94.4 AOD in proximity to Killiney Hill Road. They also show that the ground levels fall towards its southern boundary where it is shown that an ancillary building located near its south eastern corner has a ground level of 90.18 AOD with the ground levels falling towards as well as into the adjoining property to the south of the site.

Further, the ground levels are such that there is a similar significant change in ground levels in the adjoining property to the north. With its southernmost boundary having a ground level at its lowest point of 94.4 AOD and towards its eastern side this falls to circa 92.5AOD with the ground levels rising throughout this site towards its northern boundary and its neighbouring property beyond.

This change in ground level is reflected along the entire stretch of Killiney Hill Road from its junction with Victoria Road (R119) to the north and with the ground levels falling steadily towards its junction with Strathmore Road to the south as well as to the Irish Coast to the east. The ground levels also rise on the opposite side of the road with the changing ground levels giving rise to many of its properties having elevated and panoramic views over their surroundings.

On this point I note that the appellant raises the concerns that the proposed development as revised would block views much enjoyed by them from their property towards the Sugar Loaf Mountains.

The proposed extension relates to the rear of the subject property with the appellants property located to the north of it and having a similar orientation and alignment on its rectangular shaped plot on the eastern side of Killiney Hill Road.

It is of relevance to note that the view that would be partially obscured by the proposed extension and as raised as a concern by the Appellant is not a view of public interest. Nor would the extension be positioned where the Development Plan provides for the preservation of views that are deemed to be of public interest and merit. They are views enjoyed by a private individual from their private property. A private individual does not have a right to a view and whilst a particular view from a property is desirable, it is not definitive nor is it a legal entitlement. I am therefore of the opinion that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the appellants property by interfering with views of the surrounding area.

In relation to the juxtaposition of the resulting part single part two storey extension I note that the revised design positions it an additional 1m away from the northern boundary shared with No. 23 Killiney Hill Road and at its nearest point it would be within 1.15m of this boundary.

I also note that the original proposal with its northern elevation at its highest point has a given height of 4.914m which sits below the rear eaves' height of the period property to the north. The two-storey element as appreciated from the Architectural Conservation Area streetscape scene of the eastern side of Killiney Hill Road sits to the immediate rear of the host dwelling. It would project 2m further north than the host dwellings main rear elevation, however, its main external finish consists of a light weight rendered and is broken with large, glazed window opening in its façade facing onto Killiney Hill Road. Additionally, it includes a brick banding element that is positioned at a similar height to the eaves of the main roof structure of the host dwelling and it contains a flat roof over. This light weight in finishes extension would at its nearest point be circa 6m from the southern elevation of the Appellant period vernacular cottage. I considered that there would be localised views of the northernmost element of the proposed extension as viewed from Killiney Hill Road and

from the Appellants property, however, it would not be inconsistent with the pattern of interventions to the rear of properties on the eastern side of Killiney Hill Road.

Additionally, I note that the design includes sinking the proposed rear extension behind the main host dwelling which results in its northernmost two storey element presenting as having a modest 4.914m height in the context of the adjoining property of No. 23 Killiney and a single storey presentation to Killiney Hill Road. The adjoining ground levels of this property are higher than the ground floor level of the proposed structure. The overall height, the lateral separation distance through to the 5.9m depth of the proposed extension in my view limits the level of overshadowing that would arise to the rear of the appellants property to a level that is not exceptional in this suburban context. The shadow study provided in my view demonstrates this to be the case. I also consider that the documentation provided with this appeal submission does not evidentially demonstrate otherwise. Nor does it in my view demonstrate that the amendments suggested by the Observer would give rise to any significant improvement to the overshadowing outcome for the adjoining property to the north, a property that has been more significantly extended to its rear and at closer proximity to the northern boundary with its neighbour to the north.

In my view it would be difficult given the changing ground levels of this site and this context to achieve a two-storey extension that sinks further into the rear topography of the site. I also consider that the overall height of the two-storey structure is not one that could be considered excessive in its setting or exceptional in height in comparison with other two storey additions to the rear of properties on the eastern side of Killiney Hill Road.

In relation to within the site the two-storey structure maximises the change in topography southwards to where its height increases to 6.2m. The use of lightweight materials is carried through to the rear elevation and the flat roof angular shaped built form through to the provision of a red brick banding similarly provides visual connection between the period external building fabric and the southern two storey element projects c1.39m beyond the main southern elevation and finishes at a 5.5m setback from the southern boundary. This element would carry through the finishes already described above for the northern projection and as visible from the public domain of Killiney Hill would read as a single storey extension to this Arts and Crafts dwelling.

