



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-307640-20

Development	13 No. new dwellings and all associated site development works together with new access road and entrance off Sydenham Road, and a new house fronting onto Kilmacud Road Upper.
Location	Annefield (Protected Structure) and St. Anne's, Dundrum, Dublin 14.
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D20A/0189
Applicant(s)	Cormal Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	1. Marie Coyle and Ian MacNeil 2. An Taisce 3. Nick and Jean Durham

Observer(s)

1. Barry and Anne Denton
2. Tom and Francey Slowey
3. Transport Infrastructure Ireland
4. Eanna and Fiona Lalor
5. Pa and Sheila Nolan
6. Angela Cumass

Date of Site Inspection

26th of March 2021

Inspector

Emer Doyle

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site of the proposed development is located c. 150m to the east of the Main Street in Dundrum, Dublin 14. Dundrum Town Centre is situated 150m to the south-west on Sandyford Road. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of residential, educational, office and commercial uses. The Dundrum Luas station is located 430m walking distance from the site.
- 1.2. The site has a stated area of 0.72 hectares. The site has a frontage of c.9m along Kilmacud Road Upper. The Luas line runs along the western site boundary. Taney Lawns, a development of 12 No. bungalows is located to the north-western boundary.
- 1.3. The site contains 'Annefield' which is a Protected Structure. Annefield is a two storey over basement double fronted dwelling which dates to the late Victorian era c. 1860. The vehicular access is via a 120m long and narrow driveway off Taney Road. The site contains a significant number of mature trees located along the site boundaries and also interspersed on the lawn of the property.
- 1.4. 'St. Anne's' at No. 6 Sydenham Road comprises of a two storey detached dwelling and its associated front and rear gardens form the eastern section of the site. Properties to the north of 'St. Anne's' form part of the Sydenham Road ACA. Residential properties along Sydenham Road adjoin the eastern boundary and a section of the northern boundary. Sydenham Road Dundrum College, Adult Education Centre is located along the south-eastern boundary of the site.
- 1.5. At the south-western corner of the site, a footpath provides access to 'Annefield' from Kilmacud Road Upper. Sydenham Place, comprising 2 No. two storey semi-detached properties and 2 No. semi-detached single storey properties adjoins the southern site boundary.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the construction of a residential scheme comprising 13 No. houses and all associated site works on lands at Annefield (A protected Structure).
- 2.2. The main elements of the scheme are as follows:

- Replacement House at St. Anne's and new entrance off Sydenham Road.
- The development will comprise of a mixture of house types as follows:
 - House No. 1 (adjacent to proposed access and Sydenham Road ACA) 3 storey replacement house with 5 No. bedrooms.
 - House No. 2 (Kilmacud Road Upper) 2 storey house with 3 No. bedrooms.
 - House Nos. 3, 4, 5 – 2 storey with 3 No. bedrooms.
 - House No. 6- 2 storey with 2 No. bedrooms.
 - House Nos. 7,8, 9 – 2/3 storey with 3 No. bedrooms plus study.
 - House Nos. 10, 11 – 4 bedroom plus study (195 sq. m)
 - House Nos. 12, 13 – 4 bedroom plus study (215 sq. m)
- The works will include the creation of a new central landscaped area with a new stone boundary redefining the curtilage of Annefield House.

2.3. The application was accompanied by the following:

- Design Statement
- Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment
- Planning Report
- Shadow Study Report
- Construction Management Plan
- Noise Report in relation to Luas line
- Lighting Report
- Drainage details and calculations

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was granted subject to 20 No. Conditions.

Noteworthy conditions include the following:

Condition 7 required a revised site layout to be submitted prior to commencement of development showing all footpaths increased in width to 1.8m.

Conditions 10, 11, 12 and 13 required the applicant to carry out a landscaping scheme, employ a qualified arborist for the entire construction period, submit a post construction arboricultural assessment report and certificate together with a post construction condition assessment of all retained trees and a completion certificate that all permitted works were in line with the recommendations of the tree report.

All other conditions are of a standard nature.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- Considers that the density is appropriate for the site and the proposed access from Sydenham Road is the most appropriate as it facilitates the retention of the existing avenue serving Annefield. Considered that the applicant had made positive revisions to the design and layout together with the visual relationship with the Protected Structure.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Conservation Officer- considers that improvements have been made to previous scheme including increased open space, increased separation distance to protected structure, together with improved architectural design. Still of the opinion that houses 10 to 13, immediately opposite the protected structure will create a 'wall' of development when viewed from the front of the 'protected structure'.

