



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL06F.249204

---

<b>Development</b>	Two-storey mews dwelling to the rear of existing dwelling and all associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	15 The Rise, Malahide, County Dublin.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Fingal County Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	F17A/0214
<b>Applicant</b>	Eithne Catherine Hannon.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant permission.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party.
<b>Appellant</b>	1. Damien Quilligan, Sarah Flinter and Others.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> November 2017.
<b>Inspector</b>	Patricia Calleary.

# Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0 Proposed Development .....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	4
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
6.0 The Appeal .....	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	7
6.2. Applicant's Response.....	9
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	10
6.4. Observations .....	10
7.0 Assessment.....	11
7.1. Introduction .....	11
7.2. Principle, Design and Layout.....	11
7.3. Traffic.....	13
7.4. Impact on Residential Amenities .....	16
7.5. Impact on ACA.....	17
7.6. Appropriate Assessment .....	17
8.0 Recommendation.....	18
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	18

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site measures c.0.028 ha is located to the rear of a two-storey property, No.15 The Rise, Malahide in north County Dublin. It is generally rectangular, measuring c.19m in length and c.15.7m in width. It currently functions as part of the rear garden of the house at No.15 and it is laid out as garden lawns with a number of mature trees and a steel framed storage/garden shed. The site can be accessed through a pedestrian entrance gate off a rear lane known as 'Church Mews', or from the main entrance to the existing host house along 'The Rise'. This lane serves as a rear access to other properties located along both 'The Rise' and newly constructed mews houses in the rear gardens of houses known as 'Windsor Terrace' along Church Road.
- 1.2. The lane is a cul de sac measuring c.106m in length and it terminates at the appeal site. It measures c. 5.1m in width. It is accessed via an electronic gate at its northern end where it meets Healy's Lane. This stretch of lane/road (Healy's Lane) serves the library and an apartment development and it also provides loading and perpendicular on-street metered parking.
- 1.3. An old stone random rubble wall measuring c.2.0m in height marks the boundary along the east side of the lane and the rear gardens of 'The Rise'. 'The Rise' is characterised by established low density residential development within walking distance of the Main Street of Malahide village to the north west.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development would comprise a new part two-storey, part single storey mews-style dwelling with a basement and associated site development works to include access, parking spaces and site drainage.
- 2.2. The proposed house would have a stated gross floor area of 179 sq.m and would comprise an open plan kitchen/dining/living room, three double size bedrooms, a shower room, a bathroom and a small basement area for storage purposes. It would have a total GFA of c.179 sq.m including 29 sq.m at basement level.

- 2.3.** Vehicular and pedestrian access to the dwelling would be provided from the lane. The steel framed garden/storage shed on site would be removed to accommodate the development as would some mature trees.
- 2.4.** The Planning Application was accompanied by a cover letter/report from the applicant, details of a rainwater harvesting tank and a preliminary Tree Survey report. A response to further information was accompanied by revised drawings and photomontages.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

- 3.1.1.** The Planning Authority issued a decision to grant permission subject to 13 conditions, the following of note:
- **C4(b):** Measures to retain Tulip tree in the rear garden of No.15 'The Rise'.
  - **C11:** Development described in Class 1 or Class 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2017 shall not be carried out without a prior grant of permission.

#### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

- 3.2.1.** Following initial assessment, the Planning Officer recommended seeking further information on matters concerning a comprehensive design approach including evidence of consultation with adjoining landowners, transportation matters, photomontages, satisfy concerns of the conservation officer and other design amendments.
- 3.2.2.** Following receipt of further information, the Planning Officer considered amendments made to the proposed dwelling design to reduce its visual and overbearing impact were acceptable. Noting other proposals for redevelopment of lands in the vicinity and the 'RS' zoning objective, it was considered that subject to conditions, the proposal would not be overly visible and would not undermine the Architectural conservation area (ACA). A recommendation to grant permission was put forward.
- 3.2.3.** Other Technical Reports
- Water Services: No objection subject to condition;

- Transportation: Recommended refusal of permission recommended initially and following receipt of further information states no objection subject to conditions;
- Parks and Green Infrastructure: Requested additional information initially and subsequently recommended conditions;
- Conservation Officer: Requests additional information and provides commentary on additional information received.

### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

- Irish Water: No objection subject to conditions.

### **3.4. Third Party Observations**

- 3.4.1. Several submissions have been received from third parties with addresses at properties in 'The Rise', 'Windsor Terrace' along Church Road and one observation was received from the owner of a new mews house built along the eastern side of the Lane and north west of the appeal site. Collectively the observations set out concerns around design, traffic, access, residential amenity impacts, visual amenity, impact on the ACA, overdevelopment and the creating of a precedent. These have been considered by the Planning Authority during their assessment and I have also considered these in my assessment at appeal stage.

## **4.0 Planning History**

### **4.1. Appeal Site:**

- 4.1.1. There are four planning references on the appeal site which represent applications for various alterations to the existing house at No.15 'The Rise'.

### **4.2. In the vicinity:**

- 4.2.1. There has been a substantial planning history associated with the immediate vicinity. These are set out in the Planning Authority's report and those of most relevance are summarised as follows:

- PL06F.243493/ F14A/0131 – No.7 The Rise. This relates to a single two-bedroom dwelling house and associated works. Permission was refused on

the basis that the design was inconsistent with existing and permitted development.

- A number of individual mews houses were permitted at the rear of Windsor Terrace which are the substantial three storey houses (protected structures) along Church road. Those on sites Nos. 2 and 5 were both dealt with by the Board in 2009 under Appeal Case References PL06F.232211 and PL06F.224801 respectively.
- There are a number of concurrent applications for mews style houses on sites along the eastern side of the Lane (Church Mews) which are currently under consideration by Fingal County Council. The closest of these is that immediately north of the appeal site, which relates to an application for 2 mews houses at the rear of No.13 The Rise, under Reg. Ref. F17A/0382.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 is the applicable development plan for the area. The site is in an area zoned 'RS', the objective for which is to 'provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity'. The vision for the zoning is 'to ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity'.
- 5.1.2. The site is located within an ACA for 'The Rise' and the rear of the site immediately adjoins the ACA for Malahide Historic Core.
- 5.1.3. The following objectives are considered relevant:
- Objective DMS39: Infill Development respecting the height and massing of existing residential units;
  - Objective DMS87: Private Open Space;
  - Objective DMS157, DMS158 and Table 12.11: Design requirements within an ACA;
  - Objective PM39: Ensure consolidated development;
  - Objective PM44: Encourage infill on underutilised sites;

- Objective PM45: Encourage use of contemporary and innovative design solutions subject to respecting the character and architectural heritage of the area;
- Table 12.1: House Sizes and Table 12.3: Minimum Sizes;
- Table 12.11: Direction for proposed development within ACAs;
- CH32: Avoid the removal of structures and distinctive elements such as boundary treatments that positively contribute to the character of an ACA;
- DMS117: Require new developments to be designed in accordance with DMURS;
- Objective DMS32: Prohibit proposals that would create a gated community for any new residential developments.

## **5.2. Other Policy**

- 5.2.1. Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (DEHLG, 2009) and its companion document, 'Urban Design Manual 2009 – A best practice guidance' (DEHLG, 2009);
- 5.2.2. Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DTTS, 2013).

## **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

- 5.3.1. Two European sites lie c.300m to the north of the appeal site, as follows:
- Broadmeadow/Swords Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004025)
  - Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code: 000205)

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

- 6.1.1. One appeal was received from Damien Quilligan, Sarah Flinter and others who collectively represent seven parties with respective addresses in 'The Rise'. The principal concerns raised in the appeal include the following:

