An Coimisiún Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-001432
PL-501574-DR-26

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 16 October 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: **20th day of October 2026**

Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the location of the subject site within an Architectural Conservation Area, adjacent to No. 5 Longford Terrace (Protected Structure RPS 636) and in close proximity to several additional protected structures, all of which dwellings are located on lands zoned Objective A, which seeks 'to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities', and having regard to the nature, scale, design and positioning of the proposed development and

the development proposed to be retained, including the construction of a storage unit on an existing flat roof rear extension, the erection of lig[illegible]veight wooden fencing and bamboo planting to increase the height of the rear and side boundaries of the site, and the proposed retention of a doorway from the first floor rear elevation onto the existing flat roof extension to facilitate access over the flat roof to the proposed storage unit, it is considered that the proposed development and the development proposed to be retained, by virtue of its scale and positioning, would be haphazard in nature, and would constitute uncoordinated piecemeal development, which would fail to integrate with the existing structure. Given the absence of clarity regarding the intended use of the flat roof area of the existing rear extension, and the potential for nuisance to arise, the Commission could not be satisfied that the proposed development, and the development proposed to be retained, would not give rise to adverse impacts on the residential or visual amenities of properties in the area. The proposed development and the development proposed to be retained would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The Commission considered the Applicant's Noise Impact Assessment Report dated 8 April 2026, which acknowledged that the noise from the upgraded Air Handling Unit was a continuous and dominant noise source that was clearly distinguishable and which, in the absence of suitable noise mitigation measures, was likely to give rise to disturbance. Based on the information provided with the application and in the further information submitted in response to the appeal, and in the absence of details regarding the upgrading works undertaken to the ventilation and extraction ducting situated atop the rear flat roof extension, which works are proposed to

be retained, the Commission could not be satisfied that the proposed development and the development proposed to be retained, would not give rise to significant nuisance, by way of noise nuisance, for nearby residents, or that it would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area. The proposed development and the development proposed to be retained would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.