



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-305850-19.

Development

Planning permission is sought for a mixed-use development consisting of the refurbishment of an existing vacant residence; commercial unit and an existing vacant coach house to proposed new living accommodation consisting of 8 residential units and office space. The subject property is a Protected Structure.

Location

No. 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street, Mullingar, County Westmeath.

Planning Authority

Westmeath County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

196144.

Applicant

Stephen Lynn Property Ltd.

Type of Application

Planning Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant with conditions.

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant

Desmond J. Walsh.

Observer(s)

None.

Date of Site Inspection

6th day of March, 2020.

Inspector

Patricia-Marie Young.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports.....	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy & Context	7
5.1. National Planning Provisions.....	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	8
6.0 The Appeal	9
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	9
6.2. Applicants Response	9
6.3. Planning Authority Response	10
6.4. Observations	10
6.5. Referrals.....	11
7.0 Assessment	11
7.1. Introduction	11
8.0 Recommendation.....	31
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	31

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. No. 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street, has a stated site area of 0.06415ha and the main building on this site is a period terraced four-bay above ground level 3-storey vacant former townhouse that has been much extended to the rear and it fronts immediately onto Oliver Plunkett Street. According to publicly available information this period building dates to c1750 and it is a designated Protected Structure. It also forms part of a larger group of similar in date and similarly protected period buildings that form part of a period streetscape setting that is afforded protection by way of being designated an Architectural Conservation Area.
- 1.2. Its principal façade immediately fronts onto the northern side of Oliver Plunkett Street which at the time of inspection was heavily trafficked. There is pay-and-display parking aligning the footpath to the front of the site and within this streetscape setting there was little availability of spare spaces.
- 1.3. The site could be considered as being centrally located within the town of Mullingar. The site is located c25m to the west of Martin's Lane and c120m to the east of the roundabout serving the intersection of Oliver Plunkett Street, Dominic Street and Mary Street. It is also located c0.3km to the north east of Mullingar's train station and 2.7km to the west of Junction 15 of the N4.
- 1.4. To the rear the building has been extended by way of a number of later extensions of different heights, scale and periods of construction. This includes a period two storey rear return; a c1960/70s single storey flat roof extension; and, a c1960s/1970s 2-storey rear extension. In between the modern 2-storey rear return there is an area of open space and to the rear of the plot there is an attractive period coach building also present. This is a diminutive two-storey height.
- 1.5. Vehicular access is available to the rear of the site via the restricted in width Downes Lane which connects to Bishops Gate Street to the north of the site.
- 1.6. The surrounding area has an attractive period townscape which is categorised by a wide mixture of land uses.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for the refurbishment of an existing vacant 430m² residence/commercial property and an existing vacant 68 m² coach house which is located in the rear of the site to proposed new living accommodation consisting of 2 No. 1-bed and 6 No. studio units and 181m² office space, including partial demolition of existing rear extensions, demolition of 2 no. existing chimneys, works to west elevation to remove extension rear access door, balcony and façade recess, minor alterations to existing fenestration, replacement of non-historic fenestration to match existing historic fenestration, proposed new fenestration and internal layout of the existing structures.
- 2.2. The proposed development will also involve the replacement of the existing entrance gate off Downes Lane, the provision of footpaths, public open space, private open space, bin and cycle storage, landscaping and all associated site works and services at No. 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street, a Protected Structure (RPS Ref. No. 019-188).
- 2.3. This application is accompanied by the following documentation:
- Planning Statement.
 - Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment.
 - Structural Survey.
 - Engineering Report.
 - A Section 57 Declaration.
- 2.4. The applicant submitted a response to the Planning Authority's request for further information, on the 8th day of August, 2019; and, the Planning Authority's request for clarification of further information, on the 23rd day of September, 2019.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The Planning Authority **granted** permission subject to 9 no. mainly standard conditions. Including:

Condition No. 9(c): This required that the developer during construction ensured that the right of way to the adjoining premises is maintained and all traffic associated with the proposed development including delivery and service vehicle/trucks shall be coordinated in order to avoid blockages of the right of way.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The final Planning Officer's report is the basis of the Planning Authority's decision. This was on foot of a request for clarification of further information as it was considered that the applicant had not adequately addressed the issues raised in the further information request.

The initial Planning Officer's report concluded with a request for further information in relation to the following matters:

- Building Control.
- Proposed Pumping Station.
- Landscaping.
- Surface Water.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Fire Services: No objection. However, the Fire Services correspondence on file indicates that despite the further information received there was still a number of outstanding fire related issues with this proposal. It concludes that this could be dealt with a fire certification stage.

Area Engineer: No objection subject to a number of recommendations. However, I note that their final report required that the applicant during construction works ensure that the right-of-way to adjoining premises is maintained and that all traffic associated with the proposed development including delivery as well as service vehicles shall be phased and coordinated in order to avoid blockages of the right-of-way.

Acting Director of Services: Part V does not apply to this development.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- 3.3.1. **Irish Water:** The final report from Irish Water includes several non-standard recommendations.
- 3.3.2. The Planning Authority referred this file to the Development Applications Unit, Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht; An Taisce; The Heritage Council; and, the Health Services Executive. A response was received from the Health Services Executive which raised no objection subject to safeguards.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.4.1. 1 no. 3rd Party submission was received in relation to the proposed development. The concerns correlate with those raised in their grounds of appeal submission to the Board.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. **The site and in the vicinity**

- 4.1.1. None relevant.

5.0 **Policy & Context**

5.1. **National Planning Provisions**

- Project Ireland 2040 - National Planning Framework, (2018).
- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, (2018).
- Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, (2009).
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities, (2007).
- Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2004.

5.1.1. **Development Plan**

The operative county development plan is the Westmeath County Development Plan, 2014 to 2020.

5.1.2. Mullingar Town Development Plan, 2014 to 2020.

The site is located within the town boundary of the said Development Plan under which it has a zoning objective 'Mixed Use' (Note: Map Ref: MLAP14).

