



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

**Direction**  
**CD-021125-25**  
**ACP-323146-25**

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 03/11/2025.

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

#### **Planning**

**Commissioner:**

**Date:** 05/11/2025

*Mary Gurrie*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mary Gurrie

#### **DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER**

#### **Reasons and Considerations**

1. Having regard to the proposed provision of four number studio apartments and the lack of communal amenity space, the lack of private amenity space for three of the four units and the substandard provision of space and facilities in the unit in Block B, it is considered that the proposed development would fail to provide for a satisfactory standard of residential amenity for the future occupants, and would be contrary to the development standards and guidelines for residential development as set out in the Planning Design Standards for Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2023 and Development Management Standard 3 as set out in the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028. The

proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the to the proximity of the proposed development to the common boundary and the rear elevation of number 2 Ellis Cottages, it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to the requirements of SPPR 1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage in January, 2024, and would seriously injure the residential amenity at this location by reason of overlooking and overbearance. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

**Notes:**

1. The Commission noted and agreed with the comments of the inspector in Section 8.4 of the report in relation to the lack of an Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment to demonstrate that the proposed development would not adversely impact on the nearby protected structures; in Section 8.5 in relation to deficiencies in the description of the development; and in Section 8.6 in relation to the lack of clarity regarding access arrangements to the site and the potential impacts of any changes to access and boundary treatment on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. While ordinarily these matters would warrant further consideration and a request for further information, in this instance given the substantive reasons for refusal above, it was decided not to pursue these matters under the current appeal.
2. The Commission noted and agreed with the AA Screening in Section 9.0 of the Inspector's Report, noting that that the incorrect Screening for Appropriate Assessment report was attached to the Inspectors Report as Appendix 3.