Transportation Planning – Notes that the proposed vehicular and pedestrian access to Sydenham Road is the preferred option in terms of traffic impacts on the surrounding roads. Further Information required in relation to a number of matters.

Park and Landscape Section: Concern expressed in relation to the loss of trees and further information required.

Drainage Section: No objection subject to conditions.

Housing Section: No objection subject to condition required the applicant to enter into an agreement in accordance with Part V of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended.

Environmental Health Officer Planning: Further Information required.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. **Irish Water** - No objection subject to conditions.

3.3.2. **Transport Infrastructure Ireland** - Acknowledges location in close proximity to Luas line and recommends permission subject to conditions.

3.3.3. **Inland Fisheries:** No objection subject to conditions.

3.3.4. **An Taisce:** Expresses concern regarding impact on ACA and Protected Structure.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. A total of 20 No. submissions were made to the Planning Authority. The issues raised are similar to those in the appeals and observations submitted to the Board.

4.0 Planning History

PA Reg. Ref. D18A/0631/ ABP 303365-19

Permission granted by the Planning Authority and refused on appeal by the Board for one reason relating to the design and impact of the proposed development on the

streetscape of Kilmacud Road Upper and on the architectural character and setting of Annefield and of the streetscape generally.

PA Reg. Ref. D15A/0679/ ABP PL06D.246069

Permission refused for the retention of Annefield as a single residential unit, construction of 10 no. houses, new boundary treatment and all associated works (protected structure RPS no. 1040). Permission was refused for the following reason;

Having regard to the design and layout of the proposal, to the proximity of the three-storey flat roofed houses Type A to the protected structure without any effort to form a transitional area between the flat-roofed modern design of these houses and the hipped roof of the protected structure, to the failure of the scheme to have its layout informed by the existing high quality trees on site which contribute to the quality and setting of the protected structure, including trees reference numbers 254, 257 and 209 as referred to in CMK drawing number 101 received by the planning authority on the 27th day of October, 2015, to the failure to protect trees on the approach avenue to the development, inter alia by narrowing the access way at certain points and providing passing bays, given that this avenue would have formed an important part of the setting of the protected structure, and to the proposal to form a passageway surrounded by high walls in the vicinity of proposed house number 04, which would damage the character of the pedestrian access way to the protected structure, the Board considered that the proposal would seriously injure the setting of a protected structure.

PA Reg. Ref. D14A/0855/ ABP PL06D.244653

Permission refused for the construction of 33 no. houses and retention of Annefield House (Protected Structure) for 2 No. reasons as follows:

1. Having regard to the design, bulk and proximity to neighbouring boundaries of the proposal, it is considered that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining dwellings and the Protected Structure 'Annefield', would give rise to overlooking and would be

overbearing and visually unacceptable. The proposed development would be contrary to the zoning of the site which is 'A' 'to protect and or improve residential amenity' and would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity. The proposed development, would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale, height and proximity, would materially affect the character, setting and amenity of the existing house 'Annefield', a Protected Structure, in particular by the absence of a meaningful and proportionate quantum of private open space to serve the house. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to Policies RES3 and DM4 of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2010-2016 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Project Ireland 2040 - National Planning Framework

- 5.1.1. The NPF includes a Chapter, No. 6 entitled 'People, Homes and Communities'. It sets out that place is intrinsic to achieving good quality of life.
- 5.1.2. 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".
- 5.1.3. National Policy Objective 35 seeks "to increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including restrictions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights".
- 5.1.4. National Planning Objective 13 also provides that "In urban areas, planning and related standards, including in particular height and car parking will be based on performance criteria that seek to achieve well-designed high quality outcomes in order to achieve targeted growth. These standards will be subject to a range of tolerance that enables alternative solutions to be proposed to achieve stated outcomes, provided public safety is not compromised and the environment is suitably protected".

5.2. Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

5.2.1. The following is a list of section 28 Ministerial Guidelines considered of relevance to the proposed development. Specific policies and objectives are referenced within the assessment where appropriate.

- 'Urban Development and Building Heights' Guidelines for Planning Authorities
- 'Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas' (including the associated 'Urban Design Manual')
- 'Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets' (DMURS)
- 'The Planning System and Flood Risk Management' (including the associated 'Technical Appendices')

5.3. Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, DoEHLG, 2011

5.3.1. Section 13.8 refers to Development affecting the Setting of a Protected Structure or an Architectural Conservation Area.

5.4. Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, 2016-2022

5.4.1. Land Use Zoning: The proposed development site is located in an area zoned as 'A' with the stated land use zoning objective 'To protect and-or improve residential amenity'.

