



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-305363-19

---

<b>Development</b>	Demolish existing dwelling house and construct 6 detached dwelling houses
<b>Location</b>	Rossbehy, Rossbeigh, Glenbeigh, Co. Kerry
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Kerry County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	19/168
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Con & Dan Tim O'Sullivan
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant, subject to 12 conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Parties -v- Decision
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Eileen Cahill Dermot Ivo & Kay O'Sullivan
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	6 <sup>th</sup> December 2019
<b>Inspector</b>	Hugh D. Morrison

# 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
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy and Context.....	6
5.1. Development Plan.....	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations .....	6
5.3. EIA Screening .....	6
6.0 The Appeal .....	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	7
6.2. Applicant Response .....	9
6.3. Planning Authority Response .....	9
6.4. Observations .....	9
6.5. Further Responses.....	10
7.0 Assessment .....	10
8.0 Recommendation.....	17
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located 2.1 km to the west of Glenbeigh in the development node of Rossbeigh. The R564 links the N70, which passes through Glenbeigh, to this development node, which lies at the southern landward end of Rossbeigh Strand. The northern tip of this Strand corresponds with Inch Strand to the north east and between them they form the entrance to Castlemaine Harbour. Further to the north, the Dingle Peninsula forms a backdrop to this Harbour and the wider Dingle Bay.
- 1.2. The site lies between cottages and “Rosspoint” bar and restaurant, which form frontage development to the regional and adjoining local roads overlooking Rossbeigh Strand to the north, and predominantly holiday cottages to the south, which are at a higher level on the foot of the slopes to Ross Behy, a standalone hill further to the south.
- 1.3. The site itself is of elongated form and variable level. This site extends over an area of 0.45 hectares and it is accessed off an un-named through road, which runs from the regional road in the east to the local road to the west. The site accommodates a single storey dwelling house in its western extremity and an extensive area of overgrown vegetation. This dwelling house is presently vacant as is the remainder of the site. Access is off the aforementioned through road.
- 1.4. The site is composed of two discernible parts, i.e. a roughly square eastern portion to the rear of Rosspoint and a roughly rectangular portion associated with the above cited dwelling house. A hedgerow separates these two parts and further hedgerows denote their respective boundaries. The western boundary is also denoted by a drystone wall and the northern boundary by a retaining wall, which runs to the rear of cottages and Rosspoint.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal would entail the following elements:
  - The demolition of the existing single storey dwelling house (70 sqm) on the site, and

- The construction of 6 detached dwelling houses in a row across the site and all associated site works including separate entrances, parking, and boundary treatments to each house plot.

2.2. The dwelling houses would be of 4 different types, as follows:

- House type A x 2: A split-level 3-bed dwelling house (181 sqm),
- House type B x 2: A split level 3-bed dwelling house (164 sqm),
- House type C: A split-level 4-bed dwelling house (199 sqm), and
- House type E: A split-level 4-bed dwelling house (182 sqm).

Each dwelling house would present to the through road as single storey, with a two-storey portion to the rear capitalising on the fall of the site in a northerly direction.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

Following clarification of further information, permission was granted subject to 12 conditions.

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

##### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

The following further information was requested:

- Individual house plots to be clearly identified,
- Details of measures to ensure that surface water run-off does not affect neighbouring properties,
- Details of retained and proposed landscaping and boundary treatments, and
- Specification of floor areas.

Clarification of further information was requested with respect to the third and fourth of the above cited items.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Irish Water: No objection, standard advice.
- Kerry County Council:
  - Housing Estates Unit: Further information requested, no subsequent comments.
  - Archaeology: Monitoring condition requested.
  - Biodiversity: No objection.

## 4.0 Planning History

- 02/426: Demolish restaurant, function room, and bar premises, renovate and extend facilities, alter and extend façade, upgrade forecourt, and construct 4 holiday apartments: Permitted.
- 06/3389: Retain the Ross Inn, demolish dwelling house, construct 12 one and a half to two-storey holiday cottages: Refused at appeal PL08.220904 on the grounds of risk of water pollution, in the absence of an upgraded sewerage system, and loss of the residential nature of the village/premature in advance of LAP.
- 08/1621: Retain the Ross Inn, demolish dwelling house, construct 12 one and a half to two-storey holiday cottages: Permitted.
- 08/91621: Extension of duration of 08/1621.
- 17/1215: Demolish dwelling house + construct 8 split level dwelling houses (6 detached and 2 semi-detached): Refused on the grounds of inadequate parking/hazardous reversing movements and insufficient information on proposed fill in the eastern portion of the site and hence risk to residential amenity.
- Pre-application consultation (PP5129) occurred on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2019.

