



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL29N.248632

Development	Construction of two dwellings.
Location	To the side and rear of 29 Foxfield Park, Raheny, Dublin 5.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2498/17.
Applicant(s)	John Lea.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse.
Type of Appeal	First Party -v- Refusal.
Appellant(s)	John Lea.
Observer(s)	(i) J & M McKenna and Others (ii) Anne Kenny.
Date of Site Inspection	18 th August, 2017.
Inspector	Paul Caprani.

Contents

1.0 Introduction	3
2.0 Site Location and Description	3
3.0 Proposed Development	4
4.0 Planning Authority's Decision	5
4.1. Decision	5
4.2. Documentation Submitted with the Application	6
4.3. Observations	6
4.4. Planning Authority Assessment.....	7
4.5. Planner's Report	7
5.0 Planning History.....	8
6.0 Grounds of Appeal.....	8
7.0 Appeal Responses.....	9
8.0 Observations.....	9
9.0 Development Plan Provision.....	11
10.0 Planning Assessment.....	12
11.0 Appropriate Assessment	17
12.0 Conclusions and Recommendation.....	17
13.0 Decision	18
14.0 Reasons and Considerations	18

1.0 Introduction

PL29N.248632 relates to a first party appeal against the decision of Dublin City Council to issue notification to refuse planning permission for the construction of two dwellings adjacent to No. 29 Foxfield Park, Raheny. Dublin City Council refused planning permission for two reasons stating that the proposed development would result in an incongruous insertion into the existing streetscape and would constitute overdevelopment of the subject site giving rise to residential amenity problems for adjoining residences. A number of observations were also submitted to the Board supporting Dublin City Council's decision.

2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. No. 29 Foxfield Park occupies a corner site on the western side of a junction between Foxfield Park and Foxfield Lawn. It is a generously sized site with a large side garden and rear garden backing onto No. 1 Foxfield Lawn which is located to the immediate north. The site has a stated total area of 560 square metres. At its widest, the site is approximately 18 metres in width and has a maximum depth of approximately 36 metres.
- 2.2. A two-storey dwelling currently occupies the site. It forms the eastern part of a pair of semi-detached dwellings which face southwards onto Foxfield Park. The remainder of the site is currently laid out as private open space within the curtilage of the dwelling. There is a separate small garage located within the rear garden adjacent to the northern boundary of the site with direct access onto Foxfield Lawn.
- 2.3. Foxfield Park and Lawn comprises of a typical suburban residential estate dating from the late 1960s/early 1970s comprising of two-storey semi-detached hipped roof dwellings with single-storey garages to the side. There are a number of single detached dwellings located throughout the estate most of which are more recently constructed urban infill development on corner sites.

3.0 Proposed Development

- 3.1. Planning permission is sought for the construction of two detached dwellinghouses on the subject site.
- 3.2. Dwellinghouse No. 1 is to comprise of a detached dwelling located to the immediate east of the existing dwelling on site. The proposed detached dwelling is to occupy the existing side garden and is to face southwards onto Foxfield Park. The proposed dwelling is to incorporate the same building line of the adjacent dwellinghouse to the west. The dwellinghouse is to incorporate an asymmetrical pitched roof which is to rise to a ridge height of 9.152 metres approximately 0.8 metres above the ridge height of the existing dwellinghouse on site. The dwelling is to accommodate living accommodation at ground floor level with two bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor level and an additional bedroom within the roof pitch at second floor level. The bedroom at second floor level is to incorporate an angled dormer-type window facing north-eastwards onto Foxfield Lawn. A velux window is also to be incorporated within the roof pitch on the front elevation providing natural light to the staircase leading to the top bedroom. The ground floor is to incorporate external finishes comprising of plaster render finish together with select brickwork. The first floor is to incorporate a mixture of plaster render finish with natural slate cladding. The roof is to incorporate natural slate and it is also proposed to incorporate a large chimney protruding above the ridge height of the dwelling. The chimney is also to be clad in slate.
- 3.3. One car parking space is to be provided to the front of dwellinghouse 1. The dwelling is to incorporate a rear garden length of just under 10 metres and a garden width of just over 7.4 metres.
- 3.4. The rear (northern portion of the site) is to incorporate a separate dwelling (dwelling No.2) facing westwards on Foxfield Lawn. This dwelling is more contemporary in style and comprises of a two-storey flat roofed structure rising to a ridge height of 4.7 metres. The dwelling is to accommodate two bedrooms and two bathrooms at ground floor level with living accommodation together with a terraced area to the rear at first floor level. A small rear garden is also to be incorporated in the north-western corner of the site. One off-street car parking space is to be provided to the front of the dwelling. The dwelling is to incorporate glazing on the front and rear elevation with selected timber sliding privacy screens along the front elevation. A similar

elevational treatment is proposed on the rear (western elevation). However, the window is to incorporate frosted glass. The terraced area above ground floor to the rear is to be surrounded by selected timber screening 2.5 metres in height. The finished floor level of the dwelling is 1.2 metres below the ground level on Foxfield Lawn.

