



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-307245-20

Development	Alterations to the previously approved development (Reg. Ref. 3195/19) which permitted the construction of a one bed dwelling, the proposed alterations consist of 1 additional bedroom at 1st floor level and an increase in overall floor area.
Location	101, Clonliffe Avenue, Dublin 3, D03, KH21
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council North
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2309/20
Applicant(s)	Paul Pugh
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission with conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party V Grant
Appellant(s)	Carmel and Michael Lawless
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	14 th July 2020
Inspector	Máire Daly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is located at No. 101 Clonliffe Avenue, off the Ballybough Road, eastern Dublin City, c.200m east of Croke Park. The main Dublin Connolly to Longford train line runs approximately 40m to the north of the site on elevated tracks. The corner site is at the entrance to a small cul-de-sac within a mid-early 20th century social housing estate. The application site currently has a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located on it which fronts onto Clonliffe Avenue, the development is proposed in the side garden of this property.
- 1.2. The site has a stated area of 231.3-sq.m and the existing end-of-terrace dwelling has a gross floor area stated at 70.85-sq.m. The existing dwelling has been extended at ground floor level to the rear.
- 1.3. The current two storey dwelling on site is set back approx. 8 metres from the western boundary/ cul de sac road and approx.3.5m from the avenue to the north onto which it fronts. The side garden is bound by vertical steel railings of c.1.2m height

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development is to comprise alterations to the previously approved development (PA. Ref. 3195/19) which permitted the construction of a 47.5sqm one bed, two storey flat roof dwelling. The proposed alterations consist of the following:
 - Enlargement of dwelling and increase in floor area to 70sqm.
 - An additional bedroom at first floor level.
 - 1 no. new window at ground floor level and enlargement of other proposed window on western elevation.
 - 2 no. new windows on first floor level on the side (western) elevation and a reduction in size of the window in the rear elevation, which is now to comprise a high level narrow horizontal window.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The Planning Authority decided to grant permission subject to seven conditions, most of which are standard in nature, but also including the following condition no.6 :

The following conditions of the Transportation Planning Division shall be complied with:

a) The vehicular access and off street car parking space shall be omitted and replaced with a pedestrian gate to a maximum width of 1.5metres.

b) No gates shall open across the public footpath.

c) All costs incurred by Dublin City Council, including any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development, shall be at the expense of the developer

d) The developer shall be obliged to comply with the requirements set out in the Code of Practice.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planning Officer (April 2020) reflects the decision of the Planning Authority. The Planning Officer notes the following in their report:

- The proposal is acceptable in principle within the Z1 zoning.
- The principle of this type of development has already been established under the previous planning permission on site, for a one bed two storey house (Reg. ref. 3195/19).
- The proposal differs from that previously granted through the provision of additional floor space (increased of floor area to 70sqm in total) and an additional bedroom.

- The proposed development meets the minimum recommended space requirements as set out in the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 and the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Guidelines, 2007.
- The proposal includes provision for a new 3.5m wide vehicular access to the front of the dwelling to provide off-street parking. As with the previous proposal on site (Reg. ref. 3195/19) the Transportation Planning Division of Dublin City Council (DCC) had serious concerns regarding the location of the proposed new entrance. Having regard to the comments received from the division above the Planning Officer recommended that this proposed driveway be omitted by way of condition.
- The breaking of the existing building line of the dwellings along Clonliffe Avenue was established in the previous permitted proposal.
- The impact of the additional size of the proposed development is not considered to be so severe in visual or residential amenity terms as to be harmful to the character of the area.
- It is considered reasonable to allow the applicant to develop the site, which will provide an additional residential unit in a central city location and utilise the site efficiently.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Drainage Division – DCC Report dated 16/03/20 – no objection subject to conditions.

Transportation Planning Division – DCC Report dated 18/03/20 – No objection subject to conditions which include for the omission of the vehicular access driveway.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Irish Rail – No response.