- Permission was granted for F17A/0214 (the proposed development) prematurely as part of a bigger comprehensive development for which Fingal County Council gave requested Additional Information;
- The concrete evidence and agreement with other landowners as requested at further information stage was not provided;
- Current proposal must be read in the context of an adjoining larger development which would irretrievably impact on the area landscape, visual and residential amenity and the character of The Rise, located within a designated ACA;
- A number of houses on 'The Rise' and 'The Mall' have had their Planning applications to build in their back gardens refused by Fingal County Council and by An Bord Pleanála on appeal;
- It is acknowledged that there were permissions granted for mews house developments along the lane, but these were on the western (opposite) side of the lane associated with three storey protected structures known as Windsor Terrace which front onto Church Road. The development of mews dwellings on the eastern side associated with 'The Rise' would not integrate with the existing area and would be incongruous with the setting of these existing traditional two storey dwellings;
- Access is highly constrained, and the required width is not available to safely manoeuvre a car in and out of the driveway. Initial report from transport department recommended refusal;
- Insufficient private amenity space provided;
- No design statement was provided and one is required as the house is one of eight residential units;
- States that the development would not adhere to Objective DM544, DMS39, CH32, Objective Malahide 3, Objective DMS157 or with the ACA designation;
- Screening and removal of long standing trees and reducing open space would be contrary to several objectives and to good planning;
- Would set an undesirable precedent.



6.1.2. The appeal was accompanied by various photographs, drawing extracts and copies of observations made to the Planning Authority during their consideration of the application.

## **6.2. Applicant's Response**

6.2.1. A response to the appeal was received from Darragh Lynch Architects representing the applicant. The following provides a summary of the principal points put forward.

- Refers to planning history and states that the reason for refusal (based on design) on Site No.7 is addressed in the current application;
- Applicant's architects are separately appointed for similar proposals on sites Nos. 1 to 13 'The Rise' and the current proposal is part of a master plan for the area with a generic house type proposed which would be the same on each site and would create a strong rhythm of the overall streetscape (noting some slight variations to House No.15 in order to address the narrower access and to proposed House No.1 to address Healy's Lane);
- A series of individual applications have been lodged for the other similar houses referenced above and this demonstrates a co-ordinated design approach;
- Width of lane will be increased to 6m. Fingal County Council indicated that they were satisfied that this development would take place and that the widening of the lane would need to increase as the number of houses increase;
- Development would be barely visible from 'The Rise' and would not impact on the ACA;
- It is possible to manoeuvre and park two cars on the appeal site (Refers to Dwg 1653 P03: Proposed site plan);
- It is proposed to retain the Tulip tree on site and carry out replacement planting of other trees and, as such, no overlooking would occur onto the neighbouring property;

- Reference is made to a host of objectives of the current Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023.

### **6.3. Planning Authority Response**

6.3.1. The following is a summary of the Planning Authority's response.

- Having regard to the property's location at the end of the lane, it was considered that the issues relating to the realignment of the boundary wall would not affect the subject site;
- Reference was made in the appeal to a development which was refused under F15A/0321/PL05.245533, however this application is materially different to that currently proposed under F17A/0214. Reference is also made to F14A/0131/PL06F.243493 whereby planning permission was refused because of an absence of a coherent design approach;
- While F17A/0214 was not lodged with the current planning applications to the north (F17A/0382-F17A/0387), the applicant was requested to make amendments by way of additional information to demonstrate that the proposed development forms part of the comprehensive design approach and the applicant's response was considered acceptable;
- Backland development is not precluded within the ACA and the Statement of Character for the area notes that there is scope for backland development;
- Matters raised in the appeal regarding overlooking, access and compliance with the Development Plan objectives were addressed within the Planning Officer's reports. The Transportation Planning Section stated that they have no objection following consideration of the further information response;
- Requests that Conditions No.4 and 13 are included should the Board grant permission.

### **6.4. Observations**

- None

## 7.0 Assessment

### 7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. This appeal is made against a decision to grant the first mews type development to the rear of 'The Rise' and fronting onto a lane known as 'Church Mews'. From examination of the submissions and inspection of the site and environs, I consider the principal issues which arise include:

- Principle, Design and Layout
- Traffic
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Impact on ACA

7.1.2. I consider each of these issues in turn in the remainder of my assessment, as set out below. In addition, I also consider the development in the context of Appropriate Assessment.

### 7.2. Principle, Design and Layout

7.2.1. The development would comprise a two-storey detached dwelling in the rear garden currently associated with an existing two storey detached house, which itself faces onto a residential road known as 'The Rise'.

