



An
Bord
Pleanála

Board Direction
BD-010532-22
ABP-312222-21

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 19/04/2022.

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 existing local road network which is substandard in terms of suitable pedestrian and cyclist facilities, it is considered that the increased demand generated by this development would result in future residents walking and cycling along the local roads and would lead to conflict between vehicular traffic, pedestrians, and cyclists. The proposed development would, therefore, endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard.
2. Having regard to the topography of the site, and in particular the steeply sloping nature of the site, it is considered that the provision of suitable and useable pedestrian/ cyclist facilities cannot be achieved to an acceptable level, and that consequently, the proposed development would be dominated by car use for most journeys, including local trips to Glounthaune village, schools, and the railway station. The development would therefore generate a significant volume of traffic which the road network in the vicinity of the site is not capable of accommodating safely due to the restricted width and capacity of the L-2968 Local Road in the vicinity of the site and the restricted capacity of its junction at the 'Dry Bridge' with the L-2970 Local Road. The

proposed development would, therefore, give rise to traffic congestion and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard.

Note: In not agreeing with the Inspector that, the proposed development would be out of character with the pattern of development in the area due to,

- the poor disposition and quantity of public and private/ communal open space which is restricted by the sloping nature of the site,
- the loss of locally important trees, the provision of a large area of residential units on a sloping site, the need for heavy engineering features to accommodate the development, would all substantially change the views of the site and have an adverse impact on the character of the area which is designated as having a High Landscape Value,

the Board considered that, sufficient areas of varied and high quality public open space had been proposed given the sloping nature of the site and the advantageous orientation towards the south of that slope, the layout and design of the proposed development which worked with the contours available on the site, so that notwithstanding the necessary roads infrastructure, the quantity of cutting proposed would be relatively modest given the topography of the site and the engineering interventions would not be excessive, the loss of a relatively small number of locally important trees proposed to be removed could be justified given the benefits that could accrue, including increased connectivity, access to the existing grotto and rock garden, and extensive new tree and hedge planting that would improve the setting over time. The Board did not consider that the proposed development which is within the development boundary and in proximity to a railway station, would have a negative impact on the character of the area designated as High Value, given the extent of development in the vicinity, the topography of the area, and the existing trees to be retained and proposed to be planted as part of the proposed development.

Furthermore, in not agreeing with the Inspector with regard to the negative impact on visual amenity and cultural heritage of the area, by the removal of 8 potential heritage trees associated with the gardens and woodlands of Ashbourne House, a Protected Structure (RPS no. 00498), it is considered that the mitigation

recommended in the Historic Landscape Assessment provided by the applicant which would provide for an appreciation of the existing overgrown rock garden and grotto, and where the trees proposed to be felled would be replaced with the same species within the area of the proposed development, would be acceptable.

Board Member



Michelle Fagan

Date: 19/04/2022

