



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-303785-19

Development	The demolition of single storey bungalow and the construction of a two storey house with ground floor annex, with new site entrance & associated site works
Location	Cúl Clumthar, Lower Village Dunmore East, County Waterford
Planning Authority	Waterford City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	18462
Applicant	Breda English.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission.
Type of Appeal	First Party v Refusal.
Appellant	Breda English.
Observer	Ashleen Mulligan.
Date of Site Inspection	21 st June 2019.
Inspector	Susan McHugh

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description.....	3
2.0 Proposed Development.....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision.....	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports.....	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies.....	5
3.4. Third Party Observations.....	6
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. Development Plan.....	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations.....	7
5.3. EIA Screening	8
6.0 The Appeal.....	8
6.1. Grounds of Appeal.....	8
6.2. Planning Authority Response	10
6.3. Observation	10
6.4. Further Response	11
7.0 Assessment.....	12
8.0 Recommendation.....	17
9.0 Reasons and Considerations	17

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. Dunmore East is an attractive village situated on the coastline to the east of County Waterford and approximately 12km from Waterford City.
- 1.2. The appeal site is located to the northern end of Dunmore East village and is approximately 100m from the sea. The area is characterised by a mix of house types, commercial and civic buildings of various styles on plots of varying sizes.
 - 1.2.1. In the vicinity of the site to the north and north east, are a terrace of two storey houses, a holiday home development, and fire station. The Spinnaker Bar and Restaurant is located opposite the appeal site to the east, with residential development to the south east, south and west.
- 1.3. The site is bounded to the north by 'Rose Cottage' a single storey house, the gable of which abuts the public road, Glenville Terrace. To the south and south west the site is bounded by a large two storey thatched house and front garden and is home to the observer in the current appeal.
- 1.4. The existing detached single storey dwelling on site, Cúl Clumthar, is 'L' shaped with a stated floor area of 135sqm. It is positioned tight to the rear and side boundaries, with open space to the front, and is currently vacant and in poor condition.
- 1.5. The northern and eastern boundaries are defined by overgrown hedging, the southern boundary is defined by a low wall, which then steps up at the side and rear to a 2m high wall. Vehicular access is from Glenville Terrace.
- 1.6. The stated site has a stated area of 0.3ha.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought to demolish the existing single storey bungalow and erect a new two-storey 'L' shaped four-bedroom house with single storey annex to the rear.
- 2.2. The proposed dwelling has a stated floor area of 220sqm and comprises, ground floor kitchen living area, two bedrooms, wc and shower, hall and cloak room, with first floor sitting room, bathroom and two bedrooms.
- 2.3. The proposed house is located to the front of the site and has a symmetrical facade. Finishes proposed include a smooth render finish, sash windows with limestone cill and plaster band surround are also detailed in the application. First floor windows to the rear are finished in opaque glazing.

- 2.4. The proposed two storey pitched roof has a ridge height of 8.1m and is to be finished with blue/black slate. The single storey annex has a mono pitch roof and is finished with a standing seam.
- 2.5. Private amenity space is provided to the rear with a stated area of 95sqm. The patio area includes permeable paving.
- 2.6. It is proposed to block up the existing vehicular entrance and provide a new 1m high boundary wall with wicket pedestrian gate. A new vehicular entrance is proposed at the south east corner of the site. Two off street car parking spaces are also provided.
- 2.7. Revised plans were submitted by way of further information indicating a reduction in the ridgeline of the building to 7.092m and the introduction of angled windows at first floor level to afford full privacy to the property to the south/south west of the proposed house.
- 2.8. The response to further information was also accompanied by revised plans, shadow analysis diagrams, and streetscape elevations including contiguous elevations.

