



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-308458-20

Development	Demolition of garage and construction of a two-storey dwelling in the side garden of an existing dwelling.
Location	124 Templeville Drive, Templeogue, Dublin 6W.
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD20A/0191
Applicant(s)	Rachel Coleman
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Rachel Coleman
Observer(s)	(1) Lar Keogh (2) Paul & Áine McLaughlin (3) Mr. & Mrs Anthony Holden
Date of Site Inspection	9 th December 2020
Inspector	Fergal Ó Bric.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site has a stated area of 0.078 hectares, is within the curtilage of number 124, Templeville Drive Dublin 6W, a detached dormer dwelling house with a single-storey kitchen/living room extension to the side and rear on a corner site. The site is located on the northern side of Templeville Drive. The front door of the dwelling is on the eastern gable (side) of the dwelling. There is on-site parking to the eastern side of the site, with sufficient space to park two cars. The site slopes gradually downhill from west to east.
- 1.2. To the west of the site is number 124, Templeville Drive (parental home), to the north is the rear private amenity space associated with number 124, to the east and south is the local service road serving the Templeville Drive residential development. The roadside boundary comprises a wall at a height of approximately 1.2 metres, to the east is a walled boundary with a height of approximately two metres. The boundaries within the rear garden space comprise walls, at a height of approximately 1.8 metres.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought to construct a dormer dwelling house, (one hundred and one square metres, sq. m.), the roadside (front) elevation being consistent in design and height to number 124. Within the rear roof slope, a contemporary style box projection feature is proposed. A box dormer feature is also proposed within the front roof slope, consistent with the design of the dwellings further west along Templeville Drive. The dwelling would have a maximum ridge height of 7.5 metres. A render external finish is proposed and slate for the roof element. The house would be located in the side garden of an existing dormer detached dwelling house and would require the demolition of an existing single storey domestic garage (64 sq. m.), together with the provision of a new shared vehicular entrance arrangement for the proposed and existing house. It is proposed to connect to the public water supply and to public foul sewer. Surface water is to be discharged to a soakaway.
- 2.2. The appellants submitted a number of accompanying reports as part of the planning documentation including an access, sightline and parking report incorporating auto-track analysis drawings, a planning report, **a sustainability report, a daylight report** and an engineering services report.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. By Order dated 22nd September 2020, South Dublin County Council (SDCC) issued a Notification of decision to refuse planning permission for four reasons, which can be summarised as follows-

1. The proposed dwelling, by reason of its scale, layout and proximity to the existing dwelling and proposed dwelling to the north would result in an overbearing and cramped feature that would detract from the established pattern of development in the area, would be contrary to the RES zoning objective, the Development Plan and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. By virtue of the proximity of the proposals to the proposed property to the north, would result in a material loss of light, overshadowing and unacceptable sense of enclosure to the detriment of the amenity of future occupants would be contrary to the RES zoning objective, the Development Plan and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. Having regard to the inappropriate combined vehicular access and the inadequate space to park and manoeuvre vehicles safely within the application site, the development would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and obstruction of road users.
4. The Planning Authority is not satisfied that the development could be implemented successfully given the overlapping redline application site boundaries between the current application and the concurrent planning application to the north and the fact that the redline boundary contains land outside of the applicant's ownership.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Surface Water Drainage: No objections, subject to conditions.

Parks Department: No objection, subject to conditions.

Roads Department: Refusal recommended.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Irish Water: No objections, subject to conditions.

4.0 Planning History

Within curtilage of 124 Templeville Drive:

Planning reference number SD20A/0190, in 2020, concurrent planning application for development within the rear garden space of number 124 Templeville Drive. The development would comprise a three bedroomed detached dwelling, new vehicular access, two off street car parking spaces, diversion of surface water drains and associated site works. Also, the re-modelling of the existing dwelling from a three bedroom to a two-bedroom house and reduction in dwelling size from 145 sq. m to 122 sq. m. This application was refused planning permission by the Local authority and is presently under appeal to the Board under reference number ABP 308456-20.

Planning reference number SD19A/0093, In 2019, planning permission was refused for the re-modelling of the existing dwelling from a three bedroom to a two-bedroom dwelling, to demolish existing garage and construction of a two storey three bedroomed dwelling to the rear of the site, new vehicular access from the side road, two off-street parking spaces and associated site works. Three reasons for refusal can be summarised as follows: Proximity to of development to surface water sewer and would therefore, be prejudicial to public health; Inadequate sightlines and would be harmful to residential amenities and establish an undesirable precedent.

