



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP – 304572 – 19.

Development	Construction of a dwelling house complete with new entrance and new site boundaries.
Location	Blackbull Cottages, Dublin Road, Drogheda, Co. Louth.
Planning Authority	Louth County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	18/799.
Applicant(s)	James Flannery.
Type of Application	Planning Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant with Conditions.
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Buvinda Developments.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	3 rd September, 2019.
Inspector	Click here to enter text.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	4
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	5
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
5.1. National Planning Policy Provisions	6
5.2. Local Planning Policy Provisions.....	6
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	7
5.4. EIA Screening	8
6.0 The Appeal	8
6.2. Applicant Response	8
6.3. Planning Authority Response	9
7.0 Assessment.....	9
8.0 Recommendation.....	19
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The irregular shaped appeal site has a stated 0.022ha area. It lies c0.6km to the south east of Drogheda's Mac Bride Railway Station, as the bird would fly, and c26m from an intersection onto the R132 (Dublin Road) that serves the Longwood residential scheme and a gated cul-de-sac laneway located to the rear of No.s 1 to 7 Blackbull Cottages, in the southern fringes of Drogheda, County Louth.
- 1.2. The site lies immediately to the south of the aforementioned cul-de-sac laneway with its eastern boundary defined by a tall brick wall that bounds a pedestrian footpath and the western roadside edge of the main internal access road serving the Longwood residential estate. The southern-most point of this boundary wall lies c33m to the north of a pocket of communal open space that serves the Longwood residential scheme. The site also lies to the south of No. 1 Blackbull Cottages and is separated from this property by the cul-de-sac laneway. It is one of 5 such pockets of private open space that originally provided the main private open space amenity for the Blackbull Cottages. These private amenity spaces are accessed over the cul-de-sac lane and are predominantly appearing to function as amenity spaces with some having ancillary shed/garage/glass house structures alongside areas for off-street parking.
- 1.3. At the time of my site inspection the main area of the site was overgrown and unkempt with a portion of the northern area of the site appearing to be used to accommodate car parking. Its boundary with the cul-de-sac lane is not demarcated. The western boundary consists of a concrete post and wire mesh metal fence and the rear boundary consists of a tall concrete block wall which bounds part of the rear boundary of No. 12 Longwood and an Electric Substation. In addition, located in close proximity to the western boundary of the site are a number of single storey structures including a garage, a glazed greenhouse and large single storey shed structure in the adjoining plot of land.
- 1.4. The surrounding area has a mature residential character with No.s 1 to 7 Blackbull Cottage presenting an attractive period built insertion of mainly 2-storey properties that address the Dublin Road. The Longwood residential development scheme is characterised by detached 2-storey properties that share similar setbacks from the roadside edge.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for the construction of a single storey two-bedroom dwelling house together with all associated site development works. According to the submitted documentation the proposed dwelling house would have a maximum height of 3.6m and a floor area of 64m².

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The Planning Authority decided to **grant** planning permission subject to conditions including:

Condition No. 2: Requires the provision setbacks, sightlines, boundary treatments, SUDs and other road measures.

Condition No. 4: Restricts the number of bedrooms.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The **final Planning Officers report** is the basis of the Planning Authority's decision and it considered that the applicant had addressed the concerns raised by them in their further information request.

The **initial Planning Officers report** concluded with a request for further information which can be summarised as follows:

Item No. 1: Sought a revised site layout showing required sightlines in accordance with DMURS.

Item No. 2: Clarification on design and loading capacity to cater for the surface water attenuation structure.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Infrastructure: Final report – No objection, subject to safeguards.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. **Irish Water:** No objection, subject to safeguards.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. The Planning Authority received 3 No. Third Party submissions which objected to the proposed development. These submissions raised various concerns ranging from the unsuitable location of the site, access, overdevelopment, serious injury to established residential amenity, laneway is unsuitable for the additional traffic the proposed development would generate, landownership issues, potential damage and nuisance arising from construction, if permission were granted to the privately operated gate and laneway, failure of the dwelling to meet the required residential standards.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Site:

4.1.1. Of relevance to this appeal case is:

ABP Ref No. PL15.249149 (P.A. Reg. Ref. No. 16/686):

On appeal to the Board a grant of planning permission for a single storey two bed house with a stated 64m² floor area, a single parking space accessible from the Longwood access road was **refused** for the following stated reasons and considerations:

“It is an objective of national policy as set out in the “Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas” issued by the Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government in May 2009 and the “Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities” issued by the Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government in December 2015 to ensure high quality in the design and layout of places and neighbourhoods and in individual residential units. Having regard to the restricted floor area of the proposed house, the restricted access to natural daylight and direct sunlight for the proposed living/dining room, the unacceptably poor amenity value of the private open space located to the north of

the proposed house it is considered that the proposed development would seriously injure the residential amenity of future residents of the proposed development.”

