



Development

Development consisting of

- 1) The demolition of an existing single storey dwelling, ancillary buildings and existing boundary wall with complete removal of existing vegetation within the confines of the site.
- 2) Construction of a new part 3-storey, part 2-storey building comprising of 6 no. 2-bedroom apartments including integrated refuse and bicycle stores, external communal terrace and external private balcony for each apartment.
- 3) Relocation of existing entrance to site to provide new site entrance.
- 4) Landscaping, boundary treatment and all associated site services, drainage installations and external lighting.

Location

Rose Cottage, Bird Avenue, Dublin 14, D14 A3Y1.

Planning Authority Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref. D19A/0851

Applicant(s) Cecilian Holding Ltd.

Type of Application Permission

Planning Authority Decision Refuse Permission

Type of Appeal First Party

Observers Mary Martin – Maple Residents Association
Joanne McBreen
Joanne Lowe
Susan Cooney
David Phillips
Trudy Kealy
Diarmuid Ó Grada (Planning Consultant) on behalf of, Elaine & Alistair Brown, Tom & Orna Kelly and John & Rita McCarthy.

Date of Site Inspection 3rd June 2020

Inspector Paul O'Brien

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. Rose Cottage comprises a single storey detached house located on a stated site of 0.091 hectares, on the northern side of Bird Avenue, Clonskeagh, Co. Dublin. To the west of the site is the 'Church of the Miraculous Medal', which is a large red-brick church on a large site and which gable fronts the public road. Bird Avenue is predominately a residential street, with semi-detached houses to the east and south of the subject site.
- 1.2. The subject house is therefore unusual in its single-storey, detached form on a street of predominately two-storey, semi-detached houses. In addition, the house is stepped forward of the regular building line on the northern side of Bird Avenue, such that the rear of the house aligns with the established building line. The house is therefore afforded a large area of private amenity space to the rear. A driveway with off-street car parking is located to the eastern side of the house. The front boundary consists of a low wall with decorative railings over. There are sheds/ outhouses located to the western side of the house, some of which are forward of the front building line of the house.
- 1.3. Luas stops at Windy Arbour and Milltown are over 1 km walking distance from this site. There are a number of bus routes with stops available, in close proximity to this site.

2.0 Proposed Development

The proposed development consists of:

- The demolition of an existing single storey dwelling with a stated floor area of 79 sq m, ancillary buildings and an existing boundary wall along Bird Avenue. In addition all vegetation on site is to be removed/ cleared.
- The construction of a new part three-storey, part two-storey building comprising of six no. 2-bedroom apartments including integrated refuse and bicycle stores, external communal terrace, and external private balcony for each apartment.
- The relocation of existing site entrance to provide new site entrance.

- Provision of a hard-landscaped entrance forecourt and 7 no. off street parking spaces.
- New boundary treatment to existing boundaries.
- All associated site services, drainage installations, external lighting, and landscaping.
- The proposed development is circa 67 units per hectare.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority decided to refuse permission for two reasons as follows:

1. 'Having regard to the size, scale and massing of the proposed development and its proximity to the neighbouring dwelling 42 Bird Avenue (Agathos), it is considered that the proposed development would appear overbearing and dominant when viewed from this property and would be seriously injurious to the residential amenity and depreciate the value of this property. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to 2016-2022 Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan Zoning Objective A which is, 'to protect and/or improve residential amenity' and would be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area'.

2. 'The proposed development represents a poor form of development by way of its provision of communal amenity space, that comprises of a second floor communal terrace within close proximity to 29 The Maples to the rear of the site and 42 Bird Avenue resulting in harmful overlooking to the neighbouring properties. The proposed development materially contravenes Policy RES3 'Residential Density' of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan (2016-20220. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area'.

The following note was included in the decision:

NOTE: The applicant has failed to provide sufficient information on a number of elements of the development including transport, and an assessment of the existing dwelling from a heritage perspective. The applicant should note that this additional

information would need to be provided and the issues set out in this refusal of planning permission should be addressed in any future application’.

