



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321374-24

Development	PROTECTED STRUCTURE: Removal of roof over rear return and construction of 1st floor extension with associated works.
Location	34 Morehampton Road, Dublin 4
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB2107/24
Applicants	Clodagh & Ronan Doherty
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellants	Clodagh & Ronan Doherty
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	3 rd February 2025
Inspector	Rachel Gleave O'Connor

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.3. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.4. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.5. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History	6
5.0 Policy Context	7
5.9. Natural Heritage Designations	8
6.0 The Appeal	9
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	9
6.2. Planning Authority Response	11
6.3. Observations	11
7.0 Assessment	11
8.0 Recommendation	17
9.0 Reasons and Considerations	17
10.0 Conditions	18
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is situated to the north eastern side of Morehampton Road in Donnybrook, Dublin 4. The road is characterised by large front gardens providing an extensive set back to the street. Occupying the site is a Victorian mid-terrace, two bay, three storey, red brick townhouse. The front garden contains a parking area which is typical for the street. The front entrance is accessed via a flight of granite steps with cast iron railings. The property has been subdivided, with a separate access at semi-basement level for a lower ground floor property. The rear garden is shared between the lower ground and upper level units in the property. The rear of the property features a hipped roof return which is entirely rendered. Adjacent and attached to the property at no.36 a more recent 1970s era apartment block.
- 1.2. The property situated on the site is Registered Protected Structure no.5384 and is surrounded by Protected Structures. The site is also located within a Conservation Area.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is described as follows:
- (i) Removal of existing window opening to the rear/northeast elevation at lower first floor level;
 - (ii) Removal of existing roof over rear return;
 - (iii) Extension of lower first floor level to provide 1 no. additional bedroom, atop existing rear return;
 - (iv) New velux rooflight on inside pitch of rear slate roof, to include new plastered and insulated shaft and new opening in ceiling at upper first floor level; and
 - (v) All ancillary works necessary to facilitate the development.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.2. On 7th November 2024 Dublin City Council issued a Notification of Decision to Refuse Permission for the following reason:

The proposed extension and alterations to the Protected Structure would result in an unacceptable loss of original fabric and would cause serious injury to the legibility and special architectural [sic] of the rear return and historic terrace. The proposed works would therefore be contrary to Policy BHA2(b), (d), (e) and (f) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and Section 9.4.22 of the Department Guidelines (DHLGH 2011). The proposal would create a precedent for similar type development and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Report

The following comments are noted in the planner's report:

- The applicants have recently obtained planning permission reg. ref. 3626/23 at this site for a large extension to the rear of the property at lower ground level and to connect the entire property as a single family unit. Construction has not commenced for this development and the planners report submitted appears to states that the proposed development has been designed in such a way as to allow the build out of either extension or both.
- The drawings with this application indicate that the lower ground level will remain independent from the upper levels, losing the previous planning gain of returning the property to a single family home.
- Error noted in the plans, the proposed upper first floor plan should be the existing floor plan and the proposed lower first floor plan is the proposed plan.
- Note the conservation officer's report with respect to the proposal to remove an existing window on the half landing between the ground and first floor

levels, that this would be contrary to policy BHA2(f), with the loss of historic fabric.

- Note the conservation officer's report with respect to the proposed removal of original window opening, that this would result in the loss of historic fabric, removing an original sash window. Existing sash contributes to the character of the rear elevation and stair hall. Proposed alteration contrary to policy BHA2(f).
- Note the conservation officer's report with respect to the removal of the roof to the rear return, that this would result in the loss of the original roof. Under the 3626/23 permission, removal of the north and west walls of the return on the lower ground floor was granted, the proposal would further erode the original plan form of the rear return, contrary to policy BHA2(f).
- Note the conservation officer's report that the proposed extension would further subsume the historic and characterful rear return leading to a further cumulative impact on the original plan form of the building and significant alternation to the special architectural character of the rear of the Protected Structure contrary to policy BHA2(b) (d) and (e).
- Note the conservation officer's report with respect to the proposed roof light, that while not visible from the rear or street, it would be overlarge and not sympathetic to the protected structure. A conservation roof-light only would be acceptable in this location. The proposed alterations would have an impact on the rafters and joists of the main roof and on the lath and plaster ceiling below resulting in a loss of original fabric, contrary to section 9.4.22 of the Department Guidelines.
- Recommend that planning permission be refused as the proposal results in unacceptable loss of original fabric and would cause serious injury to the legibility and special architectural of [sic] the rear return and historic terrace, contrary to policy BHA2(b),(d),(e) and (f) of the Development Plan and section 9.4.22 of the Department Guidelines. The proposal would create a precedent for similar type development.

