



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-300090-17

Development	Permission for the demolition of an existing single storey dwelling and 2 single storey sheds and the construction of a terrace of 3 residential units with associated landscaping, bicycle and bin storage.
Location	14 Alexandra Terrace, Dundrum, Dublin 14
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Co. Co.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D17A/0718
Applicant(s)	Dundrum SPV Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party v. Decision
Appellant(s)	Dundrum SPV Ltd.
Observer(s)	Rosemary Johnson Killian and Traci Byrne Patricia Johnson Fiona and Patrick Cusack
Date of Site Inspection	9 th February 2017
Inspector	Erika Casey

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located between Alexandra Terrace and Magenta Terrace in Dundrum. The site's main frontage is onto Alexandra Terrace, a narrow cul de sac with a carriageway of c. 4.7 metres and on street car parking. The site has a stated area of 0.0302 hectares and currently accommodates a dilapidated single storey red brick cottage and a number of associated outbuildings. The floor area of the existing development is 58 sq. m.
- 1.2. To the east of the site, is a detached bungalow known as Emden Lodge which is surrounded by a high brick wall and hedge. To the west, are 2 no. two storey dwellings with frontage onto the Dundrum Road. The rear gardens/yards of these properties directly abuts the western boundary of the site. The remainder of development on the north side of the terrace comprises single and two storey terraced red brick dwellings. To the east of Emden Lodge is a small area of communal open space. There is a gentle rise on the topography of the terrace from west to east.
- 1.3. The rear of the site fronts onto Magenta Terrace, a pedestrian laneway that links Rosemount Park and Dundrum Road. A housing development with a height ranging from 2 to 3 storeys is located on the southern side of the lane. The northern boundary comprises a wall of approximately 2 metres in height and some planter beds. The laneway rises steeply and includes a number of stepped terraces connecting the lane down to the Dundrum Road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the demolition of the existing buildings on the site and the construction of an infill housing development comprising 3 residential units with associated landscaping, bicycle and bin storage. The dwellings comprise 2 no. 2 storey 120 sq. metre houses with open spaces of 34 and 33 sq. metres to the rear and 1 no. 3 storey 3 no. bedroom house with a 12.45 sq. metre terrace at second floor level and 21 sq. metre open space to the rear.
- 2.2. It is noted that as part of the appeal submission, the applicant proposes a number of design modifications to the development. These are described in further detail in

section 6.1 below. In brief the principal amendments comprise the provision of 1 no. off street car parking space to serve each unit and a change in the house type proposed from 3 bed units to 2 bed units.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1 To Refuse Permission for 3 no. reasons:

1. *Notwithstanding the location of the subject site close to Dundrum Town Centre, the absence of any car parking provisions related to the proposed development is considered unacceptable and it is considered the development site offers scope for the provision of same. The absence of car parking means the proposals if permitted would give rise to illegal/inappropriate parking on roads in the vicinity of the site and would thereby endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction of road users, contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
2. *The proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for developments with insufficient car parking in the surrounding area and this would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
3. *The proposed development would adversely affect the residential and visual amenities of the occupants of dwelling units in the surrounding area and would fail to provide sufficient residential amenities for the future occupants of the proposed development, contrary to policies RES3 and RES4 of the County Development Plan 2016-2022. In particular, (i) the proposals provide for insufficient private open space for future occupants (ii) the siting of the second floor of house 1, flush with the principal front building line means that this house would have an overbearing effect on the outlook of houses along Alexandra Terrace, (iii) the unscreened second floor terrace would create an unacceptable level of overlooking, harmful to the residential amenities of householders in the surrounding areas and would have an incongruous appearance (iv) the window openings to the proposed upstairs bedrooms of houses 1-3 have not been*

designed to limit issues of overlooking, given the limited separation distances proposed.