4.0 Planning Authority's Decision

4.1. Decision

4.1.1. In its decision dated 10th May, 2017 Dublin City Council refused planning permission for two reasons which are set out in full below.

1. Having regard to the residential quality standards set out in Section 16.10.9 "corner/side garden sites" of the Dublin City Development Plan, it is considered that the proposed developments set within the corner/side/rear garden of an existing dwelling would substantially break the building line of Foxfield Lawn and would result in an incongruous insertion into a formally designed and laid out streetscape scene. Moreover, the insertion of the proposed dwellinghouse forward of the building line on Foxfield Lawn would infringe the existing front building line and would diminish the visual integrity of this coherently laid out streetscape scene as appreciated from the public domain and would result in a visually overbearing built form forward of the building line particularly as viewed from the adjoining property No. 1 Foxfield Lawn. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the said provisions of the development plan and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The proposed development of two detached dwellinghouses on the side/corner garden of No. 29 Foxfield Park would constitute overdevelopment of the subject site as it would result in an inadequate quantum of usable private open space to serve the proposed northern dwellinghouse due to the lack of adequate privacy and sunlight and the proposed northern dwellinghouses first floor terrace would unduly overlook adjoining sites including the parent site. The proposed development would, therefore, be

contrary to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 16.10.9 in particular the “Z1” land use zoning provisions of the site and its setting which seeks to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. The proposed development would seriously injure the amenities of the area and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4.2. Documentation Submitted with the Application

- 4.2.1. A design and visual impact statement was submitted with the planning application on the 28th March, 2017. It notes that the subject site is located within walking distance of all local amenity and is in close proximity to public transport infrastructure.
- 4.2.2. Reference is made to numerous applications where planning permission was granted for dwellinghouses in the side and rear garden of houses in the vicinity. Reference is made to six applications granted permission between 2001 and 2007. It is argued that the design concept follows the existing building lines and for this reason it is argued that the proposal contributes positively to the existing streetscape of both Foxfield Park and Lawn. Both dwelling units are described and it is stated that both houses have been positioned and designed to ensure that overshadowing is minimised. Details of the site access and services provided are also set out. It is stated and it is intended to install an air source heating pump heating system to each of the houses. High levels of insulation will be used in each of the structures including air tightness to ensure a high energy rating. It is argued that the proposed development represents a contemporary comprehensive and well thought out scheme in a tight sensitive suburban site which respects the existing character and landscape of the area.

4.3. Observations

- 4.3.1. A number of letters of objection were submitted in respect of the proposed development arguing that the proposed development is completely out of character with the existing residential environment and will give rise to residential amenity problems and would also constitute a traffic hazard. One of the objections submitted is signed by numerous residents of Foxfield Lawn and Foxfield Park.

4.4. Planning Authority Assessment

- 4.4.1. A report from the Dublin City Council Drainage Division states that there is no objection subject to conditions.
- 4.4.2. A report from the Roads, Streets and Traffic Department states that there is no objection to the proposed development subject to a number of conditions. One of the conditions requires that the vehicular access and off-street car parking space for the development shall be relocated to the south in order to provide a minimum car parking space of 3 metres by 5 metres.

4.5. Planner's Report

- 4.5.1. The local authority planning assessment expresses concerns that the proposed contemporary infill dwelling will break the building line along Foxfield Lawn. It is also noted that while planning precedents have been set for the development of corner sites it is not accepted that they provide adequate precedent for the current application before the Board. Furthermore, the asymmetrical hipped roof to the side of the parent dwelling looks "somewhat forced into the site". It is also noted that the applicant's proposed new entrances could threaten the viability of adjacent on-street trees with no compensatory scheme proposed.
- 4.5.2. In terms of access to daylight and sunlight it is not considered that the new dwellings will result in any significant obstruction of adjoining third party's access to daylight and the proposed habitable rooms appear to be capable of receiving sufficient access to daylight with the exception of a back living room in the semi-basement level of House No. 2. In terms of overlooking it is considered that the slatted screening treatment to the proposed above ground floor terrace to the infill dwelling would still allow for overlooking of adjoining sites including the parent site. In terms of private open space, it is argued that the open space provision for the contemporary infill dwelling (House No. 2) it appears to be inadequate - at less than 40 square metres.
- 4.5.3. Based on the above assessment it was recommended that planning permission be refused for the proposed development. In its decision dated 10th May, 2017 Dublin

City Council issued notification to refuse planning permission for the reasons referred to above.