5.4.2. Annefield is a Protected Structure (RPS No. 1040)

5.4.3. Nos. 1-6 Sydenham Road are also protected structures (Nos. 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1952, 1953)

- Policy AR 1 refers to Protected Structures
- It is Council policy to Protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.
- The site adjoins Sydenham Road Architectural Conservation Area.

5.4.4. Chapter 8- Principles of Development.

5.4.5. Section 8.2.3.4 (vii) refers to infill development

- New infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units. Infill development shall retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings.

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

5.5.1. The following Natura 2000 sites are located in the general vicinity of the proposed development site:

- The South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004024), approximately 3.8km north-east of the site.
- The South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 000210), approximately 3.8km north-east of the site.
- The Wicklow Mountains Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 002122), approximately 6.4km south-west of the site
- The Wicklow Mountains Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004040), approximately 6.6km south-west of the site.
- The Dalkey Islands Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004172), approximately 9.8km east of the site.
- The Rockabill to Dalkey Island Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 003000), approximately 10km east of the site.

5.6. EIA Screening

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

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. Third Party Appeals

6.1.2. The Board received third party appeals from the following; (1) Nick and Jean Durham (2) Marie Coyle and Ian MacNeil (3) An Taisce. The main issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Impact on Protected Structure.
- Impact on Architectural Conservation Area.
- Minimal changes from previous refusal by Board and revised application does not overcome the reason for refusal.
- Concern regarding loss of long existing pedestrian access from Upper Kilmacud Road.
- Impact on Residential Amenity.
- Concern regarding design and scale of scheme.
- Considered that Nos. 12 and 13 could be replaced with single storey dwellings.
- Neither the planner's report nor the report from the Conservation Officer address the detrimental impact on the character and setting of Sydenham Road.

6.2. Applicant Response

The response submitted on behalf of the applicant can be summarised as follows:

- Considerable thought went into overcoming the reasons for refusal and Cantrell and Crowley Architects, Paul Arnold, Conservation Architect Grade 1 and Conall Boland, planning consultant were retained from the conceptual stage to inform and advise throughout the design process.
- A direct response in relation to conservation matters by Paul Arnold, Conservation Architect is included in the response.

- The proposed scheme has been very carefully designed and it is not considered to impact negatively on either the protected structure or the ACA.
- Impacts on the residential amenity of adjacent houses are minimal.
- Roof areas to the bay windows of Nos. 12 and 13 are not a terrace and there is no access to same.
- The replacement of Nos. 12 and 13 with a single storey dwelling would result in an inconsistent design approach.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- The response from the planning authority refers to the previous planner's report. It is considered that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the Planning Authority would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

6.4. Observations

6.4.1. Observations to the appeal were submitted by the following (1) Transport Infrastructure Ireland (2) Barry and Anne Denton (3) Tom and Frances Slowey (4) Angela Cumass (5) Pa and Sheila Nolan (6) Eanna and Fiona Lalor

6.4.2. The main issues raised concern the following;

- Transport Infrastructure Ireland recommends a number of conditions to be included.
- The proposed development would have a significant effect on Annefield, Protected Structure and Sydenham Road ACA.
- Concern regarding traffic safety and use of Sydenham Road access.
- Concern regarding construction impacts.
- Concern that 0.8m gap between 1 Sydenham Place and proposed house No. 2 is insufficient.
- The access should be relocated so that it is at the site of House No. 1 and adjacent to Dundrum College.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having regard to the above, and having inspected the site and reviewed all documents on file, the following is my assessment of this case. Issues to be considered in the assessment of this case are as follows:

- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Impact on Protected Structure and Sydenham Road ACA
- Access and Traffic
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Impact on Residential Amenity

- 7.2.1. The main concerns raised regarding impact on residential amenities relate to distance between adjoining residences and the site, overshadowing and overlooking.
- 7.2.2. This is an infill site and there are residences adjoining the site on Sydenham Road, on Kilmacud Road Upper, and in the Taney Lawn housing development.
- 7.2.3. I consider that there is no direct overlooking between the proposed development and existing properties due to the layout of the properties and the distance from adjoining properties. I note that concern has been raised by adjoining residents regarding overlooking from flat roofs and potential use of same as a terrace and overlooking during maintenance.
- 7.2.4. The appeal response notes that the roof areas to the bay areas fronting Nos. 12 and 13 are not a terrace and there is no access to these areas. I consider that the houses have been designed to prevent overlooking and any maintenance necessary would be of short duration only and would not unduly detract from the residential amenities of the area.
- 7.2.5. I note that concern has been raised in relation to overshadowing impacts of House No. 13 on Nos. 7 and 8 Taney Lawn. There are a large number of very high cypress trees along the western boundary of the site adjacent to Taney Lawn. The appeal response states that ‘the shadow cast by the existing boundary trees along the

common boundary is significant compared to the result of the proposed development. There will be a substantial net gain in the light of the in the rear garden of No. 7 Taney Lawn which is currently cast in shadow by existing boundary trees. No. 8 Taney Lawn is orientated south west, at an oblique angle away from the proposed development...’.