3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. **Planning Reports**

The Planning Report reflects the decision to refuse permission subject to the two reasons as above. The attached note to the decision and the Planning Report, also clearly demonstrates that there was a need to provide for a full architectural appraisal of the existing building and to address matters raised by the Transportation Department in relation to parking/ adequate footpath provision.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Transportation Planning: Further information is requested in relation to the provision of adequate bicycle parking, electric vehicle charging points, provision of a construction management plan, revisions to the proposed front boundary and evidence of consent for the relocation of an existing electricity/ telecommunication pole and substation.

Drainage Planning – Municipal Services Department: No objection subject to recommended conditions.

Parks and Landscape Services: No objection subject to recommended conditions.

Architectural Conservation Officer: The building to be demolished appears to have been built after 1842 and may be of architectural/ historical importance. Request that an Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment report be prepared. Unable to say if the Conservation Division would support the demolition of this house at the time their report was prepared.

3.2.3. **Prescribed Bodies Report**

Irish Water: No objection subject to recommended conditions.

An Taisce: Recommend that an Architectural Heritage Assessment be prepared and that alternatives to the demolition of the cottage be proposed. The report to consider the impact on the adjoining church. It may be possible to retain the cottage and

provide for houses to the rear. The proposed apartment block is out of character with the area.

3.2.4. **Objections/ Observations**

A number of letters of objection were received to the original application. The Maples Residents Association commented in addition to grouped and individual objections, were received.

Issues raised include:

- No architectural heritage impact assessment was undertaken.
- Note the importance of the adjacent church, Church of the Miraculous Medal, which is listed on the record of protected structures.
- Loss of side views and vistas of the church.
- Overbearing impact on existing houses.
- Overlooking leading to a loss of privacy will occur.
- Traffic safety issue through the proposed additional car parking/ traffic. The proposed access is opposite Beechmount Drive, this will create a very busy junction.
- Alternative development of semi-detached houses would be more in keeping with the existing character of the area.
- Footpath to the front of the site does not comply with requirements.
- The proposed apartment block is out of character with the existing form of development in the area and is too high.
- Potential loss of daylight to existing houses. Overshadowing concerns were raised in a number of the letters of objection.
- Inadequate car park provision and no visitor parking is proposed.
- The proposed development may give rise to an increase in noise levels in the area.
- Impact on the water table in the area.
- Concern about fire brigade access to the site and potential for fires to spread to existing properties.

- Concern about the internal layout in relation to meeting guidelines etc.
- Insufficient green space proposed to serve future residents.
- Distance to the Luas stop is understated, should be 17 – 20 minutes and not 10 minutes.
- Request that the building line in the area be respected and the proposed development be set back in line and not forward of the existing building line.
- Permitting the proposed development would set a precedent for similar site redevelopments in the area.

4.0 Planning History

None.

5.0 Policy and Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. Under the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2016 – 2022, the subject site is zoned A ‘To protect and/ or improve residential amenity’. Residential development is listed within the ‘Permitted in Principle’ category of this zoning objective. The adjacent Church of the Miraculous Medal is listed on the Record of Protected Structures. I also note that to the north west of the church is a ‘TA’ objective ‘To Provide Accommodation for the Travelling Community’.
- 5.1.2. Chapter 2 – ‘Sustainable Communities Strategy’ of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2016 – 2022, includes section 2.1 ‘Residential Development’. The Introduction (2.1.1) refers specifically to how future population growth will be accommodated, with one model – ‘Through the continuing promotion of additional infill accommodation in existing town and district centres at public transport nodes, brownfield sites and established residential areas’.
- 5.1.3. Under 2.1.3.4 ‘Policy RES4: Existing Housing Stock and Densification’ it is policy to:

- Encourage densification of the existing suburbs in order to help retain population levels – by ‘infill’ housing. Infill housing in existing suburbs should respect or complement the established dwelling type in terms of materials used, roof type, etc.

Under 2.1.3.7 ‘Policy RES7: Overall Housing Mix’ ‘It is Council policy to encourage the establishment of sustainable residential communities by ensuring that a wide variety of housing and apartment types, sizes and tenures is provided within the County in accordance with the provisions of the Interim Housing Strategy’.