## 5.0 Policy and Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

Under Settlement Strategy of the Kerry County Development Plan 2015 – 2021 (CDP), Rossbeigh is identified as a development node, wherein sustainable development is to be supported.

The Killorglin Functional Area Local Area Plan 2010 – 2016 (LAP) includes the Rossbeigh Local Area Plan. The development strategy for the village is “to allow small scale infill development within the existing development envelope”.

Accompanying Objectives echo this strategy (OO-1) and seek, amongst other things, to require a high standard of design to ensure integration with the landscape (OO-4) and to “Ensure that the design response to multiple level sites minimizes the impact on the residential amenity of existing and proposed properties and also minimizes visual impacts” (OO-5).

### 5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- Castlemaine Harbour SAC and pNHA (000343)
- Castlemaine Harbour SPA (004029)
- Killarney National Park, Macgillycuddy’s Reeks and Caragh River Catchment SAC and pNHA (000365)

### 5.3. EIA Screening

Under Items 10(b)(i) & (iv) of Part 2 of Schedule 5 to Article 93 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 – 2019, where more than 500 dwelling units would be constructed, the need for a mandatory EIA arises. The proposal is for the development of 6 new build dwelling units. Accordingly, it does not attract the need for a mandatory EIA. Furthermore, as this proposal would fall below the relevant thresholds, I conclude that, based on its nature, size, and location, there is no real likelihood of significant effects upon the environment and so the preparation of an EIAR is not required.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

#### (a) Eileen Cahill

- Under the CDP, the site lies in a prime special amenity area. The proposal is for 6 dwelling houses at a density of 12 to the hectare. It is prohibited within such an area.
- The proposal would adversely affect the amenities of the dwelling houses denoted as nos. 7, 8, and 9. Unlike the proposed layout under 08/1621, dwelling houses would not be sited more to the east and west of the site to mitigate this impact.
- The application is not accompanied by an assessment of the visual impact of the proposal.

The appellant reiterates the following reasons for objection that she made at the application stage:

- The appellant owns and operates Rossbeigh Beach Cottages, which enjoy views to the north over Rossbeigh Strand. Any interruption of these views would jeopardise her business.

Attention is drawn to Objective OO-5 of the LAP. Contrary to this Objective the submitted cross sections show that the proposed dwelling houses opposite existing houses, denoted as nos. 7 and 9 on the submitted plans, would exceed their parapet height and thus undermine their residential amenity. Furthermore, the separation distances that would exist between the proposed dwelling houses and existing houses nos. 1 – 4 would be tight and the difference in levels would cause the new to overlook and dominate the old.

- Application 17/1215 for the site was refused. The current proposal fails to adequately respond to the reasons for this refusal.

#### (b) Dermot Ivo & Kay O’Sullivan

- The appellants own the houses nos. 1 and 2 on the submitted plans.

- In the light of Objectives OO-1, 4, and 5 of the LAP, the proposal is critiqued as follows:
  - At two-storeys it would be too high,
  - Its density would exceed the prevailing one,
  - The proposal would be visually obtrusive, and
  - The proposal fails to minimise the impact upon residential amenity, e.g. the appellants' properties would be overlooked.

Photomontages have been submitted to illustrate the above points.

- In the light of the CDP's standards for urban developments, the proposal is critiqued as follows:
  - No public open space would be provided,
  - The need for infill development to have regard to adjoining properties is lacking, e.g. overlooking of the appellants' properties,
  - The standard separation distance of 22m would be significantly infringed at only 13m in the case of the appellants' properties. The proposed dwelling houses to the rear of these properties would be at a higher level, too, with adverse implications for the reception of morning sunlight and daylight, and
  - No allowance is made for visitor parking, i.e. 3 spaces would be required in this respect under the CDP.
- At present ground water drains from the site into the appellants' properties. The proposal would affect conditions in this site and yet this matter has not been addressed along with its implications for neighbouring properties.