5.0 Planning History

5.1. One history file is attached. Under PL29N.231543 An Bord Pleanála upheld the decision of Dublin City Council to refuse planning permission for modifications and alterations to a previously approved two-storey dwelling (under Reg. Ref. 2276/06) to include a two-storey mews dwelling to the rear. Planning permission was refused for a single reason that the proposed additional mews dwelling is substandard in terms of private open space provision, would be visually obtrusive and would be incongruous in the streetscape.

5.2. Other relevant history is set out in the planner's report and is briefly summarised below:

Under Reg. Ref. 2276/06 planning permission was granted for a two-storey dwelling to the side of No. 29 Foxfield Park.

Under 1407/01 planning permission was refused for a two-storey house to the side of the existing dwelling for reasons relating to infringing on the side building line, having inadequate separation distance between the existing and proposed dwelling and the underprovision of usable private open space.

Under Reg. Ref. 3913/00 planning permission was refused for a dwellinghouse for reasons relating to infringing on the building line and having inadequate separation distances between the existing and proposed dwelling.

6.0 Grounds of Appeal

6.1. The decision of Dublin City Council to refuse permission was the subject of a first party appeal. The grounds of appeal are outlined below.

- The positioning of the two proposed dwellings on the site has taken account of the specific buildings lines of both Foxfield Park and Foxfield Lawn. The proposed dwellinghouse to the rear (House No. 2) is on the same position as the existing garage located to the rear of the property. The positioning of this building has also been recessed down to further reduce its impact on the

streetscape. The Board is requested to view the birds eye view image on the architect's drawing.

- The proposed new house to the side garden is the same depth and volume as the existing dwelling and is appropriately set back in from the street. Both the existing dwelling and the proposed new dwelling adjacent (House No. 1) will provide rear gardens in excess of 80 square metres which is above development plan standards.
- It is argued that the residual space to the rear is suitable to accommodate a two-storey mews house with private open space. 25 square metres of open space at ground floor level is appropriate for House Type 2 and a further 15 square metres of enclosed roof terrace is provided. The terrace is enclosed by a 2 - metre high solid timber fence to ensure no overlooking occurs. One on-site parking space is provided for the dwelling.
- House No. 1 has more than adequate open space and has an internal gross floor area of 127 square metres which provides good quality accommodation.
- Reference is made to No. 15 Foxfield Lawn Raheny, and 50 Gracefield Park where permission has been granted for two houses to the side and rear of the existing dwelling. It is argued that No. 15 Foxfield Lawn is almost identical to the current application.
- In conclusion it is argued that given the current housing need in Dublin and its inner suburbs, there is an opportunity to develop mews sites through low key innovative and contemporary architectural design proposals making use of the spare garden spaces available in sites such as the current site before the Board.

7.0 Appeal Responses

It appears that Dublin City Council have not submitted a response to the grounds of appeal.

8.0 Observation

8.1. Two observations were submitted. These are briefly summarised below.

8.2. Observation from Anne Kenny of No. 27 Foxfield Park.

This observer is the owner/occupier of the dwellinghouse to the immediate west of the subject site. It is argued that the proposal will seriously damage the residential amenities of the occupant and other residents in the immediate area. It is argued that inadequate private open space has been provided for the dwelling to the rear (Dwelling No. 2) and thus the proposal fails to meet development plan standards.

It is also argued that the first floor terrace immediately adjoins the observer's boundary and there is no separation or distance proposed between the terrace and the observer's rear garden and this will result in significant overlooking. The proposal incorporates extensive screening in order to retrofit the dwelling into the site. There is no regard for existing building lines and the dwellings are completely out of character with the surrounding area. The proposal would significantly devalue the observer's property by reason of overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing. It would also create a serious precedent for other similar type developments in the area.