Note: issues that should be addressed in any future application, in revising the proposals to the subject site in light of the planning authority's decision include (i) sunlight/overshadowing analysis of the proposed development showing what overshadowing impact the development may have on dwelling units in the surrounding area. (ii) the provision of space for the storage of 3 wheelie bins per dwelling unit.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report (05.10.2017)

- A density of 99 u/ha is proposed and is considered acceptable subject to other planning considerations.
- The absence of parking may lead to indiscriminate illegal or obstructive parking on adjoining roads causing a traffic hazard.
- Notes that the provision of a vehicle access to the site from Alexandra Terrace to the site would reduce the quantum of on street parking available to existing residents of Alexandra Terrace. States that if the same number of dwelling units were provided in an apartment format, rather than houses, one vehicular crossover off Alexandra Terrace could serve the development.
- Considers that the 2nd floor element of house no. 1 is of excessive height and bulk having regard to the siting of 1 Alexandra Villas along the line of the public road and the position of the second floor element flush with the principal front building line of the proposed house.
- Notes that a gable hipped roof profile to proposed terraced house 3 would improve the relationship between this dwelling and the adjacent bungalow.
- Also considers that there is scope to revise the proposal to address overlooking considerations from habitable rooms on the first and second floors of the development and in particular the design and finish of the window opening to bedroom 1 of houses 1, 2 and 3. The design of the two rear facing bedroom windows to house 1 should also be revised to address issues of overlooking.

- Considers that the contemporary design approach and use of contemporary materials to be appropriate.
- States that the shortfall of nearly 50% in private open space provision is not considered acceptable. Notes that the private open space requirements of an apartment development of the same number of units would have small private open space requirements.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Transportation Planning (13.09.2017): Recommends refusal on the basis of:

- endangerment of public safety due to insufficient off street car parking creating potential for illegal/inappropriate parking on roads in the area and affecting local amenity.
- would set an undesirable precedent.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- No reports received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1 6 third party observations were submitted on the application. The key issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- The development provides for no off street parking provision and is thus contrary to the Development Plan. The development would cause undue pressure for parking in the area. Concerns raised regarding traffic safety and emergency vehicle access.
- The development would cause overlooking, particularly from the proposed second floor terrace. Concerns regarding potential noise impacts from the terrace.
- The bulk, height and density of the scheme is overdevelopment of the site. Having regard to the narrow width of the street, the proposed ridge heights would create a significant overbearing block to the south of the existing

residents on Alexandra Terrace and Villas. Note that there are no existing three storey buildings on the street.

- The development would cause overshadowing with consequent negative impacts to the amenities of existing residents.
- The design is incongruous and the palette of materials proposed is inappropriate having regard to the character of the existing street.
- Insufficient bin storage.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 There have been a number of previous applications on the subject site which can be summarised as follows:

Planning Authority Reference D16A/0492: Permission sought for the demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and the construction of 4 terraced, 3 storey, 3 bedroom dwellings. The application was withdrawn in August 2016. The application site included no. 1 Alexandra Villas, the existing dwelling to the west of the current site.

4.2 The following applications related to a larger site which incorporated the subject site in addition to the two existing residential properties to the immediate west.

Planning Authority Reference D10A/0622: Permission granted in July 2011 for the demolition of existing structures and the construction of 5 no. apartments with surface car parking.

Planning Authority Reference D09A/0253: Permission refused in June 2009 for a development comprising 4 no. duplex units, 2 apartments and one retail unit. Reasons for refusal related to the failure to provide a high quality design for site. It was considered that the development would provide inadequate public and private open space; would have inadequate sightlines and car parking provision; that the layout of the retail unit was not acceptable; that the proposed surface car park layout was unacceptable and insufficient detail regarding SUDS and drainage.

Planning Authority Reference D08A/0582: Construction of mixed use development in 2 blocks comprising 4 no. apartments in block 1 and a retail unit and two office

units in block 2 with basement car park. Reasons for refusal related to the over concentration of commercial development and overdevelopment of the site which would lead to an overbearing and overshadowing impact.

Planning Authority Reference D04A/1498/An Bord Pleanála Reference

PL06D.217268: Permission refused on October 2006 for a residential development comprising 7 no. 2 bedroom apartments in a four storey block fronting onto Dundrum Road and Alexandra Terrace with set back at third floor level from both Dundrum Road and Alexandra Terrace. 2 no. 2 bedroom apartments and 1 no. 1 bedroom apartment in a 2 storey wing fronting onto Alexandra Terrace. Car parking for 8 no. cars on site with an entrance from Alexander Terrace. The reason for refusal related to the scale and height of the development which was considered to be overbearing.