Irish Water – No response.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. None on file when Planning Officer was compiling report. However, the Board should note that on 24/06/20 notification was received from the Dublin City Council's Planning Department, stating that due to an administrative error a letter of objection was not logged in their system and therefore was not available to the planner when the report was being finalised. Therefore, the points raised in the submission were not addressed in the assessment of the planning application.
- 3.4.2. It should be noted that the points raised in the original observation are the same as the points raised in the grounds of appeal, these points are summarised under Section 6.1 below. The response received from the Planning Authority in response to the observations submitted which correspond with the grounds of appeal are summarised under Section 6.3.

4.0 Planning History

- P.A. Ref. 3195/19 DCC (2019) – Permission **granted** for one bedroom, two storey end of terrace dwelling. Notable condition attached omitting vehicular access and off-street parking.
- ABP Ref. 301589-18 – ABP overturned the Planning Authority's decision and **granted** permission for amendment to existing permitted development from a single storey extension to a two storey extension to the western side of the existing dwelling. P.A. Ref. 2326/18 DCC (2018) – Permission refused by DCC to alter the existing permission WEB1262/16 from a single storey side extension to a two-storey extension to western elevation of dwelling. Reason for refusal – significant infringement of the building line and visual impact on streetscape contrary to the provisions of Development Plan.
- P.A. Ref. WEB1262/16 DCC (2016) – Permission **granted** by the Planning Authority for a single-storey extension to the side existing dwelling at no. 101 Clonliffe Avenue. of 16.8-sq.m stated GFA.
- ABP Ref. PL 29N.240265 permission **refused** by the Board (overturning the Planning Inspector's recommendation) for a single storey front and side extension on grounds of serious injury to the visual amenities and character of

the area by reason of design and infringement of the building line of the cul-de-sac. P.A. Ref.3665/11 DCC (2011) – Permission granted for a single-storey extension to front side and rear of dwelling.

- P.A. Ref.2588/11 DCC (2011) – Permission **refused** by the Planning Authority for development of an end of terrace dwelling.
- P.A. Ref. 1234/05 DCC (2005) – Permission **refused** for construction of a two bedroom, two-storey detached dwelling. Refused for three reasons, including it being visual obtrusive, its adverse impact on character of the area, and setting an undesirable precedent.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Guidance

5.1.1. **Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities** – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities (2007). The following sections are particularly relevant to the current proposal:

- Section 1.4 Detailed Considerations, Inspection and Report and Subsection 1.4.1 – Infill sites.
- Section 4.3.4 Densities – states '*Infill developments and urban redevelopment projects should respect the character of the existing neighbourhood*'.
- Section 4.3.5 Private Space states '*Provision for private open space should take account of the requirements of the Development Plan for the area.*'
- Table 5.1: *Space provision and room sizes for typical dwellings – 2BED/3P House (2 storeys) – Target gross floor area – 70sqm, Minimum Main living Room – 13sqm, Aggregate Living Room -28sqm, Aggregate Bedroom Area – 20sqm, Storage – 3sqm.*

5.2. Development Plan

5.2.1. Zoning

Land use zoning objective Z1 '*to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.*'

5.2.2. Chapter 5 Quality Housing

- **Policy QH5** - To promote residential development at key locations including regeneration areas, vacant sites and under-utilised sites.
- **Policy QH8** - To promote the sustainable development of vacant or under-utilised infill sites and to favourably consider higher density proposals which respect the design of the surrounding development and the character of the area.
- **Policy QH13** - Housing design compatible with 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities' (2007).
- **Policy QH21** - To ensure that new houses provide for the needs of family accommodation with a satisfactory level of residential amenity, in accordance with the standards for residential accommodation.

5.2.3. Chapter 16 – Development Standards

- **Section 16.2.1 – Design Principles**
- **Section 16.2.2 Design Standards – Sub section 16.2.2.2 Infill development** - Within terraces or groups of buildings of unified design and significant quality, infill development will replicate and positively interpret the predominant design and architectural features of the group as a whole.
- **Section 16.2.2.4 Boundary Walls and Railings**
- **Section 16.5 – Plot Ratio** - In the case of a group of buildings with a common curtilage, the floor areas will be aggregated. The site area includes only such land as lies within the curtilage of the related building.
 - The location of subject site falls under Z1 which has an indicative Plot ratio of 0.5-2.0. In this case the plot ratio is 0.60 which is considered acceptable given the nature of the site.
- **Section 16.6 Site Coverage** – prevent overdevelopment of site. Current site falls into Z1 zoning – therefore up to 60% of the site is the indicative site coverage for new development.
 - The current proposal is considered acceptable and falls within this site coverage.