8.3. Observation from John and Monica McKenna and Others.

This observation fully concurs with the decision of the Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- The proposed construction of a three-storey residence is out of character and out of scale of existing residential properties.
- The proposed construction of a second two-storey residence to the rear would constitute an excessively high density on the site.
- The design and layout of House No. 2 is completely out of character with the existing properties on site.
- The proposed development would cause significant monetary depreciation to the value of existing properties on Foxfield Park and Foxfield Lawn.
- There have been recent problems associated with sewage for houses on Foxfield Lawn and this could be further exacerbated by the construction of an additional dwelling on the road.

- Vehicular access to the proposed development would be too near the junction of Foxfield Park and Foxfield Lawn thus creating a serious traffic hazard.
- A number of previous planning applications for similar type developments have been refused. Copies of these refusals are attached to the observation.

The observation is signed by 34 signatures from residents in the vicinity of the subject site.

9.0 Development Plan Provision

- 9.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 – 2022. Section 16.10.9 of the development plan specifically relates to residential development in corner/side garden sites. It states that the development of a dwelling or dwellings in the side garden of an existing house is a means of making the most efficient use of serviced residential lands. Such developments, when undertaken on suitable sites and to a high standard of design can constitute valuable additions to the residential building stock of an area and will generally be allowed for by the Planning Authority on suitably large sites.
- 9.2. However, some corner/side gardens are restricted to the extent that they would be more suitable for extending an existing home into a larger family home rather than to create a poor quality independent dwelling which may also compromise the quality of the existing house.
- 9.3. The Planning Authority will have regard to the following criteria in assessing proposals for the development of corner/side garden sites.
 - The character of the street.
 - The compatibility of the design and scale with adjoining dwellings paying attention to the established building line, proportion, heights, parapet levels and materials of adjoining buildings.
 - Impact on the residential amenities of adjoining sites.
 - Open space standards and refuse standards for both existing and proposed dwellings.

- The provision of appropriate car parking facilities and a safe means of access to and egress from the site.
- The provision of landscaping and boundary treatments which are in keeping with other properties in the area.
- The maintenance of the front and side building lines where appropriate.

9.4. In terms of private open space, standards the development plan require a minimum standard of 10 square metres of private open space per bedspace. Generally, up to 60 to 70 square metres of rear garden area is considered sufficient for houses in the city.

10.0 Planning Assessment

I have read the entire contents of the file, visited the site in question, have had particular regard to the planning history and the reasons for refusal cited by Dublin City Council together with the grounds of appeal. I consider the relevant issues in determining the current application and appeal before the Board are as follows:

- Precedent Applications on the Subject Site
- The Building Line
- Amenity Issues
- Design Issues
- Other Issues raised in the Observations Submitted

10.1. Precedent Applications on the Subject Site

10.1.1. I specifically refer the Board to the history file attached which relates to a similar type application on the lands in question. Under PL29N.231543 planning permission was sought for the modifications and alterations to a previously approved two-storey dwelling in order to incorporate a two-storey mews dwelling to the rear. The Board will note that planning permission was granted for a dwellinghouse to the side of the existing dwelling under Reg. Ref. 2276/06. The subsequent application (Reg. Ref. 4027/08) and appeal sought alterations which, to all intents and purposes, involved the subdivision of the site to incorporate a two-storey mews development to the rear where House No. 2 is located under the current application. The two-storey mews

dwelling sought to accommodate a two-bedroom unit with parking to the side in a garage. It also incorporated a 7.5 metre rear garden.

- 10.1.2. Both the Planning Authority and the Board refused planning permission for the proposal. The proposed mews dwelling under the previous application in my view is not dis-similar to the current application before the Board in the context of the size and scale of the dwelling proposed and its location within the subdivided garden. The Board refused planning permission on the grounds that it was out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area, offered substandard private open space and was in a visually obtrusive position in front of the established building line and would thus be incongruous in the context of the streetscape. The Board also considered that the proposal constituted an overdevelopment of the subject site.
- 10.1.3. The current application notwithstanding the more contemporary design approach in my view gives rise to many of the concerns raised in the previous application and appeal and these are explored in more detailed below. It is appropriate to highlight at this stage in my report that there is in my opinion, a relevant precedent in respect of similar type development on the subject site, where the Board previously considered such development to be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.2. **The Building Line**