- 4.3 There has been one application on the adjacent site to the west of the site at no. 1 Alexandra Terrace.

Planning Authority Reference D17A/0534: Permission was granted in August 2017 for a development comprising Retention Permission for demolition of existing single storey flat roof building to the front/west of the site (c.28.07sq. m.) and construction of a new single storey flat roof building (c.28.07sq. m.) at the same location; change of use of this building from retail use to residential use; demolition of the existing single storey structure to the rear of the existing dwelling (c.5.2.sq. m.); demolition of existing single storey flat roof residential element at the rear of the existing dwelling (c.5.5 sq. m.) and construction of a new two storey flat roof residential extension at the same location (c.11 sq. m.). Permission for: new elevational treatment to the front elevation of the single storey building located at the front of the site including 2 no. windows and provision of a new gate to the rear courtyard from Alexandra Terrace.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1 The operative Development Plan is the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022. The site is zoned objective A: *to protect and or improve residential amenity*. Relevant policies and objectives of the plan include:

Res 3: Residential Density: It is Council policy to promote higher residential densities provided that proposals ensure a balance between the reasonable protection of existing residential amenities and the established character of areas, with the need to provide for sustainable residential development.

Res 4: Existing Housing Stock and Densification: It is Council policy to improve and conserve housing stock of the County, to densify existing built-up areas, having due regard to the amenities of existing established residential communities and to retain and improve residential amenities in established residential communities.

Section 8.2.3.4 (vii) Infill: *“New infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units. Infill development shall retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings.”*

Section 2.1.3.4 Existing Housing Stock Densification: *“Encourage densification of the existing suburbs in order to help retain population levels – by infill housing.*

Infill housing in existing suburbs should respect or complement the established dwelling type in terms of materials used, roof type, etc.

In older residential suburbs, infill will be encouraged while still protecting the character of these areas.”

5.1.2 **Table 8.2.3** sets out car parking standards. For residential dwellings, 1 space is required per 2 bed unit and 2 spaces per 3 bed unit. Section 8.2.4.5 notes that reduced car parking standards may be acceptable in certain circumstances such as the location of the development and specifically its proximity to Town Centres and also proximity to public transport.

5.1.3 **Section 8.2.8.4** sets out quantitative standards for private open space. This notes that for 1 and 2 bedroom houses a figure of 48 sq. metres may be acceptable where it can be demonstrated that good quality usable open space can be provided on site. For 3 bedroom units the standard is 60 sq. metres. It is stated that *“in instances where an innovative design response is provided on site, a relaxation in the quantum of private open space may be considered on a case-by case basis.”*

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1 The nearest Natura 2002 sites are the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and the South Dublin Bay SAC located c. 3.8 km to the east of the subject site.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- Notes the strategic location of the subject site in close proximity to local services and amenities and good public transport networks.
- A number of design modifications are submitted with the appeal submission to address the reasons for refusal in the decision by Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council. These can be summarised as follows:
 - The dwellings have been reduced from 3 bed units to 2 bed units in order to facilitate car parking requirements. It is proposed to relocate the ground floor living room in each house to the first floor level in lieu of 1 of the bedrooms and to provide 1 off street parking space to serve each dwelling. It is considered that this addresses the concerns raised regarding the deficit in car parking provision. The submission notes that notwithstanding the revised design proposal, they are happy to provide a car free development. Such a zero parking strategy can be supported on the grounds of location, amenities, controlled parking zones and sustainability.
 - Based on the reconfigured plans, house no, 1 has a private open space provision of 37.7 sq. m. (21 sq. m at ground floor and 16.7 sq. m. at 2nd floor), house no. 2 is served by an area of 33 sq. m. and house no. 3 by 34 sq. m. Whilst it is acknowledged that this is not compliant with the Development Plan standards for private open space, it is considered that regard should be had to proximity to public open space, proximity to transport networks and sustainability in terms of development density. It notes that the current housing market is in such a negative position that opportunity plots for infill development such as the subject site should be

realised and that the shortfall in private open space provision should be considered a minor compromise.