3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. **Decision**

The Planning Authority decided to **refuse** permission for the proposed development, subject to one reason as follows;

1. *'It is considered that the development, by reason of its height and proximity to the neighbouring north property, would seriously injure the residential amenities of the said property by reason of visual obtrusiveness and overshadowing. The proposed development would, therefore, seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity, would depreciate the value of properties in the vicinity, and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.'*

3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. **Planning Reports (dated 27/08/2018 and 28/01/2019)**

Basis for planning authority decision. It includes;

The initial planning report which notes the following;

- *Design* - The mix of house types in the area, considers the principal of a two-storey dwelling on site to be acceptable.
- *Residential Amenity* – Notes proximity to the adjoining single storey dwelling to the north, and the location and proximity of first floor windows to the neighbouring dwelling to the south/southeast. Notwithstanding the proposed obscure glazing proposed to first floor level windows, they could give rise to loss of privacy.
- *Building Line* – Not clearly defined at this location and would not have an objection to the proposed dwelling footprint.
- *Open Space for Replacement Dwelling within the Village* – Existing dwelling provides more amenity space, but the house is located to the front of the site.
- *P.A.04/1321* – Reason for refusal highlighted potential for overlooking and loss of privacy but not the principle of a 2-storey dwelling at this location.
- Concern raised in relation to the height of the proposal relative to adjoining dwellings, proximity to neighbouring north single storey dwelling, potential overlooking of front garden of property to the south as the first-floor room is indicated as a living room.

Recommendation for further information 06/07/2018 to include contiguous elevations, revised proposals for a one and a half storey dwelling or lower site levels, revised design proposals addressing issues of overlooking, and a shadow impact analysis.

Further information response submitted 05/12/2018 triggered revised public notices.

The final planning report notes the submitted shadow assessment indicates that there will be a significant impact on the adjoining property to the north, which is a modest cottage with no windows to the rear.

Recommendation that permission be refused.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Water Services: No objection subject to compliance with requirements.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Irish Water: No objection.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One submission was lodged by Patrick Halley and Associates agent on behalf of Ashleen Mulligan the owner of the two-storey thatched property to the south and southwest in relation to the proposed development. The issues raised can be summarised as follows;

- Over-development of the site, shortfall in private amenity space.
- Excessive height relative to the height of adjoining properties.
- Planning history on the site.
- Overlooking from first floor windows.
- At variance with established building line in the area.

A further submission was lodged in response to the further information, noting similar issues to those raised in the observation to the current appeal.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

P.A. Reg. Ref. 05/204: Permission **granted** (April 2005) for the demolition of a single storey dwelling house and the erection of a replacement storey and a half dwelling house and alterations to existing entrance for Peter & Angela Queally. Permission expired in 2010 and was never implemented.

P.A. Reg. Ref. 04/1321: Permission **refused** (December 2004) for the demolition of a single storey dwelling house and the erection of a replacement two-storey dwelling house to Peter Queally. Reason for refusal referred to overlooking and loss of privacy of adjacent properties which would set an undesirable precedent.

P.A. Reg. Ref. 03/249: Permission **refused** (June 2003) for demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two-storey dwelling and associated site works to Peter & Angela Queally.

House to the North – Rose Cottage

P.A. Reg. Ref. 07/1830: Permission **granted** (July 2008) for demolition of an existing bungalow dwelling and construction of a new two storey dwelling house with drainage connection, entrance alterations and associated site works. This permission was not implemented.

P.A. Reg. Ref. 01/1113: Permission **granted** (November 2001) to erect a fully serviced thatched dormer style house and thatched boathouse together with ancillary site works, to Kieran and Ashleen Mulligan. This permission was implemented.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The village of Dunmore East is included as a District Service Centre in the Waterford County Development Plan, 2011-2017 and is zoned 'R1' in the settlement plan, contained in Volume 2 of the Plan. It is the stated objective of this zoning '*to protect amenity of existing residential development and provide new residential development – medium density*'. (see map attached)
- 5.1.2. The appeal site is identified within a Streetscape of Distinctive Character.
- 5.1.3. **Objective DO₁₇** of the Dunmore East Plan requires developments to '*have regard to the planning guidance, as set out in Section 10.46 of the Development Standards Chapter of the County Development Plan.*'
- 5.1.4. **Chapter 10** of the County Development Plan refers to Development Standards.
- 5.1.5. **Section 10.46** refers to Planning Guidance for Streetscapes of Distinctive Character. In relation to 'Replacement Dwellings' where deemed acceptable in towns or villages it states that '*new buildings should take into account existing plots, where possible, in order to retain the existing grain, character and setting of the streetscape.*'
- In relation to 'New Buildings' it states that '*all new buildings should contribute to the visual enhancement of the area while respecting its physical character.*'

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The following European sites are located in the vicinity of the appeal site.