- 10.2.1. Again I refer to the previous application on site which involved the construction of a mews dwelling adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. The Board considered that the footprint of the building adversely impacted on the building line on Foxfield Lawn and referred to this issue in its reason for refusal. The house no 2 under the current application steps the building back from the eastern boundary of the site by just over 3 metres. It is nevertheless considerably forward from the building line of existing dwellings fronting onto the western side of Foxfield Lawn. The buildings on the western side of Foxfield Lawn to the north of the subject site incorporate a building line c.9 metres from the front boundary of the site. While I acknowledge there is a subtle curvature in the building line along Foxfield Lawn, the footprint of House No. 2 is considerably beyond this curvature. In order to adequately reflect the existing curvature along Foxfield Lawn I estimate that the building would have to be setback 7 to 8 metres from the adjoining footpath. Therefore, I would agree with the

Planning Authority's conclusion that the proposal adversely impinges on the established building line. The dimensions of the site in question do not in my opinion enable a building to be placed within the rear of the existing garden while respecting and adhering to the existing building line. I am however satisfied that House No. 1 reflects and respects the established building line along Foxfield Park.

10.3. Amenity Issues

10.3.1. Dublin City Council's reason for refusal makes reference to the inadequate provision of private open space to serve Dwelling No. 2. It considers that private open space provision in respect of House No. 1 is adequate and I would likewise concur with this conclusion. The proposed mews dwellings to the rear incorporates a courtyard area in the north-eastern corner of the plot. This courtyard area is located in the north-eastern corner of the site and amounts to just over 24 square metres. It is also proposed to incorporate a fully enclosed terrace at first floor level above the bedroom to the rear and adjacent to the courtyard area. This terraced area amounts to just over 14 square metres and is surrounded by a 2.4 metre high timber screen fence. An incidental area of open space is also to be provided to the front of the dwellinghouse. I estimate the overall open space provision to be in the region of 50 square metres. While the open space provision complies with development plan standards of 10 square metres of private open space per bedspace, it does nevertheless fall short of the development plan requirement of providing 60 to 70 square metres of a rear garden area. Perhaps of greater concern in my opinion is the quality of open space provided particularly in respect of the courtyard area. The courtyard area is located in the north-western corner of the site and is surrounded to the south and west by the proposed structure. This area of open space is only 5 metres wide yet is bounded on its southern side by a 2 metre high structure with selected timber screening above, thus rising to an overall height of 5.4 metres. This in my view would provide poor sunlight penetration and will represent at best, modest levels of amenity for future occupants.

10.3.2. I note that the previous application refused by the Board under PL29N.231543 incorporated a rear garden open space of over 52 square metres. The current application offers a screen terraced area together with a small courtyard area which permits limited sunlight and daylight penetration amounting to 38 square metres. If the Board considered the open space in respect of the previous application to be

inadequate I suggest a similar conclusion could be reached in relation to the current application.

10.3.3. In relation to overlooking, I consider that both houses as designed have adequately addressed the issue of overlooking. I consider that there are adequate separation distances between the dwellings in question to ensure that no overlooking takes place. Furthermore, the mews type development to the rear does not propose to incorporate any windows on its southern or northern elevation thus prohibiting any direct overlooking of the dwellings to the north or south. All windows in the case of the proposed mews dwellings incorporate an east/west outlook which do not directly overlook any adjoining dwellings. Overlooking from the proposed terrace to the rear of house number 2 has been successfully addressed by the incorporation of a fully enclosed timber screen.

10.3.4. Notwithstanding my comments in relation to overlooking, I would refer the Board in my previous comments in respect of open space and I consider that the incorporation of a first floor terraced area which is completely surrounded by timber fencing which provides no outlook for the occupants of the dwelling, while addressing the issue of overlooking, it in itself constitutes poor private open space amenity.

10.3.5. With regard to access to daylight and sunlight, Dublin City Council requires that glazing to all habitable rooms should not be less than 20% of the floor area of the room. This appears to be achieved in the case of Dwelling No. 2 to the rear. However, some of the windows to the rear of the dwelling face onto the small enclosed courtyard which is sunken below ground level. This could in my view provide very poor levels of amenity for occupants of the dwelling and in my opinion the layout and configuration within this constrained site does not lend itself to good levels of natural light and aspect.

