



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-301591-18

Development	Two additional floors at 7 th and 8 th - floor level to Block B (Foley Street), providing for 36 hotel guestrooms
Location	The North Star Hotel, Amiens Street, Dublin 1
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2323/18
Applicant(s)	BC McGettigan Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First-Party
Appellant(s)	BC McGettigan Ltd.
Observer(s)	Transport Infrastructure Ireland, Ulysses House Management Ltd.
Date of Site Inspection	26 th July 2018
Inspector	Colm McLoughlin

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
6.0 The Appeal	9
7.0 Assessment.....	12
7.1. Introduction	12
7.2. Zoning Objectives & Development Standards.....	12
7.3. Building Height & Visual Impact	13
7.4. Impact on Residential Amenities	14
7.5. Parking & Construction Management.....	17
8.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	17
9.0 Recommendation.....	18
10.0 Reasons and Considerations	18

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site has a stated area of approximately 2,851sq.m and is located on the northside of Dublin city centre, fronting onto Amiens Street and Connolly Station and backing onto Foley Street. It is bisected by two operational railway lines. Adjacent to the south of the site is a terrace of three-storey commercial properties fronting onto Talbot Street, and adjacent to the north along Amiens Street is a railway bridge and underpass, and a terrace of three to six-storey buildings. Adjacent to the northeast along Foley Street is Montgomery Court, a six-storey residential block with commercial units at ground floor. A service laneway to the southwest separates the appeal site from Ulysses House, a five-storey commercial building. The Steelworks residential development, including four to eight-storey blocks, is located directly north of the appeal site on the opposite side of Foley Street.
- 1.2. Currently on site is a hotel, which is split into three separate blocks. Block A to the south of the railway line comprises a three-storey building over basement, which is a Protected Structure dating from the mid to late 1800s and according to the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) this originally consisted of a terrace of separate buildings, which have since been amalgamated. The central block, Block C, and the subject block B onto Foley Street, are seven storeys over basement. The hotel currently comprises 235 guestrooms and suites, meeting rooms, gymnasium, restaurants and open seating areas. The hotel has a stated gross floor area (GFA) of approximately 11,507 sq.m and a maximum stated building height of approximately 21.6m to the central lift core in Block B. The external finishes to Block B feature screen railing to the ground-floor along Foley Street, red brick and plaster from first to fourth-floor level and extensive glazing to the fifth and sixth floors. Ground levels in the area do not vary significantly.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the following:
- Two additional floors to Block B along Foley Street to provide for a nine-storey block (stated height of 27.5m) an additional stated GFA of c.1,288sq.m, accommodating 36 no. hotel guestrooms, each with en-suite washroom

facilities, extending the hotel to a total of 271 hotel guestrooms and a total stated GFA of c.12,795sq.m.

- Extension to be finished in glazing and light grey curtain supports to match the existing upper floor extension to Block C;
- Revisions to the internal layout on all levels over basement to provide for a lift core on the northeast end of Block B;
- Enabling works for the additional floors include the insertion of 32 no. structural support columns through the northwest and southwest sides of Block B.

2.2. In addition to the standard details, the planning application was accompanied by a Planning Report, a Conservation Report, a set of Photomontages and an Engineer's Report.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The Planning Authority decided to refuse permission for the following reason only:

R.1 'Having regard to the height, scale and massing of the proposed development and its relationship with neighbouring buildings in the immediate vicinity and to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, including policy SC25 which seeks to support new development that makes a positive contribution to an area, it is considered that the proposed development would result in an abrupt transition in building height on Foley street and would be highly visible from a number of locations in the public domain, by virtue of its excessive height and scale and would fail to adequately respect and complement the prevailing character and height of the existing streetscapes of Foley Street and Amiens Street. Therefore, the proposed development would be visually obtrusive and would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would not comply with the stated policies and standards of the Dublin City Development Plan

2016-2022. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area'.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

The report of the Planning Officer (April 2018) reflects the decision of the Planning Authority and noted the following:

