



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP – 308641 – 20

Development

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a two-storey flat roofed extension to an existing single storey dwelling together with all associated site development works.

Location

Cottage Lane, Sandy Lane, Blackrock, County Louth.

Planning Authority

Louth County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

20534.

Applicants

Luke and Caoimhe McCann.

Type of Application

Planning Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant with conditions.

Type of Appeal

Third Party.

Appellants

Patricia and Catherine White.

Observer(s)

None.

Date of Site Inspection

14th day of December, 2020.

Inspector

Patricia-Marie Young.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy & Context	5
5.1. Local Planning Provisions	5
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	7
6.0 The Appeal	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
6.2. Applicant Response	9
6.3. Planning Authority Response	9
7.0 Assessment	10
8.0 Recommendation.....	17
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The irregular shaped appeal site has a given site area of 0.0626ha and it is located on the western side of Cottage Lane, which is a restricted in width lane, c0.1km to the south of its junction with Sandy Lane. In addition, Cottage Lane is situated c0.2km to the west of Main Street, Blackrock, County Louth, as the bird would fly.
- 1.2. The site contains a modest in size vernacular semi-detached dwelling that has been extended in recent years to the rear. This dwelling's principal building line has a zero setback from Cottage Lane and the semi-detached pair it forms part of extends slightly out in an easterly direction narrowing the carriage width of Cottage Lane at this point. As such Cottage Lane's width at the point where it adjoins the subject property and the semi-detached pair it forms part of is at its most restricted. Cottage Lane ends c23.4meters to the south of the appeal site. At this end point there is a pedestrian access that opens immediately onto another cul-de-sac access road that forms part of 'Beech Park'. Beech Park is a residential development of modest in height single storey dwellings. Connection between the two is via a pedestrian link.
- 1.3. To the rear of the original dwelling there is a period stone and red brick single storey outbuilding. This building from its northern slope of its ridge lies within the boundaries of the site and appears to be in use for ancillary storage. The other half of the structure falls inside the boundary of the adjoining semi-detached pair property. Near the rear boundary of the site there is a detached timber single storey structure that has an appearance of a garden room.
- 1.4. To the north and south of the rear garden area there are detached backland dwellings. It would appear that the rear boundary between the adjoining such structure to the south has been recently removed and a porous wire mesh fence erected. An evergreen and porous in places mature hedge provides screening between the subject property and the adjoining property to the north. This natural screening runs alongside a window that forms part of the southern elevation of the adjoining property to the north that appears to be located either on or in close proximity to the site boundary. In addition, this boundary also includes a timber fence and the ground levels on this adjoining site are relatively higher than that of the appeal site. The rear boundary of the site adjoins a recreational space and consists of an evergreen hedge.

- 1.5. The site forms part of a mainly residentially developed suburban area that extends outwards in a westerly direction from Blackrock's Main Street. With the surrounding residential dwellings predominantly single storey structures in their overall built form.
- 1.6. Photographs taken during the site inspection are attached.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for a two-storey flat roofed extension with a given floor area of 110.3m² to an existing single storey dwelling with a given floor area of 74.1m² together with all associated site development works. The extended dwelling would be served by two car parking spaces within its curtilage and the boundary treatment would consist of fence and hedgerow.
- 2.2. On the 23rd day of September, 2020, the applicants submitted their further information response which can be summarised as follows:
- There are no discrepancies in the site layout plan provided.
 - The southern rear boundary consists of a wire fence runs with a hedge growing 600mm into the site.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. On the 15th day of October, 2020, the Planning Authority decided to **grant** planning permission for the proposed development subject to 6 no. conditions including:
- Condition No. 3: Requires a minimum of 2m separation distance between the proposed extension and the party boundary to the south.
- Condition No. 6: Surface Water.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The **final Planning Officer's report** dated the 13th day of October, 2020, is the basis of the Planning Authority's decision. This report considered that the applicant's further

information to be satisfactory and it concludes with a recommendation to grant permission subject to safeguards.

The **initial Planning Officer's report** dated the 1st day of September, 2020, concludes with a recommendation for further information on the followings matters:

Item No. 1: Revised plans sought to correct Site Layout discrepancies. It also indicates that a 2m separation distance between the proposed extension and the southern boundary would be preferable.

