

Direction CD-020314-25 ABP-322008-25

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 23/07/2025.

The Commission decided to refuse permission, generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, for the following reasons and considerations.

Planning

Commissioner:

Date: 30/07/2025

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the inadequate qualitative and quantitative provision of public open space which would be contrary to Policy and Objective 5.1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) and Policy Objective HOU 24 and Section 13.8.15 of the Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027, and, by reason of its failure to meet the required minimum floor areas and standards recommended in the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2023) in respect to private open space, storage, unit aspect, and the sizing of bedrooms

and living spaces, which would be contrary to Section 13.8.28 of the development plan, it is considered that the proposed development would not provide a high standard of residential amenity for future residents, and would constitute overdevelopment of the site. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- 2. In the absence of sufficient information, including technical details and assessment, on the full impact of all proposed site infrastructure and services on the structure and stability of the existing northern embankment, it is considered that the proposed development would give rise to an unacceptable risk to public health and safety to adjoining properties. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 3. It is considered that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard on the basis of ambiguities surrounding the scheme's internal one-way road network design and carriage-way widths and issues with same identified in the Road Safety Audit submitted with the planning application. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note:

The Commission noted the Planning Inspector's first recommended reason for refusal in relation to the siting, height and visual prominence of the proposed development, however the Commission considered that the proposal submitted at appeal stage to reduce the height of Blocks 1 and 3 to 3 storey would mitigate concerns in relation to overlooking and overbearance on surrounding properties and would also reduce the visual impact of the proposed development on the views of the town from the protected structure at Millmount Tower and considered that the height of the development if reduced to 3 storeys would not be a reason for refusal in itself.