

**Board Direction BD-017614-24 ABP-319982-24** 

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 26/09/2024.

The Board decided to refuse permission by a majority of 2 to 1, generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, for the following reasons and considerations.

## Reasons and Considerations

- 1. Having regard to the surrounding urban structure and the disposition of the building on a modestly sized and constrained site it is considered that the proposed building is excessive in terms of height, form, site coverage and scale, and would constitute a dominant and overbearing structure in the context of the existing environment. Furthermore it is considered that the proposal does not provide an appropriate transition in height and scale, and does not respond well to site boundaries or have due regard to the nature of the surrounding urban morphology. The proposed development is considered overly dominant and would have an excessive overbearing effect on adjoining property. The proposed development, would, therefore seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity and character of the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 2. The proposed development would provide for a poor frontage along the Donnybrook Road, through its design, the overhang of the building over the public footpath and the narrowness of the footpath. Due to the layout and functionality of

the building at ground floor level, the proposal would fail to enliven the streetscape and therefore would provide for a poor quality of urban design on entering the village on the R138 from the south eastern side. The provision of a set down area on Brookvale Road is considerable distance from the main student entrance on Donnybrook Road which is considered suboptimal in terms of functionality and design. The proposed development would militate against an attractive pedestrian environment, and would therefore not be in accordance with SMT11 of the development which seeks to protect improve and expand the pedestrian network in the city and objective SMTO2 which seeks to improve the pedestrian network. The removal of 2 storeys as provided for in the planning authority's decision failed to resolve problems with the functionality associated with the ground floor layout. The proposed development would, therefore, conflict with the objectives of the development plan and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

**Board Member** 

Paul Caprani

Date: 26/09/2024