Attention is drawn to the "distressed" state of the retaining wall to the rear of the appellants' properties. Concern is expressed that the proposal would lead to the surcharging of this wall and the risk of its collapse. A survey of ground conditions should have been undertaken along with a risk assessment of the proposal in this respect. Landslides have occurred in the wider area of the site.



- Concern is expressed that the proposal would lead to the devaluation of the appellants' properties, especially as a result of the rear balconies to House Types B and C.

Concern is also expressed that the proposed fence along the common boundary would heighten the loss of light to their properties. Its erection would also entail the removal of vegetation to which they would be opposed.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant responds to appellant (a) as follows:

- The proposal is for infill development within the existing envelope of Rossbeigh.
- Under planning, residents/visitors do not have a right to a view. In practise, only 1 of the appellant's cottages would have its view obstructed.

The applicant responds to appellants (b) as follows:

- The accuracy of the submitted photomontages is questioned, i.e. they give an exaggerated impression of the proposal. By contrast, the submitted cross-sections are accurate.
- The appellants' concerns over ground water and the structural stability of the retaining wall to the rear of their properties would be addressed at the detailed design stage.

The applicant adds that the proposed dwelling houses would be occupied by themselves and other local families and the proposal would be more in keeping with the site's context than the previously permitted application 08/1621 for 12 two storey dwelling houses.

## 6.3. Planning Authority Response

None

## 6.4. Observations

None

## 6.5. Further Responses

None

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1. I have reviewed the proposal in the light of the CDP and the LAP, relevant planning history, the submissions of the parties, and my own site visit. Accordingly, I consider that this current application/appeal should be assessed under the following headings:

- (i) Land use,
- (ii) Submitted plans, ground conditions, and stability,
- (iii) Amenity,
- (iv) Traffic, access, and parking,
- (v) Water, and
- (vi) Screening for Stage 1 AA.

### **(i) Land use**

- 7.2. Under the CDP's Settlement Strategy, Rossbeigh is identified as a development node within which sustainable development is to be supported. Under the LAP's Development Strategy for this development node, small scale infill development is to be allowed within the existing development envelope.
- 7.3. During my site visit, I observed that the subject site is surrounded by existing development on three of its four sides and the remaining side is effectively enclosed by the existing dwelling house that is sited in its western extremity adjacent to the local road that runs past the shoreline further to the west. I also observed that this site is elongated on an east/west axis and that to the north and to the south existing residential and holiday accommodation is variously at a lower level and a higher level. Thus, the site slots-in to the existing development envelope.
- 7.4. Appellant (a) draws attention to the site's position, under the CDP, within a prime special amenity area. She therefore considers that it should not be considered as being available for development.

- 7.5. I note that ordinarily the prime special amenity designation applies to scenic rural areas. In the case of the Rossbeigh, it is identified as a development node within such an area and so I understand the policy intention to be that, provided development occurs within the existing envelope of this node, there is no in principle objection to it.
- 7.6. I note, too, that the site presently accommodates a dwelling house and that it is surrounded by either dwelling houses or holiday cottages. In these circumstances, I do not consider that the proposal, which is for 6 dwelling houses, attracts any in-principle land use objection.
- 7.7. I, therefore, conclude that the proposal would, from a land use perspective, be appropriate.

**(ii) Submitted plans, ground conditions, and stability**

- 7.8. The application comprises a series of site plans, elevations, floor plans, and cross-sections of the proposal. A comparison of these drawings indicates that they contain several inconsistencies. Thus, the site plans indicate that the finished floor level of proposed house type B to the rear of existing houses 1 and 2 would be 23.855m, whereas on the other drawings it is indicated as being 23.168m. In the light of my assessment of amenity set out below, it is important that the lower of these two figures be adopted. Similarly, the sectional elevation A-A of the proposed dwelling houses shows each of them as having a reduced ridge height and yet this is not reflected in the accompanying house type elevation drawings. Again, it is important that the reduced ridge height be adopted.
- 7.9. Appellant (a) states that the application omits to include a visual assessment of the proposal. Appellants (b) have sought to address this omission by submitting their own photomontages of the proposal in conjunction with their two properties, which are denoted on the applicants' site plans as houses 1 and 2. The applicant has duly questioned the accuracy of these photomontages.
- 7.10. The applicants have submitted a sectional elevation A-A of the front elevations of the proposed dwelling houses, along with 6 cross sections that show these dwelling houses in relation to properties at lower and higher levels on either side. However, they have not submitted a contextual elevation of the proposed dwelling houses in conjunction with the said surrounding properties and so the important views of the