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Planning Policy Provisions

- National Planning Framework, 2040.
- Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, (DEHLG 2009) and the accompanying Urban Design Manual: A Best Practice Guide, (DEHLG 2009).
- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) (DECLG and DTTS 2013).
- Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities - Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (DEHLG, 2007).

5.2. Local Planning Policy Provisions

5.2.1. The Drogheda Borough Council Development Plan 2011 to 2017 is the applicable plan for the site and its setting in so far as it is consistent with the Louth County Development Plan, 2015 to 2021.

5.2.2. Under the said Plan the site is zoned ‘RE’ which has the stated aim “*to protect and/or improve the amenity of developed residential areas*”.

5.2.3. Core Strategy of the said Plan includes:

Policy CS 1 seeks to promote household & population growth in accordance with Table 2.5 & 2.6 of the Core Strategy.

Policy CS 2 seeks to facilitate orderly and sustainable development through the implementation of an overall phasing strategy.

Policy CS 3 seeks to require the submission of a ‘Core Strategy Population and Phasing Statement’ with all applications for residential development on zoned land. Natural Heritage Designations.

5.2.4. **Settlement Strategy:**

Table 2.2 Drogheda is a Large Growth Town in the Settlement Hierarchy.

Policy SS 1 seeks to maintain the settlement hierarchy within the County and to encourage residential development within each settlement that is commensurate with its position in the hierarchy and the availability of public services and facilities.

5.2.5. **Residential development standards:**

Internal space: Comply with national standards.

Separation distances: 22m between opposing first floor windows.

Car parking: 2 spaces per dwelling.

Private Amenity Space Design Characteristics include:

- Space for planting / garden storage.
- Access to sunlight for at least part of the day.

New Houses (Terraced / Semi-detached / Detached): Private amenity space should normally be provided to the rear of houses. In certain layouts a combination of private and semi-private spaces may be acceptable. An example of such layouts might provide small private areas opening directly onto semiprivate enclosed landscaped space which is dedicated solely for the use of residents. **Houses (suburban):** 60 m² private amenity space provision.

Waste Storage General Principles: Adequate provision should be made for the storage, segregation and recycling of refuse and for convenient access for its deposit and collection as detailed in Table 6.10.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

- The site is located c1.1km to the south of the Special Area of Conservations: River Boyne & River Blackwater SAC (Site Code: 002299).
- The site is located c1.1km to the south west of the Special Protection Areas: Boyne Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004080).

5.4. EIA Screening

5.4.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development sought, the serviced nature of the lands, lack of any direct hydrological connectivity from the site to any nearby sensitive receptors, I consider that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. Therefore, the need for environmental impact assessment can 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 grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Reference is made to the planning history of the site.
- The proposed development represents gross over development of the site.
- The applicant is unable to provide adequate private open space.
- The applicant hasn't demonstrated the necessary legal interest in the overall lands to carryout the proposed development.
- Concern is raised that the applicant proposes to demolish a wall that is outside of the site. On this matter while it is acknowledged that there is a right-of-way to the site through the lane the applicant has no right to demolish the appellants wall.
- The appellant will not consent to any interference or adjustment in height to their brick wall to accommodate the proposed development.
- Reference is made to the local planning policy provisions.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The appellant claim to have ownership of the wall but it is contended that this is not the case and the maps provided by the appellant do not accurately clarify ownership.

