

Comhairle Chontae Atha Cliath Theas

PR/0376/22

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

Reg. Reference: SD21A/0321 **Application Date:** 22-Nov-2021
Submission Type: Additional Information **Registration Date:** 25-Feb-2022

Correspondence Name and Address: Aoife Tuomey Architects The Studio, 24, Raymond Street, Dublin 8, D08 N8W7

Proposed Development: Construction of 2 storey, detached house (single family dwelling on a corner/side garden site); new boundary walls to replace existing with 2 new pedestrian entrance gateways; associated site works, landscaping and connections to public services.

Location: 63, Glenbrook Park, Rathfarnham, Dublin 14.

Applicant Name: Sarah McDonald

Application Type: Permission

(CS)

Description of Site and Surroundings

Site Area

Stated as 0.018ha

Site Description

The application site consists of a narrow curved strip of land in the corner side garden of an existing two-storey, semi-detached residential property with hipped roof located to the west of the subject site. The existing property (No. 63 Glenbrook Park) is the last property in the row of semi-detached houses.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the following:

- Construction of 2 storey, 3 bedroom detached dwelling on a corner/side garden site.
- New boundary treatment to replace existing.
- 2 pedestrian gateways. 1 gate to the front and 1 gate to the side.
- Proposed development measures c.110sq.m. as stated.

It is noted that there is no proposal to provide for on curtilage car parking.

Zoning

The subject site is subject to zoning objective 'RES' - *'To protect and/or improve Residential Amenity'*.

Comhairle Chontae Atha Cliath Theas

PR/0376/22

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

Consultations

Roads – **Refusal** recommended.

Irish Water – no objection subject to **conditions**

Surface Water Drainage – no objection subject to **conditions**.

Parks Department – **conditions** recommended in the event of a grant.

Public Lighting – No response received to date.

SEA Sensitivity Screening

No overlap indicated with SEA layers.

Submissions/Observations /Representations

One. submission was received that has raised the following concerns:

- Out of character with other dwellings in the vicinity.
- Overdevelopment of a constrained site.
- Compromise the light and views to the south of the Dublin Mountains for neighbouring dwellings.

The issues raised in the third-party submission has been taken into account in the assessment of the proposal.

Relevant Planning History

None recorded for subject site.

Adjacent sites

SD18B/0041: 54, Glenbrook Park, Rathfarnham, Dublin 14.

Single storey extension to rear with roof lights and all associated site works.

Decision: **GRANT PERMISSION.**

SD05B/0452: 54, Glenbrook Park, Dublin 14.

Demolition of an existing single storey side extension incorporating a garage, boiler and toilet and its replacement with a two storey extension to the side and a single storey extension to the front for domestic use as part of the dwelling with associated changes to the elevations and roofs (including a 'Velux' type roof window to the rear) Decision: **GRANT PERMISSION.**

Relevant Enforcement History

None recorded.

Pre-Planning Consultation

PP098/21

Relevant Policy in South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2016-2022

2 Housing

Section 2.4.0: Residential Consolidation – Infill, Backland, Subdivision & Corner Sites

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

Policy H17 Residential Consolidation

Policy H17 Objective 3:

To favourably consider proposals for the development of corner or wide garden sites within the curtilage of existing houses in established residential areas, subject to appropriate safeguards and standards identified in Chapter 11 Implementation.

7 Infrastructure & Environmental Quality

Policy IE 1 Water & Wastewater

Policy IE 2 Surface Water & Groundwater

Policy IE 3 Flood Risk

Policy IE 7 Environmental Quality

8 Green Infrastructure

Policy G1 Overarching

Policy G5 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems

9. Heritage, Conservation & Landscapes

Policy HCL2 Natura 2000 sites

11 Implementation

Section 11.2.7 Building Height

Section 11.3.1 Residential

Section 11.3.1 (iv) Dwelling Standards

Table 11.20: Minimum Space Standards for Houses

Section 11.3.1 (v) Privacy

Section 11.3.2 Residential Consolidation

Section 11.3.2 (i) Infill Sites

Section 11.3.2 (ii) Corner/Side Garden Sites

Section 11.4.2 Car Parking Standards

Table 11.24 Maximum Parking Rates (Residential Development)

Section 11.4.4 Car Parking Design and Layout

Section 11.6.0 Infrastructure and Environmental Quality

(i) Flood Risk Assessment

(i) Surface Water

(ii) SUDS

(iii) Groundwater

(iv) Rainwater Harvesting

(v) Water Services

Section 11.7.2 Energy Performance in New Buildings

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

Section 11.8.1 EIA

Section 11.8.2 Appropriate Assessment

Relevant Government Guidelines

Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas - Guidelines for Planning Authorities, Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (2008).

Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities-Best Practice Guidelines, Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, (2007).

Assessment

The main issues for assessment are as follows:

- Zoning and Council policy
- Legal Interest
- Residential & Visual Amenity
- Parks & Landscaping
- Access and Parking
- Services and Drainage
- Screening for Appropriate Assessment (AA)
- Screening for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIAR)

Zoning and Council Policy

The site is located in an area which is subject to zoning objective 'RES' 'to protect and/or improve residential amenity.' The development of a dwelling is permitted in principle subject to its accordance with the relevant provisions in the Development Plan with specific reference to Section 11.3.2 (i) which relates to Infill Sites and (ii) Corner/Side Garden Sites.

Legal Interest

The applicant has indicated in their application form that they are not the legal owner. However, the applicant has provided a letter of consent from the owner providing permission to make this planning application. The applicant is the daughter of the site owner. The site owner is also the owner of the adjoining site 63 Glenbrook Park.

Residential & Visual Amenity

Internal floor area

The planning drawings submitted show that the internal floor area for the **proposed detached two storey dwelling** with pitched roof measures 110sq.m. as stated. This would comply with the provisions of the South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2016-2022 which requires a minimum floor area of 92sq.m for a house with three bedrooms (Table 11.20: Minimum Space Standards for Houses).

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

Private open space

The planning drawings submitted show that the quantity of private open space for the existing dwelling (No. 68 Glenbrook Park) will be of a reasonable level post development (c.124sq.m).

The private open space for the **proposed house** with an internal floor area of 110sq.m is stated as 58sq.m and is slightly below the 60sq.m minimum standard for a three bedroom house. This 2sq.m shortfall is considered minor in nature and in this instance would broadly comply with the provisions of the South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2016-2022 Section, 11.3.1 Residential (iv) Dwelling Standards, (Table 11.20: Minimum Space Standards for Houses). However the Planning Authority has significant concerns that the width of the rear garden has not provided for satisfactory amenity space and is out of character with other rear gardens in the vicinity.

It is considered this may be addressed by way of **additional information**. If the applicant has ownership of No.63 Glenbrook Park and the existing dwelling can be included for in the red/blue line boundary the applicant is requested to submit revised appropriate drawings clearly showing for the widening/enlargement of the rear garden for the proposed dwelling.

Considering the limited level of private open space to be provided in the event of a grant of permission a **condition** should be attached removing exempted development rights.

Rooms sizes

Bedroom 3 measures 10.3sq.m and is a double bedroom. This proposed bedroom size **does not comply** with Section 11.3.1 Residential (iv) Dwelling Standards regarding minimum internal floor areas for proposed bedrooms. Regarding Bedroom 3, a double bedroom must measure a minimum of 11.4sq.m. In this instance Bedroom 3 only measures 10.3sq.m and would not comply with the SDCC Development Plan. It is considered this can be addressed by way of a request for **additional information**.

The proposed unobstructed living room widths requirements would comply with Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities 2007.

Overlooking & Separation Distance

At ground floor level the dwelling will be built to the eastern site boundary. The proposed dwelling will be built to the boundary with the existing dwelling. There will be a separation of c.1.2m from the existing dwelling (No.63 Glenbrook Park) with the proposed dwelling. There is a separation distance of 31.8 metres between House No.26 Glenbrook Park and the proposed dwelling. There is a separation of just over 22 metres between the proposed first floor windows on the eastern elevation and House No. 54 Glenbrook Park. Separation distances would comply with *Section 11.3.1 Residential (v) Privacy* of the SDCC Development Plan 2016-2022 whereby a separation distance of 22 metres should generally be provided between directly opposing above ground floor windows to maintain privacy. Therefore, there will be no undue overlooking.

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

Dual Frontage & Setback

The eastern(side) elevation will have a high level window inserted at ground floor level in the bathroom and kitchen area facing onto the public pathway which will provide for a limited element of passive surveillance. There will be 3 windows (home office, bedroom 2, landing) at first floor level on the eastern elevation facing onto the public realm providing for passive surveillance therefore adequate dual frontage will be achieved in this instance.

