



## Board Direction

---

**Ref: PL06D.245829**

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2016.

The Board decided to refuse permission generally in accordance with the reasons and considerations set out below.

### REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Having regard to its scale, extent, materials/finishes and location within the curtilage of a protected structure, it is considered that the proposed development would constitute the overdevelopment of a restricted site, and would have a detrimental and irreversible impact on the character and setting of Mountainview House. The demolition of the boundary walls and of the walls bounding the front curtilage of the house, the removal and replacement of the existing entrance, the removal of landscaping, and the incorporation of the front curtilage into a car park, would result in the removal of the features that frame the setting of the protected structure and that contribute significantly to its character, and would, by the nature and intensity of its proposed uses serving four houses, seriously detract from the visual amenity of the front curtilage and of Mountainview House. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the provisions of the "Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities" issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (2004), and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Board considered that the proposed development would constitute an unacceptable scale of intervention into the setting of the protected structure, having particular regard to the contribution that the features to be removed make to the character of the house. The proposed development would result in the overdevelopment of the front curtilage of the house, by reason of its cramped layout, which would not adequately serve the proposed development, and which would materially affect the character and setting of the protected structure.

*Note:*

The Board considered that any future application should show greater sensitivity to the setting and context of the protected structure. The Board might be minded to give consideration to proposals that would retain the front curtilage of the house intact, to serve the Protected Structure only. The Board considers that the front entrance and gates, the boundary walls with the public road and the walls bounding the front curtilage of the site should be retained. The existing rear entrance would be acceptable to serve a reduced scale of development that would be adequately served with bin storage, bicycle parking, and suitably-sized car park spaces. A greater sensitivity in terms of proposed materials and finishes would be required.

*Please issue a copy of this Direction with the Board Order*

Board Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 8<sup>th</sup> June 2016  
Fionna O' Regan