site from Rossbeigh Strand have not been depicted. Given that Rossbeigh's LAP emphasises that new development should integrate with the landscape and minimise visual impact, I consider that the omission of such an elevation and, ideally, accompanying verifiable photomontages is significant. I therefore concur with the concern of appellant (a) in this respect.

- 7.11. Appellant (a) states that the application fails to fully address the reasons for the refusal of its predecessor 17/1215. The second of these reasons referred to the lack of detail with respect to the level of fill to be introduced to the eastern portion of the site and its possible impacts. Appellants (b) draw attention to the retaining wall to the site that exists to the rear of their properties. This wall is in poor condition and they thus express concern that under the proposal it could be surcharged. The applicant has responded by stating that this matter could be addressed at the detailed design stage.
- 7.12. The submitted site plans indicate spot heights across the site. They are at a scale of 1: 500. No quantification of the fill that would be required for the eastern portion of the site has been submitted and no commentary has been given as to whether or not such material would be wholly or partially provided from the lowering of the western portion of the site. No site survey of ground conditions has been submitted, along with any commentary arising on the materials comprise in the site.
- 7.13. In the light of the foregoing I consider that a more comprehensive depiction of the site to a larger scale is needed so that existing baseline conditions can be properly ascertained. Details of the possible redistribution of materials on site/importation of materials to site should be made explicit along with measures that would be needed to ensure the stability of the site.
- 7.14. I conclude that the applicants have submitted insufficient information to facilitate a proper visual assessment of the proposal and to clarify how the site would be developed based on a thorough going site survey.

### **(iii) Amenity**

- 7.15. The appellants express concern over the impact that the proposal would have upon the amenities of the area. Thus, appellant (a) draws attention to the loss of views to her holiday cottages that would result from the siting of house types B, C, and E in positions forward of the existing houses denoted as 7, 8, and 9. She contrasts this

layout with that proposed under 08/1621 in which a public green would have been sited forward of the said houses.

- 7.16. Both appellants draw attention to the relationship that would emerge between the proposed dwelling houses and existing ones, at a lower level, to the north. This relationship would be shaped by the proximity of the new dwelling houses and their scale and split-level design that would facilitate the provision of balconies. It would result in a series of negative impacts, i.e. visual obtrusion and dominance, and a loss of light and privacy.
- 7.17. The applicant has responded by stating that there is no right to a view under planning and that 08/1621 would have led overall to a higher density of development to that now proposed.
- 7.18. Under the second heading of my assessment, I identified the omission of a visual depiction of the overall proposal from the north, i.e. the rear elevations of the proposed dwelling houses within the context of existing dwelling houses and holiday cottages in the foreground and in the background. In the absence of such depiction, any assessment of the visual impact of the proposal can only be provisional.
- 7.19. The submitted cross sections show that heights of the eaves line of existing houses 7 and 9 would coincide with the heights of the corresponding ridgelines of proposed dwelling houses type B, i.e. the central and western ones, respectively. These sections illustrate that the outlooks from the said holiday cottages would be affected by the proposal and views would be diminished, i.e. existing panoramic views of Rossbeigh Strand would be reduced to gaps between the proposed dwelling houses.
- 7.20. I acknowledge that under planning there is not an absolute right to the retention of an existing view. That said, I am mindful that the amenity value of the said holiday cottages is affected by the views that they afford and so I consider it reasonable that a balance should be struck between respecting this value, on the one hand, and ensuring that the development potential of the subject site is realised, on the other hand. I am not persuaded that this balance has been reasonably struck under the current proposal.
- 7.21. During my site visit, I observed that the northern boundary of the site, which abuts the rear yards to existing houses numbered 1 – 4 on the submitted plans, is denoted by a retaining wall, an embankment, and intermittent vegetation in the form of large

shrubs/small trees. Thus, the rear elevations of these houses and their yards experience a degree of enclosure at present.