- extension of the existing hotel is permissible under the 'Z5-zoning' objective;
- plot ratio (4.48) is above the Development Plan indicative plot ratio (2.5 – 3.0) standards, but subject to an appropriate design solution along Foley Street may be acceptable;
- parapet height (27.5m) meets the upper building height limits for this area. Additional floors would be 8m above the height of Ulysses House and Montgomery Court, and the proposed building height would be excessive when compared with these prevailing heights.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Engineering Department (Drainage Division) - no objection subject to conditions;
- Roads & Traffic Planning Division - no objection subject to conditions;
- Conservation Officer – requests additional information.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Minister for Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht – no response;
- An Taisce – object to the development based on building height and impact on the Protected Structure on site;
- The Heritage Council – no response;
- Irish Rail – recommends attachment of conditions, should permission be granted;
- Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) – recommends a Section 49 contribution should be attached;

- National Transport Authority (NTA) – no response.

3.4. Third-Party Submission

- 3.4.1. One submission was received during consideration of the application on behalf of Ulysses House Management Ltd., the owners of the commercial block adjacent to the southwest of Block B on the appeal site. The issues raised in this submission are covered in the observations to the appeal.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

- 4.1.1. There is an extensive history associated with the appeal site, including the following recent applications:
- Dublin City Council [DCC] Ref. 3807/16 – Permission granted (July 2017) for a glazed restaurant extension and an external seating area in Block A along Amiens Street;
 - DCC Ref. 3569/15 – Permission granted (December 2015) for two additional storeys providing for a seven-storey Block C to the hotel;
 - DCC Ref. 2533/15 – Permission granted (August 2015) for alterations to Block C and Block B to the hotel, including the omission of basement car park and change of use from ground-floor retail along Foley Street to hotel guestrooms;
 - DCC Ref. 3931/09 – Permission granted (July 2010) for five-storey central Block C to the hotel.

4.2. Surrounding & Similar Sites

- 4.2.1. There is an extensive planning history associated with the adjoining and neighbouring sites, including the following:
- 17-21 Foley Street (DCC Ref. 3752/18) – Application lodged to the Planning Authority on the 20th August 2018 for the demolition of an existing three-storey building, approximately 40m to the west of the appeal site and construction of a seven-storey office block over basement.

4.2.2. There have been numerous recent applications for additional floors to hotels in the city centre area, including the following:

- The Holiday Inn Express, Upper O'Connell Street (ABP Ref. 301378 / DCC Ref. 2084/14) – Permission refused by the Planning Authority in March 2018 for an additional eight storey to the hotel containing guestrooms, due to the visual impact on the character of O'Connell Street Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). Currently subject of an appeal to An Bord Pleanála;
- The Morgan Hotel, Fleet Street / Aston Place (ABP Ref. 300256 / DCC Ref. 3754/17) – Permission refused (April 2018) for the addition of a seventh-storey event space to the hotel, due to the visual impact on the character of the River Liffey Conservation Area;
- Academy Plaza Hotel, Cathal Brugha Street (DCC Ref. 3405/17) – Permission granted (October 2017) for an additional ninth floor to hotel;
- Hilton Garden Inn, Custom House Quay (ABP Ref. PL29N.245385 / DCC Ref. 2941/15) – Permission granted (December 2015) for extensions and an additional eight floor to the hotel.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. The appeal site has a zoning objective 'Z5 – City Centre' within the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, where it is the stated objective 'to consolidate and facilitate the development of the central area, and to identify, reinforce, strengthen and protect its civic design, character and dignity'. A hotel is a 'permitted' use on lands zoned 'Z5'. The Plan outlines that the primary purpose of zone 'Z5' is to sustain life within the centre of the city through intensive mixed-use development. Part of the strategy for this area is to provide a dynamic mix of uses that interact with each other and to help create a sense of community, which sustain the vitality of the inner city both by day and by night.

5.1.2. Block A of the North Star Hotel located on the southeast side of the site along Amiens Street is included within the Record of Protected Structures (RPS Ref. 98), as are three neighbouring terraced structures on the northeast side of the site along

Amiens Street. Chapter 11 of the Plan provides guidance on development comprising or in the curtilage of Protected Structures, including Policies CHC1 and CHC2, which 'seek the preservation of the built heritage of the city' and 'safeguard the special interest of Protected Structures' respectively. The site is also within a Zone of Archaeological Interest.

