William Doran (TechIEI)
Planning and Project Management Consultant,
Land and Property Surveys
Land Registry Specialist Mapping Consultant
Fire Safety & Disability Access Consultant
7, St. Mary's Road,
Ballsbridge,
Dublin 4
Ph 0872511579 - 016630288
Email: bill@billdoran.net

Planning Dept, South Dublin Co Co Tallaght Dublin 24

18.10.2022

JN: 6978

## Re:10 Butterfield Avenue, Dublin 14

Dear Sir,

Please find attached a planning application for retention of a porch to the front and a singlestorey extension to the rear of the above-mentioned dwelling.

My client sought advice from an architect, who advised her that a porch to the front and a single-storey extension on the rear constituted exempted development, without advising her that limitations existed in relation to such exemptions.

I attended at the property recently to produce floor plans for interior design and noted the apparent other extensions, and carried out a planning search.

The following is the planning history;

- Planning Reg Ref No B212, Order 459/69, granted 3<sup>rd</sup> April, 1969.

  Planning permission was sought and obtained for an extension.

  This appears to be the extension to the rear of the garage at ground floor.
- Planning Reg Ref No YB.0135 granted 19<sup>th</sup> April, 1983.

  Planning Permission was sought and obtained for garage conversion and extension. This appears to be the extension above the garage at first floor.
- Planning Reg Ref No S96B/0256, granted 6<sup>th</sup> November, 1996.
  Planning permission was sought and obtained for two-storey extension to rear.
  This is plainly the two-storey extension on the rear.

I have referenced the above extensions on the application drawing. It is plain they were the only alterations to the original dwelling, until recently.

This application is intended to regularise the current situation.

The porch on the front is similar in style to the porch on the front of No. 12 immediately to the east, which was granted planning permission under Reg Ref No SD16B/0058.

The extension on the rear causes no new or greater overshadowing or loss of light to the neighbour's dwellings on each side.

Using the BRE Guide (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice, Figs 17 and 18. Drawing 6978-01 shows the 45<sup>O</sup> line on each side, off the single-storey extension, demonstrating there is no impact on the windows of neighbouring dwelling at No. 8 and no significant impact on the windows at No. 12 Butterfield Avenue.

I trust the foregoing is satisfactory and look forward to receiving a grant of planning permission.

Yours Faithfully,

William Doran