3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

- Conservation Section: Comments of note set out in summary of planner's report above.
- Drainage Division, Engineering Department: No concerns raised, works to comply with drainage standards. Conditions recommended regarding the same.

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

- Uisce Éireann: Noted in the planner's report that no comments received.

3.5. **Third Party Observations**

- None received.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. Subject site:

4.2. 3626/23 – Permission granted 7th February 2024 for alterations to the lower ground floor / rear return consisting of the removal of the modern steel external staircase and balcony to rear, demolition of sections of lower ground floor return walls, alterations to internal layout, reinstatement of staircase between lower and upper ground floors and construction of new single-storey extension. Alterations to the upper ground floor include the provision of a bathroom, replacement of windows and provision of new window. At first floor, it is proposed to reconfigure the existing ensuite within the rear bedroom.

4.3. DCC Planner notes: Construction has not commenced for this development and the planners report submitted with this application appears to state that the proposed development has been designed in such a way as to allow the applicant the ability to build either extension or both extensions.

4.4. 2785/08 - Permission granted 5th August 2008 for two parking spaces in the front, the re-making to the front railings to include a wider gate, the reduction of the gravelled area in the front, planting between the entrance and the parking, and the parking and the house, and the replacement of the existing concrete footpaths.

- 4.5. 1600/08 - Planning permission refused April 2008 for two parking spaces in the front of no. 34 Morehampton Road, the re-making of the front railings to include a wider gate, the reduction of the gravelled area in the front, planting between the entrance and the parking, and the parking and the house, and the replacement of the existing concrete footpaths.
- 4.6. Neighbouring sites:
- 4.7. 14 Morehampton Road (Reg. Ref. 3055/20) Protected Structure, decision on 19th October 2020 to grant permission for a new floor (12sqm) to the rear of the existing dwelling on top of the existing rear return, at upper first floor level, including the partial demolition of an existing chimney stack on the existing rear return and removal and replacement of the existing roof finishes, with ancillary works.
- 4.8. 16 Morehampton Road (Reg. Ref. 2815/15) Protected Structure, decision dated 7th July 2015 to grant partial demolition works and additions to the rear, as follows: (i) existing single storey shed structure and external staircase to the rear of the existing terraced dwelling. (ii) existing pitched roof to two storey return. (iii) sections of external wall to rear of existing terraced dwelling. Construction of (i) Single storey extension with new courtyard, external terrace, inaccessible green roof and roof lights to rear of existing dwelling. (ii) additional storey and new mono pitched roof to second floor of existing return. Refurbishment and renovation of existing terraced dwelling inclusive of all associated landscaping and site works.
- 4.9. 24 Morehampton Road (Reg. Ref. 4151/05) Protected Structure, decision dated 5th May 2006 to grant permission for rear extension.
- 4.10. 22 Morehampton Road (Reg. Ref. 4206/05) Protected Structure, decision dated 29th September 2005 to grant partial demolition works and additions to the rear, subject to appeal PL 29S.214674, granted 5th April 2006.

5.0 Policy Context

- 5.1. Local Planning Policy is set out in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. The site is zoned Z2 'Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas)' "to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas."