5.1.3. Section 4.5.9 of the Plan includes policies relating to Urban Form and Architecture, including the following:

- SC7 - To protect and enhance important views, corridors and landmarks;
- SC25 - To promote development which incorporates exemplary standards of high-quality, sustainable and inclusive urban design, urban form and architecture;
- SC28 - To promote understanding of the city's historical architectural character to facilitate new development which is in harmony with the city's historical spaces and structures.

5.1.4. Section 6.5.3 of the Plan refers to 'tourism and visitors', and notes that it is important to continue to develop tourism infrastructure such as visitor accommodation of various types. Relevant policies include:

- CEE12 (i) - seeks to promote and facilitate tourism, as one of the key economic pillars of the city's economy and a major generator of employment, and to support the provision of necessary significant increase in facilities such as hotels;
- CEE13 (iii) - seeks to promote and support the development of additional tourism accommodation at appropriate locations.

5.1.5. Other relevant sections of the Development Plan include:

- Section 16.2 – Design Principles and Standards;
- Section 16.5 – Plot Ratio (2.5 to 3.0 within a Z5 zoning objective area);
- Section 16.6 – Site Coverage (90% within a Z5 zoning objective area);

5.1.6. Section 16.7.2 of the Development Plan sets out building height limits for development, including a 28m restriction for commercial development in the inner city and a 50m restriction within 500m of Connolly Station.

- 5.1.7. The Development Plan refers to the document 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A Guide to Good Practice' (Building Research Establishment [BRE] Report 2nd Edition, 2011) for use in assessing the impact of development on access to sunlight and daylight.
- 5.1.8. Section 16.38 and Table 16.1 of the Plan outline that a maximum of one car park space per four hotel rooms is required in the city centre.

5.2. National Guidelines

- 5.2.1. The following Guidelines are also relevant:
- Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2004);
 - Draft Urban and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities (Department of Housing, Planning & Local Government, 2018);
 - Project Ireland 2040 - National Planning Framework (2018) – including National Policy Objective 13, which states that 'in urban areas, planning and related standards, including in particular building height and car parking will be based on performance criteria that seek to achieve well-designed high quality outcomes in order to achieve targeted growth. These standards will be subject to a range of tolerance that enables alternative solutions to be proposed to achieve stated outcomes, provided public safety is not compromised and the environment is suitably protected'.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. The principal grounds of the first-party appeal can be summarised as follows:

Zoning Objectives and Development Standards

- development is appropriate to the zoning and the strategic location, being well-served by public transport;
- existing development on site, the design, the location and the need for the development justify the plot ratio;

Impact on Architectural Heritage

- the Conservation Report submitted highlights that the development would not impact on the setting and character of the Protected Structure on site, given the level of separation and the recently constructed central Block C element;
- the Conservation Officer did not recommend refusal of planning permission, as they only requested a revised window type with respect to the Protected Structure, as required by a previous condition of planning (DCC Ref. 2533/15);
- revised photomontages are submitted to more accurately reflect the proposed materials (as viewed from View 5) and these reveal minimal impact on the visual amenities of the area, as well as Protected Structures;

Impact on Visual Amenities

- an additional contextual section drawing (No.2015-47-ABP-202) is submitted to show adherence to the 28m building height restriction and also to provide additional context for the proposed development;
- building height is further justified by the strategic location proximate to Connolly Station, where an increased building height under 50m is provided for in the Development Plan;
- precedent is set by other buildings up to 35m in height in the vicinity, including Block C of The Steelworks (25m / 8 storeys) on Foley Street, Scot's Church (28.8m / 7 storeys) on Abbey Street, the Metropolitan Building (28m / 8 storeys) on James Joyce Street, No.2 Harbourmaster Place (35m / 8 storeys) off Amiens Street in the IFSC and the International Centre (28m / 7 storeys) in the IFSC;
- design sought to address the visual impact of the development by stepping up the building height moving back into the site from Amiens Street;

Parking

- additional parking is not proposed in order to protect the special interest and character of the site, including the Protected Structure, and as such follows Development Plan policy in looking to reduce private car usage in the city;

- additional cycle parking is not proposed as it would not be needed given the proximity to public transport.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- 6.2.1. The Planning Authority responded to the grounds of appeal by stating that the Planning Officer's report comprehensively deals with the issues raised and justifies their decision.