Planning reference number SD18A/0311, In 2018, planning permission was refused for the re-modelling of the existing dwelling from a three bedroom to a two-bedroom house, to demolish existing garage and construction of a two storey two bedroomed dwelling to the side, reinstatement of front gate and on-site parking, construction of a two-storey three bedroomed dwelling to the rear of the site, new vehicular access from the side road, two off-street parking spaces and associated site works. Three reasons for refusal can be summarised as follows: scale and layout would represent an overdevelopment of the site and piecemeal development which would be out of character with the pattern of development in the area. The proposals would be

injurious to residential amenity, fail to respect the building line and be contrary to section 11.3.2 of the Development Plan and contravene the RES zoning objective of the site: Unsatisfactory foul water, water supply and surface water arrangements and undesirable precedent and be harmful to residential amenities in the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

The relevant document is the South Dublin County Development Plan 2016-2022. The site is zoned RES where the objective is: To protect and/or improve residential amenity. Section 11.3.2 (ii) of the Plan pertains to infill/garden sites, and states-

- The site should be of sufficient size to accommodate an additional dwelling(s) and an appropriate set back should be maintained from adjacent dwellings.
- The dwelling(s) should generally be designed and sited to match the building line and respond to the roof profile of adjoining dwellings.
- The architectural language of the development (including boundary treatments) should respond to the character of adjacent dwellings and create a sense of harmony. Contemporary and innovative proposals that respond to the local context are encouraged, particularly on larger sites which can accommodate multiple dwellings.
- Where proposed buildings project forward of the prevailing building line or height, transitional elements should be incorporated into the design to promote a sense of integration with adjoining buildings.
- Corner development should provide a dual frontage in order to avoid blank facades and maximise surveillance of the public domain.

Chapter 2, Housing Policy H17-Rsidential consolidation where the policy is: To support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification at appropriate locations, to support ongoing viability of social and physical infrastructure and services and meet the future housing needs of the County.

Section 11.4.2 Car Parking Standards

Table 11.24 Maximum Parking standards (Residential development)

Section 11.4.4- Car Parking Design & Layout

5.2 Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1 Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal by Manahan Town Planning Consultants on behalf of Rachel Coleman, was received by An Bord Pleanála on 19th day of October 2020, and can be summarised as follows:

Principle of Development:

- The principle of development would be acceptable as per the RES zoning objective and in terms of supporting the densification of the suburbs in built-up areas where services and public transport is available.
- The proposals comply with the provisions of Section 11.3.2 of the Development Plan regarding infill development.
- Complies with specific policy H17 of the Development Plan.

Other Issues:

- The proposal would allow Rachel Coleman, daughter of the owners of number 124 to construct a dwelling in the side garden, and for her parents to move into a new dwelling in the rear garden space and for the existing parental home to be disposed of.
- There is no difficulty in implementing both permissions, if granted.
- The planner seems to be mixing up issues pertaining to the dwelling in the rear garden with that of the dwelling in the side garden with regard to overbearing.

- The proposals would not constitute backland development.
- The issue of surface water has been addressed by the appellants Consultant Engineers and the Local Authority Drainage Engineers have raised no objections in relation to this matter.

Access and Parking:

- A copy of an e-mail from the SDCC Roads Department to NRB Consultant Engineers states that the issues raised in the previous outline planning application, Planning Authority reference number SD19A/0193 have been overcome.
- The proposal allows cars to turn and manoeuvre on-site, rather than the drive-in and reverse out or reverse in and drive out scenario, that prevails within most of the neighbouring properties.
- The Report from the Roads Department has not been made available to the appellant, despite several attempts to gain a copy of the document.
- Three car parking spaces are provided for the two dwellings houses, both of two bedrooms, in compliance with Development Plan standards of 1.5 space per two-bedroom dwelling.
- The traffic flow on Templeville Drive is very low and the estate is subject to a 30 kilometre per hour speed control zone.
- The entrance width is in accordance with DoELG document - Recommendations for Site Development works for Housing Areas, where minimum driveways widths of three metres are recommended and also in accordance with the TII Design Guidance document in terms of visibility from a domestic entrance point.