- The two car parking spaces on site are existing and have been in place for over 70years and there are existing car parking spaces all along this private road. The proposed development would utilise the retained car parking spaces.
- There is 64m² of private open space excluding the existing car parking spaces.
- The proposed dwelling as granted by the Planning Authority is an environmentally friendly dwelling.
- The appellants depiction of a car accessing the rear of Black Bull Cottages shows the kerb mounted before turning right. It is considered that this is another attempt of undermining the work of the Council and the Board.
- Reference is made to the planning history of the site.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

6.3.1. The Planning Authority's response can be summarised as follows:

- No comment to make other than to refer the Board to their reports on file.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. **Introduction**

7.1.1. Before I commence my assessment of this appeal case I note to the Board that the applicant in their response question the justification behind the appellants grounds of appeal submission made to the Board. On this matter I consider that the appellants submission is a valid appeal which raises legitimate planning concerns in relation to the proposed development.

7.1.2. The key issues arising in this appeal case are:

- Principle of the Proposed Development.
- Residential Amenity Impact.
- Visual Amenity Impact.
- Access.
- Civil Matters.

- Other Matters Arising.

7.1.3. In addition, the matter of Appropriate Assessment requires assessment.

7.1.4. I further note that the proposed development was subject to a further information request from the Planning Authority. My assessment below is based on the revisions made by the applicant in their response to this request which seeks to clarify sightlines serving the proposed development onto the Longwood residential estate access road.

7.2. Principle of the Proposed Development

7.2.1. The development for which planning permission is sought relates to the construction of modest single storey two-bedroom dwelling house together with all associated site development works and services on a plot of land which formerly provided the private open amenity space provision for No. 1 Blackbull Cottages, an existing period terrace two-storey dwelling house which forms part of a group of seven period single and two storey residential properties that address the southern side of the Dublin Road and which are separated from their rear private amenity space by way of a gated cul-de-sac laneway, in the southern suburban fringes of Drogheda, County Louth.

7.2.2. The Core Strategy as set out in the applicable Development Plan seeks to support the realisation of more sustainable towns and villages appropriate to the scale of the settlement and its position in the settlement hierarchy, and the preferred Development Strategy seeks to achieve critical mass in the main growth towns of Drogheda and Dundalk.

7.2.3. The proposed development would also be located within an area that is covered by the 'RE' Residential Existing zoning objective in the Drogheda Borough Development Plan which seeks "*to protect and/or improve the amenity of developed residential communities*" and the proposed development is acceptable in principle in this land use zone.

7.2.4. Further, Policy SS1 of the Development Plan, seeks to maintain the settlement hierarchy within the County and to encourage residential development within each settlement that is commensurate with its position in the hierarchy and the availability of public services and facilities.

- 7.2.5. Moreover, Section 4.5 of the National Planning Framework indicates that a significant proportion of future urban development will be within the built footprint of existing urban areas and National Policy Objective 11 of the said Frameworks states *“in meeting the urban development requirements, there will be a presumption in favour of development that can encourage more people and generate more jobs and activity within existing cities, towns and villages, subject to development meeting appropriate planning standards and achieving targeted growth”*.
- 7.2.6. I therefore consider the proposed development to be generally consistent with the ‘Residential Existing’ zoning objective which applies to the appeal site and the surrounding area, it would be compatible with the core strategy, it would be compatible with Louth’s settlement strategy for Drogheda, it would be consistent with the National Planning Framework which seeks to encourage such developments into the built footprint of existing urban areas, and, it would be acceptable in principle, subject to consideration of the planning issues identified in Section 7.1 of this report above, in particular residential amenity for future occupants of the proposed dwelling and of properties within its immediate setting.

7.3. Residential Amenity

- 7.3.1. As concluded in the previous section of this assessment the principle of residential development on residentially zoned land is deemed to be generally acceptable subject to safeguards of protecting and/or improving the amenity of residential communities. This therefore needs consideration.
- 7.3.2. In relation to the proposed development I firstly raise a number of qualitative concerns in relation to the residential amenities for future occupants of the proposed dwelling, if permitted.
- 7.3.3. Under this proposal planning permission is sought for a development described as a single storey two-bedroom dwelling house with a stated 64m². I am cognisant that this proposal is similar to a previous application for a one and a half storey two-bedroom 64m² dwelling on site that was determined by the Board in 2018 and assessed under the same planning policy provisions that are currently in place and applicable to the subject site. This proposal was refused based on concerns relating to the unacceptably poor amenity value of the private open space, the poor solid to void ratio in the front and roadside elevation and the overall poor standard of

residential amenity of the proposed development for future occupants alongside the consideration that the proposed development would seriously injure the residential and visual amenity of property in the vicinity.

