



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-001086
PL-501161-LD-26

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 17 August 2026.

The Commission decided, by majority decision 2:1, to refuse permission generally in accordance with the following reasons and considerations.

Planning Commissioner:

Tom Rabbette

Date:

18th day of August 2026

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

1. The applicant has not demonstrated a need for an office extension in this area which adjoins existing vacant/ commercial units within the same landholding. It is considered that to permit the proposed development would set an undesirable precedent, would fail to address the issues of vacancy in Longford town

centre and would be contrary to Objective CPO 8.16 of the Longford County Development Plan 2021 – 2027. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The proposed development would be out of character with the established form of development within the Longford Town Core Area which maintains a strong traditional streetscape and would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area. The development would be contrary to Objective CPO 8.69 of the Longford County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In deciding (by majority decision 2:1) not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Commission noted that the associated landholding contains several vacant ground floor commercial units, some adjoining the proposed development. Local planning policy seeks to address large levels of vacancy within the town centre. Development of the type proposed undermines this policy and militates against the vibrancy and vitality of Longford town centre. The Commission therefore decided to uphold the planning authority's refusal reason number 1. The Commission also considered that the proposed development would be anomalous in terms of its siting in the streetscape, its relationship with the established building line, its design and height. The Commission therefore concurred with the planning authority's refusal reason number 2.