



Board Direction

Ref: PL08.245895

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 29th April 2016.

The Board decided by a margin of 2:1 to refuse permission generally in accordance with the following reasons and considerations.

Reasons and Considerations

1. Notwithstanding the alterations and reduction in two storey extent the rear of the property from that submitted with the previous proposal under PL08.243495, the Board still considered that the extent of rear projection close to a neighbouring eastern boundary would cause over shadowing and over bearing to the property to the east and would therefore be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of property in the vicinity and would not be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Notwithstanding the rationalisation that to the western elevation which had been introduced since the previous refusal under PL08.243495, the board considered that the revised design of the property introduced a series of elements into the design which would be visually incongruous, including the use of quoins, drip mouldings and top floor windows and roof lights with an excessively vertical emphasis. The board further considered that placing the ridge height above that of the terrace to the east was inappropriate given the designation of these buildings as an Architectural Conservation Area and that the ridge line of the proposed building should be lower than that of the existing terrace to the east. The board therefore considered that the proposal would be seriously injurious to the visual amenities of the area.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Board considered that the first reason for refusal under PL08.243495 had not been sufficiently addressed, and that while the second reason had been partly addressed that the additional features and increased ridge height had introduced discordant elements into the design. The board did not feel it appropriate to address these issues by condition.

Board Member: _____
Michael Leahy

Date: 29th April 2016