Description	Designation	Site Code	Distance
River Barrow and River Nore	SAC	002162	2.6km NE
Tramore Dunes and Back Strand	SAC	000671	4.6km W
Tramore Back Strand	SPA	004027	4.6km W

Hook Head	SAC	000764	5.2km SE
-----------	-----	--------	----------

The Dunmore East Cliffs pNHA, Site Code 000664, is located 300m to the south east.

5.3. EIA Screening

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. The first party appeal was lodged by Peter Thompson, Planning Solutions agent on behalf of the applicant Breda English. The appeal was accompanied by a short report on the condition of the building, and an expanded shadow analysis. The appeal can be summarised as follows;

- *Comparison with permitted development P.A. Reg. Ref. 05/204* – Permitted house was 6.899m high, closer to the rear of the site than the proposed house, with garden towards the public road. The P.A. accepted the demolition of the existing house and construction of a replacement.
- *History of sites in the vicinity* – P.A. Reg. Ref. 01/1113 permitted two storey thatch house approx. 9.5m high, at its closest is less than a meter from the rear boundary of the appeal site, first floor windows overlook the garden space. P.A. Reg. Ref. 07/1803 permitted two storey house approx. 8.5m high hard onto the northern boundary of the site.
- *Proposed House* – Two storey section faces onto the public road, thereby addressing the existing streetscape and pattern of traditional house development further to the north. Existing house and houses in the immediate vicinity are positioned haphazardly, with no set building line. The single storey section of the house to the rear is set back 2.6m from the existing rear boundary wall to allow maintenance, which the current house layout does not facilitate.

- *Addresses Issues raised in submission;*
 - *Overdevelopment* – Private open space provision conforms with Development Plan standards and will be more private than existing.
 - *Excessive Height* – Permission granted for a replacement house on site to the north which was 8.5m in height, the thatched house to the south west and south is 9.5m in height and the roadside terrace of houses further north are two storeys. The height of the proposed house was reduced from 8.1m to 7.092m in response to a request for further information.
 - *Overshadowing* – Proposed house will not result in any material loss of sun or daylight to the observer's property.
 - *Overlooking* – Proposed first floor windows will overlook part of the observes front garden which is fully open to public view from the road.
 - *Building line* – Does not respect the building line established by the houses to the south.

The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows;

Relationship with property to the North

- *Height and proximity to the neighbouring property* – Previous permission for house on the site was the same height. The P.A. had no objection to the principle of a two-storey house.
- *Visual obtrusiveness* – P.A. had no objection in principle to the proposed position or footprint of the two-storey house, and no justification for stating the proposed house is visually obtrusive. P.A. had previously granted planning permission for a far more imposing house on the site of the cottage to the north and a one and a half storey house of the same height on the application site, which together would have had a far greater visual impact than the vernacular designed proposed.
- *Overshadowing* – Notes that details of morning and evening impacts were not included in the application but are included in the appeal. Accept that the proposed house does increase shadow cast over the front of the cottage in the winter at midday but contend that it is less than compared to the previously permitted house on the site the shadow cast would be in the afternoon and for a longer period of time. The single storey element of the proposed house will have no impact on the existing cottage.

- *Injury to residential amenity in the vicinity* – P.A. had no objection to the principle of a two-storey house and its footprint in the location proposed. P.A. are satisfied that the design solution of the proposed first floor deals with any perceived or potential overlooking of the property to the south west and south. No submissions received from the owners of the property to the north. Windows to the rear initially proposed to include obscure glazing but were redesigned in response to the further information.
- *Depreciation of value of property in the vicinity* – No evidence such as a valuer's opinion has been submitted to support this aspect of the reason for refusal.
- *Development Contributions* – If the Board are mindful to grant permission contributions are only due on the additional 85sqm floor area.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority has not responded to this third-party appeal.

6.3. Observation

- 6.3.1. An observation was lodged by Halley Murphy and Associates Architects acting as agent on behalf of Ashleen Mulligan.