7.22. The submitted cross sections 2-2, 3-3, and 4-4 show that the said retaining wall would be retained and that a steep vegetated embankment and a fence would be formed/planted/erected. Cross sections 1-1 shows the retention of a natural stone wall and native hedging, while cross sections 5-5 and 6-6 show the retention of the retaining wall to the rear of the Rosspoint car park and an embankment at a gentler gradient with a fence and planting at the top of the same.

- With respect to the first three of the cross sections, I am concerned that the embankment depicted would be likely, in practise, to require retaining measures. The adjacent dwelling houses type B (western one), and E would appear as large built forms close to the rear of the existing properties. They would thus be dominant and a reduction in the daylighting of these properties would result. By the same token, their height and proximity relative to them would reduce the incidence of overlooking from balconies, which would enjoy views over their roofs.
- With respect to cross section 1-1, proposed dwelling house type C would be less dominant but there would be a greater risk of overlooking of existing house 1 and its rear yard. Thus, privacy measures to the external edges of the balcony to the lounge would be necessary to safeguard privacy.
- With respect to cross sections 5-5 and 6-6, the more spacious house plots assigned to proposed house type A would lessen resulting impacts on neighbouring properties.

7.23. In the light of the foregoing assessment, I consider that a greater degree of resolution of the proposal in its own terms would be necessary. However, even if this were to be achieved, I am concerned that it would have too great an impact upon the amenities of adjacent properties.

7.24. The proposal is for 6 dwelling houses, which would be of a size and specification as to afford a satisfactory standard of amenity to future occupiers. Likewise, they would be served by private open space, particularly with respect to generous balconies, that would augment such amenity.

7.25. I conclude that the proposal would fail to safeguard sufficiently the amenities of surrounding properties in the area.

**(iv) Traffic, access, and parking**

7.26. The proposal is for 6 dwelling houses, 4 of which would be three-bed and 2 of which would be four bed. Traffic would be generated by the residents of and visitors to these dwelling houses.

7.27. The site is served by a single lane road, which runs between a regional road in the east and a local road in the west.

- This road forms an acute angle with the westward portion of the regional road and an obtuse angle with the eastward portion. Given that the majority of traffic movements at the junction are to and from Glenbeigh in the east along the regional road, its greater use under this proposal would not present undue difficulties. Sightlines at this junction are good.
- This road is roughly perpendicular to the local road. While the sightline to the SW is good, the sightline to the NE is restricted. Under 08/1621, an earlier proposal for the redevelopment of the site would have entailed the construction of a public footpath along the nearside of the local road, which would have been returned along the frontage of the site with the road, which serves the site. I consider that, under the current proposal, this sightline should likewise be improved in conjunction with the provision of improved pedestrian facilities. Public lighting should also be addressed.

7.28. The road which serves the site rises appreciably at either end to roughly plateau over its centre portion. It presently affords access to the majority of dwelling houses and holiday cottages that comprise Rossbeigh.

7.29. Each of the proposed dwelling houses would be served by a dedicated access from the public road and by 2 car parking spaces. A comparison of the submitted plans indicates that the ramps proposed between the access points and the parking spaces would be the subject of appreciable gradients. Under the document entitled "Recommendations for Site Development Works for Housing Areas", driveways should not exceed a gradient of 10%. I estimate that the ramps to house types C, E, and B (to the rear of existing house 4) would exceed this gradient, i.e. they would be

c. 10.94%, 14.29%, and 11.55%, respectively. Thus, the proposal would fail to provide driveways that would be consistently of an acceptable gradient.

7.30. While appellants (b) question the absence of dedicated visitor car parking provision, I consider that, given that each dwelling house would have 2 car parking spaces, and given, too, the proximity of a public car park at the start of Rossbeigh Strand, such absence would be unlikely to be an issue “on the ground”.

