



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-000849
PL-500997-DF-26

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 01 July 2026.

The Commission decided to refuse permission generally in accordance with the following reasons and considerations.

Planning Commissioner:

Mary Henchy

Date:

9th day of July 2026

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

1-Having regard to the location of the development as constructed on a prominent site within a Coastal landscape Character Area that is categorised by the Development Plan as having exceptional landscape value and to the highly sensitive development and the location of the site within the Howth Special

area Amenity Order (SAAO), the development is visually obtrusive within the surrounding context and represent an incongruous form of development within the established character to the area. The development in its current location, design, height and sloped roof contravenes Objective GINHO59 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and as such would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2-The development to be retained would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments, which in itself and cumulatively would contribute to an erosion of the distinctive and attractive character of the area, be harmful to the visual and residential amenities of the area and 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 considered the totality of the file. The Commission disagreed with the Inspector and shared the opinion of the local authority with regard to the impact on the visual amenity of the lands within the Howth Special Amenity Order and the objectives in respect to same. Notwithstanding the modest scale of the structure, and the fact that a garage (albeit different in design) had been located on the site of the proposed structure, the Commission considered the context had altered with changes made to the setting and that this is to a degree that the proposed structure for retention and the internal road to access same is now visually dominant and does not integrated into the landscape.

The Commission reviewed the planning history (F21A/0066 and ABP32286-21) and noted that the site as viewed from the roadway differed to what was proposed in that planning application, specifically the landscape drawings including the boundary treatment along the public road. The revisions have resulted in change

to views to the coast from the road, making the structure for retention more dominant and incongruous in the landscape when compared to the visual impact of the previous garage on the site, views of which were limited.