5.1.4. Chapter 6 of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2016 – 2022 refers to ‘Built Heritage Strategy’. Section 6.1.3.5 ‘Policy AR5: Buildings of Heritage Interest’ is noted. This seeks to retain building of value and to assess their inclusion on the record of protected structures.

5.1.5. Chapter 8 of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2016 – 2022 refers to ‘Principles of Development’ and the following are relevant to the subject development:

8.2 ‘Development Management’ – with particular reference to section 8.2.3 ‘Residential Development’ and 8.2.3.4 ‘Additional Accommodation in Existing Built up Areas’.

Section 8.2.4.12 refers to Electrically Operated Vehicles – One parking space per 10 spaces to provide for electric charging.

5.2. National Guidance

- The National Planning Framework includes a specific Chapter, No. 6 - ‘*People Homes and Communities*’ which is relevant to this development. This chapter includes 12 objectives (National Policy Objectives 26 to 37) and the following are key to this development:
 - National Policy Objective 27 seeks to ‘Ensure the integration of safe and convenient alternatives to the car into the design of our communities, by prioritising walking and cycling accessibility to both existing and proposed developments, and integrating physical activity facilities for all ages’.

- National Policy Objective 33 seeks to ‘Prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location’.
- National Policy Objective 35 seeks to ‘Increase densities in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights’.
- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS).
- Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (Cities, Towns & Villages) (DoEHLG, 2009) and its companion, the Urban Design Manual - A Best Practice Guide (DoEHLG, 2009).
- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHPLG, 2018).

These guidelines provide for a range of information for apartment developments including detailing minimum room and floor areas.

- Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHPLG, 2018).
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (DoEHLG, 2007).
- Permeability Best Practice Guide (NTA, 2015).

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

None.

5.4. EIA Screening

Having regard to the nature of the proposed development comprising the demolition of an existing house and the construction of an apartment block with six units, in an established urban area and where infrastructural services are available, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed

development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The applicant has engaged the services of Thornton O'Connor – Town Planning to appeal the decision of Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council to refuse permission. Revised drawings and details have been submitted in support of the appeal. The revisions/ details include:

- The proposed apartment block is set such that a consistent width of footpath can be provided along Bird Avenue/ front of the site. This requires a reduction in the number of car parking spaces from seven to six. Provision is also made for electrical vehicle charging.
- The vehicle/ pedestrian access to the site is reduced in width from 4.306 m to 4 m.
- The number of bicycle parking spaces is increased from 7 to 16.
- The bedrooms in apartment no.2 are revised with windows facing onto a small courtyard area.
- Revised footpath such that a minimum of 1.2 m is provided between the apartment block and the boundary.
- Conservation Report submitted and finds that the railings to the front of the site are the only element worth retaining/ preserving.
- A waste consultant has been employed.
- Consent has been received for the relocation of the utility pole and kiosk to the front of the site.

The above alterations provide for an overall reduction in the floor area from 618.5 sq m to 614.6 sq m.

The following issues have been raised in the appeal:

- The applicant is perplexed as to why there are references in the Planning Authority Case Officer's report to further information requests and yet these were not sought.
- No windows in the first and second floor on the eastern elevation that would give rise to overlooking and setbacks have been increased.
- Note National Policy and the need to appropriately develop land for residential development at a suitable density.
- It is accepted that the design is different to the established character of the area.
- Much of the single-storey ground floor element could be constructed without requiring planning permission under exempted development.
- A number of precedent cases have been provided in Templeogue (South Dublin County Council area) and Irishtown Road (Dublin City Council area).
- With reference to the second reason for refusal, it is noted that the Parks and Landscape Services of Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council, did not object to the development.
- The proposed amenity space is set back from the boundaries and is proposed to be suitably screened. The upper level communal space could be omitted from the development as the small scale of development may result in this space not been used.
- The Conservation Impact Assessment prepared by Historic Building Consultants has found that the cottage is not of any historic/ significant importance to warrant its retention. The report recommends that a photographic survey of the house be undertaken. In addition, the railings and gate to the front with the granite coping should be salvaged for reuse.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