To the immediate south of the upper floor level a 12.5m² terrace area that sits over a lower ground floor level and that extends a further 3.8m southwards is proposed. On its southernmost side it includes a painted timber privacy screen at the upper ground floor level towards its southernmost side. The top of this screen when taken together with the lower ground floor level would present on its southern side as having an overall height of circa 4.5m. I consider that this is modestly above the eaves level of the adjoining property to the south and that it sits in a subservient height below this property's maximum roof height.

Also, there are generous lateral separation distances from this property. Planting is also indicated inside the southern boundary of the site and forward of the western elevation setback area alongside the existing roadside planting towards its southern end is indicated as being retained. The ancillary bike shed store would also visually obscure views towards the new rear extension. I also note that the lower level would be positioned with ground levels significantly below Killiney Hill Road.

Additionally, on the western side of the proposed terraced area is a glass balustrade. The southern side elevation of the part single and part two storey extension carries through in a consistent manner the palette of materials, their light hues and use of glazing to add further lightness to the proposed extensions overall built form. This includes the southern upper floor façade being comprised of floor to ceiling glazing with this returning around its eastern elevation addressing the private open space of this property from which it is setback 9.3m from the rear boundary of the site.

I note that this lateral separation distance between opposing windows, with cognisance had to the changing topography of the site setting, it exceeds the requirements of the Sustainable and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024, Specific Planning Policy Requirement 1. This sets out that in such circumstances the lateral separation distance between opposing windows serving habitable rooms to the rear of houses above ground floor level shall exceed 16m.

I further note that there is also a planter to the eastern side of the terrace area which includes two trees to provide additional privacy screening for occupants of this property as well as to limit the potential overlooking of neighbouring properties in its vicinity.

Further the proposed extension is in a context where there is a high level of existing overlooking from the subject property to both adjoining neighbours to the north and south. I consider that the overall design includes minimising the potential for overlooking from the proposed extension by the careful placement of upper-level windows, sinking the extension into the changing topography of the site through to the provision of both natural and physical additional screening measures. Overall, its placement and design would in effect give rise to less overlooking and the perception of being overlooked for the property to the north and it would not give rise to any exceptional additional overlooking to properties to the south.

I am satisfied that the proposed development as revised would not give rise to any material or adverse diminishment to the host dwelling, its Architectural Conservation Area setting or would it give rise to any serious injury to the residential amenities of properties in its vicinity. Where visible from the public domain of Killiney Hill Road it would have modest localised impacts that as said would be respectful and not overbearing.

Having regards to the above I also consider that the proposed development is consistent with the requirements set out under Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan, in particular subsection (ii). This provides for extensions to the rear of dwellings to be considered on their merits and that they will be positively considered where it is demonstrated that they give rise to no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities as well gives rise to positive residential amenities for future occupants of the host dwelling in an energy as well as climate resilient manner.

Conclusion

Having regards to the above, I am satisfied that the proposed development accords with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, subject to standard safeguards.

7.4. Other Matters Arising

- 7.4.1. **Specific Local Objective No. 130 (SLO 130) of the Development Plan:** It is raised as a concern that the proposed development is inconsistent with SLO 130. Having regards to the conclusions of the main assessment above together with the examination of the proposed development against the environmental sensitives of the area I am satisfied that, if permitted, it would not give rise a significant negative impact

on the environmental sensitivities in the area or would it significantly detract from the character of the area either visually. Further the proposed development would not give rise to any exceptional traffic generation given that it relates to an extension to an existing dwelling house which would maintain this function albeit with an increased additional floor area.

- 7.4.2. **Asbestos:** The proposed development includes the replacement of non-original asbestos roof to an outhouse structure at lower ground floor positioned to the east of the existing dwelling. There is no accompanying asbestos sampling survey report or detailed plan as to how it is proposed to deal safely with its removal, disposal through to decontamination.

I am cognisant that Section 7.8.1 of the Development Management Guidelines indicates that regard should be had to the DEHLG Circular Letter WPR 7-06 and Best Practice Guidelines on the Preparation of Waste Management Plans for Construction & Demolition Projects. These documents provide guidance on how proposals with significant construction and demolition waste management issues relevant to planning should be considered in an integrated manner.

It is unfortunate that part of the demolition works would relate to the removal and disposal of asbestos which is Category 1 carcinogen. Nonetheless it is incumbent that the proposed development, if permitted, appropriately deals with this material in a manner that accords with best practice as no level of exposure to asbestos is safe and there is no treatment currently available to aid a person to recover from its life shortening as well as life limiting consequences.

