

# SOUTH DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCILS

## ARCHITECTURAL CONSERVATION OFFICERS REPORT

**RE: SD21B/0530 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION – OAK LODGE, NEW ROAD, CLONDALKIN, DUBLIN 22**

### Appraisal

A request for Further Information was issued by the Planning Authority a number of items related to Architectural Conservation and works that directly impacted on the Protected Structure, Oak Lodge, Clondalkin (RPS Ref. 156). A number of items and concerns were raised by the undersigned and these formed the following additional information sought (RFI Items Nos 1-5).

However, before assessing the Additional Information submission it should be noted that the proposed development with regard to the original scope of works has now changed. The revised scope of works is not due to addressing RFI items but rather due to the new requirements of the owners due to financial constraints and therefore scaling back the scope of works has resulted in new works being proposed with regard to new external opes, new opes resulting in changes to the original internal layout of the Protected Structure and other associated works.

Works that were included in the original application but have now to be omitted are as follows;

- Construction of a new two-storey extension
- Installation of photovoltaic panels on the roof
- A number of internal alterations
- Works to outbuildings

The new works proposed will now be confined to the following;

- demolition of small modern extension to the centre rear of the house and associate making good where this extension is attached to the original rear wall of the existing house,
- minor works to an earlier extension at the north east corner of the rear of the house
- Construction of a single-storey extension at the south side of the semi-basement of the house
- Opening of a new doorway between two rooms on the north side of the upper floor of the house
- Provision of a rooflight at the centre valley of the roof to provide maintenance access
- New boundary wall where the existing fencing has failed
- Landscaping Works.

The change to the original application and the addition of new works have resulted in the additional information response being more than an assessment of detail to address the RFI but requires a full assessment of details in comparing the original application with the new detail submitted as part of a RFI. The undersigned sought clarification from the Area Planner with regard to the changes to the permission now being sought as it differs from the original development description.

**RFI Item 1** - Works to address the damp problems at basement level were agreed and approved as exempted development during June 2021. Those exempted works were deemed acceptable based on the details provided at that time, however additional works are now detailed in the planning application at basement level, which now includes the insertion of underfloor heating which had not been previously specified as part of the exempted works in providing a new concrete slab. Other works which will impact on the conditions of the basement include a proposed new shower room and insertion of wall linings.

- It is considered that further detail and clarification is required in relation to the underfloor heating as this was not previously detailed as part of the new concrete slab.
- Details and specifications are required for the proposed wall linings ensuring these are breathable and internal insulation is done adhering to best practice.
- Ventilation needs to be addressed at basement level in particular where a new shower room will be inserted.

Full details to address these items are required in order to fully assess the impact to the original built fabric of the Protected Structure. Details of which should be included as part of a full method statement and schedule of works for all works to the protected structure including specifications for materials and new interventions.

**Response** – Further details have been provided in a Method Statement provided in response to the RFI.

In relation to Item 1 (i) it is stated that “underfloor heating, opening up works have showed that it is possible to install underfloor heating within creed without affecting the finished floor level in the basement”.

Item 1 (ii) it is stated that “Wykamol lining with ventilation between the relevant walls and back of the lining through a small number of discreetly located wall vents at low level have been installed”. It is considered that although some works which were deemed to be exempt on assessment of the works required to address dampness at basement level the insertion of wall vents were not specified and other options should have been identified and detailed for approval as part of exempted works. It is confirmed that the vents are not visible due to the low level. Damp levels in the basement walls are such that the insertion of a lining membrane is essential to make the rooms at this level habitable. Response is acceptable in this instance.

Item 1 (iii) related to ventilation at basement level. It is stated that “a humidity controlled ventilation extract fan is proposed for use in the basement shower room. The main entrance steps in front of this room will conceal the vent from view at driveway level”. This is considered an acceptable approach and any visual impact is minimised given the location of the vent however using a humidity controlled ventilation relies on the users of the house using this during use of the bathroom.

**RFI Item 2** - A Conservation Report/Method Statement has been provided but the details read as a summary of works and do not provide a detailed Method Statement and Schedule of Works for each floor level and element of works proposed. The Architectural Impact Assessment has not provided details on the direct impacts to the original built fabric in assessing the scope of works proposed. The architectural impact assessment has failed to provide an assessment of the proposed partial demolition and reconstruction of two-storey extension, side patio extension and photovoltaic panels with regard to direct impacts and visual impacts. New interventions and new elements should have been included as part of any assessments with regard to overall impacts. It is considered that a greater level of information is required in particular to ascertain why the proposed new designed extension which is to be a flat roof now exceeds the height of the existing extension.

**Response** – A method statement has been provided detailing the revised scope of works submitted as part of the RFI submission. A revised and very brief Architectural Impact Assessment has been provided in response to the RFI Item 2 and I would not agree that the level of detail provided in the original AIA was acceptable as by the nature of an architectural impact assessment/statement all works being proposed should be assess with regard to any possible impacts and how this impacts are being minimised or mitigated by the nature of the proposed works in demonstrating that best practice is being adhered to.

**RFI Item 3** - It is also proposed to add photovoltaic panels which will be positioned facing into the centre valley. Additional details for the insertion of photovoltaic panels and the works involved to facilitate their use have not been provided. It is considered that further information and specifications are required for this work, details should include;

- Information on the panel loads and their effect on the existing roof.
- The effects of any increase in loading should be identified to ensure this impact is addressed with regard to safety structural issues and any direct impact to the original roof.
- Details and specifications should be included on how the panels will be mounted. Associated works and additional services/items etc should be included as part of the methodology for the insertion of the photovoltaic panels in order to identify and highlight any such works to facilitate their use on a Protected Structure.