Section 7.10.6 of the LAP indicates that Protected Structures and Architectural Conservation Areas are dealt with comprehensively in Chapter 5 and Volume 5 of the County Development Plan 2014-2020.

Policy P-SR4 states that the Planning Authority shall seek: *"to promote residential accommodation in the town centre as part of mixed-use schemes"*.

Section 9 – Residential Development.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. The site does not form part of nor is it located in close proximity to any Natura 2000 sites. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are as follows:

- The Special Area of Conservation: Lough Ennell SAC (Site Code: 000685), which is located c3.2km to the south west of the site;
- The Special Protection Areas: Lough Owel SPA (Site Code 004047), which is located c3.7km to the north west of the site;
- The Special Protection Areas: Lough Ennell SPA (Site Code: 004044), which is located c3.7km to the south west of the site; and,
- The Special Area of Conservation: Lough Owel SAC (Site Code: 000688) which is located c4km to the north west of the site.

5.3. EIA Screening

5.3.1. Having regard to the nature and extent of the proposed development; the serviced nature of the site and its setting; the significant lateral separation distance between the site and Natura 2000 sites alongside the lack of any direct or indirect connectivity; together with the absence of any specific environmental sensitivity in the vicinity of the site, it is considered that no appropriate assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The Council own land on Downes Lane and that on foot of a recent Part 8 application four units were permitted on.
- There are double yellow lines in front of the Councils land and these lands are opposite a school and a church entrance.
- No regard was had to the appellants requirement for 24hour, 7 day a week ordinary and emergency access to the back of their property by way of the right-of-way.
- The lack of onsite parking could result in parking on Downes Lane and on the right-of-way serving the appellants property.
- Concerns are raised on the matter of waste collection from the premises.
- Concerns are raised in relation to fire safety and the concerns raised by the Fire Officer.
- Permission was granted despite adequate access and turning facilities for emergency vehicles and services.
- Concern is raised that Irish Water recommended a refusal of permission in their initial submission to the Planning Authority.
- While the appellant is in favour of providing accommodation within the town centre this shouldn't be at the cost to existing residents.
- Any obstruction on Downes Lane could have disastrous consequences.
- The Board is requested to refuse permission.

6.2. Applicants Response

6.2.1. The applicant's response can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed development would not result in any undue amenity impacts.

- The proposed development seeks to exceed the local planning policy standards for this type of development.
- The Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment concludes that the proposed development accords with established good conservation practice and will not significantly impact on the character, setting and fabric of the Protected Structure.
- This proposal seeks to contribute to retaining residential within the town centre.
- There is no vehicle parking required in this area for the development proposed.
- The free movement of vehicles along the right-of-way on Downes Lane will be maintained but the construction traffic will require the use of Downes Lane for site access; however, a detailed construction management plan will be in place to manage construction traffic, delivery vehicles and the like.
- It will be the responsibility occupants and of refuse companies to determine the final refuse collection strategy.
- Irish Waters submission of the 4th day of June, 2019, was superseded by consultation prior to the submission of clarification of further information. The deviations with the Code of Practice for Wastewater Infrastructure have been deemed acceptable by Irish Water in this case due to the constraints of this site. In addition, Irish Water in their submission dated 21st day of September, 2019, confirm that they are satisfied with the engineering proposals for the pumping station and associated foul services.
- The proposed development is consistent with relevant planning provisions.
- The Board is requested to uphold the Planning Authority's decision.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

6.3.1. None.

6.4. **Observations**

6.4.1. None.

6.5. Referrals

- 6.5.1. The Board referred this appeal case to the Development Applications Unit, Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht; Failte Ireland; and, An Chomhairle Ealaíon. No responses were received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

- 7.1.1. By way of this application, planning permission is sought for the change of use from a vacant residential/commercial property (No. 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street) and a vacant period coach house building located in the north eastern corner of the site into a mixture of 8 dwelling units; a separate office space; and, all associated works and services.
- 7.1.2. The initial application was subject to a request for further information and clarification of further information.
- 7.1.3. As these requests resulted in a level of qualitative improvement to the scheme proposed and importantly provided necessary clarity to various aspects of the proposed scheme that were deemed to be required by the Planning Authority to make an informed determination on the development sought my *de novo* assessment below is based on the scheme as revised. It is on this revised scheme that the Planning Authority made a determination to grant planning permission, subject to conditions, on the 16th day of October, 2019.
- 7.1.4. This decision is now subject to a 3rd Party appeal with the concerns raised in the appellants submission primarily relating to access; potential for the proposed development to give rise to obstruction and curtailment of a right-of-way; lack of car parking; adequacy of services; compliance with relevant codes; and, potential to adversely impact on established residential amenity.
- 7.1.5. The appellant therefore seeks the Board to overturn the Planning Authority's decision on the basis of the adverse impact the proposed development would give rise to in terms of their established amenities. Moreover, the adverse impact that would arise to their use of Downes Lane as a right-of-way to the rear of their property and it is

considered that the proposed development being prejudicial to public health and public safety.

- 7.1.6. The applicant seeks that the Board uphold the decision of the Planning Authority. They contend that the proposed development would not give rise to any undue adverse impact on the amenities of the area, properties in the vicinity, including that of the appellant. They further contend that there is no requirement to provide car parking at this location, that compliance with relevant codes can be achieved and they do not accept that the proposed development either during construction phase through to operational phases would give rise to any undue obstruction on the appellants right-of-way.
- 7.1.7. Having regard to the subject site, it is in my view important to firstly consider that No.s 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street, benefits from specific protection as a Protected Structure, and by virtue protection is also afforded to buildings and structures deemed of significant merit within its curtilage. In this case it includes the period coach house building and remnants of period boundary walls.
- 7.1.8. Since their construction there have been a number of less sympathetic built interventions that have occurred to the original period townhouse building. In particular, a part single and part two storey rear extension. These potentially date to the mid-20th Century and by way of this application partial demolition is proposed. In this regard, I note that the partial demolition consists mainly of the single storey element which has a stated 12m² gross floor area. It is of no quantifiable built heritage merit or significance.
- 7.1.9. I note that policy BH1 of the Town Development Plan seeks to protect and conserve buildings, structures and sites contained in the Record of Protected Structures.
- 7.1.10. It also indicates that it is a policy to resist the demolition of Protected Structures. As the demolition proposed in this case does not relate to any important built layer of definable built heritage interest and it is a structure that is unsympathetic to the appreciation and legibility of this Period Structure. It is also a structure that visually detracts from the visual legibility of the rear elevation of the period terrace group of similarly protected buildings at this location. Based on these considerations I raise no particular objection to this component of the proposed development subject to safeguards. Including but not limited to safeguarding and making good the historic

building layers which it attaches too in a manner that accords with accepted best practice for such buildings.

