



The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on August 28th 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. The development of the subject site is premature pending the provision of a coordinated and wider planning strategy/framework for the area and pending the upgrading of the existing local network to facilitate increased traffic and pedestrian levels as well as facilitating better linkages to the public transport infrastructure in the area. A coordinated approach is needed among the landowners as the current approach would lead to piecemeal and haphazard development as well as potentially leading to development that does not make sufficient use of zoned land in close proximity to existing and future public transport infrastructure (Luas line B1). The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. It is considered that the proposed development, which involves significant alteration to the existing embankment and the loss of trees, fails to consider the biodiversity and ecological importance of the site and could potentially impact negatively upon the natural heritage importance of this site, the county wide

ecological network, the non-designated areas of biodiversity importance and the Loughlinstown River, and would be contrary to Policies LHB23: Non-Designated Areas of Biodiversity Importance, LHB24 : County Wide Ecological Network and LHB25: Rivers and Waterways, as set out in the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. It is considered that the proposed terrace of eight houses, by reason of its elevated location on a steeply sloped embankment, and by reason of its design, scale, and bulk, would represent a visually obtrusive element when viewed from Cherrywood Road. Furthermore, by reason of its height, design and the orientation of windows and balconies, the proposed development would have an overbearing impact upon the existing dwelling on site and the dwelling to the north of the site ('Windermere') and result in a loss of privacy at these existing dwellings. The proposed development would, therefore, be visually obtrusive, would seriously injure the residential amenities of the existing dwellings in the vicinity, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4. The proposed development would result in a significant intensification of traffic exiting the proposed development onto the Falls Road, which is a local (urban) road, narrow in width and without footpaths. This would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction of road users. Furthermore, the proposed development is considered to be premature as there is an existing deficiency on the Falls Road in terms of the lack of adequate, safe pedestrian facilities, which renders it unsuitable to carry the increased pedestrian traffic likely to result from the proposed development. The proposed development, if permitted, by itself or by the precedent that the grant of permission for it would set for other relevant developments, would adversely affect the use of the Falls Road by traffic. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note: The Board was not satisfied that adequate information had been provided, as part of the application and appeal, in relation to the impact of the construction of the proposed development on the retention of trees which are identified for retention and on the stability of this steeply sloping site, having regard to the necessity of protecting the water quality of the Loughlinstown River and the riparian biodiversity associated with the River, but decided not to pursue these issues further, in the light of the substantive reasons for refusal as set out in the Order.

[Please issue a copy of this Direction with the Board Order.]

Board Member

Date: 13th September 2017

Philip Jones