Item No. 2: The applicant is advised that revised public notices would be required if significant alteration arises to the development sought.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports:** None.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. None.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. The appellants submitted observations to the proposed development during the course of the Planning Authority's determination of this application. I consider that the substantive concerns raised correlate with those raised in their appeal submission to the Board.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. **Relevant and Recent Planning History:** None.

5.0 **Policy & Context**

5.1. **Local Planning Provisions**

5.1.1. **Louth County Development Plan, 2015 to 2021.**

The Louth County Development Plan is the overarching Development Plan for County Louth and it includes the administrative area of the former Dundalk Town Council including Blackrock Village.

This appeal site is located within the settlement of Blackrock which is located within the environs of the town of Dundalk.

The said Development Plan states that the Dundalk and Environs Development Plan, 2009 to 2015, will be replaced by a Local Area Plan. This is supported by Policy SS 3 of the said Development Plan which states that the Planning Authority will seek: *“to review the Dundalk and Environs Development Plan 2009 – 2015 and to prepare a Local Area Plan for Dundalk and Environs which will be consistent with the provisions of the County Plan”*; however, such a plan has yet to be adopted.

As such the Dundalk Town & Environs Development Plan, 2009 to 2015, as varied and amended, is the most recent zoning framework for the area and under this Plan the site and its setting is situated on land that is zoned ‘*Residential 1*’.

The zoning objective for ‘*Residential 1*’ is: *“to protect and improve existing residential amenities and to provide for infill and new residential development”* and of note the Town & Environs Development Plan stated that infill sites are excluded from the phasing requirements set out in the Core Strategy of the Plan.

Section 2.19.14 of the Development Plan deals with the matter of extensions to dwellings.

Policy SS 57 of the Development Plan is relevant. It states that the Planning Authority will seek: *“to limit the size of extensions to not more than 100% of the floor area of the original dwelling subject to compliance with Table 2.9 and Policy SS 52. Extensions in excess of 100% of the floor area of the original dwelling shall only be considered where the proposed extension compliments the original house in terms of proportion, position, materials and details and harmonises with any adjoining property”*.

Table 2.9 of the Development Plan sets out dwellings gross floor area and minimum site sizes.

Policy SS 52 of the Development states that the Planning Authority will seek: *“to require that within Development Zones 3-5, in those cases where the proposed dwelling (excludes replacement dwellings) or extension to the dwelling is in excess of 220sqm cumulatively, the site area shall be correspondingly increased by a ratio of 20 square metres for each 1.0 square metre additional floor area of the dwelling”*.

Policy SS 58 of the Development Plan indicates that the Planning Authority will consider extensions to dwellings on site sizes less than 0.2ha (0.5ac) depending on the site history, context, location, and capacity of the site together with the proposed design.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The appeal site is located c212 meters to the west of Special Area of Protection: Dundalk Bay SPA (Site Code: 004026) and Special Area of Conservation: Dundalk Bay SAC (Site Code: 000455). In addition, the appeal site is located c8.3km to the south west of Special Area of Conservation: Carlingford Mountain SAC (Site Code: 000453) and c9.3km to the north east of Special Area of Conservation: Stabannan Braganstown SPA (Site Code: 004091).

5.3. EIA Screening

- 5.3.1. Having regard to the nature, scale and extent of the proposed development, sites location on serviced lands with capacity to accommodate surface water runoff and wastewater as well as the distance of the site from nearby sensitive receptors, I consider that 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. The grounds of this 3rd Party appeal may be summarised as follows:
- The principle of the applicants extending their property subject to it being of a design that does not give rise to adverse residential and visual impact is not objected too.
 - The proposed extension would result in overdevelopment of the existing cottage.