Storage

Drawings submitted show no dedicated storage will be provided for the proposed dwelling. This would not comply with the minimum storage area requirements as per the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities 2007. A minimum of 4sq.m of dedicated storage space should be provided for a 3 bed, 4 person, 2 storey house. Therefore, the level of storage to be provided **would not comply** with the above policy. It is considered this may be addressed by way of a request for **additional information**.

Building lines & Overbearing impact

The proposed main front building line will be setback by c.1.35m from the main front building line of the existing dwelling (No.63 Glenbrook Park). However at ground floor level the proposal will align with the main front building line of the existing dwelling.

The site level will be lowered such that is approx.. 1m lower than the adjoining site 63 Glenbrook Park. The proposed ground floor main rear building line will project beyond the main rear building line of the existing dwelling by c.3.4m. at its nearest point to the existing dwelling. The proposed first floor rear projection would be some 2.8m beyond the rear building line of the existing dwelling. It is considered that the proposed rear building line would have an **overbearing** impact on the existing dwelling (No.63 Glenbrook Park). It is considered this may be addressed by way of **Additional Information** whereby the applicant is requested to reduce the depth of projection of the first floor element. The applicant could give consideration to pulling forward the first floor front building line in doing this.

Boundary Treatment

The 2.0 metre high front wall boundary treatment proposed would create issues with forward visibility for vehicles egressing the neighbouring property at No.63 Glenbrook Park. It is considered this may be addressed by way of **additional information**. This is addressed further in the Access & Parking section of the report.

Roof Profile

The proposed dwelling will primarily have a pitched roof with a ridge height of c.8.5m and an eaves height of c.5.4m. The proposed ridge height will be set below the ridge height of the existing dwelling. At ground floor level the proposed dwelling will have a flat parapet roof with a parapet height of c.3.5m.

Parks & Landscaping

The Parks Department has issued a report recommending **conditions** to be attached in the event of a grant. An extract taken from the Parks report states the following:

Comhairle Chontae Atha Cliath Theas

PR/0376/22

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

1. Landscape Plan

The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping which includes boundary planting; details of which shall be submitted to the Public Realm Section for approval. CONDITION

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and integrating the development into the landscape

It is considered appropriate to attach the above **conditions** in the event of a grant.

Access and Parking

A report was received from the Roads Section recommending **Refusal**. An extract taken from the Roads report states the following:

Description:

Construction of 2 storey, detached house (single family dwelling on a corner/side garden site); new boundary walls to replace existing with 2 new pedestrian entrance gateways; associated site works, landscaping and connections to public services.

Car Parking: The proposed development does not provide for any on-curtilage car parking. As per SDCC CDP 2016-2022, the maximum parking provision for a 3+ bedroom in zone 1, is 2 spaces. In addition, the proposed development would reduce the on-curtilage parking area of the existing property at no.63.

Bicycle Parking: Bicycle parking is to be provided at the front of the property.

Boundary Wall: The front boundary wall is to increase in height from 850mm to 2000mm.

*Roads recommends **refusal** on the grounds of:*

- 1. Insufficient on-curtilage parking. The Roads Department's concern is that vehicles will be parked on public realm where they would endanger public safety by creating a traffic hazard.*
- 2. The increase in the height of the front boundary wall to 2000mm would create issues with forward visibility for vehicles egressing the neighbouring property at no.63.*

Notwithstanding the report from the Roads Department it is considered that the applicant be requested to address this by way of **additional information** whereby the applicant is requested to submit revised appropriate drawings demonstrating there is sufficient room to provide for a 6 metres long driveway to park a car with a vehicular entrance with a maximum width of 3.5m. The applicant is requested to submit appropriate drawings showing a reduction in proposed front boundary treatment wall from 2.0m to 0.9m and pillars reduced to 1.2m to allow for forward visibility for vehicles egressing the neighbouring property at No.63 Glenbrook Park.

Alternatively, a combined vehicular entrance with the adjoining site No. 63 could be considered, but the red line boundary would need to be extended to include No. 63.

Services and Drainage

Both Irish Water and Surface Water Drainage have recommended no objections subject to **conditions**. An extract taken from the Irish Water report states the following:

Comhairle Chontae Atha Cliath Theas

PR/0376/22

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

1 Water

Prior to the commencement of development the applicant or developer shall enter into water connection agreement(s) with Irish Water.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water facilities.

