

Board Direction BD-018378-24 ABP-320529-24

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 04/12/2024.

The Board decided to refuse permission for the following reasons and considerations.

## Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the pattern of development in the area and the scale of the development proposed for retention and the proposed development, it is considered that by reason of its scale, dimensions, bulk, dominance and massing, the development proposed for retention and the proposed development would seriously injure the visual and residential amenities of the area, would be contrary to Objective SPQH045 (domestic extensions) and Development Management Standards in Section 14.10.2.5 (dormer extensions), and would set a precedent for inappropriate development in the vicinity of the site. The development proposed to be retained and proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Board, in agreement with the planning authority, considered that the development proposed for retention by reason of excessive scale and extent, would not accord with the condition attached by the planning authority in the previous grant of permission in order to protect residential amenity in accordance with Objective SPQH045. The Board shared the concerns of the planning authority that the impact of this aspect of the development on the quantum of private open space available to

the dwelling was unclear based on the documentation available. In relation to the proposed development, the Board, in agreement with the planning authority, considered that the impact of the addition of two dormer extensions on this prominent corner site would not accord with the criteria set out in the Development Management Standards Section 14.10.2.5, would be overly dominant, and would have an excessive visual impact on the character of the area and the privacy of adjacent properties.

## Note:

The Board noted commentary by both the planning authority and the Inspector regarding discrepancies in the plans and particulars received with the application and appeal, including the presence of a single storey flat roofed structure at the rear of the site that was not referenced in the site layout plans. The Board considered that these matters must be satisfactorily addressed in any future application relating to the subject site.

**Board Member** 

Martina Hennessy

Date: 04/12/2024

ABP-320529-24 Board Direction Page 2 of 2