- 7.1.11. I am also cognisant that it is proposed by way of this application that the remainder of the buildings on this subject site are essentially refurbished, repurposed and modestly extended in order to accommodate the 8 dwelling units and office space proposed (Note: the gross floor area of building to be retained as stated is 486m² and the gross floor area of dwelling units and office space as stated is 517m²). I consider that this broadly accords with policy BH1 of the Town Development Plan.
- 7.1.12. Further, the later rear residential two storey component's external expression is also modified under this proposal in order for it to read as a more sympathetic and visual appropriate built intervention to the rear of this Protected Structure and in turn the group of similarly protected as well as similar in period terrace properties it forms part of. Moreover, I consider that the sensitive repair and conservation works proposed to the principal of No.s 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street, is also generally acceptable and accords with local through to national planning provisions.
- 7.1.13. Having regard to No. 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Streets location in the historic heart of the settlement of Mullingar, it is a substantive concern that this Protected Structure together with its associated additions and built features within its curtilage are in a vacant state. Ergo it is a further concern that this vacant state has unfortunately given rise to its decay, particularly in recent times. This vacant state also diminishes the appreciation of this Protected Structure as observed from the public domain of Oliver Plunkett Street as well as the public through to private domain to the rear with Oliver Plunkett Street being a vibrant and vital streetscape scene within the town. As such its vacant and unkempt appearance detracts from this vibrancy and vitality. Moreover, it also diminishes the intrinsic period quality, character and identity of the northern stretch of Oliver Plunkett Street which contains an important group of mid-18th century townhouse terrace buildings that are some of the oldest buildings in extant in the town.
- 7.1.14. Thus, securing a building sensitive and sympathetic viable new use for this Protected Structure is not just essential for safeguarding and conserving this building into the future but it is also important to the visual amenities and qualities of its streetscape scene.

7.1.15. The subject premises and neighbouring land, form part of a larger area of urban land, that are zoned 'mixed-use' under the LAP. The stated objective for such land is "*to provide for, protect and strengthen the vitality and viability of the town centre, through consolidating development, encouraging a mix of uses and maximising the use of land, to ensure the efficient use of infrastructure and services*". Both residential and office land uses are deemed to be acceptable on such land subject to safeguards. Moreover, mixed use developments are actively pursued alongside encouragement given to adding to the existing quantum of residential development present within the town.

7.1.16. In addition, Section 10.2.2 indicates that "*mixed use reflects the mixture of land uses which have always co-existed in town centres and which gives them the vitality, variety and intensity of uses which makes them attractive*". It also indicates that the "*mixed use zoning provision can also help to ensure the economic efficiency through which public infrastructure and services can be provided*" and that it is a policy of the LAP to sustain and enhance the vitality of the town centre alongside where appropriate consolidate the urban core area. Furthermore, it advocates that this will be achieved by encouraging a mixture of compatible town centre land uses in various ways including mobilising brownfield and under-utilised land for development where appropriate.

7.1.17. Based on the above, I consider that the general principal of the mixed-use development scheme put forward for this vacant Protected Structure and its curtilage is acceptable as is the partial demolition of part of an existing later rear return.

7.1.18. I therefore consider that the substantive issues remaining for consideration in this appeal case are as follows:

- Residential – Mixture of Tenure
- Built Heritage
- Car Parking
- Impact on Properties in the Vicinity
- Access/Right-of-Way
- Services

7.1.19. I also consider that the matter of '*Appropriate Assessment*' requires examination.

7.2. Residential – Mixture of Tenure

- 7.2.1. This proposal seeks planning permission for a mixed-use office and residential development, with the residential component proposed consisting of 8 residential units that are described as six studio units and two one-bedroom units. The Planning Authority raised no concern in relation to this breakdown during its determination of this application and did not seek any introduction of more varied mixture of tenure by way of condition as part of its notification to grant planning permission. Moreover, it did not place any restriction on the use of each of the residential units proposed.
- 7.2.2. Having regard to the information provided on file I can find no rationale behind the applicant's proposal for six studio units and two one-bedroom units, i.e. whether they would be units for rent, units for sale and/or a mixture of both. Whilst they have the appearance of units for individual rent on short term basis there is nothing on file that would suggest this is the case. It is therefore my view that it is appropriate to consider them each as individual apartments in their own right as that is what is implied in the documentation on file and consider them against relevant planning policy considerations for this type of residential development.
- 7.2.3. In relation to the provisions set out in the Town Development Plan Section 2.6 of the sets out an aim: *"to facilitate the provision of high quality residential development in sustainable communities and provide an appropriate mix of house sizes, types and tenures in order to meet the different household needs"*. In addition, Section 2.8 advocates a mix of residential units, tenure mix, unit size and design to support the development of balanced communities. I also note that Policy P-HT1 states that the Planning Authority shall seek: *"to ensure a mix and range of housing types and in particular two bedroom accommodation, to meet the diverse needs of residents of the town"*.
- 7.2.4. I therefore raise a serious concern that this proposal puts forward little diversity in terms of the mixture of housing unit types through to their sizes. Under this application the smallest unit is a substandard studio unit with a stated Net Floor Area of 32.5m² (Gross Floor Area of 33m²) i.e. Unit 6. This I note fails to meet the minimum required under the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines. The largest unit proposed has a stated Net Floor Area of 45m² (Gross Floor Area of 48m²) i.e. Unit 4. The other six units vary in their sizes between these

two units with each of the units having very similar overall layouts, room sizes and the like.