6.3. The submitted appeal statement and amendments are noted by the Planning Authority. The proposed amendments are welcomed. The reduction in car parking to one space per unit is acceptable and the revisions to the internal and external layout are also welcomed. The Conservation Report is noted, and the Planning

Authority have no objection to the demolition of this house. However, the reasons for refusal have not been addressed and the PA maintains that these are appropriate. The Planning Authority do not oppose the suitable development of this site.

6.4. Observations

Observations have been received from a number of those who objected to the original application; Mary Martin (44 The Maples) – Maple Residents Association, Joanne McBreen (34 The Maples), Joanne Lowe – Clonskeagh Residents Association (47 Bird Avenue), Susan Cooney (23 The Maples), David Phillips (27 The Maples), Trudy Kealy (30 The Maples) and Diarmuid Ó Grada (Planning Consultant) on behalf of, Elaine & Alistair Brown (29 The Maples), Tom & Orna Kelly (31 The Maples) and John & Rita McCarthy (Agathos, 42 Bird Avenue).

The main planning issues include:

- The development would have an excessive footprint and the proposed density is similarly excessive.
- The development would give rise to overlooking of adjoining properties through the provision of elevated balconies.
- Query if there is a need to re-advertise the development having regard to the amendments made and to the submission of a model in support of the appeal.
- Consider that there is too much emphasis put on integrating with the adjacent church rather than comment on how the development integrates with the existing houses on Bird Avenue.
- The site is not located within the ‘inner suburban environs’.
- Character of the area is established by houses with large front and rear gardens.
- The proposed design is bulky and would have a negative impact on the neighbouring residential properties through overbearing, overshadowing and overlooking.
- The communal open space is north facing and is therefore compromised in its quality. The space will be overshadowed and not be useful for future residents.

- Technical issues were raised including the scale of drawings printed on A3 sheets and how the drawings are presented.
- Proposed footpath to front of site is not suitable/ is not wide enough.
- Uncertainty over the accessibility of the proposed apartments.
- Concern about the lack of car parking and traffic congestion in the area.
- Support the reasons for refusal as issued by Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council.
- Potential impact on the adjoining church, which is a protected structure.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. The main issues that arise for consideration in relation to this appeal can be addressed under the following headings:

- Procedural Comments
- Principle of Development
- Design and Impact on the Character of the Area
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Density
- Traffic and Access
- Other issues
- Appropriate Assessment Screening

7.2. **Procedural Comments**

7.2.1. The observation prepared by Diarmuid Ó Grada suggest that there was a need for new public notices to be provided as the alterations to the development in support of the appeal would require such notices. I am satisfied that the alterations are not significant as to radically change the design of this apartment development and the general character has not changed from what was submitted to the Planning Authority.

7.2.2. I also note that a number of observations have been received including from those living adjacent to the subject site. I am therefore satisfied that requesting new public notices would not serve a useful purpose as there is adequate awareness of the appeal/ proposed alterations, albeit of a minor nature, to the development.

7.3. Principle of Development

7.3.1. The subject site is zoned 'A' for residential development, and it is therefore considered that the provision of residential development on this site is acceptable in principle. Considering the character of the area is primarily established through two-storey houses, there may be an opportunity to develop this site with an additional floor such that a three storey unit could be provided; this is considered further in this report.

7.3.2. I am satisfied from the information submitted in the appeal and from the site visit, that Rose Cottage has no historical importance that would warrant its retention. The house is not dissimilar to countless other examples in the Dublin Area and no importance of a local/ historical nature have been demonstrated.

7.4. Design and Impact on the Character of the Area

7.4.1. The area is characterised by semi-detached houses and the church to the west of the site. The church through its large scale and height dominates the area and I would suggest that any infill development on this site should primarily have regard to the semi-detached houses rather than the church. The church is of a unique architectural design and is of its era.