Design and Layout:

- All relevant house design standards in accordance with the Development Plan are achieved.

- The design is respectful of the character of the area, with the eastern (side) gable elevation providing a more contemporary approach, which is provided for within the Development Plan.
- The established building line would be respected, the house type would be consistent with adjoining house types, it provides for off-street parking and private rear amenity space, consistent with the pattern of development in the area.
- The dwelling has been specifically designed to ensure that no overlooking or overshadowing would arise from the development.
- The house has been designed in order to achieve optimal levels of sustainability, with an A2 BER energy rating to be achieved in the new build.
- The site is sufficiently large to accommodate an additional house.

Residential Amenity:

- The Planning Officer considered that a vantage point from the proposed first floor eastern gable window would overlook the rear amenity space of number 122A, however this could be overcome with the insertion of obscured glazing.
- Adequate private rear amenity space would be provided for the proposed and existing dwelling in accordance with Development Plan standards.
- The specific design would ensure that no additional overlooking would arise over and above that which exists already.

6.2 Planning Authority Response

Response received outlining the following:

- The Planning Authority confirms its decision,
- The issues raised within the appeal have been covered in the planner's report.

6.3 Third Party Observation

Three third-party observations were received from neighbouring residents, who reside at number 122A, 126 and 128 Templeville Drive, to the east and west of the appeal site, and can be summarised as follows:

Design and Layout:

- The proposals represent an over-development of the site, the development of a single house within the curtilage of number 124 or as a pair of semi-detached dwellings would be acceptable in principle.
- The precedent of developing a residential property has also been established in the area, at number 122A, Templeville Drive.
- The scale of the overdevelopment of the existing residential property must be put in the context of the pattern of development in the local area
- The area consists of traditional vernacular dwellings set out in a back-to-back configuration with a minimum of 22 metre separation distances. The dwellings respect the established building line, and the front dormers provide a single aspect within the front roof slope overlooking the internal service road only.
- The proximity of the proposed dwelling at less than 1 metre from the eastern gable of number 124 would block daylight into bedroom number 2 of the existing dwelling.
- Overlooking of the property at 122A, Templeville Drive would arise from the first-floor bedroom window,
- No combined/overall site plan showing the full extent of the proposed two dwellings within the curtilage of number 124, has been submitted.
- No contiguous elevations showing both of the proposed dwellings in their context have been submitted.
- The appellants have offered no material revisions to their proposals as part of their appeal submission.

- The principle of the dwelling in the side garden replacing the existing domestic garage and respecting the established pattern of back-to-back development is acceptable.
- No precedent exists in this area, whereby two dwellings have been developed in side/rear gardens of one existing dwelling.
- There are a number of examples in the vicinity of the appeal site where one additional dwelling has been developed in side gardens on Templeville Road, to the west or Cypress Grove Road to the east.
- Proposals are contrary to section 2.3.1 of the Development Plan, regarding Residential Design and Layout. The proposals would substantially modify the character and pattern of development in the area.
- Proposals are contrary to section 2.4.0 of the Development Plan, regarding Residential infill, subdivision and corner sites, and has been refused previously by SDCC, for an almost identical development in 2019.
- The cumulative proposals on site represent overdevelopment and fail to adhere to the standards set out in Section 11.3.2 of the Development Plan, which sets out the criteria for corner/infill sites.
- For the dwelling in the side garden to be acceptable, it would need to be presented as a single side garden element similar to that at number 122A on the opposite (eastern) side of the internal link road, with a full-length rear garden and not a cramped garden
- The design of the side garden dwelling should be revised whereby the first-floor bedroom window on the side (eastern) elevation at first floor level should be omitted, as there is a rear (north) facing window which would provide adequate illumination to that bedroom space. The side window would overlook the property at number 122A.
- Window fins would not prevent overlooking, their purpose is to manage the quantum of sunlight received in a room.