- 7.2.5. I therefore consider that the proposed scheme does not include any real choice or mix of dwelling type nor does it provide any of the type of dwelling unit for which there is an identified shortage of provision within the Town Development Plan area, i.e. Policy P-HT1.
- 7.2.6. On this point I also note that Section 4.3.3 of the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities advocates the provision of a mixture of dwelling type and it indicates that this: *“should be informed by the relevant Local Authority Housing Strategy”* as well as that *“regard should be had to current best estimates regarding the size and type of households likely to seek housing in the future and to the need to achieve a balanced mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures”*.
- 7.2.7. In addition, Section 5.1.2 advocates that apartment types should be designed to facilitate future adaptability and Section 5.3.2 it states that: *“the mix of dwelling type, size and tenure should support sound social, environmental and economic sustainability policy objectives for the area”*.
- 7.2.8. I further refer to National Policy Objective 4 of the National Planning Framework which states the following: *“ensure the creation of attractive, liveable, well designed, high quality urban places that are home to diverse and integrated communities that enjoy a high quality of life and well-being”*.
- 7.2.9. While I consider that the proposed development puts forward densities that are considerably in excess of the density advocated for such an inner urban site, I seriously question that the apartment mix proposed is one that accords with local through to national planning policy standards and provisions. Though planning provisions advocate achieving increase densities they also advocate that quality of design is of paramount importance to ensuring sustainable urban developments and that there are a variety of factors that require consideration in order to determine what is an appropriate density having regard to the constraints and latent potentials of a particular site.
- 7.2.10. Further, as discussed in the following section of this assessment I have question marks over the ability of the coach house to meet current building regulation standards in relation to the floor-to-ceiling heights associated with the bedroom spaces for each

of its three units. I also note the concerns raised by the Fire Officer and the concerns that are unresolved within this design concept. Both of which I do not deem to be acceptable at this stage of the design resolution.

- 7.2.11. Moreover, I raise question marks that the bedroom spaces as indicated in each of the three units in the coach house building change of use genuinely meet floor area requirements set out under national planning policy guidance, in particular the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines, having regard to their actual layout and dimensions of these rooms as well as what can be realistically considered as the bedroom itself.
- 7.2.12. In addition to this I note that each of these three units fall short of meeting the required aggregate floor area of living/dining/kitchen for studio units with Unit 6 being 15m²; Unit 7 being 9m²; and, Unit 8 being 6m² below required minimum standards respectively. As previously noted, Unit 6 is also c4m below the overall required minimum floor area for a studio apartment.
- 7.2.13. As such the three units proposed for the modest coach house building put forward a substandard level of future residential amenity for future occupants and as such represent overdevelopment of this historic building.
- 7.2.14. In relation to the remaining units in the rear extension attached to the original building envelope of No.s 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street, I do not accept that these put forward an appropriate level of qualitative internal amenity space for future occupants. In this regard I note in relation to meeting the aggregate floor area of living/dining/kitchen that Unit 1 is 8m² below; Unit 2 is 11m² below; and, Unit 3 is 11m² below the required minimum standards respectively as set out in the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines.
- 7.2.15. Similarly, like the coach house building I raise question marks over whether the bedrooms spaces as shown genuinely meet the required 11.4m² and/or meet the required internal dimensions when examined and regard is had to their actual dimensions taking into account incursions in these dimensions from the internal layout and design of these units.
- 7.2.16. For example, Unit 2, in actuality has a width of 2.5 and depth c3.3m. This again does not meet the dimensional requirements set out in the Sustainable Urban Housing:

Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines. In addition, its combined living and kitchen does not have consistent minimum width of 4m dimension throughout.

- 7.2.17. Of further concern inadequate details have been provided as to how each of the proposed apartment units alongside the office space are going to cater for their independent waste storage needs on site in a manner that accords with relevant local through to national standards. If each apartment unit has to provide storage for their individual bins within their limited in area pockets of open space these spaces then cannot meet the quantitative and/or qualitative level of private open space that they are required to have, i.e. 4m² for studio units and 5m² for one-bedroom units, respectively, as required under the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines.
- 7.2.18. There is also no clarity provided in terms of the space adjoining the covered bicycle storage as to whether this is storage of waste or other for the office use and/or for the residential use proposed.
- 7.2.19. Either way, having regard to the quantum of residential and office uses proposed under this application I am not satisfied that there is either sufficient communal storage area to satisfy the collection of mixed dry recyclables, organic waste and other residual waste designed into this particular scheme, based on the information provided, on site and should there be no communal organisation of refuse this could give rise to collection issues for this waste from the public domain.
- 7.2.20. Particularly, at the location where Downes Lane intersects with Bishops Gate Street as Downes Lane has no capacity to accommodate a normal refuse collection lorry and its turning requirements.
- 7.2.21. I do not consider that Downes Lane where it intersects Bishops Gate Street has a public domain that can accommodate the level of bins such a development would give rise to if each unit has their own independent waste collection arrangements without giving rise to obstruction and/or conflict with other road users. In particular those using the restricted in width footpath.
- 7.2.22. On a separate point, I raise a concern that, if permitted, the proposed residential development despite the low number of residential units involved would give rise to an undesirable precedent for other similar homogenous in tenure type developments that

also fail to demonstrate regard to the future residential needs of the area as identified in the local planning provisions.

7.2.23. I also note that it is generally accepted that apartments should be designed to provide good quality accommodation, that they are flexible to meet the changing needs of occupants as far as practical and that the design approach should not be predicated on the assumption that apartment living is a transient phase in the life of people. With the latter in mind it is not expected that the minimum space standards are to be taken as a norm for an apartment unit type but they are an absolute base line under which it is considered that the resultant space standards are not generally accepted can give rise to a good quality of living accommodation.