7.3.4. Whilst I acknowledge that this proposal seeks to overcome the Boards previous reasons and considerations to refuse planning permission for a dormer dwelling house on this site I am not convinced that this application has put forward a development that would give rise to a high-quality dwelling house with good standards of internal and external residential amenity. This conclusion is based on the following factors:

1) *Private Amenity Space Provision*

The private amenity space, which I note is not to the rear of the proposed dwelling house and occupies a central location facing onto an adjoining amenity space which includes a number of structures and would require in terms of privacy at a minimum a 1.8m in height boundary wall, is seriously substandard in terms of its size being less than 30m² in area.

Moreover, despite the limited height of the single storey structure the proposed private open space amenity having regard to its orientation and relationship with built structures proposed and existing would be significantly overshadowed for the majority of the days throughout the year.

Section 6.7.3 of the Borough Development Plan requires as part of the design characteristics for such spaces to be suitable for places to play, for washing/drying, providing space for planting/garden storage, providing potential space for future dwelling extensions through to having access to sunlight for at least part of the day.

In addition, Table 6.3 requires at a minimum 60m² for a dwelling of this type. This provision is consistent with the County Development Plan and national planning guidance on such matters. Further the area to the front of the proposed dwelling consists of car parking provision for not just the proposed dwelling but also for a 3rd Party as it is indented by a 5m by 2.5m car parking space which is indicated as being in separate ownership and outside of the applicant's legal control.

The other spaces around the dwelling house are extremely restricted in width and can only be considered as incidental narrow strips of land with negligible passive through to recreational amenity for future occupants.

Policy RES 27 of the County Development Plan requires all private amenity spaces to be in accordance with the quantitative standards set out in this plan. The proposed development fails to meet the minimum 60m² requirement set down for this type of development in the Development Plan.

Based on these considerations the private amenity space provision for the type of residential unit proposed is substandard in qualitative and quantitative terms. It also conflicts with the minimum standards set out in both local and national planning policy provisions.

2) Internal Amenity: Bedroom Spaces

I raise a concern that the proposed two-bedroom dwelling house contains two bedrooms both with 2.69m widths. This width is only suitable for a single bedroom when regard is had to the internal space standards set down under Table 4.7 of the County Development Plan.

Under Table 4.5 of the County Development Plan there is a requirement for a two-bedroom single storey dwelling to have an aggregate 20m² floor area. This proposal falls below this minimum area being 19.09m².

Within this aggregate bedroom floor area of 19.09m² there is no indication of these bedrooms benefitting from a separate area of storage and within the overall design of the proposed dwelling there is no separate provision for storage with a significant portion of the dwelling house design incorporating a 7m in length and 1.5m hallway that essentially links the two bedrooms which are located in the northern portion of the proposed dwelling to the southern portion of the dwelling that contains an open plan kitchen and living space that is adjoined by a bathroom and a small utility space. As such I consider this long hallway is of limited functional use other than providing a separation between living and sleeping areas and it takes up a significant 10.5m² out of the total 64m² floor area of the dwelling.

Moreover, it would be the norm to expect that as the minimum standard for a two-bedroom single storey dwelling which sets out that these are 3 Person residential units, and not 2-person units, that one of the bedroom spaces should at least be suitable to sleep 2 persons, i.e. with a width of at least 2.8m. This would be consistent with both local and national planning policy provisions. This is not the case in the design put forward under this proposal.

Policy RES 25 of the County Development Plan requires that all proposed residential developments including apartments comply with the internal space provisions set out in the Development Plan under Table 4.5 to 4.8. This proposed development does not.

3) *Internal Amenity: Living*

The open plan kitchen sitting area fails to meet the minimum 28m² required aggregate floor area for living/dining/kitchen areas as set out under Table 4.5 of the Development. This standard is consistent with national guidelines on such matters. I therefore consider that the internal amenity living space is substandard in terms of its size but I also consider that the layout fails to utilise opportunities such as providing an access from the internal living space to the private open space amenity proposed. This component of the proposed development is inconsistent with Policy RES 2.5 of the Development Plan as set out above.