Planning History – To date three of the four planning applications made on the site were for two storey dwellings and all were refused by the P.A. The permitted house was for a storey and a half dormer type dwelling, which in terms of mass, scale, proportion and aesthetic is completely dissimilar to that now proposed. Notes the difference in eaves heights between that which was approved and the current proposal at 3.53m and 4.695m respectively.

Scale – The height from floor level to ridge of the proposed house is 7.092m, which is substantially higher than neighbouring properties, which are also set back considerably from the public road, which softens their visual impact and perceived scale. The proposed dwelling is set back only 3.27m from this roadway.

Building Line – Argue that a building line has been established from the existing dwellings to the south, with a precedent for setting back dwellings from the public roadway already established.

Overlooking – There is currently no direct overlooking of the appeal site from the property to the south west. However, the proposed layout of the proposed house

would result in direct overlooking of the proposed private amenity space. Notes separation distances between the first-floor windows to the rear of the proposed house and the adjoining house to the south west varies between 17m and 12m. The proposed first floor windows on the southern gable will directly overlook the front garden and entrance and impact on the privacy of the dwelling.

Design and Layout – Do not accept the justification for the demolition on the basis of dampness as valid.

Design and Visual Impact – Proposed design is inappropriate and does not respect the cottage style vernacular of the surrounding area. Low roof pitch proposed is out of keeping with the character of the area.

Owners of the Cottage to the North – Query the contention by the applicants that the owners have no issues concerning the proposal and may be unaware of the application.

6.4. Further Response

A further response to the observation was lodged by Peter Thompson, Planning Solutions agent acting on behalf of the applicant Breda English. The contents of the submission can be summarised as follows;

- *Site History* - The scale and design of the proposed house and its position relative to that previously permitted under P.A. Reg. Ref. 05/204 will have less of an impact on the neighbouring house to the south west. There is no fixed building line and the position of the proposed house relative to the public road is in keeping with other developments in the vicinity, in particular the terrace of houses to the north.
- *Scale* – The thatched house immediately to the south west is considerably higher (2.4m) than the proposed house and most other houses in the vicinity. The proposed house is similar in height to the other two storey dwellings along the road front and complements the streetscape due to its proximity to the road.
- *Building Line* – The pattern of development is haphazard and there is no definite building line, the proposed house is appropriately positioned parallel to the public road frontage.
- *Overlooking* – The design of the windows to the rear avoids direct overlooking of the adjoining house to the south west. There will be some indirect overlooking of the

appeal site from the existing first floor bedroom windows, but this is unavoidable given the backland location of the observers' property.

- *Design and Layout* – The existing property is no longer suitable as a modern habitable dwelling and interventions required in restoring it are not physically or economically feasible.
- *Design and Visual Impact* – Do not concur with the observer's architects' comments in respect of the design of the house or the roof pitch.
- *Owners of the Cottage to the North* – Applicant was in contact with the owners prior to lodging the application and provided them with a set of plans.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. The main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise. The issue of appropriate assessment also needs to be addressed. The issues can be dealt with under the following headings;

- Principle of the Development
- Visual and Residential Amenity Issues
- Appropriate Assessment

7.1.1. I draw the Boards attention to the previous planning history on the site granted under P.A. Reg. Ref. 05/204, which the appellant and observer to the appeal have both referred to. The appellant maintains that the current proposal would have less of an impact on the neighbouring houses to the north and to the south west than that previously permitted.

7.1.2. While my assessment of the current appeal refers to this application, the current proposal will be assessed on its own merits.

7.2. Principle of Development

7.2.1. The appeal site is located in the northern area of Dunmore East village, Co. Waterford on lands zoned residential in the settlement plan, contained in Volume 2 of the Plan. It is the stated objective of this zoning "*to protect amenity of existing residential development and provide new residential development – medium density*". Residential development is therefore acceptable in principle.