2 Foul

Prior to the commencement of development the applicant or developer shall enter into waste water connection agreement(s) with Irish Water.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate waste water facilities.

It is considered appropriate to attach the above **conditions** in the event of a grant.

An extract taken from the Surface Water Drainage report states the following:

Surface Water Report: No objection subject to:

1. Include Water Butts in proposed development as part of SuDS (Sustainable urban Drainage).

Flood Risk No Objection

The Developer shall ensure that there is complete separation of the foul and surface water drainage for the proposed development.

All works for this development shall comply with the requirements of the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works.

It is considered appropriate to attach the above **conditions** in the event of a grant.

Screening for Appropriate Assessment (AA)

Having regard to the scale and nature of the development, connection to public services and the distance from Natura sites, it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site, therefore Stage 2 AA is not required.

Screening for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIAR)

Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, and the distance of the site from nearby sensitive receptors, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

Conclusion

There are significant concerns with the proposal in relation to the creation of a traffic hazard, lack of on-site parking, overbearing impact on the existing dwelling, unsatisfactory geometry of rear private open space, insufficient bedroom sizes and insufficient storage provision. It is considered the above may be addressed by way of a request for **additional information**.

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

Recommendation

Request Further Information.

Further Information

- Further Information was requested on 25/01/2022.
- Further Information was received on 25/02/2022.

No submissions/observations on the further information have been made.

The following Further Information was requested.

Item 1: Access & Parking

The applicant is requested to submit:

- (i) revised appropriate drawings demonstrating there is enough room to provide for a 6 metres long driveway for a car to park with a vehicular entrance with a maximum width of 3.5m.
- (ii) appropriate drawings showing a reduction in the proposed front boundary wall from 2.0m to 0.9m and pillars reduced to 1.2m to allow for forward visibility for vehicles egressing the neighbouring property at No.63 Glenbrook Park.

Item 2: Overbearing Impact.

The Planning Authority has serious concerns that the level of projection of the main rear building line at first floor level at c2.8m would have a significant adverse overbearing impact on the immediate neighbour (No. 63 Glenbrook Park). The applicant is requested to significantly reduce the depth of projection of the first floor element. The applicant could give consideration to pulling forward the first floor front building line in an attempt to achieve this. Alternatively, a combined entrance with the adjacent dwelling No. 63 could be considered but the red line boundary must therefore be extended to include the entirety of No. 63.

Item 3: Width of rear garden.

The Planning Authority has significant concerns that the width of the rear garden has not provided for satisfactory amenity space and is out of character with other rear gardens in the vicinity. If the applicant has ownership of No.63 Glenbrook Park and the existing dwelling can be included for in the red/blue line boundary, the applicant is requested to submit revised appropriate drawings clearly showing for the widening/enlargement of the rear garden for the proposed dwelling such that there is a more equal division of the rear garden between the existing and proposed dwelling.

Item 4: Storage

Drawings submitted show no dedicated storage will be provided for the proposed dwelling. This would not comply with the minimum storage area requirements as per the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities 2007. A minimum of 4sq.m of dedicated storage space should be provided for a 3 bed, 4 person, 2 storey house. The applicant is requested to submit revised appropriate drawings to clearly demonstrate the required minimum level of storage.

Comhairle Chontae Atha Cliath Theas

PR/0376/22

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

Item 5: bedroom sizes

Bedroom 3 measures 10.3sq.m. and is a double bedroom. This proposed bedroom size does not comply with Section 11.3.1 Residential (iv) Dwelling Standards regarding minimum internal floor areas for proposed bedrooms. Regarding Bedroom 3, a double bedroom must measure a minimum of 11.4sq.m. In this instance Bedroom 3 only measures 10.3sq.m and would not comply with the SDCC Development Plan. The applicant is requested to submit revised appropriate drawings to clearly demonstrate the minimum internal floor area for a double bedroom is achieved.

Further Consultations

Roads Section – **Refusal Recommended.**

Further Submissions/Observations

None received.

Assessment

Item 1: Access & Parking

The applicant has submitted a cover letter and revised drawings in an attempt to address the request for additional information. An extract taken from the cover letter submitted states the following revised drawings have been submitted:

Proposed Site Layout Plan x/ Roof plan-Response to Item 1(i) P-1001-A.I.

Proposed Front + Side Elevations (N-E) + Section C-C
Response to Item 1(ii) P-1100-A.I.