- **Section 16.10.2 Residential Quality Standards** – Houses – sets out standards to be achieved in new build houses, including consideration of:
 - Floor space
 - Private Open Space
 - Aspects, Natural Light and Ventilation
 - Separation distance – 22m separation distance.

- **Section 16.10.9 Corner/Side Garden Sites**

The planning authority will have regard to the following criteria in assessing proposals for the development of corner/side garden sites:

- The character of the street.
- Compatibility of design and scale with adjoining dwellings, paying attention to the established building line, proportion, heights, parapet levels and materials of adjoining buildings.
- Impact on the residential amenities of adjoining sites.
- Open space standards and refuse standards for both existing and proposed dwellings.
- The provision of appropriate car parking facilities, and a safe means of access to and egress from the site.
- The provision of landscaping and boundary treatments which are in keeping with other properties in the area.
- The maintenance of the front and side building lines, where appropriate.

- **Section 16.10.10 Infill Housing**

Infill housing should:

- Have regard to the existing character of the street by paying attention to the established building line, proportion, heights, parapet levels and materials of surrounding buildings.
- Comply with the appropriate minimum habitable room sizes.
- Have a safe means of access to and egress from the site which does not result in the creation of a traffic hazard.

Appendix 5: Roads Standards for Various Classes of Development states:

- Where driveways are provided, they shall be at least 2.5 m or, at most, 3.6 m in width, and shall not have outward opening gates.
- The design standards set out in the planning authority's leaflet 'Parking Cars in Front Gardens' shall also apply.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The third-party appellants, Carmel and Michael Lawless, Clonliffe Avenue, have appealed the decision to grant permission. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The development if permitted would breach the Z1 zoning objective.
- The proposal would result in an over densification of the site.
- The proposal will infringe on the building line of the cul de sac.
- The proposal will injure the visual amenity and detract from the established character of the area.
- The site lies at the entrance point of a residential cul de sac with a carefully designed layout, the development would therefore disfigure the established arc of the cul de sac.
- The development would create a back garden which would abut the appellants front gardens. This would create a permanent brick wall view and cause loss of light and privacy.
- The development would create a planning precedent by permitting an over densification of the site by the creation of a standalone dwelling.
- The development would have an overpowering effect due to its proposed proximity to neighbouring properties and would damage residential amenity.

- The proposed development would breach zoning objectives.

6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed alterations to the original permission PA. Ref. 3195/19 are for the provision of an additional bedroom, and a slight increase in floor area. The alterations are considered minor in terms of the scale of the development.
- The Planning Authority considers that the proposed break to the building line of the dwellings to the immediate south of the proposed site would not unduly impact on the existing residential and visual amenities of the area.
- Several examples are presented which show similar proposals have obtained planning permission in nearby housing estates. These developments have broken the building line but their design has allowed them to integrate well into the surrounding streetscape.
- No. 118 Clonliffe Road has an extension to the rear and side of the existing dwelling which breaks the previously existing building line. A precedent is therefore set for the building lines along the cul de sac to be broken.
- Breach of Zoning Objectives – In response to the appellants claims, the applicant has stated that the dwelling has been designed to be subordinate to the main dwelling and sensitive to the character of the surrounding area. 44.5sqm of open space would remain surrounding the proposed dwelling and a slim high-level first floor window to the rear of the dwelling would ensure no overlooking of the property to the south.
- Over densification of the site – the proposed development would break the sightline of the houses on Clonliffe Avenue, but these sightlines have been previously broken due to the presence of an extension on the property at No. 118 Clonliffe Avenue. The proposal at no. 101 has been sensitively design and scaled to respect the character of the surrounding area and is subordinate to the existing dwellings in the surrounding area while promoting infill of an infill site.