Residential Amenity:

- The private open space proposed to serve the dwelling is substandard at 48 sq. m., less than the recommended standard of 55 sq. m. as set out within the Development Plan, and would be severely impacted upon by the proposed dwelling in the rear garden space.
- The proximity of the dwelling to the existing house would create an overbearing aspect and overshadowing of the existing house and rear amenity space, by virtue of the proximity of the proposal to the existing property.
- Proposals would be contrary to Section 5.9.1 of the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban areas, DoEHLG 2009 where the need to protect the amenities of directly adjoining neighbours and the general character of the area and its amenities, should be considered when assessing development proposals
- Proposals are injurious to the built form, scale, character and residential amenity of Templeville Drive.
- The proposals fail to protect the residential amenity of adjoining residential properties and would be contrary to the zoning objective of the area.

Other Issues:

- Planning permission pertains to the site and the occupation of an appellant has no relevance to the appeal process.
- The house refused permission under planning Authority reference number SD19A/0193 is the exact same as that sought under SD20/0191, both within three metres of the 225mm surface water sewer, yet the subsequent application was not refused on grounds of impacting upon the maintenance of the sewer line, yet this was used as a refusal reason in the 2019 application. The 2019 reason for refusal remains relevant if no material changes in circumstances have occurred.

- The diversion of the foul sewer into a dysfunctional sewer on the main road which has been prone to blockages is contrary to the protection of public health.
- The proposals to outfall to the public surface water sewer which is deficient in capacity is likely to increase the risk of flooding locally.
- The communication between the road's engineers and SDCC did not form part of the formal pre-planning discussions.
- The proposed house fails to meet the safeguards and standards as set out in Chapter 11 of the Development Plan, regarding Development Management standards.
- There have been previous refusals of planning permission by SDCC to develop houses within the curtilage of number 124, Templeville Drive.
- There is an overlap of the redline application site boundary between the two concurrent appeals within the curtilage of number 124, and this raises concerns regarding the implementation of both permissions, if permitted.
- Each planning application should include a combined layout for the concurrent planning applications.
- The appellant's quotation from a historical planning report is not relevant in this instance as there are material differences between the two historical proposals and the current proposal.
- If number 124 is to be disposed of, as set out within the appeal submission, it could lead to issues over the ownership of the parking and access to number 124 and the dwelling in the side garden.
- The previous reasons for refusal as set out by the Planning Authority should be upheld by the Board.
- The proposals would result in a devaluation of neighbouring residential properties.
- The proposals are contrary to policy objective H17 of the Development Plan and also to the underlying RES zoning objective, by reason of its scale, layout and proximity to the existing dwelling.

- The development at number 122A permitted by the Board under planning reference number PL065.216924 was for the development of a 90 sq. m dwelling on a site area of 352 sq. m, as opposed to the current proposals for a 101 sq. m dwelling on a modest side garden plot.
- The proposed development would cause increased traffic congestion during construction, with concrete, and block deliveries as well as other building material deliveries and a construction management plan would be required to be developed for any construction phases.
- Noise, dust and vibration impacts would need to be mitigated and construction working hours should not commence before 8am.
- Planning permission pertains to the site and the occupation of an appellant has no relevance to the appeal process.

Access & Parking:

- Car access to the site must be made safe for pedestrians and children walking to the two local primary schools.
- The practicality and functionality of the combined entrance and parking area and the ability of vehicles to manoeuvre safely on site and not impact upon pedestrians is questionable.
- The parking for the three cars would result in the entire front garden area being turned into a parking lot.

7.0 Assessment

7.1 General Comment

The principle of erecting a house in the side garden of number 124 Templeville Drive is not at issue in this instance, rather the positioning of the house, its design and layout, impact upon neighbouring residential properties and access and parking. The following are therefore considered to be the principal planning issues that arise from the appeal and observer submissions:

- Principle of Development
- Layout and Design
- Residential Amenity
- Access & Parking
- Other issues
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2 Principle of Development

7.2.1 The site is zoned RES as per the Development Plan where the zoning objective to: To protect and/or improve residential amenity. Therefore, the principle of the development would be acceptable subject to an appropriate design and layout being presented, that the residential amenity of neighbouring properties is respected, and that suitable access and parking proposals are presented. These matters will be addressed in detail below.

