



Board Direction

Ref: PL06F.246722

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 10th October 2016.

The Board decided to refuse permission generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, and in accordance with the draft reasons and considerations set out below.

REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

1. The site of the proposed development is part designated as High Amenity and part residential in the Fingal Development Plan 2011 - 2017. The High Amenity zoning objective seeks to protect and enhance high amenity, which is considered reasonable. The site is also located in a coastal area designated as being a Highly Sensitive Landscape, and it is an objective of the Development Plan to protect the special character of the coast by preventing inappropriate development along the coast. Having regard to the location and layout of the proposed detached house and associated residential garden area, it is considered that the proposed development would seriously injure the visual amenities and landscape character of the area, would be contrary to the High Amenity zoning objective, would constitute the overdevelopment of a restricted site within the residential zone, would be contrary to Objective Z04 of the Development Plan in respect of transitional zonal areas, would consolidate a poor pattern of development in proximity to a recorded monument, and would seriously detract from the character and setting of the monument, which is identified in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage as being of national importance. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the limited extent of the courtyard area and access requirements to serve three houses, which would be wholly hard paved, without provision for soft landscaping, and with high walls to the west, it is considered that the car parking arrangement for the proposed development would be seriously substandard by reason of cramped parking and manoeuvring arrangements, would result in poor residential amenity, would constitute the overdevelopment of a restricted site within the residential zone, would lead to conflict between vehicular traffic and pedestrians, and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard.

Note:

The Board concurred with the Inspector that two houses might be considered on this site, having parking to the front, and a building line staggered in relation to the houses to the north and to the south, with a management plan to maintain the open coastal landscape within the High Amenity area that forms the setting for the Martello Tower.

Board Member: _____ Date: 17th October 2016
Fionna O' Regan