4) *Access to the Internal Space of the Proposed Dwelling*

The proposed design includes one entry point into the dwelling and thus only one means of escape should a fire or other similar emergency occur. The proposed access is located on the eastern elevation and it opens onto a restricted in width long narrow strip of land that provides connection to the north to the car parking area and to the south onto the pedestrian footpath of the Longwood residential estate which this proposal seeks to amend at this juncture, to provide a new pedestrian access. This strip of land is at its widest point a stated 900mm, but this width is restricted by the indents of the wall and the proposed step up to the front door. This access does not appear to be compliant with current Building Regulations I refer to Section 3.1.2.1 (a) of the said Regulations which indicates that where an access route is provided a clear opening "*width of at least one point of access should be a minimum of 900mm. This access route, leading from this, should maintain a clear width of at least 900mm and have a firm and even surface*" and Section 3.2.2 of the said Regulations which states that there "*should be a clear level area of at least 1200mm wide and at least 1200mm deep in front of every accessible entrance*".

The Louth County Development indicates that in line with Part M of the Building Regulations 1997 to 2014, all private buildings will have provision for suitable access

for persons with disabilities (Note: Section 6.3.12). This is reinforced by Policy RES 50 of the Development Plan.

I am not satisfied that the proposed development is consistent with Building Regulation requirements for access or with Policy RES 50 of the Development Plan.

6) Light and Natural Ventilation

I consider that the proposed is poorly articulated in terms of its solid to void ratio and this in turn makes me question the adequacy of the overall design in terms of access to daylight and ventilation within the spaces of the proposed dwelling. I consider the level of daylight, solar gain through to passive ventilation, if permitted in the form proposed, would be qualitatively poor and as such would further compromise the residential amenity for future occupants.

7) Storage: The design of the proposed dwelling fails to meet local through to national standards for storage for a residential unit of this type (Note: Table 4.5 of the County Development Plan and the Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities - Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (DEHLG, 2007) require a minimum provision of 3m²). This further adds to the substandard quality of the internal living environment of the dwelling proposed for future occupants.

7.3.5. In relation to the residential amenities of properties in the vicinity I consider that despite the single storey nature of the proposed dwelling house it has the potential to result in overshadowing of the adjoining plot of private amenity space to the west from both the built form of the dwelling house but also from the boundary treatment that would be required to safeguard the privacy of future occupants of the proposed dwelling and those who benefit from the use of the adjoining private amenity space. Notwithstanding, the level of overshadowing would not be inconsistent with such a suburban setting nor would it be significant due to the single storey height of the structure.

7.3.6. In conclusion I consider that the proposed development, if permitted, would provide a substandard residential amenity for future occupiers. I further consider that based on the failure of the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed development can meet minimum requirements for internal as well as external amenity for future occupants, which are generally expected to be exceeded in such developments where possible,

to permit the proposed development would result in the overdevelopment of what is restricted in size and dimensions suburban site.

7.4. Visual Amenity Impact

- 7.4.1. The proposed dwelling house in terms of its design, built form, massing through to palette of materials would in my view contribute little to the character of its streetscape scene with its principal façade consisting of a highly homogenous elevation containing only an opening with associated glazing for the proposed entrance door. Its appearance is unarticulated, its detailing and use of materials is substandard, and it has a very blank expression. While its view within the streetscape scene would be limited because of its single storey built-form and the presence of tall brick wall in front of it in general the design concept shows little attempt to harmonise with and respect the built forms, architectural detailing through to palette of materials of existing buildings in its vicinity.
- 7.4.2. I further consider that the other side elevations are similarly poor in terms of their appearance, detailing through to their use of materials. I am therefore not convinced that the proposed design would positively enhance the cul-de-sac road it would be setback from and there is no landscaping to soften its overall homogeneity and monolithic elevational expression.
- 7.4.3. In conclusion, I consider to permit the proposed dwelling, a dwelling with limited architectural merit in its overall design concept consideration would in my view visually diminish the amenities of its setting and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments.

7.5. Access

- 7.5.1. Having regard to the documentation submitted with this application and having inspected the site I am not convinced that the site is suitable to safely accommodate an intensification of car movements in the vicinity of its northern boundary which opens directly onto the gated entry point that serves the cul-de-sac laneway that runs to the rear building line of No.1 to 7 Blackbull Cottages and provides access to the Dublin Road, c26m to the north.
- 7.5.2. I am also not convinced that the applicant can provide the required sightlines to serve the proposed development in either direction nor am I convinced that the proposed development, if it were permitted, would not endanger road users in the

vicinity of this access point despite this access point opening onto a 50kph access road that serves the Longwood residential estate and the low volume of traffic the proposed development would generate.

