An Coimisiún Pleanála

**Commission Order**

**PL-501513-RN-26**

**Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended**

**Planning Authority: Roscommon County Council**

**Planning Register Reference Number: PD/26/60007**

**Appeal** by Ronan and Fiona Kildea against the decision made on the 14th day of May, 2026 by Roscommon County Council to refuse permission for the proposed development.

**Proposed Development:** A change of house design and relocation of the garage previously permitted under planning register reference number PD/22/663 (An Bord Pleanála reference number ABP-319526-24) and to construct all necessary site works at, Corraree and Ballygatta, Taughmaconnell, Ballinasloe, County Roscommon. The proposed development was revised by further public notices received by the planning authority on the 17th day of April, 2026 as follows: a change of house design and change of site layout (including a change of the location of the house and garage) from that approved under planning register reference number PD/23/42 (An Bord Pleanála reference number: ABP-319526-24) and to construct all necessary site works.

## Decision

**REFUSE permission for the above proposed development in accordance with the reasons and considerations set out below.**

## Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to Section 12.7 (Rural House Design Considerations) of Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028, and the County Roscommon Rural Design Guidelines which emphasise the importance of taking a sympathetic approach to the siting, location and design and integration of new dwellings into the landscape, and to the typography of the site, the existing roadside farmyard pattern of development in the area, the position of the proposed development together with its height and mass and the resulting extensive driveway, it is considered that the proposed development would form a discordant and obtrusive feature on the landscape at this location, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would militate against the preservation of the rural environment and would set an undesirable precedent for other such prominently located developments in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, 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 documentation submitted with the application and appeal, along with the planning history pertaining to the subject site and determined that the siting of the proposed dwelling house and garage accessed via an approximately 105 metres long driveway towards the rear (southwest) of the site would fail to respect the traditional roadside farmyard development pattern of the locality. In this regard, the Commission noted the commentary in Section 4.2 'Locating the House' in the Rural Design Guidelines which states "A principle factor in house location on a rural site is the development pattern of the area which is fundamental in the ability of the dwelling to assimilate into the existing landscape. The pattern should reflect the character of the locality itself and at this stage it is important to differentiate between the rural and suburban pattern of development. In a traditional rural pattern, the dwelling is surrounded by the landscape and indeed forms part of the landscape as compared to the suburban pattern where dwellings occupy individual plots of land with the building form being the dominant object on the site". The Commission determined that the proposed house and garage, by reason of its height, mass - notably the width of the facade fronting the road (house approximately 24 metres, house and garage approximately 37 metres) on an elevated position would result in a building form that dominates the site rather than assimilating into the landscape. Furthermore, the Commission considered that the proposed finished floor level for the house and garage at 65.90 OD and the ridge level for the two storey section at 73.00 OD given the road level of 64.00 OD at the entrance to the site and the extent of the artificial platform (approximately 37 metres wide) at 65.90 OD would give rise to a visually exposed development and conspicuous buildings which are unrelated to the site typography, and would, therefore not, accord with Section 4.4 of Rural Design Guidelines. While the Inspector considered the proposed layout would reduce the visual impact of the development when compared to a layout on the 65.5 contour

line to the front (northeast) of the site and with reference to the CGIs submitted with the appeal documentation, the Commission carried out a de novo assessment of the proposed development and did not share the view of the Inspector that the proposed development would of itself be acceptable in the proposed location. The Commission considered that the proposed development, arising from its overall height and positioning to the rear of the site elevated above the road level with an extensive driveway, fails to assimilate into the existing landscape, and notwithstanding the proposed landscaping, does not complement the visual integrity of its surroundings or work in tandem with the existing contours of the site. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

**Emer Maughan**
**Planning Commissioner of An Coimisiún Pleanála duly authorised to authenticate the seal of the Commission.**

**Dated this** 4th **day of** November **2026.**