7.2.2. The site is zoned 'RS' with a stated objective 'to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity'. While the development would provide for residential development, the objective also requires consideration of whether the development would protect and improve residential amenity. I intend to revisit this aspect under Section 7.4 of my assessment below. The proposal would represent an in-fill development which is generally supported by planning policy, particularly having regard to the Guidelines for Sustainable Residential Development and the proximity of the site to the village centre and train station. The development of an infill house on the site would also be consistent and supported by Objective DMS39 which recognises new infill development once it respects the height and massing of existing residential units and retains the physical character of the area and features.

- 7.2.3. The dwellinghouse, as revised at further information stage, would appear to comply with the development plan standards set out under Table 12.1 (house sizes) and Table 12.3 (minimum room sizes). Open space provided behind the front building line measures c.50 sq.m from the drawings presented and it is laid out as a narrow space to the rear (east) widening at each end. It is below the quantitative requirement of 60 sq.m set out under Objective DM87. However, additional amenity space is proposed to the west of the house. I accept this area would serve as private amenity space having regard to the enclosed nature of the space. Therefore, the combined open space provision is acceptable.
- 7.2.4. I note that the gardens associated with the protected structures, 'Windsor Terrace' properties on the west side of the lane are considerably longer than those of the host house, No.15, and other neighbouring properties at the east of the lane. The distance from the rear building line to the western side of the lane measures approximately 50m and as such these garden spaces can readily accommodate mews houses while providing sufficient amenity space to their rear and having adequate separation distances from the host houses. The appeal site is more constrained with a 30m length between the rear of the house and the sites western boundary at the lane, within which it is proposed to accommodate adequate rear amenity space for the existing house, setbacks from the lane, the proposed house and its private amenity space. The proposed mews house would be set back by 3m (porch) and 4m (living/kitchen/dining) from the existing boundary to its west, c. 19m from the existing house on site (No.15 The Rise) and c.4.5m from a similar proposed house to the north, which is currently under consideration by Fingal County Council (F17A/0382 refers).
- 7.2.5. The Board previously refused planning permission under PL06F.243493 (Fingal County Council ref number F14A/0131) for a mews style house at No.7 'The Rise' broadly on design grounds, noting the absence of a design approach that would provide a level of coherence with existing and permitted development. I am satisfied that the design presented in the current proposal would integrate to an acceptable degree with the previously permitted and constructed mews style houses on the west of the lane and would not detract from the host house or other houses along the eastern side of the lane, to the rear of 'The Rise'.

7.2.6. Overall, I consider the design presented, while having some shortcomings in terms of open space provision and separation distance from the existing/host house, is generally acceptable, having regard also to its location close to the core of Malahide village and noting policy support for infill development. I also have regard to the guidelines for sustainable residential development which support consolidation in urban centres. Other planning and environmental matters arise, including traffic, residential amenities and ACA and I set out my considerations on these matters in the remainder of my assessment.

### **7.3. Traffic**

7.3.1. Based on the information on file and gathered during my site inspection, I consider that the main issue which arises in this appeal centres around traffic safety.

7.3.2. The existing lane measures between c.5.1m in width. Its original function was to serve the rear gardens of houses along The Rise and Windsor Terrace present onto Church Road. The lane terminates immediately after the existing pedestrian entrance gate to the appeal site. Two houses have been constructed fronting onto the lane and others have been permitted and/or were under construction on the date of my inspection. These are all located on the west side of the lane.

7.3.3. The lane is approached from a sharp 90-degree bend off Healys Lane and is gated at this point. Healys Lane is a busy location in its current context, as it accommodates rear access to the library and access to a substantial gated apartment development. It also has a row of perpendicular on-street parking spaces over the majority of its length and on the day of my site inspection. There was notable activity in the form of cars turning into and reversing out of the car spaces. No footpaths are present for the majority of this (Healys) lane. I also note there is a vehicular gated entrance to a private property just at the 90-degree bend on Healy's Lane.