- 7.2.2. The principle of the demolition of the existing house is raised in the appeal. I note that the existing house is not a protected structure or located in an architectural conservation area. It is however located within a streetscape of distinctive character. In my opinion the existing house is not of any architectural merit to warrant its retention.
- 7.2.3. I can confirm from my site inspection that the house is in very poor condition and appears not to have been occupied in quite some time. I also noted from my site inspection that the eaves of the adjoining shed over sails the rear boundary of the appeal site, and the narrow area between the northern side elevation and boundary wall is quite overgrown.
- 7.2.4. I tend to concur with the applicant that the positioning of the existing house on the site in such close proximity to site boundaries has contributed to difficulties in relation to maintenance.
- 7.2.5. The applicant submitted a brief Condition Report with the appeal prepared by a consulting engineer. It notes that the floors are generally suffering from rising damp with no DPM, and that the internal walls, soffit fascia boards, and roof are poorly constructed and in poor condition.
- 7.2.6. I further note that the principal of the demolition has already been established in the previous grant of permission under P.A. Reg. Ref. 05/204.
- 7.2.7. I am satisfied, therefore, that the proposed demolition of the existing dwelling is acceptable.
- 7.2.8. As the subject site is located within a streetscape of distinctive character, the development of the site is required to comply with the requirements of DO₁₇ of the Dunmore East Plan which states that *'any development which is proposed in a Streetscape of Distinctive Character shall have regard to the planning guidance set out in Section 10.46 of the Development Standards Chapter'*. The County Development Plan provides guidance for building in such streetscapes. In this context, the Plan requires that replacement dwellings should *'take into account existing plots, where possible, in order to retain the existing grain, character and setting of the streetscape'*. In addition, it is stated that *'all new buildings should contribute to the visual enhancement of the area while respecting its visual character'*. I propose to deal with matters of visual amenity, which include the potential impact of the proposed design further below.

7.3. Visual and Residential Amenity Issues

- 7.3.1. The Board will note the planning authorities' reason for refusal refers to the height and proximity of the proposed house to the neighbouring property to the north, and impact on the residential amenities of that house by reason of visual obtrusiveness and overshadowing. The observer to the appeal is the owner of the property to the south and southwest.
- 7.3.2. It is proposed to replace the existing single storey house located to the rear/west of the appeal site with a two-storey house positioned to the front/east of what is a very restricted site.
- 7.3.3. The existing three-bedroom 'L' shaped house has a floor area of 135sqm and an overall height of 4.9m. The house is located approx. 2m from the southern side boundary and 1m from the northern side boundary, and effectively has no private side or rear garden. The front gable of the house is set back from the front eastern boundary of the site by approx. 6m, with the main entrance door to the house set back approx. 9m from the front entrance driveway.
- 7.3.4. In terms of the proposed development, it provides for a four bedroom 'L' shaped house with a floor area of 220sqm. The Board will note that the ridge height of the proposed dwelling was reduced from 8.1m to 7.092m in response to the further information request by the planning authority. The two-storey house is set back approx. 3.27m from the public road and includes a single storey annex and private rear patio area to the rear.
- 7.3.5. The first party refers to the previously permitted dwelling house on the site under P.A.Reg.Ref.05/201. This had a floor area of 193sqm and similar ridge height to the proposed dwelling of 6.899m. While I accept that the floor areas and ridge heights are comparable, in contrast to the current proposal it was located roughly within the footprint of the existing house. The design which included dormer windows to the front and rooflights to the rear also significantly reduced the massing of the first-floor accommodation. I also note that this permission followed two earlier applications for two storey replacement houses which were both refused by the planning authority.
- 7.3.6. As such, I would conclude that the proposed replacement house and layout is significantly different to the existing dwelling on site and the previously permitted dormer style house.
- 7.3.7. As already noted above the appeal site is adjoined by an existing single storey house 'Rose Cottage' to the north which abuts the public road. It is perpendicular to

and extends almost entirely forward of the existing house on the appeal site. The front and south facing elevation and front garden of 'Rose Cottage' address the front garden, driveway and entrance to the existing house on the appeal site.

