



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-000795
PL-500868-WD-26

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 25 June 2026.

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

Planning Commissioner:

MaryRose McGovern

Date:

25th day of June 2026

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the location of part of the subject site within the curtilage of Summerville House, which is a protected structure listed in the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028, it is considered that by reason of the proposed demolition of part of the eastern walled garden/site boundary wall, the

creation of a new entrance, and the provision of an internal roadway, footpath, and landscaping, the proposed development would extinguish the connection between Summerville House and its walled garden, and would damage the relationship between Summerville House, the walled garden, and the streetscape along Summerville Avenue. The proposed development would materially and adversely affect the special character and setting of the protected structure and this part of its curtilage, would fail to comply with Objective BH 01 (Record of Protected Structures), Objective BH 11 (Maintaining and Enhancing Special Character), and Objective BH 12 (Setting and Vistas) of the development plan, and would be contrary to Section 13.5.2 of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2011. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the totality of the information submitted with the application and the appeal response, the Commission was not satisfied that the proposed development would be capable of being safely accessed by all road users, and was not satisfied that it would not create an unacceptable risk to pedestrian and traffic safety, or endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard. Further, the Commission considered that the proposed pedestrian footpath in the internal layout failed to meet the requirements of Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS), and there was an absence of clarity as to whether the remainder of the proposed internal layout, the entrance, and the proposed junction with Summerville Avenue would achieve the necessary design standards. It is considered that the proposed development would fail to comply with Development Management Standard DM 47 of the development plan, and with Policy and Objective 4.1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and

Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. On the basis of the entirety of the information submitted with the application and the appeal response, the Commission was not satisfied that surface water run-off from the development could be satisfactorily collected, infiltrated and disposed of on-site and that groundwater quality would not be adversely affected. The proposed development would therefore pose an unacceptable risk of environmental pollution and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.