6.3. Observation

- 6.3.1. An observation was received from TII, stating that the site is within the area subject of the LUAS Red Line Docklands Extension Section 49 contribution scheme.

- 6.3.2. The observation submitted on behalf of the owners of Ulysses House can be summarised as follows:

- seeking further information would not have resolved the concerns of the observer;
- development would impact on the operation of Ulysses House and the applicant failed to engage with the observer;
- Foley Street is not a wide street and the surrounding prevailing building height is five to six storeys;
- overdevelopment of the site would arise, as exemplified in the development failing to meet the necessary standards for plot ratio in this area;
- no additional parking is proposed as part of the proposed development, despite the area experiencing significant parking capacity concerns;
- overshadowing along Foley Street has not been adequately addressed;
- application is absent of meaningful construction and construction traffic management proposals, including mitigation measures.

- 6.3.3. An observation was received from Fáilte Ireland, supporting the proposed development, while outlining the need for additional tourist accommodation in Dublin city.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. I consider the substantive planning issues arising from the grounds of appeal and in assessing the proposed development are as follows:

- Zoning Objectives & Development Standards;
- Building Height & Visual Impact;
- Impact on Residential Amenities;
- Parking & Construction Management.

7.2. Zoning Objectives & Development Standards

7.2.1. The proposed development would provide for an additional two floors to the hotel along the Foley Street side, increasing the building height of Block B to nine storeys or 27.5m. Under the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022, the appeal site is zoned 'Z5 - City Centre' and is subject to an objective 'to consolidate and facilitate the development of the central area, and to identify, reinforce, strengthen and protect its civic design, character and dignity'. Hotel use is a permissible use under this land-use zoning objective. The proposed development would add an additional 36 hotel guestrooms to the tourist accommodation for the city. Consequently, Development Plan policies CEE12(i) and CEE13(iii), seeking to continue to develop tourism infrastructure such as visitor accommodation of various types, is supported by the subject proposals. The immediate area comprises an expansive mix of uses, including residential, educational, office and retail uses. Overall, I consider the principle of the proposed development to be acceptable, subject to assessment of the relevant planning and environmental considerations identified below.

7.2.2. The additional floors to the hotel would result in a stated plot ratio of 4.48, whereas the indicative plot ratio for Z5 lands in the Development Plan is 2.5 to 3.0. Site coverage would not alter. Given the location of the appeal site within an inner-urban area, adjacent to various modes of public transport, I am satisfied that, in accordance with Development Plan policy, a higher plot ratio is acceptable in this

instance, subject to more detailed consideration of the impacts of the development on local amenities.

7.3. Building Height & Visual Impact

- 7.3.1. The Planning Authority decision to refuse permission was partially based on the height of the proposed additional floors and the resultant impact on the surrounding streetscape. While the Planning Authority considered that the building height (27.5m) would be within the Development Plan limitations, which allow for 28m-high commercial buildings in inner-city areas, the proposals would be excessive when compared with prevailing building heights. In response to this, the grounds of appeal assert that the increased building height is justified by various existing buildings of similar or greater height in the city centre area, the stepped approach to building height and the adherence of the proposals to Development Plan standards.
- 7.3.2. The existing hotel building on site, includes a three-storey block, which is a Protected Structure, to the front along Amiens Street (Block A), a seven-storey central block (Block C) and the subject block (Block B) fronting onto Foley Street. Building heights along Amiens Street and Foley Street largely range from three to six storeys. There are three terraced Protected Structures immediately to the northeast of the site along Amiens Street. Within The Steelworks mixed-use development to the northwest, building heights vary from four storeys directly onto Foley Street stepping upwards to eight storeys moving into the complex.
- 7.3.3. Section 16.7.2 of the Development Plan sets out the maximum building height for commercial buildings in the inner-city area as 28m, although there is scope for a building up to 50m in height in this location based on Development Plan provisions. Nevertheless, the overall height of the proposed additional floors would be 27.5m, which is within the upper height limits for this area. Section 16.7.2 also sets out that 'notwithstanding the maximum permissible heights specified in this section, proposals will be subject to assessment against standards set out elsewhere in the Development Plan' and in this regard I note that Policies CHC1 and CHC2 of the Development Plan, seek to preserve the built heritage of the city and safeguard the special interest of Protected Structures. Assessment of the proposed development with respect to standards relating to residential amenity is undertaken in Section 7.4 of this report.

