

Direction CD-020624-25 ABP-322536-25

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 09/09/2025.

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

**Planning** 

Commissioner:

Date: 10/09/2025

**DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER** 

**Reasons and Considerations** 

Having regard to the totality of the application documentation submitted with the proposal, which describes a proposed guest house use, the policy objectives of Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028, in particular Objective TI 1 (Tourist Infrastructure) which seeks to encourage and promote tourism related facilities and accommodation within existing settlements, subject to compliance with Development Management Standards, and Objective TI 2 (Visitor accommodation) which seeks to encourage and facilitate visitor accommodation facilities where there is a justifiable requirement, subject to compliance with the relevant Development Management Standards, and having regard to DM Standard 31: Parking Standards, including

Table 15.5 which illustrates the car parking standards for different types of development, including a standard of 1 car space per bedroom for Guest House and Hostel developments, it is considered that in the absence of a Transport Mobility Management Plan to support the omission of car parking, the proposed development would be in conflict with the policy objectives of Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028. The 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 Commission noted the inspector's observation that no evidence was provided in any of the application documents, to demonstrate whether the previous use of the upper floors was standard residential or commercial in nature. The Commission also noted that other premises in the town centre of Oughterard which offer overnight accommodation do not appear to offer the benefit of on-site parking, and the Commission was of the opinion that in the absence of a Transport Mobility Management Plan, setting out parking demand calculations to detail demand throughout the day, as required by DM Standard 31, the applicant failed to demonstrate that the omission of car parking from the proposed development, can be justified.

## NOTE:

The Commission had concerns regarding the quality of amenity for future users of the proposed development, as the proposal lacked clarity regarding services for the proposed development, and the layout failed to demonstrate the provision of adequate usable open space. In addition, the Commission noted and agreed with the concerns expressed by the Inspector regarding the design of the southernmost third block within its surrounding environs in an Architectural Conservation Area, and regarding the poor quality architectural design offered by the southern (rear) elevation. Whilst ordinarily this may have warranted further consideration and a request for further information, in this instance given the substantive reason for refusal above, it was decided not to pursue these matters under the current appeal.