



Board Direction

Ref: PL06D.246271

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 13th July 2016.

The Board decided to refuse permission generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, for the following reasons and considerations.

Reasons and Considerations:

1. The proposed development by reason of the inadequate provision of public open space and connectivity to the available public open space to the south of the site, would constitute a substandard form of development which would seriously injure the amenities of the area and of the residents of the proposal and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. It is the policy of the Planning Authority as set out under RES3 of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2016-2022 to promote higher residential densities. The site is located within 1km of the DART, where higher densities at a minimum of 50 units per hectare will be encouraged. It is also policy under RES7 to provide for a variety of house types. It is considered that the selected housing typology has unduly constrained the achievement of higher densities. The proposed development would therefore set an undesirable precedent for similar sites, would contravene the provisions of the development plan and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. Having regard to the design principles enunciated in the *Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS)* issued jointly by the DoECLG and DoTTS in 2013, and notwithstanding the proposals for revised surface paving as lodged with the appeal, the Board

considered that the over- reliance on longitudinal parking within the estate, without the provision of grouped visitor parking, leads to the development of a street form without any proper sense of enclosure as recommended in para 4.2.1 of *DMURS* and would militate against the development of a sense of place either on the approach to, or within, the proposed development. Further, the Board was not satisfied that increased pedestrian permeability, as recommended in *DMURS* could not have been provided between the proposed development and surrounding developments via the open space to the south. The proposal would therefore be seriously injurious to the amenities of residents in the vicinity and within the proposed estate and would not be in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.

Board Member: _____ Date: 13th July 2016
Michael Leahy