While I am cognisant that there are other legislative codes that deal specifically with asbestos and that compliance with such codes falls outside of the remit of the Board. Notwithstanding, should the Board be minded to grant permission for the proposed development sought under this application I recommend that it include a condition that clarifies the presence of asbestos on site and what measures are to be taken in the interests of public health for its safe removal.

- 7.4.3. **Devaluation of Property:** The main component of the proposed development sought under this application is additional habitable space to an existing dwelling within a well-established mature residential estate, where there is an established pattern in its vicinity of extensions and in a suburban neighbourhood setting where it is reasonable

to expect that developments of this nature would normally be located. The extension, subject to safeguards, would not in my view be a type of development that could be reasonably be considered to be a bad neighbour in its context. Further, there is no expert-based evidence, including from a professional with expertise in the sale of properties that sets how they derived that this proposal would give rise to a devaluation of the appellants property. Accordingly, I am satisfied that this matter is not a material consideration in this appeal case.

- 7.4.4. **Contributions:** I refer to the Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Councils Development Contribution Scheme. The development is not exempt from the requirement to pay a development contribution. I therefore recommended that should the Board be minded to grant permission that a suitably worded condition be attached requiring the payment of a Section 48 development contribution in accordance with the Planning and Development Act, 2000.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the proposed development which includes demolition of mainly non-original building fabric, together with alterations, restoration repairs, additions together with other ancillary works in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning & Development Act, 2000, as amended.
- 8.2. The subject site is not located within or adjacent any Natura 2000 sites designated Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) or Special Protection Areas (SPA). The closest Natura 2000 sites are Rockabill to Dalkey Island Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 003000) which is located circa 1.6km to the east of the site and Dalkey Islands Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004172) which is located circa 1.9km to the north east of the site, as the bird would fly.
- 8.3. The proposed development is located in a mature serviced suburban area to the south of Dublin city. The site is a brownfield containing an existing dwelling host with the proposed development retaining its original built form with the removal of later additions through to the construction of additional habitable floor area in the form of a part single and two storey rear extension as well as including part demolition of the existing roadside boundary to Killiney Hill Road as part of providing for a wider vehicle

entrance to serve an area within its front setback that would accommodate off-street car parking together with other associated ancillary development works.

- 8.4. No significant nature conservation concerns were raised as part of this appeal case or by the Planning Authority in their determination of this planning application.
- 8.5. Having considered the nature, scale, extent, and location of the development I am satisfied it can be eliminated from further assessment as there is no conceivable risk to any Natura 2000 site.
- 8.6. The reason for this conclusion is the nature of the development and its location in a suburban area of metropolitan Dublin that is served by mains drainage, the surface water drainage measures incorporated into the design, the limited additional footprint of buildings that would arise, the lateral separation distance to the nearest Natura 2000 sites, the topography and suburban nature of intervening habitats and landscape as well as the absence of ecological or hydrological pathways to any Natura 2000 site or sites.
- 8.7. I conclude that on the basis of objective information the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any Natura 2000 site(s) either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment Stage 2 under Section 177V of the Planning & Development Act 2000 as amended is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. I recommend that permission be **granted** subject to conditions for the reasons and considerations set out below. I note that Condition No.s 3, 5, 6 and 8 are bespoke conditions that are attached in the interests of the proper planning as well as sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1. Having regard to the policies and objectives of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan, 2022-2028, in particular its provisions relating to development to dwellings located on residentially zoned land, 19th Century buildings and Architectural Conservation Areas, the nature of the proposed development sought under this

application which includes but is not limited to the demolition of non-original rear extension, the repair and restoration of an existing highly intact 19th century period dwelling house, a building which positively contributes to its Killiney Architectural Conservation Area setting, alongside the topography of this site and setting, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, that the proposed development can be positively assimilated by this site and its setting in a manner that would not unduly impact the character and built fabric of the host dwelling as well as its contribution to its Architectural Conservation Area setting. Additionally, it is considered that it would not seriously injure the character and amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and it would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 30th day of April, 2024, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The entire dwelling shall be used as a single dwelling unit and shall not be subdivided in any manner or used as two or more separate habitable units.

Reason: To prevent unauthorised development.

3. Prior to the commencement of development, the Applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority revised drawings which provide for a revised vehicular entrance that shall not exceed 3.5 metres in its width and provides details of the roadside boundary treatment.