7.2.24. Whilst it would appear that all units outside of Unit 6 in the proposed scheme appear to just meet the minimum requirements for studio and one-bedroom spaces and include levels of deviation from internal dimensional standards. I am not of the view that these units are of a particular high standard of liveability for future occupants. I note that Section 5.1.2 of the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities advocate that apartments should be designed to provide a good quality, permanent and sustainable living accommodation.

7.2.25. In this case I consider that the provision of 8 residential units, if permitted in the manner proposed, would result in the overdevelopment of this site; and, importantly would, not accord with local through to national planning policy provisions for residential development. Of particular concern Policy P-HT1, Section 2.6 and Section 2.8 of the Town Development Plan; and, would conflict with the guidance given Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, (2018), as well as Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities, (2007). I therefore consider that the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7.2.26. The Board may consider this a new issue in terms of their assessment.

7.3. **Built heritage impact of the proposed development on No. 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street and its built heritage rich site setting.**

7.3.1. No. 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street is a designated Protected Structure (RPS Ref. No. 019-188) and it is also listed in the NIAH Inventory (Reg. No. 15310200) where it is a

building given a 'Regional' rating alongside being a period building whose categories of special interest are identified as 'architectural' and 'social'.

- 7.3.2. According to the survey data provided by the NIAH the original use of this building is as a 'house' and at the time of the survey it was listed as being in the same use and it provides the following comprehensive description of it:

"Terraced four bay three storey house, built c.1750, having a shopfront to the west end of the ground floor. Steeply pitched slate roof with moulded eaves course, rendered chimneystacks to each gable end and cast-iron rainwater goods. Rendered facade with square headed openings having stone sills with one-over-one pane timber sliding sash windows to the second-floor openings and replacement windows to the first floor. Square-headed window opening with moulded arises to the east end of the ground floor having a ten over ten pane timber sliding sash window and a cut stone sill with decorative cast-iron sill guard. Central segmental-headed doorway, c.1860, having simple inset surround, glazed timber door, timber surround with timber brackets supporting moulded lintel over and a plain glass overlight. Early-twentieth century shopfront to the west end of the ground floor with square-headed openings having bronzed metal detailing".

- 7.3.3. It also provides the following appraisal:

"A large mid-eighteenth century house, which retains its early form and character. This building is an important legacy of the early town and is one of the earliest buildings still extant in Mullingar. This building, and its neighbours adjacent to the west, could well date to the immediate aftermath of a fire that apparently devastated much of Mullingar in 1747. Although altered over the centuries, many of these alterations are of a good standard and add another layer of interest to this early building, including the well-detailed mid-nineteenth bracketed timber doorcase and the simple early twentieth-century shopfront to the west end. The wide window opening to the east end at ground floor level, which retains a cast-iron sill guard of some decorative merit, suggests that the ground floor of this building has been used as a retail outlet from an early date. This building remains an important element of the architectural heritage of Mullingar and an integral element of an interesting group of mid-eighteenth century buildings to the north side of Oliver Plunkett Street".

- 7.3.4. As previously discussed, it is a cause of concern to observe that the lack of active use and upkeep is unfortunately taking its toll on No. 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street as well as built features of interest within its curtilage. In particular, the coach house building and what remains of the period boundary walls. I acknowledge that this is a situation that needs to be urgently addressed before further deterioration causes irreversible loss of built fabric through to more serious structural issues that could diminish the integrity and intactness.
- 7.3.5. It is broadly accepted under local through to national planning policy provisions that the principal of the retention, sympathetic re-use and rehabilitation of a Protected Structure as well as its setting is supported and as such is generally deemed to be acceptable subject to safeguards. For example Section 7.3 of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities states that “*it is generally recognised that the best method of conserving a historic building is to keep it in active use*” ... “*usually the original use for which a structure was built will be the most appropriate, and to maintain that use will involve the least disruption to its character*”.
- 7.3.6. In addition, Section 7.10.5 of the Town Development Plan indicates that primary provisions for Protected Structures are set out under Volume 5 of the County Development Plan with Volume 5 of the Plan containing a number of policies and objectives. Including but not limited to Policy P-BH4 which seeks: “*to encourage the sympathetic and appropriate reuse and retention of Protected Structures*”. In addition, the Plan on the matter of extensions or alterations to a Protected Structure indicates that the Council will normally only grant consent for such proposals where all the criteria set out under Section 14.8.2 are met. The three criteria are:
- “(a) *The essential character of the structure and its setting are retained, and its features of special interests remain in situ, intact and unimpaired;*
 - “(b) *The works proposed make use of traditional and/or sympathetic structural materials and techniques which match or are in keeping with those found on the structure; and,*
 - “(c) *The architectural details (e.g. doors, gutters, and windows) match or are in keeping with the structure.*”
- 7.3.7. I consider that in general the proposed development accords in a positive manner with these criteria. This is generally achieved through the design concept taking the

Protected Structure not as a blank canvas but seeing the latent potential of it, its associated building and structures by finding an appropriate as well as viable new use and by employing a design methodology that accords with accepted good practice for such buildings. In particular, those set out in the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines.

- 7.3.8. As previously discussed this proposal seeks the removal of part of a later built extension which is a non-sympathetic addition of no merit or significance, it seeks to conserve where possible and where practical the exterior and interior of its buildings, including updating the appearance of a later possibly mid-20th Century two storey domestic extension to the rear so that it more sensitively harmonises with the period character of the main mid-18th Century building on site. It also seeks to conserve and refurbish where possible and where practical later interventions made to No.s 8 to Oliver Plunkett Street that are deemed to be of significance and merit.
- 7.3.9. Notwithstanding this in my view further clarity is still needed on the extent of interventions proposed to the principal façade which addresses Oliver Plunkett Street. This façade in my view is the most interesting and most intact component of this particular Protected Structure as viewed from the public domain of Oliver Plunkett Street where this buildings contribution to the visual amenities and visual qualities of the public realm of the town is of particular importance.
- 7.3.10. In this regard, the submitted drawings of the proposed works to this elevation fail to show the decorative cast iron sill attachment to the ground floor window to the right of the timber door. In addition, it shows that this existing window is an eight over eight sash window but this is not the case in reality. This window is a 10 over 10 sash window. It is also a surviving period timber sash window, but it is referred to as being of metal construction. While the drawings do not implicitly suggest the removal and replacement of this window opening of merit it does however show a different outcome for this window opening which is a cause of concern. Of further concern there is no indication that the decorative cast iron sill would be maintained *in situ*. This is an additional cause of concern as this feature adds to the interest of this window opening and is part of the buildings evolution from when the building was used as a shop in part at ground floor level. Any loss or diminishment of either of these features would not be in the best interest of safeguarding and conserving this building's surviving built fabric and features of merit.