7.3.4. If the development is permitted, it would give rise to conflict with the Healy's Lane traffic movement and parking and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar development. There is also the matter of conflict with development plan objective DMS32 which seeks to prohibit proposals that would create a gated community for any new residential developments. Even in the event of the gate

being removed at this point, there is also an issue regarding poor visibility of traffic entering and exiting a 90-degree bend at the point where Healys lane meets church Mews.

- 7.3.5. I note that the lane is constrained in width, does not include any footpaths and does not have any turning circle at its southern end. On the day of my inspection, there were cars casually parked along its length and it was congested. The transport section noted that as no footpaths were proposed or required in the development of the mews houses on the western side along Windsor terrace, the lane would require a setback along the eastern side, where the proposed house which is the subject matter of this appeal would be located.
- 7.3.6. Following receipt of further information, proposals were presented which included stated alterations to the lane by widening it slightly so that it would function as a shared surface arrangement with a 3.0m carriageway and a 1.5m wide pedestrian zone on either side along the lane, a total of 6m. It is stated that the outer 1.5m edge of the lane would be marked with textured road paint and that a speed cushion would be constructed to approximately half way along the length of the road (lane) control the speed of traffic. In addition, two passing bays were proposed (10m long by 4.8m wide) to allow cars to meet and pass are proposed. This proposal presented at further information stage was deemed to be satisfactory by the transport section.
- 7.3.7. While I have some concerns about the lack of designated footpaths to protect pedestrian movement from this development or cumulatively with future similar development on adjoining lands, nonetheless, I accept that shared surfaces are acceptable having regard to the mandatory guidance set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Streets (DMURS). Specifically, Section 4.4.4 of the DMURS, refers to shared surfaces as a desirable option where movement priorities are low (e.g. liveable streets/homezones/local streets) and pedestrian activities are high and vehicular movements are only required for lower level access, for example streets within centres to promote activity. I accept that if developed, the lane could be categorised as a local street.
- 7.3.8. Notwithstanding the proposal for a shared surface lane, I have a number of concerns. Firstly, the works required to deliver such alterations to the lane lie outside of the red and blue line boundaries that mark the area of the current application and

the lands over which the applicant has control, and according to the site location submitted, the applicant's interest in the lane is that of a wayleave only.

- 7.3.9. While the application and appeal refer to other individual applications, these are not directly linked to the current proposal now before the Board. I do not consider it would be appropriate to attach a planning condition to require the works to be carried out on the lane on lands which are not in the applicant's control and where there is no concrete evidence that these works can be carried out. In this regard, I have had regard to guidance provided for the criteria for conditions set out under Section 7.3 Development Management Guidelines by the DEHLG (2007). Specifically, my concern is that a condition to carry out the alterations would not be reasonable or enforceable given that the applicant has not demonstrated evidence of sufficient interest in the lane, which is central in addressing this issue.
- 7.3.10. In addition, I also have concerns about the manoeuvrability and turning movements of vehicles, particularly of refuse and emergency vehicles at both the start of the lane where a 90-degree bend and a gate across the lane both exist and the end of the lane where no turning circle is available or proposed. I note the absence of any swept path analysis in this regard. I also have serious concerns about the limited visibility at the junction of the lane with Healy's Lane, exiting from a gated lane at a 90-degree bend. On the day of my inspection, it was necessary to reverse along the lane which I consider would lead to a dangerous situation and there is no information on file for turning proposals which would be necessary to allow vehicles to leave the site in a forward direction.
- 7.3.11. Having regard to the above, I consider that the lane is constrained and not fit for the purpose of accommodating the development in its current form from a traffic and road safety perspective. Based on the information on file, I am not satisfied that any proposed alterations to the lane can be delivered given that the applicants only interest is shown as that of a wayleave and where no comprehensive plan has been submitted as part of the current planning application. I recommend that the development should be refused as the traffic it would generate and the conflicts which would arise between vehicular movements and other more vulnerable road users including pedestrians, would pose an unacceptable traffic hazard to all road users. This would also set an undesirable precedent for further similar development along the lane.