Reason: In order to accord with Section 12.4.8 of the County Development Plan, 2022-2028, and in the interests of orderly development.

4. Details of the materials, colours, and textures of all the external finishes shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

5. Prior to the commencement of any development on site the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the Planning Authority, an asbestos survey and plan in relation to the safe management of its removal from site in a manner that accords with best practice. This survey should also identify, if any, any other hazardous materials removal from site as a precaution.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

6. Prior to the commencement of development to the main building which is an Arts and Crafts period dwelling that forms part of the Killiney Architectural Conservation Area the developer shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority a specification and method statement, covering all works to be carried out to it. This statement should demonstrate how the development would be carried out in accordance with good conservation practice.

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

7. The attenuation and disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

8. The access arrangements, any works to the adjoining public carriageway of Killiney Hill Road shall comply and surfacing arrangements for off-street car parking within the setback area shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit final details of these works for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety.

9. That all necessary measures be taken by the contractor to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble, or other debris on adjoining roads during the course of the works.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.

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

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.

11. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0900 to 1400

hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

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

12. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Patricia-Marie Young
Planning Inspector - 13th day of December, 2024.

Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-319950-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of an existing single-storey extension for the construction of a two-storey extension with internal and external alternations to the dwelling and all associated site works.		
Development Address	Red Cottage, Killiney Hill Road, Killiney, Co. Dublin, A96 WR67.		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	✓
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes	✓	Class 14 of Part 2 (demolition of part dwelling house)	Proceed to Q3.
No			No further action required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	✓		Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			

Yes	✓	Development includes demolition to an existing dwelling house/ancillary structure on site.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)
-----	---	--	---

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	✓	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____

Date: 13th day of December, 2024.

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference Number	ABP-319950-24
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of an existing single-storey extension for the construction of a two-storey extension with internal and external alternations to the dwelling and all associated site works.
Development Address	Red Cottage, Killiney Hill Road, Killiney, Co. Dublin, A96 WR67.
<p>The Board carried out a preliminary examination [ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended] of at least the nature, size or location of the proposed development, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</p> <p>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>	
Characteristics of proposed development	<p>The proposed development includes demolition of an existing single storey extension to the rear totalling 25.3m² and the removal of an existing asbestos roof as part of a proposed development that includes alterations and additions to an existing period host dwelling that would give rise to a retained gross floor area of 86.1m² and an additional part single as well as part two storey rear extension providing an additional gross floor area of 118.4m² that will include the provision of a roof terrace. It additionally includes widening of existing access onto Killiney Hill Road, the provision of bicycle storage structure to the south western corner of the site, restoration works to the main arts and crafts period structure that has an existing connection to the public water and waste water supply as well as all ancillary site works.</p> <p>Also given the modest size of the proposed demolition, the extension to the existing house through to the ancillary and associated works sought under this application, I do not consider that the level of waste generated would be significant in the local through to national context.</p> <p>Outside of the removal and disposal of asbestos from the existing structure which would be required to accord with appropriate best practices for the same. It is considered that the proposed development no significant waste, emissions or pollutants would arise during the demolition, construction, or operational phase due to the nature of the proposed development.</p>
Location of development	The proposed development relates to a period dwelling that forms part of a predominant period in architectural character suburban neighbourhood in Killiney to the south of Dublin city

	<p>that is served by a public mains water and foul drainage supply.</p> <p>The proposed development includes surface drainage measures, and the nature of the development is such that it would not result in any significant additional demands on this public infrastructure.</p> <p>It also forms part of a setting where single and two storey extensions are not uncommon to the rear of its period residential building stock which occupy an elevated topography.</p> <p>The proposed development as a whole is not exceptional in the context of its setting.</p> <p>Additionally, the site does not form part of, nor does it adjoin any Natura 2000 sites. It is outside of the zone of influence for the nearest such sites which include Rockabill to Dalkey Island Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 003000) which is located circa 1.6km to the east of the site and Dalkey Islands Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004172) which is located circa 1.9km to the north east of the site.</p>	
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	Having regards to the site's serviced brownfield location, the modest nature of development sought, the standard best practices for the dealing of asbestos decontamination, removal, disposal from site through to the pattern of development that characterises the eastern side of Killiney Hill Road and the site's wider setting, I consider that there is no real likelihood of the proposed development alone or in combination with other plans or projects to result in any significant adverse impacts.	
Conclusion		
Likelihood of Significant Effects		No
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.	

Inspector:

Date: 13th day of December, 2024.

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)