- 7.3.11. There are also other important details not accurately depicted in the drawings submitted including the existing timber door, its associated opening details and whilst it is indicated that there is an intention to repair the timber sash windows at the second floor level alongside replace the PVC windows at first floor level with matching windows these window openings, as depicted in the drawings, appear to be imposed with a centrally very heavy proportion bar that is not reflective of the more slim profile of period sash windows, including those present at second floor level, and appear to be more reflective of more heavy pvc type window frames.
- 7.3.12. The documentation provided also provides insufficient clarity in terms of how the extensive level of wiring on the principal façade of 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street will be dealt with. I note that it is not indicated on the proposed principal elevation, as depicted in the submitted drawings, but there is no mention of its removal and/or what measures are required for it to be appropriate and sensitively integrated into this historic structure. I consider it would be a positive outcome if this extensive wiring was removed or more site sensitively appropriately dealt with.
- 7.3.13. There is also a lack of clarity as to whether it will be just the exterior timber shop front elements that would be made good as there is no reference to the remaining components of this historic shopfront which includes other built fabric of merit including attractive rectangular came glass sections enclosed in hard wood timber panels though there is an outline of them shown in the proposed ground floor plans. In my view the submitted drawings do not provide adequate assurance on what will be the actual extent of intervention to this important surviving built element. This building layer as appreciated from the adjoining public footpath adds to the individuality and period charm to this period building. I therefore raise a concern that there could be unnecessary loss of built fabric from this shopfront which consists of more than just its exterior timber elements.
- 7.3.14. In relation to the interior spaces associated with the mid-18th century building at No.s 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street, as provided for in the submitted drawings and documentation, I consider that these support that the conversion into an office use is an appropriate site sensitive one as it clearly results in the ability to maintain a high level of intactness and minimal loss of historic built fabric by essentially maintaining the existing internal layout as far as possible and as far as is practical with new rooms being reversible in their construction. Further, important interior elements like

fireplaces, mouldings, floor tiles, period timber joinery and other surviving features of merit within the interiors are being kept and conserved in a manner that accords with best practice for such buildings as provided for under the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines.

7.3.15. In relation to the later rear extensions that would be subdivided into 5 dwelling units I also consider that this has been sensitively design despite the residential concerns I have raised previously in this assessment.

7.3.16. In relation to the coach house building which has a stated gross floor area of 68m², a maximum ridge height of 6.86, a roof slope of 45 degrees to a eaves height of 3.8m, a stated 15.35m length of and a width of 5.96m, in my view it cannot sustainably accommodate the two levels of living accommodation associated with the three proposed studio units. While I consider that the conservation, refurbishment and adaption of this historic building in order to accommodate a viable new use is generally acceptable, and I consider that residential use is a suitable use for this building, I am not convinced that the quantum of residential units proposed under this application can provide a high quality of residential amenity for future occupants nor could it be safely and sustainably be accommodated in this building due to its modest overall dimensions.

7.3.17. I also consider that the information provided lacks adequate detail in terms of what level of intervention is proposed to this structure in order to meet a qualitative level of internal living space for future residents. For example, the level of intervention to roof structure shows that it will be built up to engineering specification whilst maintaining its shape and profile. Yet there is practically no depth to accommodate insulation through to other interventions that may be required. Such details I consider are imperative so that one can I quantify whether the required floor-to-ceiling heights of the upper floor level of accommodation can be achieved in a manner that meets Building Regulation standards. I therefore cannot see how in either of three residential units proposed for this coach house building, i.e. Units 6, 7 and 8 can achieve the minimum required floor areas (Note: 11.4m²) and floor-to-ceiling heights for each of their individual bedrooms (Note: 2.4m over 50% of the habitable floor area) when regard is has to overall internal dimensions. These bedroom spaces are not of a width, depth or of a ceiling height that meet the required standards when one factors in their actual dimensions and what could be realistically considered as bedroom floor space.

- 7.3.18. On this point I note Section 5.3.2 of the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Guidelines indicates that bedroom spaces should be well proportioned in terms of floor shapes and ceiling heights so as to provide a good quality living environment for occupants. It also indicates that there should be adequate space for the normal range through to typical arrangement of furniture for the determined use of rooms.
- 7.3.19. This proposal also puts forward several rooflights to this roof structure which I acknowledge are necessary to provide light and ventilation to the upper floor level yet there is no indication that these would be of a type that are sympathetic to such a historical building.
- 7.3.20. In relation to the treatment of the internal envelope of this historic building it is unclear the level of built fabric that would be retained through to it is unclear that the drawings as put forward include drylining and the like or other interventions to ensure that the proposed units are free from damp etc. Such interventions, in my view, could potentially reduce further the habitable floor area of the units proposed. Alongside potentially the floor-to-ceiling heights at ground floor level further which are at ground and first floor at their maximum stated height of 2.45m modest. Moreover, there is potential for loss of surviving built fabric such as those associated with the original roof structure and timbers that tie/brace the building together.
- 7.3.21. While I consider that the general approach appears to be acceptable there are still too many issues for which clarity is required so as to make a fully informed determination of the potential impacts of the proposed development on this Protected Structure, alongside buildings and features within its curtilage. In terms of the site context, I consider that in general the proposed development would in reversing the vacant state of buildings on this site would enhance the visual amenities of its setting, including the setting of Protected Structures in its visual curtilage and it would contribute to the visual amenities of its ACA streetscape scene.
- 7.3.22. The Board may consider the concerns raised above on built heritage to be a new issue in terms of its determination of this appeal.