7.2.6. I noted the presence of these trees c. 12m high on the site inspection and I am satisfied that their removal would impact positively on the adjoining houses in Taney Lawn.

7.2.7. I note that an observation has been submitted from No. 1 Sydenham Place (Kilmacud Road Upper) regarding the separation distance between her property and House No. 2 of 0.8m. Concern is expressed in relation to the narrowness of this gap in relation to maintenance of property in the future. I consider that whilst 0.8m is a restricted space, it is adequate for maintenance purposes and generally acceptable.

7.2.8. I consider that this is a difficult site to develop both due to the protected structure and proximity to an ACA, and in terms of proximity to residences. Nonetheless, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have an undue impact on the residential amenities of adjoining properties.

7.3. Impact on Protected Structure and Sydenham Road ACA

7.3.1. It is considered by the Planning Authority that the principle of development is acceptable and that the issues raised in the refusal by the Board have been addressed. The key changes identified by the Planning Authority report are as follows:

- Increased open space for the Protected Structure from 625 square metres to 700 square metres.
- Creation of central landscaped area to the front of the Protected Structure.
- Increased separation distance to the Protected Structure.
- Significant and positive architectural revisions to the design of the new dwellings.

- House No. 2 fronting onto Kilmacud Road to take the form of the adjoining terrace but designed in a contemporary style.

- 7.3.2. The report from the Conservation Section considers that 'for the most part, the revisions will help to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on the protected structure, however, I would still be of the opinion that Houses 10 to 13, immediately opposite the proposed structure will create a 'wall' of development when viewed from the protected structure.'
- 7.3.3. Under the County Development Plan, 'Annefield' is a protected structure (RPS No. 1040). Policy AR1 (iii) undertakes to ensure that proposals for such structures and their curtilages have regard to the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities. The site is located adjacent to the Sydenham Road Architectural Conservation Area. Policy AR12 (i) undertakes to protect the character and special interest of an area which has been designated as an ACA, (ii) ensure that all development proposals within an ACA are appropriate to the character of the area having regard to the Character Appraisals for each area, (iii) seek a high quality, sensitive design for any new development(s) that are complimentary and/or sympathetic to their context and scale, whilst simultaneously encouraging contemporary design.
- 7.3.4. The applicant has submitted an Architectural Heritage Assessment which concludes that the proposed development represents a very significant improvement on previous proposals in respect of the legibility of the setting of Annefield and by virtue of most houses addressing the garden/public open space, retains a sense of the significance of Annefield in the new setting.
- 7.3.5. In overall terms, I am of the view that the quality of the layout and architectural styles has been significantly improved from previous applications. However, I consider that the increase in open space provision and distance between the proposed houses and the protected structure will have little or no impact on the quality of the proposed development over the previous scheme refused by the Board. I note that the access road has been slightly repositioned to a straighter alignment and this has resulted in a larger open space and very minimal difference in the separation distance between the houses 1 to 4 in the previous application and houses 10 to 13 in the current application.

- 7.3.6. Whilst I note the reduction in height and the improvement in design of the houses facing the protected structure, I concur with the views of the Conservation Officer that the design of houses 10-13 would create a 'wall' of development when viewed from the protected structure. These houses are located directly opposite the protected structure and I have concerns that the design and scale proposed would detract from the setting and character of the protected structure.
- 7.3.7. Sydenham Road ACA adjoins the site and the current application proposes a revised design for the replacement house at St. Annes's, together with the insertion of the access road at this location. The revised house type is contemporary and of high quality in terms of the front elevation. However, taken together with the large opening required for access and the width, bulk, and scale of the side elevation, I consider that the proposed development will significantly detract from the ACA. I note that Nos. 1-6 Sydenham Road are all protected structures within the ACA. There has been new development on Sydenham Road in recent years, but it has been extremely discreet and sensitive to the ACA. I am of the view that the approach from the northerly direction from the Taney Road junction towards the site, is critically important having regard to the proximity to the protected structures and the ACA. I consider that the design and scale of the proposed development at this location would be overly prominent and visually obtrusive and would have a negative impact on the character and setting of the ACA.
- 7.3.8. I note that a number of the appeals and observations raise concerns both in relation to the design of House No. 2, and the loss of an existing pedestrian access which links Kilmacud Road Upper with Taney Road.
- 7.3.9. I note that the Conservation Assessment carried out by Paul Arnold Conservation Architect considers that the pedestrian path was excluded from the original development as follows: 'This confirms the curtilage as extending to the entirety of the subject site, excluding St. Anne's and excluding the south-trapezoidal portion which fronts onto Lower Kilmacud Road'. This contrasts with the Conservation Assessment that accompanied the 2015 application, D15/0679 by Mr. Rob Goodbody which recognised the spur as part of the curtilage of the protected structure as follows: 'The spur of land running from Kilmacud Road Upper seems to have been part of the property from the outset.'

