



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

**Board Direction**  
**PL06D.247850**

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on April 11<sup>th</sup> 2017.

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

### **Reasons and Considerations**

1. Having regard to the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the proposed replacement house, by reason of its detailed design, its scale, mass and bulk, and its undue proximity to site boundaries, would be visually obtrusive, incongruous and overbearing in relation to neighbouring dwellings and would seriously injure the residential amenities of adjoining properties by reason of overlooking and overshadowing. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Under the provisions of section 8.2.3.4 (vii) of the Dún Laoghaire- Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022, it is policy to ensure that new infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units. This policy is reasonable. It is considered that the proposed replacement house, by reason of its height, design and first floor fenestration, would constitute a form of development which would be out of character with existing development and would not respect the height and massing of existing residential units in its vicinity. The proposed development would fail to

respond appropriately to the context of the site and its surroundings, and would represent an incongruous feature that would represent an undesirable precedent for similar re-development proposals in the area and would contribute to the incremental erosion of the character of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note: The Board noted the revisions made to the proposed development as part of the appeal, but considered that these revisions were not sufficient or adequate to deal with its concerns and reasons for refusal outlined above. The Board noted that the revised proposal adequately dealt with the treatment of the front boundary, and accordingly did not include a reason for refusal that was reflective of the Planning Authority's third reason for refusal. The Board accepted the rationale put forward as part of the appeal for the demolition and replacement of the existing dwelling, but considered that the proposed replacement house was unacceptable and did not respond appropriately to the constraints of the subject site and to its surroundings, for the reasons outlined above.

*[Please issue a copy of this Direction to the parties and to the observers with the Board Order.]*

**Board Member**

**Date:** 11<sup>th</sup> April 2017

---

Philip Jones