- 5.2. Chapter 11 of the Development Plan concerns Built Heritage and Archaeology. A summary of relevant policies is set out below.
- 5.3. Policy BHA2 requires works to Protected Structures or impacting their setting, to be carried out sensitively to the special character of the structure and to conserve and enhance their curtilage and setting. Relevant extracts with respect to this appeal include:
- (b) Protect structures included on the RPS from any work that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.
 - (d) Ensure that any development, modification, alteration, or extension affecting a protected structure and/or its setting is sensitively sited and designed, and is appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, layout and materials.
 - (e) Ensure that new and adapted uses are compatible with the architectural character and special interest(s) of the protected structure.
 - (f) Protect and retain important elements of built heritage including historic gardens, stone walls, entrance gates and piers and any other associated curtilage features.
- 5.4. Policy BHA7 requires development proposals to contribute positively to Architectural Conservation Areas and the protection of the special interest and character of Architectural Conservation Areas.
- 5.5. Policy BHA9 requires the protection of the special interest and character of conservation areas.
- 5.6. Policy BHA11 concerns the rehabilitation and reuse of existing older buildings, with suitable adaption encouraged in preference to demolition and redevelopment.
- 5.7. Other Relevant Guidelines:
- 5.8. Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities.
- 5.9. **Natural Heritage Designations**
- 5.10. The subject site is located approximately 2km to the west of the European sites at South Dublin Bay SAC and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. There is no connection to any European (Natura 2000) sites and no pathways.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The main points of the grounds of appeal are as follows:

- The proposed extension, due to its limited size, will not result in any substantive loss of historic fabric and, by association, no serious injury to the legibility and special architectural character of the rear return and historic terrace;
- In addition to the precedent identified within the subject terrace, a significant quantum of planning precedent has been identified in respect of previously approved planning applications for similar or more extensive extensions to protected structures.
- The development proposed is designed to allow the applicant the ability to build either the extension already permitted, or that currently proposed, or both of these extensions together.
- Note that the conservation officer comments do not focus on the design of the proposed extension itself, and focuses more on loss of historic fabric.
- Do not consider that the proposed rooflight would have any bearing on conservation impact given its position and that it is invisible when viewed from adjoining properties or the public realm.
- With respect to policy BHA2(b), note that the proposed works will only be visible at certain private locations, principally from rear gardens, and imperceptible from the public realm.
- With regard to BHA2(d) the proposal is a 10sqm addition to a 230sqm structure, considered to be sensitively sited and designed.
- With regard to BHA2(e) the proposal does not present any concern to the form and structural integrity of the protected structure, which historically, the planning authority have allowed to be irreparably compromised by the redevelopment of no.36 Morehampton Road.

- With regard to BHA2(f) consider the proposal to have no undue impact on the historic fabric and special interest of the structure's interior. While the proposal results in removal of original window, roof structure and slates, it will not change its plan form, the internal hierarchy of spaces, structure and architectural detail, fixtures and fittings, and materials.
- Precedent at the following addresses within the terrace, with permission most recently granted in 2020 for the construction of an extension atop an existing rear return: 14, 16, 22, 24 Morehampton Road.
- Precedent cases identified at 68 Ranelagh Road (Reg. Ref. 3078/17); 69 Palmerston Road (Reg. Ref. 3470/18); 52 Leeson Park (Reg. Ref. 2515/20); 41 Dartmouth Square (Reg. Ref. 2798/20); 60 Kenilworth Square (Reg. Ref. 3854/17).
- 14 Morehampton Road (Reg. Ref. 3055/20) decision on 19th October 2020 to grant permission for a new floor (12sqm) to the rear of the existing dwelling on top of the existing rear return, at upper first floor level, including the partial demolition of an existing chimney stack on the existing rear return and removal and replacement of the existing roof finishes, with ancillary works.
- 16 Morehampton Road (Reg. Ref. 2815/15) decision dated 7th July 2015 to grant partial demolition works and additions to the rear.
- 22 Morehampton Road (Reg. Ref. 4206/05) decision dated 29th September 2005 to grant partial demolition works and additions to the rear, subject to appeal PL 29S.214674, granted 5th April 2006.
- 24 Morehampton Road (Reg. Ref. 4151/05) decision dated 5th May 2006 to grant permission for rear extension.
- It is concluded that the design as originally submitted should be reasonably open for consideration. In response to the planning authority interpretation of policy and government guidance, an alternative design approach is presented to acknowledge the issues raised within the conservation officer report, while retaining the enhance accommodation the applicant seeks. (Appendix C drawings dated 29/11/2024). The alternative design has a reduction in

glazing, the existing sash window would be reused, the roof would be hipped, and heritage style cast aluminium goods would be incorporated.

(Inspector note: erroneous reference to the proposal being situated at Belgrave Road, as well as the wrong RPS no., which are not consequential matters, and have not impacted the assessment set out in this report).