10.4. **Design Issues**

10.4.1. I would have concerns in respect of both dwellings in relation to the overall design. While the subject site is not located in an architectural conservation area or a residential conservation area, the subject site is located in an area that displays a uniformity of residential design. While there is scope and precedent for infill development on corner sites throughout the estate, I consider that such development

should be broadly reflective of the existing character inherent in the suburban design and layout. In the case of Dwelling No. 2, I consider the contemporary design approach, while attractive in itself, to be totally incongruous to the architectural typology within Foxfield Park and Lawn. The design approach is in no way reflective of the prevailing residential suburban type character of the area and in my view would be more appropriate in an area that incorporates a wider variety of residential design types.

10.4.2. In relation to House No. 1, I note that this house is located on a corner site and for this reason it is visually prominent within the estate. The dwellinghouse proposed incorporates an asymmetrical roof pitch with a ridge height higher than the adjoining dwelling to the west. Furthermore, it incorporates a new dormer style window within the roof pitch which is set at an angle to the main north/south orientation of the house. This in my view is incongruous and out of step with the prevailing roof profiles in the area. The extension of the natural slate cladding on the west elevation and north elevation at first floor level again is not reflective of the prevailing external finishes in the immediate area and in my view could have an overbearing effect on design terms. The visual impact resulting from the proposed cladding is indicated on the proposed 3D image (of House Type 2 from Foxfield Lawn) indicated on Drawing 1611-P-03 submitted with the original planning application.

10.5. **Other Issues**

10.5.1. I note that one of the observations submitted expresses concerns in respect of traffic and drainage. In relation to the latter issue I note that a report on file from the Drainage Department, which are the competent authority in relation to drainage matters, do not raise any concerns in respect of drainage matters. Based on conclusions contained in this report, I do not consider that the proposal should be refused on drainage grounds.

10.5.2. In relation to traffic, the observation argues that the additional dwelling on Foxfield Lawn (House No. 2) is located too close to Foxfield Lawn/Park junction and this could have traffic safety implications. Having inspected the site, I do not consider that the proposed entrance is too close to the Foxfield Lawn/Foxfield Park junction so as to constitute a traffic hazard. I note that there is an existing garage at this location which is designed and erected to accommodate off street vehicles at this

location. I further note there are two vehicular entrances directly opposite the proposed dwelling serving House Nos. 4 and 6 Foxfield Lawn which are equally close to the same junction and finally I note that the vehicular entrance serving House No. 2 Foxfield Lawn is 20 metres closer to the junction in question than the proposed vehicular entrance to serve Dwelling No. 2.

10.5.3. While I note that the report from the Roads Streets and Traffic Department does not object to the proposed development on a point of principle. It does however raise concerns in relation to the off-street car parking arrangements. It notes that the plans indicate that the off-street parking proposed in the drawings is 4.4 by 2.3 metres which is less than the requirements in the development plan which is 5 metres by 3 metres. Based on the drawings submitted I do not think it would be possible to accommodate a car parking space in accordance with the development plan requirement based on the dimensions shown. It appears that the site would have difficulty accommodating a large family type car as the car parking space is only 4.4 metres long. This in my opinion is another example that the inherent site constraints are not suitable to accommodate an additional dwellinghouse to the rear of the subject site.

11.0 **Appropriate Assessment**

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the nature of the receiving environment together with the proximity to the nearest European site, no appropriate assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

12.0 **Conclusions and Recommendation**

Arising from my assessment above I would recommend that the Board uphold the decision of the Planning Authority and refuse planning permission for the proposed development. Based on my analysis above together with the planning history relating to the subject site I consider that the site in question is suitable to accommodate one dwelling only and this dwelling should occupy the footprint of House No. 1 proposed under the current application. The Board could consider issuing a split decision in

granting planning permission for House No. 1 and omitting House No. 2. However, under the current application I consider the overall design approach in respect of House No. 1 to be incongruous and unsympathetic to the existing suburban residential environment and I would recommend that planning permission be refused for House No. 1 on design grounds. Therefore, in conclusion I would recommend that the Board refuse planning permission for both dwelling units in the current appeal.

13.0 Decision

Refuse planning permission for the proposed development.

14.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that the provision of two dwellinghouses on the subject site would constitute an overdevelopment of the site and would result in substandard private open space and off-street vehicular parking, particularly in respect of Dwelling No. 2 to the rear of the site, it is considered therefore that the proposed development would seriously injure the residential amenities of the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the character and pattern of residential development in the surrounding area it is considered by reason of overall design that both dwellings would be incongruous in the context of the existing streetscape and would therefore seriously impact on the existing character and visual amenity of the area and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Paul Caprani,
Senior Planning Inspector.

21st September, 2017.