- 7.3.4. The impact of the proposed building height and scale on the surrounding context is a key consideration in this instance. A visual impact assessment of the proposed development did not accompany the application, but computer-generated images (CGIs) from nine locations were provided, including six views from along Amiens Street. The existing buildings and the narrowness of Foley Street would largely screen views of the proposed additional floors from the north and west. CGI views from the northeastern approach along Amiens Street reveal that the proposed additional floors would be largely screened from view by the existing buildings. Therefore, the most sensitive views of the proposed additional floors would be along Amiens Street immediately fronting the Protected Structure and also from the southwestern approach. The proposed additional floors would be set back approximately 27m to 62m from Amiens Street and 34m from Block A, the Protected Structure.
- 7.3.5. The Dublin City Development Plan acknowledges the intrinsic quality of Dublin as a low-rise city and recognises the need to protect the architectural character of existing buildings, streets and spaces of artistic, civic or historic importance. While the prevailing character of the area to the south along Amiens Street, is of lower scale, the set back from this street and the buffer provided by the seven-storey central Block C, would ensure that the additional floors would not be highly visible from Amiens Street and, accordingly, would not result in an abrupt transition in existing and proposed building heights. Considering the location of the proposed additional floors and the intention to use materials that match materials in the adjacent Block C, I am satisfied that this aspect of the proposals would have an imperceptible impact on the setting and character of the Protected Structures along Amiens Street and would not have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area. In conclusion, I recommend that permission should not be refused on the basis of the impact of the proposals on visual amenities.

7.4. Impact on Residential Amenities

- 7.4.1. The impact of the proposed development on neighbouring residential amenities did not form part of the Planning Authority's decision to refuse permission, nor was it addressed in a substantive manner within the application. As such, the Board may wish to treat this as a new issue.

- 7.4.2. The development area on the appeal site is situated along Foley Street, which is characterised by a mix of uses and building heights all fronting onto a narrow cobblestone street. On the opposite side of Foley Street and to the north of the subject hotel is Block C of The Steelworks development, built in the 00s and comprising ground-floor commercial and educational units along Foley Street with apartments above. Other residential buildings within the immediate area include Montgomery Court adjacent to the northeast, as well as apartments along Beaver Street approximately 35m to the north. Of these neighbouring residential properties, the development would only have the potential to impact on the residential amenities of The Steelworks, which features apartments from first-floor to fifth-floor level, with balconies or terraces serving as their sole private amenity space onto Foley Street. The proposed development would not worsen the existing situation with regards to overlooking or loss of privacy, as the additional floors would not be any closer to the apartments in The Steelworks.
- 7.4.3. In discussing the challenges facing the provision of housing in the city, the Development Plan highlights that it is important that housing is affordable and attractive to all who want to live in the city, including, quality spacious housing units with good levels of amenity in terms of daylight and sunlight amongst other qualities. In providing guidance for new development the Development Plan refers to the principles outlined within guidance document 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A Guide to Good Practice' (BRE, 2011).
- 7.4.4. The Steelworks (Block C) apartments are directly to the north and northwest of Block B to the North Star Hotel and at present would experience some negative impacts by virtue of their proximity and relationship with Block B. A daylight / sunlight and shadow study comparing the effect of the existing Block B of the North Star Hotel and the proposed development on surrounding properties, including residential apartments in Block C of The Steelworks along Foley Street and their associated balcony amenity space, was not submitted with the planning application or appeal.
- 7.4.5. Drawing No.2015-47-ABP-202 submitted as part of the first-party appeal, to an extent illustrates the relationship between The Steelworks and the proposed development. While I recognise that floor to ceiling heights within The Steelworks are greater than in the subject Block B, should the development proceed as submitted, the first-floor residents along Foley Street would be presented with a

