

Board Direction

Ref: 29S.247771

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 13th, April 2017.

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

Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the provisions of the Sustainable Urban Housing Design Standards for Apartments-Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoECLG 2015) and the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016 to 2022, the proposed development would fail to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation to serve the future occupants of the two apartments. Furthermore, the proposed dormer window structures would seriously injure the residential amenities of neighbouring properties by way of overlooking, perceived overlooking, overbearance and visual intrusion. The proposed development would also constitute an overdevelopment of a restricted corner site and it would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan, 2016 to 2022, the prominent corner position of the existing building which is located within an Architectural Conservation Area, opposite a Protected Structure and adjacent to an area covered by the "Z2" zoning objective which seeks "To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas", the design and layout of the existing building, and to the scale, extent and location of the proposed roof lights, windows, balconies and dormer window structures, it is considered that the proposed development would be visually obtrusive, it would seriously injure the visual amenities of the surrounding streetscape, Architectural Conservation Area and adjoining Residential Conservation Area. The proposed development would therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Paddy Keogh

Note: The Board shared the Planning Inspector's concerns in relation to the visual impact of the proposed development. However, it was considered that this would constitute a new issue in the context of the appeal. Having regard to the refusal of permission on other grounds the Board decided not to pursue this matter further with the parties.