- Enclosed: Appendix B Conservation – Planning and Design Assessment. This is an Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment prepared for the appeal by a Grade 1 Conservation Architect with Sheehan & Barry Architects. This concludes that the submitted design is modest in that the essential hierarchy of the forms are retained although the height to the return is extended. The essential plan form remains intact, the materiality and design reflects that for the extension already approved ref.3226/23, providing a coherent approach. In relation to the alternative design, this takes into account the concern of the conservation officer, and offers a more contextual approach which would retain more original fabric and provide for the improved accommodation with less significant visual change and an approach utilising more traditional forms and materiality while signalling the point of addition in a restrained manner.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- No response.

6.3. Observations

- None received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. I propose to assess the appeal under the following headings:

- Compatibility with Policy BHA2 of the Development Plan and the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities;
- Precedent Cases; and
- The Alternative Design.

7.2. Compatibility with Policy BHA2 of the Development Plan and the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities

- 7.2.1. The Planning Authority assessment and reason for refusal refers to policy BHA2 of the Development Plan, and relevant extracts of this policy are copied below:

“BHA2 - Development of Protected Structures: That development will conserve and enhance protected structures and their curtilage and will:

(b) Protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.

(d) Ensure that any development, modification, alteration, or extension affecting a protected structure and/or its setting is sensitively sited and designed, and is appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, layout and materials.

(e) Ensure that new and adapted uses are compatible with the architectural character and special interest(s) of the protected structure.

(f) Protect and retain important elements of built heritage including historic gardens, stone walls, entrance gates and piers and any other associated curtilage features.”

- 7.2.2. The grounds of appeal address the relevant parts of policy BHA2 extracted above. I have set out my assessment against this policy below. My assessment has been informed by the Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment submitted with the application and the Conservation – Planning and Design Assessment submitted with the appeal. I have also considered in detail the Local Planning Authority Conservation Officer’s report on the application.

- 7.2.3. In relation to part (b), to determine whether the proposal is compatible in this regard, it is first necessary to consider what forms the special character and appearance of the Protected Structure. I note that there is no listing for the property on the NIAH. I concur with the appellant that the Protected Structure is already compromised by the attached 1970s apartment block at no.36 Morehampton Road. To the rear, this adjacent more recent building is imposing, and negatively effects the setting of the Protected Structure (Figure 6.0 on page 8 of the appeal report illustrates this). The value of the Protected Structure at the appeal site in my view, lies in its contribution to the streetscape where it retains much of its original fabric visible to the public

realm, as well as in its intact interior elements, which are identified comprehensively within the submitted Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment for the application. Related to this, I note the lack of original internal historic fabric to the rear as identified in the submitted reports for the application.

- 7.2.4. Therefore, in my view, the special character of the Protected Structure is primarily in its contribution to the street and from its intact historic fabric, which would not be adversely affected by the proposed development. The appearance of the Protected Structure would be altered by the proposed development to the rear, however this would not be visible from public areas and as I note in my section below concerning precedent cases, the rear of the terrace as a group of Protected Structures, already exhibits numerous alterations and additions. I am satisfied that the proposal would be acceptable with reference to policy BHA2(b) as a result.
- 7.2.5. In relation to part (d) of policy BHA2(d), the proposed development is relatively minor in scale, mass and form in comparison to the existing building on the site. The proposed extension while higher than the existing rear return, sits substantially below the eaves to the main part of the existing building and would clearly appear as an addition, without overwhelming the original building structure. The proposed first floor extension is relatively compact at 4.571m deep and 2.964m wide (approx.) in size (matching the current depth and width to the rear return). It would sit above the existing rear return at the property to a height of 8.5m (approx.), compared to the existing height of the rear return of 6.2m (approx.), equating to an increase of height of approximately 2m. While the height to the main property is over 10m to the eaves and over 12m to the ridge, with a width of over 5m. As such, I am satisfied that the proposal would be acceptable with reference to policy BHA2(d).
- 7.2.6. With respect to part (e) of policy BHA2, the proposed extension forms part of the established residential use of the property and facilitates continued accommodation in this regard, to the benefit of the longevity and continued appropriate use of the structure. As such, I am satisfied that the proposal would be acceptable with reference to policy BHA2(e).
- 7.2.7. In relation to part (f) of policy BHA2, the proposed development does not result in the removal of important elements of the historic rear garden. The rear garden to the original property has been shortened, as a result of development to the rear, and