7.4. Car Parking

- 7.4.1. Chapter 1 of the Town Development Plan sets out a reduced car parking requirement for town centre areas for new small-scale development in a manner that accords with the Westmeath County Development Plan.

- 7.4.2. It seeks to promote the regeneration of the town centre, reduce vehicular traffic in the town centre, promote pedestrian and cycle movement within the town through to increase the use of public transport with the town being served by rail and bus public transport.
- 7.4.3. Objective O-AC2 of the Town Development Plan reiterates this by stating that the Planning Authority will seek: *“to maintain reduced car parking requirements for Town Centre Areas in accordance with Development Management Standards contained within Chapter 9”*.
- 7.4.4. Table 9.11 of Chapter 9 sets out the car parking standards for the administrative area of the Town Plan. It also sets out for small scale development listed within the area described under Map 9.1 no parking requirements will apply. The subject site is located within this area where no parking requirements apply.
- 7.4.5. The appellants concerns raised in relation to the capacity of the surrounding area to absorb the quantum of car parking this type of development would generate and alongside the concerns raised in this report that the proposed development in terms of the number of residential units proposed would result in the overdevelopment of the site. Despite these concerns there is no requirement for the proposed development to provide any car parking for proposed development sought under this application.
- 7.4.6. I consider that the provision of any car parking spaces on site would not only compromise the residential amenity of what is a restricted site as it would result in the loss of communal open space, give rise to noise through to additional safety issues.
- 7.4.7. Moreover, it would result in additional traffic on Downes Lane which is a substandard lane due to its restricted width, its poor surface, its poor lighting through to its inadequate sightlines at its entrance onto Bishops Gate Street. Moreover, there are points along this lane where other properties appear to benefit from access onto this lane and with the sightlines from these points of access onto the lane also not benefitting from adequate sightlines.
- 7.4.8. I am therefore of the view that to provide car parking on-site of any quantum would result in road safety hazards through to additional amenity considerations for properties in the vicinity. This is in addition to Downes Lane not been of a standard to accommodate any additional traffic generated by any new development or increased use of land that adjoins it.

7.5. Impact on Properties in the Vicinity

- 7.5.1. In terms of impact on the residential amenity of impact I consider that the proposed development would give rise to no additional overlooking, no additional overshadowing, loss of daylighting and/or other significant impact on properties in its vicinity due to the proposed development essentially refurbishing and re-using an existing vacant buildings on site outside of the nuisances that would inevitably arise during the demolition and construction phases. These I consider can be dealt with by way of standard conditions should the Board be minded to grant permission.

7.6. Access/Right-of-Way

- 7.6.1. The appellant raises concerns that the proposed development could give rise to obstruction and curtailment of their use of a right of way that provides access from the rear of their property via Downes Lane to Bishop Gates Street to the north. I consider that this is a reasonable concern and on the day of my inspection of the site vehicle access to Downes Lane, to the rear of the site and to the rear of the appellants property was obstructed by vehicles associated with the ground works associated with the construction of the residential units referred to by the appellant in their appeal submission. Unlike the current latter works on-going on adjoining Council land, the subject site does benefit from a vehicle entrance and space to the rear of the site, where vehicles associated with any demolition and construction works can be catered to some degree. Thus, minimising the potential for obstruction and conflict with other users of Downes Lanes, including the appellant, for vehicle access
- 7.6.2. Moreover, as previously discussed, there is no requirement for the provision of car parking on the subject site and as such the proposed development whilst having the potential to give rise to the requirement for car parking in its wider vicinity over and above that of its previous uses it is not likely to result in a significant generation of traffic once demolition and construction works are completed. It is likely that the main movements generated on Downes Lane would be from pedestrians and cyclists using the lane due to that being the point of access for the residential units proposed. With the sites central location giving future occupants easy access to public transport, services and other general amenities. It is also possible for public transport to be used to access the office use and there is a wide range of parking options within the town itself.

- 7.6.3. There is also a positive that the proposed development would give rise to increase use of the lane that would add to passive and active surveillance for its users.
- 7.6.4. I therefore consider that subject to appropriate management of traffic associated with the demolition and construction phases of development is acceptable. I also concur with the Planning Authority that this matter can be dealt with by way of an appropriately worded condition.
- 7.6.5. My only outstanding concern is that the documentation submitted does not fully clarify land title of the Downes Lane and whether this lane is in public ownership.
- 7.6.6. While I acknowledge that the Board has no statutory power to adjudicate upon matters relating to title, ownership through to intricacies of rights-of-way as these matters constitute civil matters that can only be resolved by agreement between the parties or in the civil courts as appropriate; notwithstanding, I consider any potential curtailment of use of an established right-of-way to be problematic. Therefore, I recommend that as a precaution any grant of permission is accompanied by an advisory note reiterating Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended. This states that *“a person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under this section to carry out any development”*.

7.7. **Services**

- 7.7.1. No.s 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett street is served by existing connections to public infrastructure for its water supply as well as for the removal of its wastewater and surface water. In its present state this building and its coach house building are vacant therefore creating no significant demands on this infrastructure outside of some potential surface water run-off.
- 7.7.2. In terms of water supply a new connection is proposed to Irish Water’s network on Bishops Gate Street. There appears to be no capacity issues or fundamental objections to this from Irish Water or the Planning Authority.
- 7.7.3. In terms of method of sewage disposal, I note from details on file that the applicant proposes to install a Pumping Station on site and to also connect to the Irish Water network on Bishops Gate Street. There appears to be no capacity issues in relation to facilitating this with no fundamental objection raised by Irish Water or the Planning Authority following on from the additional details provided by way of further information and further clarification of information.

