

Board Direction BD-000356-18 ABP-300377-17

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on May 22nd 2018.

The Board decided, generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, to make a split decision, to

(1) grant permission for the retention of a fire escape only door constructed from a ground floor window opening in the eastern elevation of Block C, safety handrails on the roof of the existing single storey extension to form an escape route from the fire escape door, and a fire escape staircase constructed linking the lower ground level to the escape route from the fire escape door, for the reasons and considerations marked (1) under and subject to the conditions set out below,

and

(2) refuse permission for the retention of ground mounted air handling units and input flue to service the adjoining kitchen at lower ground level providing ventilation to catering kitchen of Block C and the air handling extract flue to the eastern elevation of Block C at ground floor level, and refuse permission for an an extension of the existing pedestrian ramp with handrails and gates between the front (north) of Block C and the lower ground level and a new sound baffle enclosure around the existing lower ground level air handling units, for the reasons and considerations marked (2) under,

Reasons and Considerations (1)

Having regard to the planning history on the site and the pattern of development in

the area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out

below, the development for which retention is sought, comprising a fire escape only

door constructed from a ground floor window opening in the eastern elevation of

Block C, safety handrails on the roof of the existing single storey extension to form

an escape route from the fire escape door, and a fire escape staircase constructed

linking the lower ground level to the escape route from the fire escape door, would

not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would,

therefore, not be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the

area.

Conditions

1. The development shall be retained shall be in accordance with the plans and

particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in

order to comply with the following conditions.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The fire escape door, and the adjoining staircase and walkway and route, shall

be used for fire escape purposes only, and shall not be used as a means of

egress or access to/from the building, nor for servicing/deliveries to the building.

The fire escape door shall not be kept open at any time other than for fire

escape emergencies or associated drills.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

Reasons and Considerations (2)

Having regard to the planning history on the site and on the basis of the submissions made in connection with the planning application and appeal, the Board is not satisfied that the development for which retention is sought, comprising ground mounted air handling units and input flue to service the adjoining kitchen at lower ground level providing ventilation to catering kitchen of Block C and the air handling extract flue to the eastern elevation of Block C at ground floor level, and the proposed development of an extension of the existing pedestrian ramp with handrails and gates between the front (north) of Block C and the lower ground level and a new sound baffle enclosure around the existing lower ground level air handling units, all in close proximity to an established residential dwelling of long standing, would not continue to cause significant and material injury to the residential amenities of the adjoining property known as *The Barn*, by reason of excessive noise and other disturbance. The subject development would seriously injure the residential amenities of adjoining property and would be contrary to the policy of the development plan for Z1 zones which seeks to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. The subject development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Board Member		Date:	23 rd May 2018
	Philip Jones	_	