Drawings submitted put forward two options for consideration for car parking. However, neither of these two options provide for any on curtilage car parking space with a 6 metre long driveway and neither option will provide for a 3.5m wide vehicular entrance. Option 1 and option 2 show on street car parking provision whereby part of the public realm will be removed to provide for this car parking.

The Roads Section has reviewed the additional information submitted and has recommended **refusal**. An extract taken from the Roads report states the following:

Roads Department Assessment:

1 (i). The applicant has not fulfilled the request for additional information by failing to demonstrate that there is “enough room to provide for a 6 metres long driveway for a car to park with a vehicular entrance with a maximum width of 3.5m.” Section 4 of the SDCC House Extension Design Guide sets out a minimum driveway length of 6m.

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

*The applicant has made a case for having no on-curtilage parking and this was considered by the Roads Department. However, with reference to **Section 11.4.2** of the **SDCC County Development Plan 2016-2022**, in order to be considered for car free housing, the site must “have convenient access to high frequency public transport services and / or are located within a town or village centre” This site is not in a town or village centre so access to high frequency public transport was investigated. It was found that;*

- *Section 11.4.2 of the SDCC County Development Plan 2016-2022 states that in order to be considered for lower parking rates in Zone 2 a site must be **within 400m of a high quality bus service.***
- *Section 11.4.2 of the SDCC County Development Plan 2016-2022 states that A high frequency route is where buses operate with a minimum **10 minute frequency at peak times and a 20 minute off-peak frequency.***
- ***250m** from the proposed site is Willbrook Road Stop 2946 which is only serviced by the **No 61 bus** which stops approx. every **1hr.***
- ***550m** from the proposed site is Willbrook Road, Stop 1330 on Grange Road which would be considered a high quality route with numerous bus services running every **10 mins** approx.*
- *The nearest high quality bus service is therefore beyond the threshold of 400m and so the site cannot be considered for car-free housing.*


The applicant has also submitted 2 possible options for locations of off-curtilage parking but they are in areas outside the ownership of the applicant so cannot be considered as they would set an undesirable precedent for further similar parking arrangements in the area.

Roads Related Additional Information Requested by SDCC:

1 (ii). The applicant is requested to submit appropriate drawings showing a reduction in the proposed front boundary wall from 2.0m to 0.9m and pillars reduced to 1.2m to allow for forward visibility for vehicles egressing the neighbouring property at No.63 Glenbrook Park.

Applicant Submitted Response in Additional Information:

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order



Roads Department Assessment:

1 (ii). Roads department is satisfied with the applicant submitted response.

Roads recommends refusal.

The applicant has failed to provide an on-curtilage parking layout so has not fulfilled the request for additional information. The SDCC County Development Plan 2016-2022 does allow for car-free housing in limited circumstances but in this case the site is unsuitable. Roads department concludes that the lack of on-curtilage parking would lead to on street parking which would increase the risk of a traffic accident, thereby endangering public safety by reason of a traffic hazard.

The proposals for off-curtilage parking have been deemed inadequate and cannot be considered as options.

Planning Department Appraisal and Conclusion

Although the Planning Authority considered the applicant has satisfactorily addressed item 1(ii), it is not considered that the applicant has satisfactorily responded to the request for additional information for item 1(i).

Proposals of off-curtilage car parking are not unacceptable in principle, and it is further noted that under Bus Connects there will be a high frequency bus route through Rathfarnham Village, approx. 450m from the subject site. It is considered however that the proposal could benefit from the provision either of a shared vehicular access with No. 63, or on-curtilage parking to the rear. The precise proposals of off-curtilage parking are not considered to be acceptable for the following reasons:

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

(i) Option 1 (on-street parking)

This option is located on the bend of Glenbrook Park and would require interventions on the public street to facilitate parking. The applicant has introduced the possibility of development outside the red line and this creates a problem in terms of procedure and precedent.

In addition to the Roads Report above, the Roads Department has further commented that it does not view Option 1 as being unsafe in principle. It is therefore considered that the option can be considered by the Planning Authority subject to submission of additional details and the applicant obtaining a letter of consent from SDCC's Property Division, as well as modifying the red line boundary to include the proposal. Thus, **clarification of additional information** should be sought.

It is additionally noted that the proposal under Option 1 would reduce the carriageway width at a point in close proximity to public open space. This is considered to comply with modern DMURS standards and would be a beneficial outcome of the intervention.