- Loss of privacy/overlooking of third-party property – the proposed dwelling has been designed to reduce any potential impact of overlooking or loss of privacy to adjacent properties. The stepped back nature at the first-floor level increases the separation distance from the rear boundary.
- The subject site has the capacity to accommodate a development of this scale and the dwelling will still be subordinate to the existing dwelling adjacent. The building footprint does not overbear or dominate the site.
- The proposed development is consistent with the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 policies in relation to Infill Development and Section 16.10.9 in relation to Corner/Side Garden sites and Open Space requirements.
- The provision of a new vehicular entrance and off-street parking is considered in compliance with policy.
- The traditional separation distance of 22m between the rear of two storey dwellings as set out in Section 16.10.2 of the Development Plan does not apply to the current proposal as the rear of the dwelling does not directly face any-first floor windows. However, the applicant has sought to incorporate design measures in the form of high-level windows to ensure no overlooking of the front gardens of the adjoining dwellings.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. As mentioned under Section 3.4 due to an administrative error in DCC's Planning Department the original letter of objection was not logged. Subsequent correspondence from the Planning Authority however addresses those points raised as part of the submission which are the same points as those raised in the appeal. The response from the Planning Authority (received by the Board on 24th June 2020) addressed each of the points raised under the appeal, the main points can be summarised as follows:

- The DCC Planner's report refers to the breaking of the existing building line and the precedent already set by the previous grant of permission on the site (PA. Ref. 3195/19). The proposed amendments to the previously approved development increase the width of the proposed dwelling by 1.05m and this is

not considered significant, nor would it render the dwelling harmful to the visual amenity or urban form of the area.

- The proposed dwelling (as amended from that previously submitted PA. Ref 3195/19) is considered acceptable and it is not expected that its contemporary design will detract from the established character in the area.
- The proposed boundary treatment which includes a 2 metres high rendered wall separating the subject site from the adjacent property at 102 Clonliffe Avenue was approved under the previous permission and no changes are proposed to this boundary under the current application. It is not considered that this wall will be overbearing when viewed from no. 102.
- The previous permission granted on the subject site has already set a precedent for this type of development.
- The area planner states that that the proposed development does not breach the zoning objectives of Z1 lands as outlined in the Development Plan.

6.3.2. The Board should also note the following which was raised in the response from the Planning Officer:

- The 3rd party appellants state that the development will have an overpowering effect due to its proximity to neighbouring properties and therefore will damage residential amenity. The Planning Officer states that in light of the fact that the 3rd party submission (submitted in response to the planning application subject to this appeal PA. Ref. 2309/20) was not available at the time of compiling the planning report, the impact of the proposed development on adjoining residential amenities was revisited by the Area Planner. The Area Planner states *'having regard to the incremental increase of the size of the development granted on the site by the previous planning permission and the increase proposed in this application the planning authority have concerns that the proposed dwelling, especially the first floor, may appear overbearing when viewed from No. 102 Clonliffe Avenue, impact on the amenities of the adjoining west facing front garden and hence would be injurious to the residential amenities of the adjoining dwelling'.*

6.4. Observations

- None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Residential Amenity
- Access and Carparking
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Principle of Development

7.2.1. The site is zoned Z1 'Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' with a Land-Use Zoning Objective '*to protect, provide for and improve residential amenities*'.

7.2.2. Residential development, including new dwellings is a permissible use within this zoning category subject to sensitive design of development and compliance with policy. As such the proposal is acceptable in principle, subject to the detailed considerations in the sections below.

7.2.3. The principle of a two-storey, one-bedroom dwelling on this site has been accepted under a grant of permission by the DCC Planning Authority PA. Ref. 3195/19 (not appealed). The Board should also note however that the Planning Authority have in the past refused permission for a 2-storey, 3 bedroom dwelling attached to the side of no.101 under PA. Ref.2588/11 (not appealed) and a two bedroom, two storey detached dwelling PA. Ref. 1234/05 DCC (not appealed) on the same site, refusal reasons related to infringement on building lines, impact on character of cul de sac, substandard open space and setting an undesirable precedent. In addition it should be noted that in the case of ABP Ref. PL 29N.240265 the Board refused a single

storey extension on the site (overturning the decision of the PA and Inspector's recommendation) on grounds of serious injury to the visual amenities and character of the area by reason of design and infringement of the building line of the cul-de-sac.