- 7.5.3. In conclusion, I am not satisfied that the proposed development, if permitted, would not give rise to any road safety or traffic hazard concerns for other road-users.

7.6. Civil Matters

- 7.6.1. There appears to be conflicting details submitted in terms of the ownership of the eastern boundary of the site which currently is demarcated by a high brick faced wall on the Longwood access roadside. This I consider gives rise to a concern should any grant of permission require amendments to this wall to achieve suitable sightlines in a southerly direction to improve the vehicular access to the site. I note that this is the case under Condition No. 2 of the Planning Authority's notification to grant permission for the proposed development sought under this application. This condition requires full visibility of 45m at a setback of 2.4m from the edge of the carriageway at a height of 1.05m to 0.6m in each direction to be made available prior to the commencement of any other works on the site.
- 7.6.2. In addition, arguably any development at this location would require a more meaningful relationship with the Longwood estate road that bounds the eastern boundary of the site and presence as viewed from the public domain of this estate road as well as from the cul-de-sac laneway that it addresses.
- 7.6.3. Further, there is latent potential to widen the footpath that currently bounds the eastern boundary of the site. In its current form it is extremely restricted in its width which compromises its functionality for more vulnerable road users.
- 7.6.4. Notwithstanding, I am cognisant that Section 34(13) of the Planning Act, 2000, as amended states: *"a person is not be entitled solely by reason of a permission to carry out any development. Where appropriate, an advisory note to this effect should be added at the end of the planning decision. Accordingly, where in making an application, a person asserts that he/she is the owner of the land or structure in question, and there is nothing to cast doubt on the bona fides of that assertion, the planning authority is not required to inquire further into the matter. If, however, the terms of the application itself, or a submission made by a third party, or information which may otherwise reach the authority, raise doubts as to the sufficiency of the*

legal interest, further information may have to be sought under Article 33 of the Regulations”.

- 7.6.5. I therefore advise the Board should they be minded to grant permission for the proposed development that may wish to first seek further clarity on land ownership of the eastern boundary of the site.

7.7. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.7.1. Having regard to the modest nature and scale of the proposed development and its location within a long established built up urban area which is connected to existing public services, which includes public mains water and wastewater, and the separation distance to the nearest sensitive location and lack of a direct aquatic connection, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on any European sites arising from the proposed development and the need for Appropriate Assessment screening is not required.

7.8. Other Matters Arising

- 7.8.1. **Car Parking:** I raise a concern that the proposed development appears to seek the regularisation of the use of the northern portion of the site for car parking use. I raise a concern that any intensification of car parking at this location has the potential to further add to the road safety and traffic hazard concerns due to the increased levels of manoeuvring that would be required in order for vehicles to access and egress the two spaces proposed to serve the proposed dwelling alongside the third adjoining space which is indicated as being outside of the applicant's legal control.

It would also appear that some type of boundary is proposed around the adjoining car parking space as part of the proposed development and that there is a light standard/utility pole present towards the north western corner of this car parking space provision.

The latter gives rise to an additional concern on whether views would be obscured from this space together with the fact that the remaining internal dimensions of this space is a stated 2.5m by 5m and whether these dimensions would be encroached upon by an existing light standard/utility pole in its immediate vicinity along the roadside edge of the cul-de-sac road.

This is a highly restricted space and the proposed physical delineation of it would result in further road hazards due to the level of manoeuvres that would be required for vehicles accessing and egressing from it onto the cul-de-sac road and in the vicinity of the cul-de-sac's intersection with the Longwood main estate road which is located in close proximity to its junction with the Dublin Road, a regional road that is heavily trafficked.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. Based on the above I recommend that planning permission be **refused** for the reasons and considerations set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is an objective of national policy as set out in the "Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas" issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in May 2009 and the "Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities" issued by the Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government in December 2015 to ensure high quality in the design and layout of places and neighbourhoods and in individual residential units. Having regard to the restricted floor area of the proposed house, the restricted access to private amenity space, the restricted access to natural ventilation, daylight and direct sunlight for the internal living spaces through to the substandard nature of the internal spaces it is considered that the proposed development would seriously injure the residential amenity of future residents of the proposed development. For these reasons, the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Patricia-Marie Young
Planning Inspector

25th day of September, 2019.