- 7.3.8. The two-storey thatched house to the south and south west is set back approx. 20m from the public road. It includes a two-storey arm to the rear which is located at an angle close to the subject site. There is therefore, no fixed building line along this section of the road.
- 7.3.9. While I have no objection in principle to the proposed house design, I have reservations regarding the impacts of the citing and scale of the proposed dwelling on both the visual amenities of the area, as well as the existing residential amenities of the adjacent residential properties. I have had regard to the contiguous elevations submitted by way of further information and to the variety of house and building styles in the vicinity of the site. I am satisfied however, that the drawings clearly illustrate that the height, bulk and scale, of the proposed house would dominate the single storey house to the north.
- 7.3.10. My concerns are compounded by the size of the subject development site and its context as it relates to the existing residential dwellings adjacent. In particular, I consider that the proposed massing and scale is excessive in the vicinity of properties which reflect simple, traditional and scaled features and design elements.
- 7.3.11. I do not consider that the height, bulk and scale of the development proposed on this small plot, respects the context of the site and if permitted, would not retain the existing grain, character or setting of the streetscape at this location. Having regard to the layout of the adjacent properties, I consider that the scale of the house proposed on the subject site, would have a significant impact on the streetscape and on the general amenities of the existing residences adjacent.

Overlooking

- 7.3.12. Concern was raised by the planning authority in terms of overlooking from the first-floor windows in particular along the rear west facing elevation of the proposed house of the existing thatched house to the south and south west. In response to a request for further information the applicant submitted a revised proposal to replace the originally proposed obscure glazed windows with angled windows to avoid the potential for overlooking in particular from the proposed first floor sitting room, hall and bedroom.

- 7.3.13. The Board will note the concerns of the observer in terms of the potential for impacts on the existing residential amenity arising from the proposed development.
- 7.3.14. In this regard, I note that the proposed first floor window to the southern elevation includes a large window serving the sitting room which will overlook the front garden of the thatched house to the south.
- 7.3.15. The Board will also note that the existing first floor windows of the thatched house already overlook the appeal site and would potentially directly overlook the private amenity space to the rear of the proposed house. Therefore, I am satisfied that additional overlooking will arise both from the proposed and existing dwellings in the event of a permission being granted.
- 7.3.16. *Overshadowing*
- 7.3.17. In terms of potential overshadowing, I refer the Board to my concerns in relation to the height, bulk, scale and layout of the development proposed on this restricted site.
- 7.3.18. The planning authority requested that a shadow analysis be carried out by way of further information and concluded that the proposed two storey house would result in overshadowing of the existing single storey house to the north. The applicant on appeal has submitted additional times as part of the shadow analysis.
- 7.3.19. I have reviewed the shadow analysis submitted which compares the shadow impact of the current development on site with the proposed, for the summer and winter solstice and autumn equinox specifically in relation to the house to the north. The analysis indicates a significant increase in overshadowing of this property during the winter solstice. Notwithstanding the fact that I visited the site around midday on the summer solstice 21st June, I am generally satisfied that the proposed development, if permitted, would result in significant overshadowing of the existing property to the north.
- 7.3.20. That said, I restate my concerns in terms of the height, bulk scale and layout of the proposed development and the impact of same on the character of this streetscape as well as the potential impacts on existing visual and residential amenity of the area by reason of the prominence of the dwelling on the site.
- 7.3.21. I am satisfied, therefore, that the reason for refusal on the basis of visual and residential amenity should be upheld.

7.4. **Appropriate Assessment**

The site is not located within any designated site. Having regard to the nature and scale of development proposed for retention and proposed, to the nature of the receiving environment, namely a fully serviced location, no appropriate assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the development proposed for retention 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. I recommend that planning permission be refused.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The subject site is located within an area of Dunmore East which has been identified as a 'Streetscape of Distinctive Character'. Having regard to the objectives of the current Development Plan for the area, Objective DO17 of the Dunmore East Plan requires developments to have regard to the planning guidance, as set out in Section 10.46 of the Development Standards Chapter, and that replacement dwellings should 'take into account existing plots, where possible, in order to retain the existing grain, character and setting of the streetscape'. In addition, it is stated that 'all new buildings should contribute to the visual enhancement of the area while respecting its visual character'. It is considered, by reason of the height, bulk, scale and layout of the development proposed on this small plot, that the proposed house design does not respect the context of the site and, if permitted, would not retain the existing grain, character or setting of the streetscape at this location and would, if permitted, have a significant impact on the streetscape and on the general and residential amenities of the existing adjacent properties particularly to the north, contrary to the Development Plan requirements and would seriously injure the visual and general amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Susan McHugh
Planning Inspectorate

4th July 2019