- To address issues of potential overlooking, the roof terrace has been redesigned to include powder coated aluminium louvre screening. The use of louvres creates only directional sightlines thus mitigating against perceived overlooking.
- Due to the reconfiguration of internal floorspace, the living room is now located at first floor level. It is proposed that the largest glazing panel from each of these living spaces is to be fitted with permanently obscure glazing as to retain the light source while preventing any potential perceived overlooking.
- Mid level obscure glazing has also been added to both windows of the two rear facing bedrooms within house no. 1 at first and second floor level.
- The plans have been revised to provide for 3 wheelie bins within the proposed parking area.
- A hipped roof profile is now proposed for house no.3 in order to create a more direct relationship with the existing bungalow.
- A sunlight and overshadowing analysis is submitted with the appeal. This indicates that for the majority of the year that shadows cast by the proposal are limited to the street itself as opposed to surrounding/adjacent properties.
- The design and materials proposed are considered appropriate. A pastiche design would be out of character with the existing buildings. The contemporary design complements the existing context.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- It is considered that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the Planning Authority, would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

6.3. Observations

6.3.1 4 no. observations made by Rosemary Johnson, Kilian and Traci Byrne, Patricia Johnson and Fiona and Patrick Cusack, all residents of Alexandra Terrace. Issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- The drawings as submitted to An Bord Pleanála are materially and substantially different.
- The use of car ports is unfeasible due to the narrowness of the terrace. Access to the car ports would be restricted by a car parking on the opposite side of the road or in proximity to the entrances. Concerns raised regarding traffic congestion, emergency vehicle access and construction traffic. The development will result in the loss of on street parking.
- The two houses fronting the Dundrum Road also have no parking. It is likely that occupants of these dwellings will also park on Alexandra Terrace exacerbating pressure on parking. The development as a whole would provide up to 14 bedrooms and thus 3 car parking spaces is not sufficient. The suggestion that this is not an area of high car dependency is untrue.
- Question the validity of the sunlight analysis. Consider that the development will cause adverse overshadowing. The development in particular will have an adverse impact on no. 14 Alexandra Terrace.
- The development will result in a loss of privacy to existing dwellings and will result in overlooking. Concerns raised regarding noise intrusion from roof terrace.
- The style and contemporary design of the development does not assimilate with the existing Victorian redbrick terrace. Consider that the use of obscured glass in the proposed living rooms would impact negatively on the amenity of the proposed dwellings.
- The reference to the single tall building on Magenta Terrace as indicative or typical of the height of development in the area is misleading. The proposed development will be significantly higher than any of the existing two storey houses on Alexandra Terrace.

- The shortfall in private open space provision provides a poor level of amenity to future residents.
- Concern regarding potential impact on existing willow tree located at no. 14 Alexandra Terrace.

6.4. Further Responses

CDP Architecture (18.01.2018):

- The current proposal has shown how car parking can be achieved within the site itself whilst the original proposal illustrated the proposal without car parking. There is a responsibility to encourage car free development where appropriate. It is considered that notwithstanding the revised plans submitted, that the subject site is an appropriate site for no car parking provision.
- The issue of on street parking highlighted by the observers is one which they themselves have generated. The current residents have occupied, purchased and rented these properties on the basis of not having designated on street car parking spaces.
- To mimic or copy traditional design is not considered to be good practice. The design, materials and detailing of the development are considered appropriate in this regard.
- The minor compromise in private open space should be considered having regard to the sites proximity to public transport networks and public amenity areas.
- The subject site accommodates 3 no. wheelie bins within the site boundary for each of the 3 no. properties.
- Concerns regarding construction impacts can be managed by means of a Construction Management Plan.
- Correspondence from Fire Safety Consultants confirming that the proposed development does not strictly require fire tender access from Alexandra Terrace and firefighting operations can be from Dundrum Road. The proposed

development will also have no new or greater contravention in relation to fire tender access to the existing properties.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. The main issues are those raised in the grounds of appeal and observations and it is considered that no other substantive issues arise. Appropriate Assessment also needs to be addressed. The issues can be dealt with under the following headings:

- Parking
- Impact on Residential Amenities
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2 Parking

7.2.1 The application as originally proposed provided no off street parking to serve the development. The Planning Authority raised significant concerns regarding such a proposal on the basis that it would give rise to illegal/inappropriate parking on roads in the vicinity of the site and set an undesirable precedent.