- The proposed extension in the form proposed would seriously injure the appellants residential amenities by way of being overbearing, overshadowing, diminished privacy and overlooking.
- The proposed two storey extension would be visually incongruous and out of character with its urbane context.
- The existing extension sits lower than the ridge height of the original cottage.
- Cottage Lane is a short and narrow cul-de-sac road providing access to eight dwellings and the rear garage of a neighbouring Sandy Lane residence. It is contended to be heavily trafficked by pedestrians and cyclists.
- The predominant character of the immediate area is single storey.
- Reference is made to various local planning provisions. In particular RES 1 zoning; Section 2.9.14 through to Policy SS57 of the Development Plan. It is contended that the proposed development is contrary to these Development Plan provisions.
- There are discrepancies in the drawings submitted regarding the separation distance between the proposed extension and the existing boundary.
- The applicants are currently in the process of cutting back the deep hedgerow which has acted as the demarcation between their properties for decades as well as has provided a substantial visual screen between the site and their properties.
- The proposed development will present a large, blank, and imposing south facing elevation measuring positioned between both of the appellants properties.
- This application fails to clarify the impact or amendments that would result to the boundary between the subject site and the appellants properties.
- The position of the proposed extension's first floor rear (western) and front (eastern) elevational windows is such that the appellants dwellings and private amenity space will be materially overlooked thus resulting in the loss of privacy. The provision of a common boundary will not be sufficient to mitigate against this adverse impact.
- The diminishment of residential amenities that would arise to their properties is such that it would result in a devaluation of their properties.

- At 6.185m the height of the proposed extension will substantially protrude above the existing cottage's 4.094m ridge height. The extension would be highly visible and out of character with its context.
- The proposed extension put forward in this application could not be considered to be subservient to the main dwelling.
- An approval of the proposed development would set an undesirable precedent.
- It is sought that the decision of the Planning Authority in this case is overturned.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. No response was received from the applicants in this case.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. The Planning Authority's response can be summarised as follows:

- The issues raised by the appellants in relation to residential and visual amenity impact have already been considered. It was not considered that any undue residential and visual amenity impacts would arise.
- In order to address the discrepancy between the existing boundary fence and the proposed extension Condition No. 3 was imposed. This condition requires a 2m separation distance to be maintained between the proposal and the party wall to safeguard the amenities of the appellants property.
- The modern design, positioning and the use of materials of the proposed extension is deemed to be satisfactory as it provides a contrast between the proposed new building layer and the existing dwelling.
- The level of development is deemed to be reasonable given the sites location in an established urban residential area.
- This development would not give rise to any additional hazards for road users using Cottage Lane.
- The existing access arrangements are not impacted by the proposed development.

- The proposed development is in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- The Board is requested to uphold the Planning Authority's decision.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of all relevant planning provisions, in particular the Louth County Development Plan, 2015 to 2021, and the Dundalk and Environs Development Plan, 2009 to 2015, the submissions on file and I have conducted an inspection of the site and its setting. I consider that the main matters that arise in this appeal case are:

- Principle of the Proposed Development
- Compliance with Development Plan - Visual Amenity Impact
- Residential Amenity Impact
- Road Safety & Access

7.1.2. In addition, the matter of 'Appropriate Assessment' requires examination.

7.2. Principle of the Proposed Development

7.2.1. Under the applicable Development Plan the appeal site and its setting are zoned 'Residential 1'. The stated land use zoning objective for such lands is: *"to protect and improve existing residential amenities and to provide for infill and new residential development"*. The proposed development essentially seeks planning permission for an extension to an existing dwelling house. As residential development is deemed to be permissible development on lands zoned 'Residential 1', I therefore consider that the principle of the proposed development is acceptable in this instance, subject to safeguards.

7.3. Compliance with Development Plan

7.3.1. As stated above the land use zoning objective for the site and its setting as set out in the Development Plan seeks to provide protection to existing residential amenities.

