



South Dublin County Council  
Planning Department  
County Hall  
Town Centre  
Tallaght  
Dublin 24.

04 October 2021

Dear Sir or Madam

**Re: Further Information for Planning Application SD21B/0346**

Please find attached Further Information submission in relation to planning application, ref SD21B/0346, for proposed development at 8 Sarsfield Terrace, Lucan, Co.Dublin, a Protected Structure.

The development will consist of a new rooflight to the rear slope of the existing roof, demolition of the existing shed, a new two storey extension with flat roof and parapet to the rear of the existing house. internal alterations to the existing house. a new garden shed and ancillary site works.

We include the following:

- Architect's Drawing Issue Sheet
- 6 copies of revised drawings as per Drawing Issue Sheet
- 6 copies of Shadow Study Report

**Further Information Item 1:**

*The Planning Authority has concerns regarding the impact of the two storey rear extension on the amenity of the adjoining properties. The property is situated mid terrace in a plot with an irregular shape. It is also visually prominent, due to the rear access. No details of the shed have been provided and it is unclear whether the living room space provided would function effectively.*

*In order to address this concern, the applicant is requested to provide the following details and amendments:*

- *Indication of the impacts on the adjoining properties in terms of daylight and overshadowing and, if necessary, revised drawings to address these impacts, in accordance with the SDCC House Extension Design Guide;*
- *Details of the shed;*
- *Details of the remaining amenity space;*
- *Details of living space downstairs (including any combined spaces).*

**In response to Item 1:**

- We have prepared and submitted 6 copies of a Shadow Study we have produced, clearly showing the limited impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties.
- We have submitted revised proposed drawings to show the living room remaining in the front room of the house and the Kitchen extended to the rear to provide addition space. We are confident that this additional space is required and is the best solution which will function effectively for our client.

### **Private Open Space**

We note that the planning report raised concerns regarding residential amenity in relation to the reduction of the private open space to the rear being reduced. The report states:

"In terms of amenity, following the extension, circa 22m of garden space would remain, which would be acceptable, however, it is also proposed to add a further shed and reduce the area. This is not considered to be acceptable. The applicant is requested to increase the provision of amenity space by either removing the proposed shed or reducing the footprint of the extension."

In responding to this point, we have decided to omit the proposed new shed from the rear garden. This will result in keeping the remaining private open space amenity to the rear at **22.5sqm**.

### **Residential Amenity**

In relation to residential amenity, we note the concerns of the planner with regard to living space and the current standards for new developments. We wish to make the following clarifications:

- The existing living room has a floor area of **10.8sqm**.
- We can confirm that the existing Kitchen / Dining area has a floor area of **8.9sqm**.
- The combined area of Living / Kitchen / Dining is **19.7sqm**. This is far below the current standards of **30sqm** required for a 2 bedroom house.
- The proposed design calls for a combined Living / Kitchen / Dining area floor area of **32.6sqm** which will exceed the current minimum standards for a 2 bedroom house.
- The current minimum width for a Living / Dining area is 3.6m.
- The minimum width in the existing Kitchen is **2.1m**, which is greatly below the minimum as set in the current guidelines of **3.6m**.
- The minimum width in the existing Living Room is **3.1m**, which is below the minimum as set in the current guidelines of **3.6m**.
- The proposed development will increase the existing minimum dimension in the Kitchen / Dining area from **2.1m** to **3.2m** which is as close as is achievable to the current guidelines for new developments.
- The proposed development calls for the ground floor to be opened up and extended which will greatly improve the overall feeling of space and light in the Living / Kitchen / Dining area. While the minimum dimension is 3.2m we feel this is acceptable given the lack of available space and the overall gain in available living space which will significantly improve the residential amenity of the existing dwelling.

### **Visual Amenity**

In relation to visual amenity we note the planners concerns as raised in the planning report:

*The two storey extension is 5.92m to parapet which is slightly higher than the extension of the adjacent dwelling. This is below the ridge of the existing dwelling. It is not apparent from the information submitted that there would be significant impacts on the property to the south, due to its location and the existing extension. However, given the orientation of the buildings and the length of the extension, there is concern about the property to the north, in terms of loss of light / overshadowing and overbearing.*

We have prepared a detailed Shadow Study to demonstrate the effect of the proposed development on neighboring properties. In particular, the property to the North will experience little by way of loss of light.

We feel we have demonstrated that the proposal is acceptable in its current form.

We note from the above statement from the planning report and wish to acknowledge that our proposed parapet is slightly higher than the extension of the adjacent dwelling. This is simply due to the fact that the neighboring extension does not have a parapet and instead uses a less effective roof edge detail which exposes the edge of the roof covering and employs a bolt on gutter system with fascia and soffit.

Our proposal is designed to be high of a high quality finish, with no exposed gutters and the parapet will protect the roof membrane from damage from high winds.

The planners report also mentions the proposed flat roof in the context of conservation:

*"A flat roof structure would be prominent in this location and the design of the proposal should undergo further consultation with the Architectural Conservation Officer."*

We are confident that the Conservation Officer would agree with our contention that the extension should have a flat roof from a design perspective as it will help to identify the new extension as being a contemporary addition instead of trying to construct a pastiche pitched roof with slates which would blur the lines between old and new.

It should also be noted that, from a construction point of view, a new pitched roof would be almost impossible to achieve given the geometry of the site given that the new roof would be meeting the existing roof at an angle of 147 degrees on the North side and 151 degrees on the South side. The extension is not square, nor does it meet the existing house at a square angle.

A pitched roof would also result in an overall increase in the bulk in appearance of the extension when viewed from neighbouring properties.

#### **Further Information Item 2:**

*The applicant shall liaise with the SDCC Architectural Conservation Officer to agree what works are acceptable, given the property is a Protected Structure, located within an Architectural Conservation Area. It should be noted that the applicant may be required to submit a further Architectural Impact Assessment and Method Statement as a result of this discussion. The applicant is requested to outline, in the additional submission, the steps taken to address the design on back of the consultation with the ACO.*

#### **In response to Item 2:**

- We attempted to make contact with the Architectural Conservation Officer however she was not available.
- We note that the original submission did include a detailed Conservation Report which should contain all the information required by the ACO and the Planning Authority to make a decision in this application. We would request that if there are specific requirements, from the Conservation Officer, that they could be conditioned into a planning decision.
- As previously noted in our Conservation Report, while the building is a protected structure, it has been heavily altered in the past and there is no evidence of any existing plaster or joinery or any items of a historic nature. While we do propose alterations to the existing building, the existing layout will be legible in the final design.

I trust you will find everything to be in order. Feel free to contact me directly if you have any queries or concerns regarding any aspect of this proposed development.

Yours sincerely,



Mark Monaghan MRIAI