**Response** – The addition of photovoltaic panels no longer forms part of the works original proposed and is therefore does not form part of the current application.

**RFI Item 4** - It is proposed to construct a side extension with a pitched roof in the form of a bay with sliding sash window side lights over timber panels with French doors onto a new patio which will replace an existing uPVC side door and poor quality patio area. It is considered that this element is fussy in design and pastiche in trying to match the existing first floor bay window.

It is considered that any such modest side extension should be simple in design and form and should allow for a contemporary addition at this location in contrast to original architectural features and design of the existing house, thereby clearly showing it as a modern intervention and addition to the existing house. It is therefore considered that this element should be redesigned and revised to address the above concern.

**Response** – The overall design of the new proposed bay extension at the south side of the semi basement has now been redesigned to allow for a simpler design and construction thereby minimising the visual impacts at this location. The proposed new bay extension consists of a bay window containing a door and side lights with a flat roof. It is proposed to provide energy efficient glazing in either painted timber, aluclad or uPVC. It is extremely surprising that a conservation architect would deem the use of uPVC for any element relating to a Protected Structure as suitable. It is considered that any new window or door proposed should be painted timber framed energy efficient systems and the profile and finish/paint colour should be submitted for agreement prior to the commencement of development thus ensuring suitable additions/modern interventions to a Protected Structure.

**RFI Item 5** - It is proposed to reuse the existing rear single-storey outbuilding. As part of the works to the existing outbuilding it is proposed to remove the original internal wall and replace with a new wall which appears to be virtually in the same location. The replacement of the original internal wall with a new wall is deemed unnecessary and needs to be justified. Details to clarify this issue should be submitted as well as proper justification for the proposed removal of the original internal wall. A proper photographic survey of the existing outbuilding should be provided to show the full extent of the interior of the structure.

**Response** - The proposed works to the existing outbuildings no longer forms part of the works original proposed and is therefore does not form part of the current application.

## **Recommendation**

It is considered that the proposed development is acceptable subject to the following conditions:

1. It should be noted that the proposed development with regard to the original scope of works has now changed, therefore the proposed works should be carried out in accordance with the details and particulars as provided which now relates to a reduced scope of works or new works now included as part of the Additional Information Submission some of which are not deemed acceptable as detailed below.

The proposed development will now be confined to the following;

- Demolition of small modern extension to the centre rear of the house and associate making good where this extension is attached to the original rear wall of the existing house – deemed acceptable as the modern extension is of no architectural value and detracts from the original character of the protected structure.
  - Minor works to an earlier extension at the north east corner of the rear of the house – considered appropriate as considered minor works.
  - Construction of a single-storey extension at the south side of the semi-basement of the house (new bay extension) – Details of materials and all proposed windows and doors should be submitted for agreement and approval prior to the commencement of works. The conservation architect should be reminded that uPVC is not an acceptable material for use as new additions to a Protected Structure and therefore it is considered that painted timber energy efficient units would be more suitable.
  - Provision of a rooflight at the centre valley of the roof to provide maintenance access – Insertion of rooflight for maintenance access is deemed acceptable.
  - New boundary wall where the existing fencing has failed – It is considered that the new boundary wall should be plastered to match the existing wall type and for the overall integrity of the protected structure.
  - Landscaping Works – deemed to be minor in nature and will not impact directly on the protected structure.
2. It is proposed to provide a new opening between two rooms on the north side of the upper floor of the house, at a location where there is an existing hatch between the rooms. The proposed new doorway will be located on the wall which contains a very ornate dining room fireplace which is an original feature. This intervention and new opening is deemed inappropriate at this location, it is visually obtrusive and will directly impact on the original built fabric of the Protected Structure. This proposed opening and doorway should be omitted from the proposal and a revised Upper Ground Floor Plan should be submitted showing that this element has been omitted from the plans.
  3. The proposed new bay extensions door and side lights should be painted timber to match the original door and window materials as although contemporary the most suitable material would be timber. It is noted that aluclad or uPVC timber is referenced on the drawing (21-04-FI-01). The use of uPVC is completely unacceptable as a material type for new additions and use for a Protected Structure. A schedule of Materials and final details for all new windows and doors proposed at Oak Lodge should be submitted for written agreement and approval prior to the commencement of development.
  4. It is proposed to lower an existing window on east elevation and to glaze the existing stair window at this location. It is considered that where windows are being revised that the original type window should be reinstated to match the historically correct type with regard to design, profile and material. It is considered that the GF east elevation window should be retained as per the existing window opening unless justification for its replacement is provided. Details should also be submitted in relation to the existing stair window at FF level which is proposed to be glazed. Details clarifying the window type and proposals for this window should be submitted for agreement.
  5. A Schedule of materials and finishes should be provided for the proposed new additions and elements to the Protected Structure. This should be submitted prior to commencing development by way of confirming final material finishes and colours. This should include full details on materials and finishes for all elements of the proposed development.

6. Safety measures should be put in place during the proposed demolition works and works proposed. A Safety Statement should be provided detailing how the existing structures will be protected during demolition works and site clearance/excavation and new works. A safety statement should be submitted for written agreement with the Councils Architectural Conservation Officer prior to the commencement of development.

The above conditions should be submitted for written approval and agreement with the Councils Architectural Conservation Officer (Ms. I. McLoughlin) prior to the commencement of development.

**Irenie McLoughlin**  
**Architectural Conservation Officer**

**25<sup>th</sup> April 2022**