- 7.7.4. The proposed pumping station will be maintained as a private piece of infrastructure on the site that will not be taken in charge and/or vested by Irish Water.
- 7.7.5. The applicant is also willing to accord with the requirements set out by Irish Water for the site.
- 7.7.6. In terms of surface water there will be no significant additional surface water generated on the site but there is an opportunity for sustainable urban drainage solutions to be used as part of the overall methodology of the redevelopment of this site. I note that the Engineering details provided during the course of this planning applications determination by the Planning Authority included clarification that this would indeed be the case and that is proposed to locate a soakaway in the open space between the coach house building and the rear two storey extension to No. 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street. The documentation also indicate that the soakaways design would meet BRE Digest 365 standards. Further, maintenance of deep soil in the communal landscaping area together with the use of appropriate planting would also improve the level of surface water being confined within the curtilage of the site.
- 7.7.7. The submitted documentation also indicates that this proposal will decrease the loading/discharge to the existing combined sewer line on Oliver Plunkett Street.
- 7.7.8. Should the Board be minded to grant permission for the proposed development I recommend that water supply, foul drainage and surface water drainage should be dealt with by way of appropriately worded conditions. I also advise that they include the specific and detailed requirements of Irish Water. Subject to this I raise no significant objection to the proposed development on the matter of services.

7.8. Screening for Appropriate Assessment

- 7.8.1. The subject site can be described as an urban site. The proposed development seeks only minor demolition of an existing structure and seeks to provide a mixed residential and office land use for vacant existing buildings on site with upgrades to the existing connections to public mains water and wastewater services.
- 7.8.2. There are a number of Natura 2000 sites within a 15km radius of the subject site. The nearest being the Special Area of Conservation: Lough Ennell SAC (Site Code: 000685), which is located c3.2km to the south west of the site. The accompanying Engineering report indicates that the proposed development is designed using sustainable urban drainage, which drains into the surface water system.

7.8.3. Having regard to the zoning of the site for town centre mixed use development, to the availability of public piped services including water and sewerage, to the nature of foreseeable emissions from the proposed development, to the patterns of development in the area and the separation distance between the application site and any Natura 2000, the lack of any objection by the Planning Authority and Irish Water to the proposed development subject to safeguards, it is reasonable to conclude, on the basis of the information available on file, which I consider adequate in order to issue a screening determination, that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on any European site, in view of their Conservation Objectives, and I consider that a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

7.9. Other Matters Arising

7.9.1. **Nuisance:** The submitted grounds of appeal raise concerns in relation to potential adverse impact from the proposed development during the demolition and construction phase.

I consider that some degree of noise and dust nuisance is an inevitable component of any project during the demolition and construction phase alongside the potential obstruction of the right of way during this period.

The site of the proposed development occupies a town centre location, with plot sizes in this area being long and of tapering width. In addition, these plots in general are characterised by high plot coverages. The vast majority of the properties in the immediate vicinity of the site are in business and commercial use addressing Oliver Plunkett Street with residential development being more characteristic to the rear. It would also appear that the generous building sizes of the terrace group that No.s 8 to 10 Oliver Plunkett Street together with their high quality have maintained many in their historic use as residential in their upper floor levels. It would therefore be wrong to assume that only few properties in the vicinity of this town centre site are in residential use. It would appear that the opposite is the case, and this is a use that is actively encouraged to be maintained and enhanced further by local planning policy provisions.

While some disruption to occupants and users of properties in the vicinity of the site would be inevitable, I consider that, subject to normal demolition and construction practices and mitigation measures, the proposed development should not unduly

injure the established amenities of the area during the limited demolition and construction phase.

- 7.9.2. **Communal Open Space Provision:** This proposal exceeds the required communal open space provision for the residential component of the development proposed and should the Board be minded to grant permission for development I recommend that it include a condition requiring the landscaping and lighting of this space together with other communal spaces within this scheme to be agreed with the Planning Authority prior to any commencement of development on site.
- 7.9.3. **Bicycle Parking:** I raise no objection to the level of provision for bicycle parking subject to this being provided with appropriate lighting in the interests of safety.
- 7.9.4. **Boundary and Entrance:** Should the Board be minded to grant permission I consider that the boundary and entrance treatments should be subject to prior agreement with the Planning Authority to ensure surviving historic built fabric is preserved and safeguarded alongside ensuring that any new interventions are site context appropriate.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that planning permission is **refused** for the reasons and considerations set out below.
- 8.2. I also note to that the two reasons and considerations for refusal relate to new issues.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the lack of residential mix proposed, the design and layout of the residential component of the mixed-use scheme proposed, with a number of the residential units providing substandard internal living spaces, the Board considers that the proposed development would represent a poor design response to this site.

The Board is concerned that the proposed development would result in an unsatisfactory standard of residential amenity for future occupants, would provide a homogenous mix of dwelling types with these dwelling types of a design and size that provides no resilience or adaptability to meet future occupants needs in terms

of their use and in so doing would result in a development whose residential component conflicts with local through to national planning policy provisions that require such residential schemes to not only be of a minimum qualitative space standard but also to include an appropriate mix of tenure in a manner that accords identified local housing needs.

As such the Board considered that the proposed development is contrary to the provisions of the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, (2018), and, Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities - Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities, (2007), issued to Planning Authorities under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act.

The Board also considered that the proposed development for the same considerations is contrary to the provisions of the Mullingar Town Development Plan, 2014 to 2020, in particular Policy P-HT1; Section 2.6 and Section 2.8.

The Board was further of the view that the number of residential units proposed for the subject site would also result in overdevelopment of a historically highly sensitive to change site.

For these reasons, the Board considers that the proposed development would, seriously injure the residential amenities of the area and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The Board is not satisfied based on the information provided, that the proposed works by their extent, nature and level of intervention, would not have a detrimental and/or diminishing impact on the essential qualities and attributes of this Protected Structure.

In particular, as contributed to by the intactness and integrity of its surviving mid-18th Century, as altered in the mid-19th Century and as further altered in early-20th Century, principal façade addressing Oliver Plunkett Street, and, thereby having the potential to materially affecting its character as a Protected Structure and an integral component of a terrace group of Protected Structures address the northern most extent and side of this street.

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

Patricia-Maris Young
Planning Inspector

11th day of March, 2020.