building approximately 10m to the south and 24m higher than the floor level of their apartments. While I note that this is an inner-urban context and that there is significant demand for tourist accommodation in the city, the proposed development would have an overbearing impact when viewed from the lower apartments in Block C of The Steelworks. Furthermore, the proposed development would have a significant impact on the levels of natural light available to the apartments and would result in a significant increase in overshadowing of balcony amenity space. The balconies serving the subject apartments are well used and The Steelworks has been designed, finished and maintained to a high standard, which I consider is worthy of protected into the future, while the proposed development would undermine this.

- 7.4.6. Stepping the building line of the additional floors back from Foley Street may in fact address the impact of the development on natural lighting relative to the existing situation, while meeting the relevant BRE standards cited in the Development Plan. However, I believe that the appropriate setbacks can only be achieved based on detailed sunlight /daylight and shadow studies, which were not submitted as part of the planning application or appeal. I also note that the development would be enabled by steel-support columns and involves internal layout alterations to provide access to the additional floors in compliance with Building Regulations and fire safety requirements. Consequently, in the absence of detailed studies, I do not consider it would be appropriate to secure revised setbacks of the additional floors by way of a condition to a permission.
- 7.4.7. In conclusion, I consider that the proposed additional floors to the hotel would detrimentally impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring apartments along Foley Street, specifically in Block C of The Steelworks, by virtue of the height, scale and proximity of the proposed additional floors relative to these apartments, which would result in a significantly overbearing impact for residents of the apartments and would significantly restrict sunlight and daylight to the apartments and their associated balconies. Accordingly, I recommend that permission should be refused on the basis of an unacceptable impact of the proposals on neighbouring residential amenities.

7.5. Parking & Construction Management

- 7.5.1. An observer to the appeal asserts that in the absence of a meaningful construction management plan and given the additional commensurate car parking required to serve the hotel, the proposed development should be refused. In this regard I note that the site is highly accessible by various modes of public transport, including Luas, rail and bus. The Roads and Traffic Planning Division of the Planning Authority and TII have both reported on the subject application, outlining that, subject to conditions, they do not object to the development. The Roads and Traffic Planning Division noted that no cycle parking spaces are proposed and that spaces should be provided. Considering these reports, the city centre location and the use of maximum car parking standards in the Development Plan, I am satisfied that there would not be a necessity to provide additional car parking spaces to serve the extended hotel. Irish Rail set out specific requirements with respect to the construction programme. Should the Board be minded to grant permission measures to allow for the free-flow of vehicular, rail and pedestrian traffic during the construction phase, should be required to be submitted to and agreed with the Planning Authority, as part of a Construction Management Plan. In conclusion, subject to conditions addressing the shortfall in cycle parking and the need for a detailed Construction Management Plan, the proposed development would be adequately provided for in terms of parking and mitigation measures can be undertaken to address temporary construction impacts arising. Accordingly, the proposed development should not be refused permission for reasons relating to parking and construction management.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

- 8.1. Having regard to the existing development on site, the minor nature of the proposed development, the location of the site in a serviced urban area and the separation distance to the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1.1. I recommend that planning permission should be refused, for the reasons and considerations, as set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the scale and height of the proposed development and to its proximity to adjoining residential apartments to the north in Block C of The Steelworks along Foley Street and in the absence of detailed sunlight / daylight and shadow studies, it is considered that that the proposed development would result in significant loss of sunlight and daylight and excessive overshadowing of balconies serving as private amenity space to those neighbouring apartments, would have a significantly overbearing impact from those neighbouring apartments and, accordingly, would adversely impact on the residential amenities of residents in Block C of The Steelworks. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Colm McLoughlin
Planning Inspector

5th September 2018