The proposed intervention under Option 1 would provide infill residential development with off-curtilage parking in this instance where formal arrangements can be incorporated into the public realm without reducing the amenity or rights of others, or traffic safety. The accommodating traffic conditions of the area, including the street width, hierarchy of street network and the extent of on curtilage parking in the existing houses are relevant consideration in this regard.

(ii) Option 2 (off-street parking beside open space)

This option would impinge on public open space and would not be appropriate in and of itself, additionally it would set a poor precedent for infill development in the county, undermining both the 'RES' and 'OS' land-use zoning objectives.

Overall, it is considered that clarification of further information should be sought.

Item 2: Overbearing Impact.

The applicant has submitted a cover letter and revised drawings in an attempt to address the request for additional information. An extract taken from the cover letter submitted states the following.

Proposed Ground + First Floor layouts
Response to Item 2

P-1005-A.I.

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

Note re: Item 2- to be read in conjunction with Dwg. No. P-1005-A.I.

I would like to add a comment here in relation to Item 2 of the A.I. request and the concern expressed about the level of projection of the rear building line at first floor level of the proposed house of 2.8m and how this would have a significant overbearing impact on No. 63. This has been addressed on Dwg: P-1005-A.I. where the whole house was pulled forward to reduce the level of projection at the rear to 1.38m. (Please note that pulling the first floor element only as was suggested in the A.I. letter would have required a complete redesign of the layouts and the applicant's brief could not consequently be met.)

This amended design is a compromise and I would like to request, on behalf of Sarah MacDonald that further consideration be given to the design and placing of the proposed house as per original application as follows:

Please refer to the images of a working model of the proposed house below-

- 1.. The East/South/West orientation for No. 63 ensures there is good light to the corner where the rear building line at first floor of No. 63A projects 2.8m beyond the rear façade of No. 63 throughout the day .This would help reduce any perception of overbearing.
- 2.The siting of the proposed house No. 63A at a lower level to No. 63 allows the roof height of the proposed house to align with the height of the lower part of the hipped roof to No. 63 and being proportionate in size to the narrower corner site, is not visually dominant here.
3. I appreciate you can only assess what is currently in place but it is very likely that a future extension built to the rear of No. 63 will be located in this corner where the light is best. Any building here will negate the perception of any overbearing.



Image to rear of houses showing the current position of the 20 yr old Conservatory.



Potential location for a future extension or sunny corner of the garden

Comhairle Chontae Atha Cliath Theas

PR/0376/22

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

The revised drawings submitted show that the depth of projection of the main rear building line at first floor level has been reduced to 1.38m. This reduction is considered to mitigate against overbearing impact on the immediate neighbour (No. 63 Glenbrook Park). Although the applicant states it is their preference to **keep the original design this is not considered acceptable**. It is considered that the applicant has satisfactorily responded to the request for additional information for this item.

Item 3: Width of rear garden.

The applicant has submitted a cover letter and revised drawings in an attempt to address the request for additional information. An extract taken from the cover letter submitted states the following revised drawing has been submitted:

Proposed Ground Floor Layout-Private Open space
Response to Item 3

P-1004-A.I.

The applicant has not provided a revised design but has argued that the proposed garden would meet the standards in the County Development Plan and the applicants' brief. The applicant's agent also notes that the applicant does not own No. 63.

The Planning Authority must consider the subdivision of the site as proposed and therefore consider the entire site to be part of the planning application. The continued provision of a side passage in the grounds of No. 63, and the proposed configuration of the rear amenity space, appears to compromise the quality rather than quantity of private amenity space to be provided. A realignment of the rear boundary without impacting the proposed side passage may rectify this issue. **Clarification of additional information** should be sought.

The applicant has referred to differing levels of interest by the applicant to lands in the red line and lands in the blue line; properly speaking, the entire existing residential plot should have been included in the red line as the proposed development includes, as an integral part of development, the subdivision of the existing site. This should also be **clarified**.

Item 4: Storage

The applicant has submitted a cover letter and revised drawings in an attempt to address the request for additional information. An extract taken from the cover letter submitted states the following revised drawing has been submitted:

Proposed Ground Floor Layout-Response to Item 4.

P-1002-A.I.

Proposed First Floor Layout-Response to Items 4 and 5.

P-1003-A.I.