## **7.4. Impact on Residential Amenities**

- 7.4.1. The proposed house would be sited c.19m from the rear of the host house at No.15 'The Rise' and c.2m from its dividing boundary with the private amenity space associated with this existing house. It would lie immediately adjacent to the garden associated with the one of the appellants' houses and its associated garden to the south. To the south west is St. Andrew's Malahide Parish Centre and national school. It is important to note at this point that the rear garden immediately adjacent to the north of the appeal site is currently the subject of a planning application for a similar style mews house, as are the remainder of the sites on the east side of the lane, all which are currently under consideration by Fingal County Council.
- 7.4.2. Given the position and orientation of the current proposal north of the closest appellant's house, it would not give rise to overshadowing onto the appellant's house to the south. The development of a two storey mews house would however, introduce activity and noise into this garden area which is currently highly private. When compared with typical mews type development this would result in quite an intrusion into the rear garden space of this adjoining property to the south. There is no issue with direct overlooking, however, there is potential for indirect overlooking from the proposed mews house rear window onto this neighbouring garden.
- 7.4.3. Additional landscape screening on the applicant's southern boundary is not proposed and I suggest there is insufficient space or separation distance to allow for effective additional landscape screening at this location. I note however that the adjoining rear garden is itself well screened at its north-western corner adjoining the appeal site. In addition, I note the current proposals intend to retain the Tulip tree on site which together would reduce the issue of indirect overlooking to an acceptable level.
- 7.4.4. If permitted, the development would not be inconsistent with Objective 'RS' of the current Development Plan which supports residential development and includes a stated requirement to 'protect and improve residential amenity'. The development should therefore not be refused for reasons of impact on residential amenity.



## **7.5. Impact on ACA**

- 7.5.1. Development within ACAs are required to be carried out in a manner sympathetic to the distinctive character of the ACA. Specifically, Objective DMS157 of the current Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 requires that new development must enhance the character of the ACA and be appropriate in terms of design.
- 7.5.2. A guide on development in ACAs is set out in Table 12.11 of the Fingal Development Plan. With regard to new buildings, a sensitive design approach is required. The guidance allows for contemporary buildings provided it does not compromise the integrity and character of the area. In that regard, the scale, mass and height of the proposed house is acceptable, and it would read as a mews subordinate to the existing house on site and would not compromise the integrity or character of the area.
- 7.5.3. I note the boundary wall along the lane is an old random rubble wall, c.2m in height which I consider contributes to the historic character of the lane. While I would have concerns with the loss of the distinct boundary wall at the location of the intended house, I also consider that the stone material could be re-used and incorporated into the boundary treatment of the site if developed. The Conservation officer required further information and following receipt of further information, did not state any objection to the development but rather provided comments around landscaping, screening and colour palette, which are items that could be readily addressed by way of appropriate planning conditions.
- 7.5.4. On balance and having regard to the policy support for consolidation of urban centres, I consider the proposal would not negatively impact on the character or setting of the ACA to such a degree that permission should be refused for this reason.

## **7.6. Appropriate Assessment**

- 7.6.1. The appeal site is not within or adjoining any Natura 2000 site. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the location of the site in an urban serviced area and the separation distance to the nearest European sites, 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.

## 8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. Further to the above assessment of matters pertaining to this appeal, including the consideration of the submissions made in connection with the appeal and information gathered during my site inspection, I recommend that permission is **refused** for the reasons and considerations outlined below.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development, by itself and by the precedent it would set, would give rise to an unacceptable intensification of traffic movements on a gated lane in a busy urban area where visibility is restricted arising from a 90-degree bend at the gated point and where it has not been demonstrated that vehicles, including emergency and refuse vehicles, can safely turn into and exit the lane or safely turn and leave in the forward direction from the southern end of the lane and from the proposed house at this point. Furthermore, in the absence of satisfactory evidence that the stated widening and alterations to the lane can be delivered such as would comply with the guidance set out in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, 2013, it is considered that the development, if permitted, would lead to unacceptable movement conflicts between motorised vehicles and other road users which would fail to protect vulnerable road users in particular. Accordingly, the proposed development would be prejudicial to public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

Patricia Calleary  
Senior Planning Inspector

12<sup>th</sup> December 2017