7.3 Layout & Design

- 7.3.1 I would see no difficulty with the principle of siting of a dwelling house within the curtilage of number 124, Templeville Drive. The front elevation design proposed is two-storey (dormer), consistent with the design of number 124 and the dwellings further west. The width of the dwelling and set back from the edge of the public carriageway, would be consistent with the dwelling widths and set backs of the neighbouring dwellings to the west. A separation of 0.85 metres from the eastern gable of number 124, Templeville Drive, to the west is proposed. The proposed dwelling would be 0.96 metres from the from the existing eastern boundary wall.
- 7.3.2 The site narrows towards the road frontage to a width of approximately 7.5 metres, and therefore, careful consideration would be required in terms of the design, layout, bulk and scale having regard to the challenging site configuration. Therefore, a bespoke design solution would be required, which would respect the established character of the streetscape, and at the same time respect the amenities of the neighbouring residential properties. The design as presented, represents a

traditional design to the front (streetscape) elevation and a more bespoke design to the rear elevation. Contemporary designs are provided for within Section 11.3.2 (ii) of the Plan for infill/garden sites. Section 11.3.2(ii) sets out that the design and siting should respond to the roof profile of adjoining dwellings. The design as presented is considered acceptable and is cognisant of the character of the area.

7.3.3 Contiguous elevations have been submitted by the appellants, which confirm the suitability of the design proposals, when considered within the context of the established streetscape. Another of the requirements set out with Section 11.3.2(ii) is that the architectural language of the development should respond to the character of adjacent dwellings and create a sense of harmony. The floor area of the proposed house is 101 sq. m. The proposed house would be constructed in close proximity to the western boundaries – leaving a narrow passage(0.86 metres) to the west. The two-storey dwelling would have a maximum height of approximately 7.6 metres, consistent with the ridge heights of the neighbouring residential properties.

7.3.4 Overall, in its current form, it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its design, massing, scale and height would not have an adverse impact upon the visual amenity of the area.

7.4 Residential Amenity

7.4.1 Although the design of the proposal is considered acceptable, the impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring residential properties is another matter for consideration. Given the scale, massing and height of the proposed dwelling in proximity to number 124, to its west, the impact in terms of loss of light and overshadowing should be considered.

7.4.2 I note the applicant submitted a contextual elevation as part of the planning documentation. This illustrates that the proposed dwelling is located in close proximity to the western gable of number 124, being only separated by 0.86 metres. The western gable of number 124 includes the main front door access to the house and a dining room window at ground floor level, a landing window and a window serving bedroom number two. There are no other windows providing illumination to these rooms. It is considered that the proposed two-storey dwelling, in such close proximity to the existing two storey dwelling, would compromise the daylight afforded

to a number of habitable rooms and to the main access door and hallway. The design of the proposed dwelling has been modified to the rear, to include a boxed roofed projection feature, within the rear roof slope which would assist in reducing the loss of light to the single -storey rear kitchen extension of number 124.

7.4.3 No daylight/sunlight analysis has been submitted by the appellants in support of their proposals. At present, the eastern elevation of number 124 would benefit from morning sun and sunlight up to the early afternoon and with the construction of the new dwelling, this sunlight would be diminished. This would directly impact upon the main front door access, hallway and dining room and bedroom number two at first floor level. From the existing floor plans of number 124 submitted (drawing number 743-100) the effected windows appear to be the only sources of illumination for those rooms. Having reviewed the documentation submitted, I consider that the proposals would have an adverse impact upon the residential amenities of the neighbouring property to the west by reason of overshadowing and loss of light. It is therefore, considered, that due to the orientation of the appeal site, the height and scale of the proposed dwelling and the proximity to the existing dwelling, that the proposals would unduly impact upon the residential amenities of the neighbouring property to the west by virtue of overshadowing and loss of light.

7.4.4 In term of overlooking, it is noted that the appellants would have a large bedroom window serving a bedroom at first floor level on the rear and side elevations, to the north and east. Within an urban environment, an element of overlooking is inevitable. The question is whether the extent of overlooking would unduly impact upon neighbouring amenities. However, given, the separation distances, from the nearest part of the dwelling to its east, would be approximately 13 metres, and separated by two-metre-high boundary walls, a local service road and footpaths on either side of same, I am satisfied that the proposals would not result in undue overlooking of the neighbouring residential properties.