does not retain its original form. The proposed development does not alter the front garden or any features within that area, which strongly contribute to the special character of the Protected Structure. While the proposed extension would result in the removal of historic fabric to the rear of the Protected Structure, particularly the hipped roof and original openings, these elements are not visible from public areas and reflect similar alterations to other structures in the terrace. In that context, these alterations are not harmful in my view. While I note the addition of a large rooflight, this is not visible externally and would not be visually negative internally, appearing as a contemporary addition to the Protected Structure, clearly distinguishable from retained historic fabric elsewhere in the property. As such, I am satisfied that the proposal would be acceptable with reference to policy BHA2(f).

7.2.8. Overall, in my view the proposed alterations to the rear of the Protected Structure, specifically the proposed extension, removal of existing roof and inclusion of new openings, including rooflight, would not negatively impact the special character of the Protected Structure, particularly in consideration of the established context for the terrace.

7.2.9. The Planning Authority assessment and reason for refusal also refers to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities. Section 9.4.22 of these Guidelines concerns roof details, it states:

‘Where it is proposed to install new dormers or rooflights, the extent of potential damage to historic roof structures should be considered. If the building is part of a terrace, the proposed addition may upset the balance of the whole architectural composition. New rooflights and dormers on minor or concealed slopes may be considered acceptable in some cases. Low-profile ‘conservation-type’ rooflights with a central glazing bar should be used in preference to standard modern types. Where large increase in natural lighting is required in the roof space below, it is usually preferable to permit the use of patent glazing in place of the existing roof cladding rather than the use of excessive numbers of rooflights which would disrupt the visual appearance of the roof.’

7.2.10. I am satisfied that with respect to the extract from the guidelines above, that this is focused upon the external visual appearance of the roof, and how that might be disrupted – particularly within a terrace – where new rooflights (or other additions)

are visual. In the current proposal, the proposed rooflight would not be visible from external areas, and as such will not disrupt the visual appearance of the roof. While I note that the guidelines stress the importance of features of the roofscape, this is in the context of features that contribute to the special interest of a protected structure or contribute to the streetscape. The current proposal concerns the removal of roof to a rear return, that is not visible from public areas, and as I outline above, does not contribute to the special character of the Protected Structure.

7.2.11. The Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities also state at section 6.2.5 that in the assessment of applications, that impact upon the character of protected structures be considered when determining an application, and where demolition is proposed, consider whether exceptional circumstances apply, which is also required under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). As outlined above, I have outlined what forms the special character of the Protected Structure at no.34 Morehampton Road on the application site in my view, namely being its frontage appearance to the street and internal intact historic fabric, which will not be impacted by the proposal. Noting the special character of the structure, and the contextual locational characteristics, (including numerous examples of rear alterations and additions to other protected structures in the terrace); I am satisfied that this forms the justification and exceptional circumstances, under which partial demolition works to the Protected Structure on the site can be considered to be acceptable.

7.2.12. I note that the Planning Authority assessment outlines concern with regard to the cumulative effect of the approved extension alongside the proposed extension. My assessment outlined above is cognisant of the overall effect of extensions to the property, in light of both the approved extension and the proposed extension under this appeal. I am satisfied, with reference to the same considerations regarding the special character of the Protected Structure and the locational context set out above, as well as with reference the rest of my assessment set out below, that the proposed extension, in addition to that already approved at the property, would be acceptable.

7.3. Precedent Cases

7.3.1. The grounds of appeal identify a number of precedent cases of relevance to this appeal, of primary relevance are those related to protected structures within the

terrace for the appeal. The grounds of appeal provide an aerial image illustrating the rear additions and alterations to the terrace in Figures 7.0 and 28.0 (pages 9 and 25) which is particularly useful. No's 24, 22, 16 and 14 Morehampton Road have experienced significant alterations and additions to the rear of those properties. I am satisfied that the proposed development would not be detrimental to the Protected Structure on the site or the wider terrace of protected structures, given the existing additions and alterations exhibited to the rear of properties in the terrace.

- 7.3.2. As such, it is my view that in these circumstances, the proposed development would not form an unacceptable precedent as suggested by the Local Planning Authority, given that such precedent is already readily apparent.