7.3. Design

7.3.1. The proposal the subject of this appeal, is for amendments to a previously approved development (PA. Ref. 3195/19) to construct a two-storey dwelling to the side (western) elevation of no.101 Clonliffe Avenue. The amendments to the development propose to increase the floor area of the dwelling from 47.4sqm to 70sqm. An additional bedroom is to be provided at first floor level and the additional space on the ground floor now provides an area for a utility room and enlarged bathroom. The proposed dwelling complies with the minimum floor area standards as set out in *Table 5.1: Space provision and room sizes for typical dwellings* of the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines, 2007, this is demonstrated as follows:

Minimum Requirements for 2BED/3P House (2 storeys)	Proposed development
Target gross floor area – 70sqm	70sqm
Minimum Main living Room – 13sqm	16.4sqm
Aggregate Living Room -28sqm	33.81sqm
Aggregate Bedroom Area – 20sqm	21.8sqm
Storage – 3sqm	2.7sqm (plus under stairs area)

7.3.2. The site the subject of this appeal is located on the junction with Clonliffe Avenue and the entrance to a keyhole cul de sac of the same name. The existing dwelling fronts onto Clonliffe Avenue to the north, with its side elevation and boundary facing onto the cul-de-sac. The existing side (western) elevation of no. 101 currently approximately aligns with the front elevation of no. 102 Clonliffe Avenue (which fronts on to the cul de sac). The proposed development would breach the front building line (northern building line) onto Clonliffe Avenue by approximately 300mm.

The proposed development would break the existing western building line formed by the existing dwellings along the cul de sac by approximately 5.6 metres. The existing permission on site under PA. Ref 3195/19 is for a dwelling which extends 4.4 metres beyond the building line to the west. I would disagree with the Planning Officer that this increase of 1.2 metres is insignificant given the location of the site.

7.3.3. The upper floor of the proposed dwelling would also increase in size from that which was previously granted under PA. Ref. 3195/19 with an additional 1.2m to the western side and approximately 800mm to the rear and 600mm to the front of the building.

7.3.4. Section 16.10.9 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 sets out the considerations for Corner/Side Garden Sites within the city and states that the Planning Authority will have regard to certain criteria in assessing proposals for the development of corner/side garden sites, these are listed in Section 5.2.3 of this report. Following an assessment of the current application I would consider the proposal to be contrary to a number of these guiding principles set out below.

7.3.5. The design of the dwelling is contemporary and does not correspond with any of the existing dwellings on the street. I note that the proposal is for an enlargement of the dwelling from that previously permitted under PA. Ref. 3195/19. The main issue in this instance is not the design of the dwelling but the compatibility of this design and the impact that the increased scale of the development will have on the adjoining dwelling at No.101 and also No.102. With an increase in floor area from 47.4sqm to 70sqm the proposed dwelling is no longer subordinate to the existing dwelling at No.101 (as suggested by the applicant) and is considered excessive on this site, in particular when considering the impact on no. 102 Clonliffe Avenue which is located to the rear of the site. In addition, the flat roof structure of the proposal does not integrate well into the existing roof structure at no. 101 Clonliffe Avenue. From an examination of the previously permitted design under PA. Ref. 3195/19, it is my opinion that the proposed development's design is more overbearing and lacks integration with the adjoining property.

7.3.6. In response to the appeal, it is noted that the applicant has submitted several examples of other new dwellings which break the existing building lines in different locations nearby, however, those examples submitted have more traditional designs

which match the existing character of the houses on the subject streets and therefore have a type of uniformity. Also, these houses do not have the added issue of the site being located at the entrance to a keyhole cul de sac. In these cases, the front building lines of these structures do not break those of the adjoining existing dwellings (Reg. Ref. 3442/04 and 5980/05). It is noted that a single storey extension has been constructed onto No.118 Clonliffe Avenue which breaks the building line on the western side of the cul de sac. The applicant argues that a precedent has therefore been established to break the building line on the street. In my opinion this single storey extension differs significantly to the current proposal. A 70sqm two-storey dwelling is proposed which would break the western building line at ground and first floor level by an additional 1.2 metres onto that already permitted under P.A. Ref. 3195/19.

