

Direction CD-020088-25 ABP-322081-25

Date: 27/06/2025

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 27/06/2025.

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

Planning

Commissioner:

Paul Caprani

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

1. It appears from the information contained on file that the dwelling for which retention of planning permission is sought, seeks to replace an smaller unauthorised residential unit which previously was located on the site. It is considered that the location of the unauthorised structure within the site, in such close proximity to the western boundary of the site would adversely impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining residential dwelling by reason of being overbearing and overshadowing. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

ABP-322081-25 Direction Page 1 of 2

2. It is considered that the overall design of the dwelling to be retained is inappropriate incorporating a mono-pitched roof together with the gable end of the dwelling fronting onto the public road. The development as constructed constitutes an incongruous design that adversely impacts on the visual amenities of the area and property in the vicinity of the of the site and is therefore contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Commission had regard to the location of the dwelling within the site and the proximity of the dwelling to adjacent dwellings and the overbearing nature and structure in the context of adjoining sites. The Commission also had concerns regarding the orientation and design of the house and the fact that the structure to be retained does not face onto the public road. The orientation of the structure to be retained is considered incongruous in layout and design terms and adversely impacts on the visual amenities of the area. The Commission were of the opinion that if a development of this nature was proposed in the first instance that planning permission would be refused for the reasons set out above.