7.4. The Alternative Design

- 7.4.1. With respect to the alternative design presented in the submitted appeal, I note that this is offered in acknowledgement of the Local Planning Authority's concerns, but that the appellants preference is to obtain consent for the design in an unamended form.
- 7.4.2. The proposed design as originally submitted, ties in with the design for the consented lower / ground floor extension recently permitted at the site (reg. ref. 3626/23). In the event that both extensions were constructed, it would be beneficial in my view that both extensions exhibited the same design approach. In the event that the proposed extension subject to this appeal was built in isolation to the approved extension, I still consider that the original design intent is preferable to the amended design set out in the grounds of appeal (Appendix C). This is because it will clearly appear as a contemporary addition to the Protected Structure, and without ambiguity with respect to what formed original historic fabric at the property and what formed more contemporary additions. This allows the evolution of the property over time to be appreciated through the visual appearance of the structure and its additions. As such, I am not recommended that the Board approve the development in an amended form, however this remains an option, and could form a condition to any grant of planning consent with reference to Appendix C of the grounds of appeal, should the Board determine otherwise.
- 7.4.3. I note that the Local Planning Authority report does not raise any specific concern with respect to the proposed design, with the reason for refusal relating to loss of

historic fabric. I am satisfied that the proposed design, materiality and form is acceptable.

- 7.4.4. In order to ensure that the works are carried out in a manner sensitive to the Protected Structure, conditions can be included to require the application of conservation standards. I have therefore recommended conditions with respect to the same below, which would build upon the detail already included within the conservation reports submitted for the application and appeal.

7.5. Conclusion

- 7.6. With reference to the assessment set out above, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would comply with Policy BHA2 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. Having regard to the above, I recommend that permission be GRANTED for the development, subject to conditions, for the reasons and considerations set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to:

(1) the zoning of the site under Z2 'Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas),

(2) planning policies and objectives under the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028,

(3) the nature and design of the alterations, with consideration of the protected structure status of the property (RPS no. 5384), and

(4) the existing pattern of development in the vicinity, with consideration of the conservation status of the area,

it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously, or disproportionately, injure the

amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would otherwise be sensitive to the protected structure status of the property, wider terrace and conservation status of the area, and therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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, or as otherwise stipulated by conditions hereunder, and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. In default of agreement the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development on the Protected Structure samples of materials shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority, and all works shall be carried out in accordance with this written agreement. In the event of agreement not being reached between the developer and the planning authority, the matter may be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination, and all works shall be carried out in accordance with any determination made resulting from such referral.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the protection of architectural heritage in accordance with the provisions of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities.</p>
3.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development on the Protected Structure the applicant/developer shall submit, for the written agreement of the planning authority, a detailed method statement covering all works proposed to be</p>

	<p>carried out, including: (a) a full specification, including details of materials and methods, to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with current Conservation Guidelines issued by the Department of Arts, Heritage & the Gaeltacht, (b) methodology for the recording and/or retention of concealed features or fabric exposed during the works, (c) details of features to be removed, (d) details of protective measures for the structure during the construction works, (e) materials/features of architectural interest to be salvaged. Details to be accompanied by drawings of an appropriate scale of not less than [1:50].</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the protection of architectural heritage in accordance with the provisions of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities.</p>
4.	<p>Prior to the commencement of works, the developer shall make a record of the existing protected structure, to include: (a) A full set of survey drawings to a scale of not less than 1:50 to include elevations, plans and sections of the structure; (b) the recording of the details and current condition of the structure; and, (c) a detailed, labelled photographic survey of all internal rooms, including all important features and fittings, the exterior and the curtilage of the building. A copy of this record shall be submitted to the planning authority prior to commencement of development and to the Irish Architectural Archive.</p> <p>Reason: In order to establish a record of this protected structure and in the interest of the protection of architectural heritage.</p>
5.	<p>Drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the relevant Section of the Council 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>

6.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 07:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08:00 to 14:00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.</p>
7.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

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.

Rachel Gleave O'Connor
Senior Planning Inspector

4th February 2025

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary	PROTECTED STRUCTURE: Removal of roof over rear return and construction of 1st floor extension with associated works.		
Development Address	34 Morehampton Road, Dublin 4		
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		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			
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The proposal is for an extension to an existing structure which does not form a class.	No further action required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			
No			

4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes			

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____