- 7.3.2. In addition to this Section 2.19.14 of the Development Plan, which I note deals with the matter of extensions to dwellings, states that these: *“should complement the original building, where applicable harmonise with adjoining properties and not have an undue adverse impact on the visual amenities of the area”*. It further indicates that extensions which are out of character and proportion to the main dwelling will not be considered favourably alongside that: *“the size of any extension should be proportional to and in keeping with the character of the existing structure”*.
- 7.3.3. Of further relevance to the proposed development sought under this application is Policy SS 57 of the Development Plan. This I consider is of relevance to the subject matter of this appeal due to the size of the proposed extension being in excess of 100% of the size of the original floor area (Note: 110.3m²). Of note it is also in excess of the cumulative original floor area and the later extension of the subject dwelling is 74.1m² and the original floor area is significantly smaller than this and an approximate floor area has not been provided. Policy SS 57 sets out that the Planning Authority will seek: *“to limit the size of extensions to not more than 100% of the floor area of the original dwelling subject to compliance with Table 2.9 and Policy SS 52. Extensions in excess of 100% of the floor area of the original dwelling shall only be considered where the proposed extension compliments the original house in terms of proportion, position, materials and details and harmonises with any adjoining property”*.
- 7.3.4. Whilst I acknowledge that the existing dwelling house, despite being extended, has a modest floor area, notwithstanding the dwelling is part of semi-detached period pair in a setting characterised by an array of single storey detached and semi-detached dwelling houses. There are also a number of dormer examples in the wider context of Cottage Lane as well as limited examples of two storey built forms present on Sandy Lane which lies to the north of the site with the extended examples in the area sitting on limited in size suburban type curtilages of various sizes and orientations.
- 7.3.5. Though not afforded any specific protection, the subject dwelling, and the semi-detached pair it forms part of despite both being significantly altered and extended nonetheless as appreciated from the public domain maintains a level of vernacular quality and aesthetic character that sets them apart within their visual setting. Particularly when viewed as part of the public domain of Cottage Lane and also the neighbouring Beech Park they are attractive additions to the streetscape as well as their urban landscape context.

- 7.3.6. The subject pair in terms of its surviving principal elevation that addresses Cottage Lane, and its original gable shaped sides also consists of an attractive palette of local stone, red brick and render that is characteristic of vernacular and period cottage buildings like this within this locality and indeed nationally. This also contributes in a positive manner to their setting.
- 7.3.7. I therefore raise a concern in relation to the proposed design, the built form, height, massing, scale and positioning of the proposed two storey extension relative to the existing subject dwelling it would be attached to, the semi-detached pair it forms part of and in terms of its relationship with other existing buildings on Cottage Lane, which I observed is characterised by single storey in overall built form residential dwellings would be out of character and at odds with the physical and visual attributes of the main dwelling; the visual harmony that exists between extended dwellings in the visual setting of the main dwelling whether a contemporary or more traditional approach was chosen through to the pattern of development that characterises the sites setting which is predominant single storey in its built form together with a proliferation of gable and similar shaped roof structures. .
- 7.3.8. The existing ridge height of the semi-detached pair the subject property forms part of has a modest height of 4.094meters. The more recent rear extension to it does not exceed this ridge height nor do the later additions present to the rear of the adjoining semi-detached property to the south. In addition, the site is also bound by other single storey residential properties on both its southern and northern boundaries.
- 7.3.9. The proposed development sought under this application seeks to link the proposed two-storey extension via extending the existing later single storey extension out by c2m to where it would connect with the proposed two storey c6.185m in height rectangular in shape flat roofed extension. Whilst arguably this would provide another distinct new building layer of concern the design chosen does not seek in its contemporary approach to in anyway harmonise with the main dwelling or indeed to be subservient in its character.
- 7.3.10. Notwithstanding, I consider that the lack of visual subservience between the proposed extension and the main dwelling; the undue angularity of the design concept for the structure itself through to its elevational expressions; the lack of real tangible connection between the palette of materials chosen and the design attributes of the

main dwelling through to the overtly solid and heavy external expression of the facades, if permitted, would result in my view a design approach that fails to have taken sufficient inspiration from the main dwelling or indeed other dwellings within its immediate setting in order to achieve any visual harmony or respect with its existing setting. Achieving appropriate harmony with the built environment in which a new building layer is to be added does not require replication nor does it preclude the use of a contemporary design approach.