7.31. I conclude that traffic generated by the proposal would be capable of being satisfactorily accommodated on the public road which serves the site provided the NE sightline at its western end is improved and pedestrian facilities and public lighting are provided. Likewise, proposed driveways should be to a gradient of no more than 10%.

#### **(v) Water**

7.32. Under the proposal, the redeveloped site would be connected to the public watermains and the public foul water sewerage system. Irish Water raises no objection to this proposal.

7.33. Under the proposal, a surface water drainage network would be installed. This network would discharge to a surface water drain adjacent to the western boundary of the site. As shown on drawing no. K1931-A3-510-A, it would serve the front roof planes and driveways of the proposed dwelling houses. The drainage arrangements for the rear roof planes are not shown. They may be capable of SuDS methodologies such as soakaways, although I acknowledge appellant (b)s’ concern over the risk of surface water draining from the site to the rear of their properties (existing houses 1 and 2). Likewise, any need for attenuation and the installation of an oil interceptor should be addressed in a fuller presentation of how surface water would be handled on the redeveloped site.

7.34. The OPW’s food maps do not show the site as being the subject of any identified flood risk. The nearby Rossbeigh Strand was the subject of a recorded past coastal/ tidal flooding event between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> January 2014.

7.35. I conclude that the applicant has submitted insufficient information to demonstrate that surface water would be capable of being satisfactorily drained from the redeveloped site.



## **(vi) Screening for Stage 1 AA**

- 7.36. The site does not lie within a Natura 2000 site. Rossleigh Strand, to the north of this site, lies within Castlemaine Harbour SAC, as does Castlemaine Harbour SPA, which extends to the west of the site, too.
- 7.37. At present, the site is subject to gradients that cause surface water run-off to head north and west. Under the proposal, at least some of this run-off would be collected into a surface water drainage network, which would discharge to a drain in the local road to the west of the site. As discussed under the fifth heading of my assessment, insufficient information has been submitted with respect to surface water run-off from the redeveloped site. Likewise, the route of the said drain and whether or not it would discharge into a Natura 2000 site has not been made explicit, although there is a high probability that this would be so.
- 7.38. The applicant has not submitted any construction management plan and so no details are available as to how surface water would be handled during any construction phase.
- 7.39. The applicant has not undertaken a screening exercise for the purpose of AA. While the Planning Authority's Biodiversity Officer raises no objection to the proposal, in the light of the above discussion, I consider that it is premature to undertake a screening exercise of the proposal for the purpose of AA.

## **8.0 Recommendation**

- 8.1. That permission be refused.

## **9.0 Reasons and Considerations**

1. Having regard to the application as submitted and subsequently augmented and revised under further information, it is considered that the applicant has failed to submit sufficient information to enable the Board to fully assess and determine the proposal. Specifically, the following gaps in the application have been identified:
  - No site survey of ground conditions,
  - No quantification of and commentary upon the lowering and raising of levels on the site and insufficient details of associated retaining measures,

- No contextual visual depiction of the proposal from the north of the site, and
- No information on how surface water would be handled during the construction phase and insufficient information on how it would be handled during the operational phase, including details of the drain to which the proposed network would discharge to.

In these circumstances, it would be premature to grant permission and thus contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Notwithstanding the first reason for refusal, it is considered that the proposal would, due to its siting, size, and design, be unduly dominant and visually obtrusive with respect to surrounding properties, some of which are holiday cottages. Furthermore, the said dominance would lead to a loss of daylight to the properties denoted as houses 1 and 2, and the proposed house type C, while not dominating house 1, would lead to overlooking and a consequent loss of privacy at the same. The proposal would thus seriously injure the amenities of properties in the vicinity of the site and so it would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. Notwithstanding the first reason for refusal, it is considered that the net increase in traffic movements generated by the proposal would warrant improvement to (a) the north eastern sightline across the western boundary of the site with the adjoining local road, (b) pedestrian facilities along the northern and western boundaries of the site, and (c) public lighting within the vicinity of the site. Furthermore, the proposed ramps to each of the house plots from the public road should be designed to have a gradient of no more than 10% in the interests of their ready usability. In the absence of these improvements, it would be premature to grant permission and at variance with good road safety measures. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

Hugh D. Morrison  
Planning Inspector

16<sup>th</sup> December 2019