7.4.2. I consider that the proposed development does not provide for a suitable form of infill development on this residential street. The area has an established character and I do not foresee much opportunity for infill development in the immediate area. The development has been designed to integrate with the area, for example the single storey element to the eastern side and the set back of the building to be more in line with the existing houses than is the case with Rose Cottage. The revised details submitted in support of the appeal strengthen this approach with moderate increases in separation distances to the boundaries.

7.4.3. The overall design approach is noted, however, the submitted southern elevations or contiguous view along the street, demonstrate concern about this development. The

houses on Bird Avenue are large semi-detached units, yet the proposed apartment block will dominate them. The bulk of this building is broken up, particularly through the use/ location of the private amenity spaces/ balconies which are set into the building, the narrowness of the two/ three storey element and the void to solid ratio of the windows/ walls. This approach is let down by the plant room on the roof which adds an additional 1.9 m in height to the overall building. When viewed from the front/ south, the proposed building will provide an almost pyramid shaped building on the streetscape, rising from a wide base at ground floor level to a narrow peak at the plant room, thereby exaggerating the height of the building. The photomontages submitted with the application do not adequately demonstrate the impact of this feature. The front/ south elevation also indicates that the height and proportions of this building will dominate the existing houses and would be particularly dominant on no. 42 to the east.

- 7.4.4. High quality infill development has to take account of its surroundings. I appreciate that there are difficulties in developing this site. The applicant has attempted to address the issue of overlooking by not placing windows on the upper floors on the east elevation and those on the west are restrained in their width. Internal floor to ceiling heights are acceptable and need to be at least 2.7 m to ensure that adequate daylight can reach into the centre of rooms.
- 7.4.5. Overall, I consider that the submitted design does not adequately integrate into the existing streetscape and would be visually intrusive when viewed from the public street and from adjoining properties on Bird Avenue and from The Maples.

7.5. Impact on Residential Amenity

- 7.5.1. The proposed development provides for adequate room sizes in accordance with the apartment guidelines and adequate storage provision is available to future occupants. Access to upper floors is available by way of a stair and lift core, which is accessible.
- 7.5.2. The negative impact on adjoining properties was given by the Planning Authority as a reason for refusal and I would agree with this. If permitted, the adjoining number 42 Bird Avenue would suffer from overbearing as the ground floor element of this development would extend by circa 20 m on the eastern elevation, behind the rear building of no. 42. I agree with the applicant that the church would already cast a

shadow over the rear garden of no. 42 at certain times of the day. I note the submitted shadow analysis and wish to point out that it is limited in that the results for June end at 4 pm, an additional analysis at 7 or 8 pm would be useful as I would suggest that the church would cast a significant shadow at this time of day, significantly more than the proposed development. I am satisfied that overbearing rather than overshadowing will be the greater concern, though there is no doubt that the development will increase the overshadowing on no. 42 Bird Avenue. The submitted eastern elevations clearly indicate the impact on no. 42 and the bulk of the building will be overbearing especially when viewed from the rear garden of this property. This would give rise to a significant loss of residential amenity for the residents of no. 42.

7.5.3. As already addressed in this report, the applicant has attempted to overcome concerns regarding overlooking by the careful placement of windows, with none in the eastern elevation, upper floors. The location of the private amenity space has been carefully considered and should not give rise to overlooking. The communal area on the second floor is sufficiently set back from the adjacent boundaries as to address issues of overlooking. I do not foresee a significant loss of amenity from the residents of The Maples who live to the north of the subject site as separation distances address issues of overlooking, though the issue of overbearing is also a concern on this side of the site.