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

Revised drawings submitted show 4sq.m. for dedicated storage will be provided for the proposed dwelling. This would not comply with the minimum storage area requirements as per the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities 2007. The Planning Authority considers that the applicant has satisfactorily addressed this request for additional information for this item.

Item 5: bedroom sizes

The applicant has submitted a cover letter and revised drawings in an attempt to address the request for additional information. An extract taken from the cover letter submitted states the following revised drawing has been submitted:

Proposed Ground Floor Layout-Response to Item 4. P-1002-A.I.

Proposed First Floor Layout-Response to Items 4 and 5. P-1003-A.I.

The drawings submitted show that Bedroom 3 is a single bedroom and measures 9.6sq.m which exceeds the 7.1sq.m for a single bedroom. This proposed bedroom size complies with Section 11.3.1 Residential (iv) Dwelling Standards regarding minimum internal floor areas for proposed bedrooms. The Planning Authority considers that the applicant has satisfactorily addressed this request for additional information for this item.

Conclusion

The proposed development may be acceptable subject to changes relating to the car parking arrangements and rear garden arrangements.

Recommendation

I recommend that **CLARIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION** be requested from the applicant with regard to the following:

1. The applicant has proposed two options for car parking. Option No. 2 (off-street parking on periphery of Glenbrook Park) is not appropriate as it would impinge upon an existing open space and would, by and of itself and as a precedent for future development in the county, undermine the 'RES' land-use zoning objective and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Option No. 1 relates to the provision of parrallel public parking provided formally outside the northern boundary of the site. This may be an appropriate solution which would additionally narrow the carriageway on this residential street. The proposed intervention under Option 1 could provide infill residential development with off-curtilage parking where formal arrangements can be incorporated into the public realm without reducing the amenity or rights of others, or traffic safety, and would therefore need to be carefully considered.

The applicant has not shown sufficient legal interest to initiate such a proposal as part of the planning application as the lands lie outside the ownership of the owner(s) of the

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

subject site. The applicant is requested to clarify these proposals and submit the following information:

- (a) A letter of consent from SDCC (Economic Development Section), consenting to the inclusion of the relevant lands as part of a planning application.
- (b) A revised Site Location Map - at a scale of no less than 1:1000 - showing a revised red line boundary, including the relevant lands as part of the planning application site.
- (c) A revised Site Layout Plan - at a scale of no less than 1:500 - showing the same revision to the red line boundary.
- (d) Plans, elevations and sections drawings - at a scale of no less than 1:200 - showing the details of the proposal under Option 1.
- (e) The applicant may wish to consult with the SDCC Water Services Department (servicemaps@sdblincoco.ie) regarding the location of any pipes in the area and any measures required to ensure no detrimental impact to services.
- (f) The applicant is advised that the parallel spaces would be public car parking spaces. Alternatively, in conjunction with the red line amendments in point no.2, the applicant is also invited to consider a shared parking area with the existing house with consideration of widening the existing entrance to 3.5m.

2. The applicant has not addressed item 3 of the Request for Additional Information to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority. The proposed development seeks the subdivision of what is currently a single residential plot. It is considered that the private amenity of the proposed dwelling could be greatly improved by way of modest adjustment to the rear garden boundary proposed to intersect the existing plot.

The applicant has noted that the lands inside the blue line are outside the red line boundary of the planning application. It is prudent and accurate, though not strictly enforced, that an application for subdivision of an existing site should include in its red line the entirety of the site to be subdivided.

The applicant is therefore requested to clarify their proposals and lodge the following information:

- (a) Revised Site Location Map - at a scale of no less than 1:1000 - showing the red line boundary to include the entirety of the existing residential plot, which it is proposed to be subdivided.
- (b) Revised Site Layout Plan - at a scale of no less than 1:500 - showing the same revision to the red line boundary.
- (c) The applicant should also consider a realignment of the proposed rear garden boundary to improve the quality of the private amenity space proposed to be afforded to the proposed new house.

Comhairle Chontae Atha Cliath Theas

PR/0376/22

Record of Executive Business and Chief Executive's Order

REG. REF. SD21A/0321

LOCATION: 63, Glenbrook Park, Rathfarnham, Dublin 14.




Colm Maguire,
Executive Planner

ORDER: I direct that **CLARIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION** be requested from the applicant as set out in the above report and that notice thereof be served on the applicant.

Dated:

24/3/22



Eoin Burke, Senior Planner