7.4.5 Section 11.3.1 (iv) pertains to development standards for dwellings. The minimum floor area for a two bedroomed dwelling is 80 sq. m, which the current proposals exceed. The minimum private open space area for a two bedroomed dwelling is 55 sq. m. As per the Site Layout Plan submitted, the private rear garden space is stated to be 60 sq. m. However, on closer scrutiny, it is apparent that a private rear amenity space of approximately 47 sq. m. is provided for. The Development Plan sets out the

following in terms of compliance with private open space standards: Development proposals for housing must be required to accord with or exceed the minimum private open space standards set out in Table 11.20. Open space should be located behind the front building line of the house and be designed to provide for adequate private amenity. It is apparent that the quantity of private open space fails to meet the required standards, and this quantity of space could not be increased in this instance, having regard to the proposals contained within the concurrent planning appeal, within the curtilage of number 124, under An Bord Pleanála reference number 308456-20, currently under consideration by the Board.

7,4,6 Overall, in its current form, it is considered that the proposed development would have an adverse impact upon neighbouring residential amenities by reason of loss of light and overshadowing and would diminish the residential amenity of the residents within number 124, to the west, so as to warrant a refusal of permission. It is considered that the proposed development, in conjunction with the proposed development north of the site, within the curtilage of number 124 Templeville Drive, by reason of the scale and layout would seriously injure the future residential amenities of the occupants of the proposed dwelling, by virtue of the inadequate quantity and quality of private rear amenity space and would, therefore, be contrary to the underlying RES zoning objective and with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7.5 Access and Parking

7.5.1 Two of the refusal reasons set out by the Planning Authority related to parking and access proposals. In relation to the parking, three on site car parking spaces are proposed to serve number 124 and the proposed dwellings. Under the proposals, both dwellings would provide for two bedrooms and the car parking standard as set out within the Development Plan is 1.5 spaces per two bedroomed dwelling. The quantity of on -site parking proposed is considered acceptable and in accordance with the Development Plan standards. It is also noted that there are a number of bus stops (numbers 2401 and 2402, route 54A), north of the site, along Templeville Road, within 500 metres of the site. An auto-track analysis has also been submitted demonstrating that there is adequate space on site to manoeuvre and turn cars on site even when three cars would be parked within the site curtilage. I am satisfied

that adequate parking provision and internal manoeuvre space has been provided as per the planning documentation submitted.

7.5.2 In terms of the entrance width proposed at four metres, this width is considered adequate to serve the existing and proposed dwelling. The existing front boundary wall is approximately 0.6 metres in height. I am satisfied that the access proposals would accord with best practice in terms of road safety and access onto the internal service road, which would not be compromised by traffic accessing/egressing from the proposed shared domestic entrance point.

7.6 Other Issues

7.6.1 It is noted that the red line application site boundary includes the front garden area of number 124 (the parental dwelling of the applicant) and a letter of consent from the appellant's parents has been submitted consenting to the making of the application. However, given that the main front door access to number 124 is on the eastern (side) gable of their dwelling, one would be stepping into the boundary of the proposed dwelling once they would exit their front door. This would create a less than satisfactory situation for the residents of number 124 and for the future residents of the proposed dwelling in terms of ownership and maintenance of the narrow pathway that would be created between the two properties.

7.6.2 From the planning history of number 124, it is noted that previous planning applications were submitted seeking the construction of two additional dwellings within the curtilage of number 124. The current proposal involved the lodging of separate but concurrent planning applications for the development of two dwelling units within the curtilage of number 124. However, given that there is overlapping of the red line application site boundaries and some inconsistencies between the proposals, particularly in relation to the proposals for the existing single storey rear extension to number 124, which appears to remain under the current proposal, and

to be demolished under appeal reference number, 308456-20, greater clarity and consistency of approach would be of benefit.

7.6 Appropriate Assessment

- 7.6.1 Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the distance from 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

I recommend that planning permission be refused for the following reasons.

- 1 Having regard to the location of the site to the side of an existing dwelling in close proximity to an existing dwelling to its west, it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of the scale, bulk and height of the two-storey elements would seriously injure the residential amenities of property in the area by reason of loss of light and overshadowing and would, therefore, be contrary to the underlying land use zoning objective and with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 2 Having regard to the restricted nature of this corner site and the established pattern of development in the surrounding neighbourhood, it is considered that the proposed development by reason of its scale, form and layout would constitute overdevelopment of a limited site area, would result in an inadequate quantity and quality of private amenity space and would be out of character with development in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, seriously injure the amenities of future residents and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Fergal O'Bric,
Planning Inspectorate.

10th January 2021