7.5.4. The issue of quality of amenity space was raised by the Planning Authority. All units have adequate private amenity space in accordance with Appendix 1 of the apartment guidelines. The location of some of these may not be optimal for future occupants but in general they are acceptable. I agree with the Planning Authority that the communal open space is not of a high quality. There appears to be very little separation between the rear windows of Apartment 03 facing north east and the adjoining communal open space. This may give rise to issues of privacy for the occupants of this unit. The narrowness of this space to the north east and its orientation will cause it to be under shadow for much of the day thereby reducing its usability. The roof level/ second floor communal space may also suffer from overshadowing. Once again, I appreciate the difficulty of providing for necessary open space at a suitable quantity/ quality on such a site, however that is an issue of design and the need to work within the statutory requirements. Some of the open

space may therefore need to be excluded from the calculations due to its poor quality/ lack of usability by future residents and which gives rise to a deficiency in the quantity of open space to be provided.

7.6. Density

- 7.6.1. There is a conflict of opinion here regarding the acceptability of the proposed density of development. The applicant considers the density to be acceptable at 67 units per hectare as this is an infill site in an urban area within walking distance of the Luas stops at Windy Arbour and Milltown on the Green Line. The Observers generally disagree and consider the density to be excessive in this location dominated by two-storey semi-detached houses.
- 7.6.2. The density is somewhat exaggerated as the site is very small at 0.09 hectares and even one house gives a density of 11 units per hectare. I would caution the proximity of the Luas stops which I measure at just over 1 km away and not on direct routes, however they are within easy cycling distance and there is a reasonable bus service in the area. I would not therefore be concerned about the density of development which can be misleading for some and I have placed a greater emphasis on impact on residential amenity in this case. It may be possible to provide a development on this site with an even higher density but which does not negatively impact on the established visual and residential amenity of the area.

7.7. Traffic and Access

- 7.7.1. The revisions to the parking and access layout submitted in support of the appeal are acceptable to the Planning Authority and I also consider them to be acceptable. The existing footpath to the front of Rose Cottage creates a pinch-point on an otherwise wide footpath, so the proposed set back of the boundary to allow for an improved footpath is to be welcomed.
- 7.7.2. The provision of six car parking spaces is appropriate for this development. A reduced number of car parking will encourage the take-up of more sustainable forms of transport, which are available in the area. Adequate bicycle parking is provided on site to serve the residents. I note the provision of on-street parking in the area even though most houses have adequate in-curtilage parking.

7.7.3. I do not foresee any traffic safety issues arising from the proposed means of vehicular access, as revised in support of the appeal. The scale of development is such that I do not foresee any issues of traffic congestion arising from the development.

7.8. Other Issues

7.8.1. A number of issues were raised by the Observers and I will comment on some of these where relevant to planning. I appreciate the importance of the adjacent church and the fact that it is a protected structure, however as already mentioned the church is a unique structure that sets its own character and the development as proposed does not impact on it. The use of a red/ brown brick would be appropriate in the finish of any development on this site.

7.8.2. The relocation of utility poles/ boxes to the front of the site should be achievable to the satisfaction of all. The submitted Conservation Impact Assessment did not find the house to be worthy of retention and recommends that the railings be reused. I note the findings of this report and whilst it should be possible to redevelop the house, retaining much of its character, this is not the only option for the development of this site in an efficient manner.

7.9. Appropriate Assessment Screening

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

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend that permission be refused for the development for the following reasons and considerations as set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the location of the site on Bird Avenue and to the existing established character of two-storey, semi-detached houses, it is considered that the

proposed development, consisting of a three storey apartment block with plant room above, would be incongruous in terms of design, would be out of character with the streetscape and would set an undesirable precedent for future development in this area. The design is not considered to justify the demolition of the existing structures on the site. The proposed development would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would be contrary to the stated policy of the planning authority, as set out in the current County Development Plan, in relation to urban development and urban renewal and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The proposed development, by reason of its inadequate qualitative and quantitative provision of communal open space, would conflict with the provisions of the current Development Plan for the area and with the minimum standards recommended in the "Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas: Guidelines for Planning Authorities" published by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in December, 2008 and would constitute an unacceptable level of development on this restricted site. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. Having regard to the pattern of development in the area and the scale of development proposed, it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its scale, bulk and proximity to site boundaries, would seriously injure the residential amenities and depreciate the value of adjoining properties by reason of visual obstruction and overbearing. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Paul O'Brien
Planning Inspector

8th June 2020