7.2.2 In response to these concerns, the applicants have submitted revised design proposals that results in the house types being amended to 2 bed units with a car port provided at ground floor level.

7.2.3 Under the current Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2016-2022, the parking standard for a 2 bed unit is 1 car parking space. Notwithstanding the location of the site close to good quality public transport including the Luas, I consider that the provision of at least one parking space per unit is appropriate. Whilst the applicant sets out the case for a 'zero car development', I note that neither of the two dwellings to the west of the site that are in the control of the applicant are provided with off street parking. I consider that the provision of 5 dwellings with no off street parking in an area with restricted on street parking availability would result in significant pressure for parking on roads in the vicinity. It is not realistic to expect that all residents of these dwellings would not require some degree of parking provision.

7.2.4 However, the proposal to provide three separate car port vehicular access points from Alexandra Terrace is somewhat problematic. The terrace has a very narrow carriageway with a width of less than 5 metres. At present residents tend to park on the southern side of the street. There are however, no parking restrictions on the northern side of the street. The applicant has not provided any auto track analysis to demonstrate that the proposed car ports can be accessed and egressed and I consider that if a car was parked opposite or in close proximity to any of the proposed new entrances, that turning movements are likely to be very constricted.

7.2.5 I accept that the subject site is a brownfield underutilised site that is capable of accommodating a new infill development with perhaps some provision for a shared vehicular access and parking area. However, the provision of three new vehicular access points from an extremely constrained and narrow cul de sac street is likely to give rise to excessive turning movements and result in a traffic hazard. I also consider that the provision of three new entrances would significantly reduce the level of on street parking due to the requirement to keep the space in front of the car port entrance free from parking to enable access. This would further exacerbate parking demand on a street with limited supply.

7.3 Impact on Residential Amenities

7.3.1 Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the development on the residential amenities of the area and on future occupants of the scheme. Issues raised include design, overshadowing and overlooking and private open space amenity.

7.3.2 The proposed development comprises 2 no. 2 storey dwellings and 1 no 3 storey dwelling. Whilst contemporary design is welcomed, I have some concerns regarding the design of the development as proposed. House no. 1 in particular presents as a three storey flat roofed dwelling with an external terrace to the west at second floor level. Concerns were raised by the Planning Authority regarding potential overlooking from this terrace and the applicant has responded by proposing louvered screening to prevent external views.

7.3.3 It is noted that no. 1 Alexandra Villas is located to the immediate west of house no. 1. As indicated in the plans submitted under Planning Authority Reference D17A/0534, the only amenity space serving this dwelling is a small courtyard of c. 11

metres to the rear. I consider that the three storey design of dwelling no. 1 coupled with the external terrace would have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenities of the dwellings on Alexandra Terrace and particularly no. 1 by virtue of its potential overbearing impact. I also consider the design of this dwelling due to its height, flat roof profile and the external terrace to be incongruous with the prevailing character and pattern of development on the street. Whilst the mitigation of the louvered screens on the terrace is noted, I consider this would offer a poor level of amenity to future occupants of the dwelling in terms of the functionality of this space as usable private open space. I also note the concerns raised by the observers regarding potential noise impacts, particularly to amenities of the dwellings to the west.

7.3.4 In terms of the design of the dwellings, the amendments to the roof profile to dwelling no. 3 are noted, in general however, I consider the design of the zinc standing seam roof to be incompatible with the existing streetscape.

7.3.5 Concerns have been raised by the Planning Authority regarding potential overlooking. In response to this, the applicant has proposed the insertion of permanent obscure glazing into the principal fenestration serving the living rooms at first floor level in each of the dwellings. I would consider such a measure somewhat unnecessary. It is not untypical for dwellings to be located opposite each other in tight urban streets such as the current site. The use of opaque glazing to the principal living room fenestration would result in a poor level of amenity for future occupants of the dwellings. Should the Board be minded to grant permission, I would recommend that such opaque screening is removed by way of condition.