- 7.3.7. It is my opinion therefore, that the revised proposal by reason of design will result in further infringement of the building line and character of the cul de sac and would be more severe in impact than that permitted under previous applications.

7.4. Residential Amenity

- 7.4.1. It is noted that the size of the proposal, for a new dwelling to the side of no. 101 has increased incrementally through numerous applications submitted for the site to date. Initially the proposal on site was for a single storey extension of 16.8sqm to the side of the dwelling (reg. ref WEB1262/16), then for a 33.5sqm two storey side extension (ABP Ref. 301589-20) and most recently a permitted 47.4sqm semi-detached dwelling on the site (PA. Ref. 3195/19). The current application proposes amendments including an increase in floor area to 70sqm and additional windows.
- 7.4.2. The appeal observations received from the Planning Authority revisited the assessment and raised an additional concern in relation to the impact of the increased size of the proposed development and the possible impact that this may have on adjoining properties and residents. In particular, the Planning Authority state that the first floor may appear overbearing when viewed from no. 102 Clonliffe Avenue and that this may impact on the amenities of the adjoining west facing front garden and hence would be injurious to the residential amenities of this adjoining property.

7.4.3. As mentioned in paragraph 7.3.6, the applicant has made reference to other dwellings in nearby locations which have been permitted on corner garden sites. It is worth noting that in the case of PA. Ref. 5980/05 (Dwelling to side of No.1 Tolka Road) there is a distance of 8 metres between the rear of the dwelling on this corner site and the boundary of the dwelling to its immediate south west. In the case of the current proposal, according to the proposed site plan, the rear wall of the enlarged dwelling will be approximately 4.78 metres from the boundary wall of the dwelling to the immediate south (No. 102 Clonliffe Avenue). Although I note that adequate open space of 44.5sqm has been provided for the proposed dwelling in compliance with the Dublin City Development Plan (5-8sqm per bedspace for Inner City areas) and the existing dwelling on site (No. 101 Clonliffe Avenue) will maintain 25sqm, I do not consider 4.78metres an adequate separation distance between the rear of the proposed dwelling and the front garden space of the dwelling at no. 102 Clonliffe Avenue. It is my opinion that the development of this enlarged two storey dwelling at this location due to its overbearing nature would seriously injure the amenities of the adjoining houses along the cul de sac on Clonliffe Avenue.

7.5. Access and Carparking

7.5.1. The proposed development relates to amendments to a permitted two-storey dwelling on the site under PA. Ref. 3195/19. It is noted from the documents submitted as part of the appeal that the Transportation Planning Division of DCC had aired concerns with regard to the vehicular entrance on this previous application. The site layout plan submitted with the current application indicates the provision of a 3.5metre wide vehicular access to the front (north) of the proposed dwelling. It is noted on advice from the above Transportation Division, condition no. 6 of the Planning Authority's report omits this entrance due to the insufficient depth provided in the driveway to accommodate safe off-street parking. I would be in full agreement with the Transportation Planning Division and would recommend that a similar condition be included if the Board are minded to grant permission.

7.6. Appropriate Assessment

7.6.1. Having regard to the small-scale nature of the development proposed within an existing built-up area, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and 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.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that planning permission should be refused for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the prominent location of the site at the entrance to a short, tightly knit residential cul-de-sac and the established built form, it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its design, scale and bulk, would be out of character with the existing residential properties in the vicinity, would significantly infringe on the existing building line along Clonliffe Avenue and would significantly impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining properties and set a precedent for further over scaled development in the vicinity of the site. The proposed development would, therefore, seriously injure the visual and residential amenities of the area, conflict with Section 16.10.9 of the Development Plan and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Máire Daly
Planning Inspector

10th August 2020