



## Board Direction

**Ref: PL21.245961**

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2016. The Board decided to refuse permission in accordance with the draft reasons and considerations set out below.

### REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Having regard to the scale, mass and bulk of the proposed development, its proximity to neighbouring boundaries, and to the layout and design of the proposed house in relation to the pattern of development in the vicinity, it is considered that the amenities of neighbouring property to the west would be seriously injured by reason of overshadowing and overbearing impacts and loss of daylight. The design of the house, and its inappropriate siting behind neighbouring dwellings, would be significantly out-of-keeping with the character of the generally modest or traditional housing in the vicinity, and would exacerbate the impacts on neighbouring residential amenity. The proposed development, would, therefore, seriously injure the visual and residential amenities of the area and of property in the vicinity, would contravene the residential zoning objective for the area, 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 had serious concerns in relation to the impact on the visual and residential amenity of the neighbouring house to the west, arising from overshadowing and overbearing impacts and loss of daylight, and also considered that the design and set-back location of the house would be out-of-keeping with the character of the streetscape at this location, having regard also to the generally modest and/or traditional design approach of property in close proximity. The Board did not share the Inspector's view in relation to the acceptability of the design, arising from its poor visual quality, and its large and bulky form. The Board also considered that the shadow studies were seriously inadequate.

*Note:*

Notwithstanding the current moratorium on multiple housing schemes in Strandhill, the appeal site forms part of a substantial area of greenfield land that is zoned for residential development. The Board had concerns that, in the absence of a masterplan or overall design concept for these lands, the development of an individual site might prejudice the future design approach for the overall lands, and might constitute piecemeal and haphazard development. While access would still be available into these lands as a result of the proposed development, this is not the only consideration that would arise. The Board considered that any future planning application on this site should address this matter.

*Please circulate of copy of this Direction with the Board Order.*

Board Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 25<sup>th</sup> April 2016  
Fionna O' Regan