- 7.3.10. I note that the path links Kilmacud Road Upper with Taney Road at present. Whilst there may be a difference of opinion between two conservation architects in terms of when the pathway dated to, the pathway has been there for a considerable period of time and is very valuable to the area. There is a huge range of facilities including two schools, Dundrum Village and Dundrum Town Centre in close proximity to the site and I consider that the loss of this pathway would be detrimental to the amenities of both the community of Dundrum and the intended occupants of the site. The existing access on Kilmacud Road Upper is located in close proximity to Dundrum Garda Station and there was no evidence of anti-social behaviour on the site inspection. I note that the appeal response states that this was never a formal pedestrian thoroughfare.
- 7.3.11. I consider that the retention of the pathway is critical to the scheme and in keeping with national and local policies in terms of both the provision and improvement of pedestrian links and sustainable development of the area. I am of the view that the House No. 2 could be redesigned to provide an element of passive surveillance of the pathway at this location. I note that the appeals and observations submitted are extremely supportive of the retention of this walkway and I consider that provided that the matter is properly and sensitively designed, this would be a huge planning gain for the area.
- 7.3.12. I am of the view that whilst there have been significant improvements to the proposed scheme from the previous scheme in terms of the design and layout, the reason for refusal has not been sufficiently addressed. The three main elements of concern in my view are the loss of the pedestrian access from Kilmacud Road Upper, the dominance of houses 10-13 when viewed from the protected structure, and the unforgiving combination of the proposed access and design of the proposed replacement house on Sydenham Road which in my view would overwhelm the approach from a northerly direction. This is the most important approach from a conservation viewpoint. There has been a very limited amount of development in this ACA and any new development has been extremely discreet and in keeping with the sensitive location. As such, I consider that the design approach proposed would seriously detract from the character and setting of Annfield and Sydenham Road ACA.

7.4. Access and Traffic

- 7.4.1. I note that significant concerns have been raised in the appeals and observations with regard to the access proposed from Sydenham Road. I note that the report from the Traffic Section states the following: The proposed vehicular and pedestrian access to Sydenham Road has been the preferred option in terms of traffic impacts on the surrounding roads and it is deemed appropriate in these circumstances.
- 7.4.2. The principle of the development has been accepted by all parties. I note that the existing access is on Taney Road. This is an attractive tree lined access to the protected structure and I am of the view that the use of this access would not be desirable from a conservation point of view.
- 7.4.3. I note that Sydenham Road is used as a bus route which causes congestion on the road. I also note that the road is used by a significant number of pedestrians due to the proximity to two schools.
- 7.4.4. Having regard to the nature of the development, an infill site in a serviced area, and the low number of new houses proposed, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard.
- 7.4.5. I note that concerns have been raised in relation to parking and access during the construction period. I note that a Construction Management Plan was submitted with the application which does not allow for parking of construction traffic on Sydenham Road and provides for parking and unloading within the curtilage of the site. Should the Board be minded to grant permission, this matter can be dealt with by way of a suitably worded condition.

7.5. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.5.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, an infill site in a serviced urban area, and its distance to the nearest European site, 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.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. Having regard to the foregoing I recommend refusal of permission as follows:

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the existing character and prevailing pattern of development, the site location in proximity to an Architectural Conservation Area and the presence of a Protected Structure, it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of overall design and layout and in particular the design of Houses 10-13, and the scale, design and bulk of House No. 1 and its impact on the streetscape at Sydenham Road, would seriously detract from the architectural character and setting of Annefield and of the streetscape generally. The proposed development would, therefore, seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Emer Doyle
Planning Inspector

29th March 2021