



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Direction
CD-021352-25
ACP-323187-25

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 20/11/2025.

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

Planning

Commissioner:

Date: 20/11/2025


Mary Rose McGovern

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028, and in particular Objective HE 16-21 (Design and Landscaping of New Buildings) and Objective RP 5-22 (Design and Landscaping of New Dwelling Houses and Replacement Dwellings in Rural Areas), both of which encourage new buildings that respect the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and that fit appropriately into the landscape, it is considered that the proposed development, by way of its scale, mass and bulk would have an overbearing impact on the existing dwelling, and would not be of an appropriate scale and design relative to the existing structures on the site. It is also considered that notwithstanding the proposed revisions to the architectural treatment, submitted with the appeal, the design of the proposed extension would be out of character with its rural setting and with the

existing vernacular dwelling, and would not comply with Objective HE 16-21, Objective RP 5-22, or Objective RP 5-30 (Redevelopment or replacement of an Uninhabitable or Ruinous dwelling). It is also considered by the Commission that notwithstanding the proposed restoration of the vernacular farmhouse, the provision of such a large overbearing extension of this design would not accord with Objective HE 16-19 (Vernacular Heritage) due to the impacts on the setting of the house. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of this area.

NOTE:

The Commission had concerns regarding the nature and the length of the proposed access to the subject site, via an existing farm track of apparent grass format, through the adjacent farmland, and considered that the shared access proposed may not be appropriate for residential access to this location. Whilst ordinarily this would 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 this matter under the current appeal.