- 7.3.11. There is also a distinct solidity in the angular design of the extension whereas a lighter weight approach may have resulted in diminishing the visual incongruity of the provision of a second-floor level in a visual setting that is characterised by single storey residential developments and where the main dwelling as well as the semi-detached pair it forms part of is single storey in its character. As are all the other properties bounding the subject site.
- 7.3.12. Moreover, though the overall 2-storey height proposed is modest, it is notwithstanding at odds with the pattern of development within the subject properties visual setting and the use of highly angular and solid in appearance envelope does little to reduce its visual overbearance.
- 7.3.13. I therefore consider that there is merit to the appellants concerns that the proposed development would, if permitted, be visually prominent and overbearing when appreciated from the public through to the private domain of its setting.
- 7.3.14. While I am cognisant that Policy SS 57 of the Development Plan seeks to limit the size of extensions to not more than 100% of the floor area of the original dwelling subject to safeguards, I consider given the modest floor area of the subject dwelling even when the extension is included, would be unreasonable in this suburban context. Notwithstanding Policy SS 57 clearly sets out that where extensions in excess of 100% of the floor area of the original dwelling will only be considered where the proposed extension compliments the original house in terms of proportion, position, materials, and details and harmonises with any adjoining property.
- 7.3.15. In this situation based on the reasons set out above I consider that this has not been achieved in the design concept for the extension put forward. As such to permit the proposed extension in the form proposed would be contrary to Policy SS 57 of the

Development Plan. It would also in turn fail to contribute to its visual setting by way of its lack of harmony with the original dwelling and adjoining property.

- 7.3.16. I therefore consider that the proposed development, if permitted, would seriously injure the visual amenities of its setting in a manner that would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7.4. Residential Amenity

- 7.4.1. In terms of residential amenity impact I am cognisant that the appellants raise a number of concerns on this matter. They contend that the proposed development, if permitted, would seriously and adversely impact upon their established residential amenities. With their amenities being so compromised by the development sought under this application that this would in turn devalue both of their properties.
- 7.4.2. In terms of overlooking, I consider that this is one area in the design that is handled in a manner that no undue serious overlooking would arise from the first-floor level side elevations of the proposed extension. Notwithstanding, the rear elevation would arguably result in additional levels of overlooking onto adjoining amenity spaces of properties to the north and south over and that above the existing situation and over and above that expected in a context where adjoining as well as neighbouring properties in the vicinity are single storey in their built form.
- 7.4.3. I do not consider that overlooking would be a significant issue for the adjoining property to the north due largely to the change in ground levels between both properties alongside the existing man-made and natural boundary treatments that are in place. Moreover, the properties along the northern boundary are positioned in such a manner that the dwelling that is closest effectively is positioned along this rear boundary and as such essentially acts as a visual buffer and screen.
- 7.4.4. Similarly, having regard to the first-floor level eastern elevation of the proposed extension due to the significant lateral distance between it and any potential future development that may occur on the eastern side of Cottage Lane opposite, I consider that no adverse residential amenity impact would arise by way of overlooking. Moreover, this elevation arguably could result in an increased perception of passive surveillance over Cottage Lane.
- 7.4.5. In relation to the properties adjoining the southern boundary of the site, I raise a concern that it would appear that both of these properties have little in the way of

qualitative and quantitative functional private amenity space provision. From my inspection of the site alongside an examination of available aerial photography of these adjoining properties it would appear that the main amenity space serving them is an area located between both properties with this area being highly visible from the public domain.

- 7.4.6. The proposed rear elevation contains three windows, two serving bedrooms and the central window serving a bathroom.
- 7.4.7. The main rear boundary appears to have been recently modified and it provides no meaningful visual screening or buffering to either protect the subject property or indeed the two adjoining residential properties to the south of the site.
- 7.4.8. Whilst the provision of a solid boundary of a suitable height would result in an improved situation, if permission were to be granted, this would only be effective in eliminating overlooking arising from the ground floor level rear elevation of the proposed extension.
- 7.4.9. It is also arguable that as the two other windows serve bedrooms alongside are not excessive in their overall dimensions that these would not give rise to significant residential amenity diminishment in what is essentially a suburban and significantly developed landscape context.
- 7.4.10. Moreover, it is not unexpected that in such suburban areas that a level of overlooking exists or could be added too by way of new developments.
- 7.4.11. What is in my view important is the pattern of development in this area, in particular Cottage Lane and within the immediate visual setting of the appeal site. It is characterised by single storey and not two storey built forms.
- 7.4.12. As such neither of the appellants properties have a level of established overlooking from adjoining and neighbouring development outside of what has occurred from the recent southern boundary modification of the subject site. With this modification obviously resulting in added tension between the parties. In this context the introduction of a first-floor level with windows with angled views over the limited amenity space serving the appellants property would unfortunately give rise to overlooking and the perception of being overlooked over and above that which could reasonably be expected in this context. While it is standard practice for bathroom windows to be glazed in opaque glass and this could be required by condition should