7.3.6 One of the grounds of refusal raised by the Planning Authority related to the poor level of private open space provision proposed. Under the current development plan, a 2 bed unit requires a minimum of 48 sq. metres of private open space. The proposed dwellings provide 37.7 sq. m., 33 sq. m. and 34 sq. m respectively. Whilst I acknowledge that some reduction in private open space may be permissible having regard to the location of the site and general pattern and grain of development in the immediate vicinity which typically comprises terrace dwellings with limited private open space provision, I would have concerns regarding the significant shortfall in private open space provision in terms of the future amenity of these dwellings. Dwelling no 1 in particular is deficient. This dwelling is served by a rear amenity

private open space of just 21 sq. metres. As noted previously the usability of the louvered terrace as a secondary private open space is questionable.

7.3.7 The shadow analysis submitted by the applicant is noted. However, no quantitative analysis has been provided regarding daylight impacts in accordance with the standards set out in the relevant BRE Guidance.

7.4 **Appropriate Assessment**

7.4.1 Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, an infill residential scheme within an established and fully serviced urban area, and its distance 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.

7.5 **Conclusion**

7.5.1 The subject site is an underutilised brownfield site that has the potential to accommodate an infill development that would improve the visual amenity of the site and streetscape and provide additional housing stock. Whilst the need to promote additional density on such sites in close proximity to good quality public transport is clearly advocated at a national and local level, the guidance also notes that the overriding concern should be the quality of the proposed residential environment to be created.

7.5.2 It is noted from the planning history, that there were a number of previous development proposals that included the two dwellings within the applicant's ownership to the west of the site. These dwellings are however, excluded from the current development proposal and are retained. The impact of the development on the amenities of these dwellings, the neighbouring dwellings on Alexandra Terrace and the amenity and quality of the dwellings themselves for future occupants must, therefore, be considered.

7.5.3 In this instance, the site is a constrained urban site. I consider that the development in its current format represents an overdevelopment of the site. Whilst a higher density of housing may be achievable in a different housing format such as apartments, the provision of three infill dwellings with their current design and layout would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of the area. It is

considered that the height, scale and design of dwelling no. 1 would in particular be incongruous with the existing streetscape and would have a significant adverse overbearing impact on the dwellings located to the west. The extent of private open space is deficient particularly for this dwelling and measures to obviate potential overlooking such as louvred screens to the proposed terrace and opaque glazing to the living room fenestration would impact negatively on the amenity of the proposed dwelling.

7.5.4 Car parking is also problematic and it is considered that some degree of off street parking should be provided. The proposition however, for three separate car port accesses off an extremely narrow and constrained cul de sac is considered likely to cause adverse traffic impacts and would significantly reduce the level of on street parking causing disamenity to existing residents. The applicant's case for a zero car development is noted. However, it is considered reasonable that 1 car parking space per unit should be provided having regard to the suburban location of the site and the reality that future occupants will require at least 1 space to store and park their car. In this regard, I do not consider that the development is in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note

7.5.5 It is noted that the applicant has submitted a number of revisions to the design of the development as part of their appeal submission which I consider to be material. Should the Board be minded to grant permission for the development, they may wish to consider requesting revised public notices.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. It is recommended that permission be refused permission for the reasons set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that the proposed layout and design of the proposed development and in particular dwelling no.1 would be of insufficient architectural quality and would produce a substandard form of development on

this site. It is considered that the three storey dwelling (house 1) would be incongruous in terms of its design, scale and height, would be out of character with the streetscape, would have an overbearing impact on the dwellings to the west and would, therefore, seriously injure the amenities of the area and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. It is the Policy of the Planning Authority as set out in the County Development Plan 2016-2022 that residential development is provided with adequate private open space in the interest of residential amenity. The proposed development and in particular house no. 1 is deficient in the quantum, location and quality of private open space. The proposed development would, therefore, not be in accordance with the Development Plan Section 8.2.8.4 (i) Private Open Space Quality, and would seriously injure the residential amenity of future residents and the amenities of property in the vicinity and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. Having regard to the revised proposals submitted to the An Bord Pleanála on the 1st day of November 2017 to provide 3 separate vehicular entrances and car ports to serve the 3 no. dwellings, it is considered that due to the fact that the site is located on a cul de sac which is substandard in terms of width, that the traffic turning movements generated by the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users. The development would also result in an unacceptable loss of on street parking. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Erika Casey
Senior Planning Inspector

12th February 2018