the Board be minded to grant permission, I recommend that a condition be imposed requiring the applicant to modify the window openings on either side of the bathroom window at first floor level of the proposed extension in a manner that would eliminate overlooking in a southerly direction. This could be achieved by contemporary oriel designed window openings that are specifically designed and glazed to mitigate against adverse overlooking arising or other similar measure the Board may deem to be appropriate in this site context.

7.4.13. As the site and its setting are subject to 'Residential 1' land use zoning and with the zoning objective for such lands seeking in part to protect existing residential amenities. In this instance I consider that when taken with the visual overbearance that would arise from the addition of a 2-storey structure alongside the lack of visual harmony of the overall design; particular in this context the highly homogenous 2-storey southern elevation which is out of character with its setting, the proposed extension would be contrary to land use objectives of 'Residential 1' zoned land by way of diminishing the residential amenities of adjoining properties to the south.

7.4.14. In terms of overshadowing, I do not consider that the proposed development given the lateral separation between it and adjoining properties as well as their associated amenity spaces would give rise to any significant additional overshadowing.

7.4.15. In terms of depreciation of property value, the appellants have not provided any substantive evidence from a professional in this area that would support this concern.

7.4.16. In terms of the residential amenity of occupants of the subject property I consider that the proposed extension would give rise to improved internal residential amenity and that there would be qualitative and quantitative private amenity space remaining. The latter I acknowledge is consistent in part with 'Residential 1' land use zoning which also permits improvements to existing residential amenities.

7.5. Road Safety and Access

7.5.1. This application does not seek to amend the existing access serving the subject dwelling onto Cottage Lane and the proposed development, if permitted, would not give rise to any significant additional volumes of traffic movements on Cottage Lane outside of during the construction phase of the development sought. This would be of a limited duration and it is standard practice that conditions are included to deal with and mitigate against adverse impacts that can be associated with as well as result in

issues for properties in the vicinity during this period. I am of the view that the proposed development, if permitted, would not give rise to any significant additional road safety issue and/or traffic hazard for users of this cul-de-sac lane, including more vulnerable road users for which concerns are raised by the appellant.

7.6. Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 7.6.1. The closest European Sites in relation to the appeal site are Dundalk Bay SPA (Site Code: 004026) and Dundalk Bay SAC (Site Code: 000455). These are located c0.2km to the east of the appeal site, respectively. The site consists of an existing developed plot of suburban serviced land close to the centre of Blackrock village and contains an existing semi-detached dwelling which has been extended, an associated side and rear garden area together with outbuildings including a garden room. There are no connections between the appeal site and the aforementioned European sites or other European sites in the wider setting.
- 7.6.2. Having regard to the nature, extent and scale of development, it is reasonable to conclude that on the basis of the information on the file, which I consider adequate in order to issue a screening determination, that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on European Site No. 000455 or 004026, or any other European site, in view of the site's Conservation Objectives, and a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that permission be **refused** for the reasons and considerations set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the current development plan for the area, in particular Policy SS 57 of the Louth County Development Plan, 2015 to 2021; the 'Residential 1' land use zoning objective of the site which seeks to "*protect and improve existing residential amenities and to provide for infill and new residential development*"; the pattern of development that characterises the immediate site context and the nature, scale and extent of development proposed for this modest

existing vernacular single storey semi-detached cottage, it is considered that the proposed extension, by reason of its height, scale, bulk and mass, would seriously injure the residential amenities by reason of visual obtrusion, overbearance and overlooking. It is also considered that the design resolution of the proposed extension is of insufficient architectural quality and shows a lack of harmony with the main dwelling and built forms within its visual setting and for this reason it is considered that the proposed development would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, be contrary to the Policy SS 57 of the Development Plan and the land use objective for 'Residential 1' zoned land. The proposed development, would therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Patricia-Marie Young
Planning Inspector

17th day of February, 2021.