

**For the Attention of the Board.**

**RE: - Appeal Case No 309044.**

**Demolition of Existing Structures & Construction of Residential Development.**

- 1.1. I refer to the Board's request dated, 9<sup>th</sup> August, 2021 for an assessment of the original application submission and to my report and recommendation dated, 26<sup>th</sup> April, 2021. It is recommended that this following addendum assessment be read in conjunction with the original report.
  
- 1.2. **The application submission.**
  - 1.2.1. The original proposal is for a residential development comprising seven apartments, and the further information submission provided for substitution of commercial use, in two units at ground floor level and design modifications. The planning authority in its request for additional information had indicated concerns as to the single, residential use for the proposal and drew the applicant's attention to the 'Z4: mixed use' zoning objective for the 'District Centre' location within the CDP.
  
  - 1.2.2. The original application lodged with the planning authority indicates proposals for demolition of the existing structures which have a total stated floor area of 108 square metres and for construction of an apartment development comprising seven units in a three-storey block, flat roofed block with a stated gross floor area of 558.7 square metres and height of 9.6 metres. The accommodation to be provided consists of one studio unit, four one bed units one, one bed duplex unit and one two bed duplex unit. Private open space is provided for in the form of balconies and winter gardens.
  
  - 1.2.3. Pedestrian access is off the Long Mile Road and the Walkinstown Road and a landscaping scheme is shown at the entrance. The application also includes proposals for a sedum roof, bicycle parking, / mechanical plant room, bin storage,

signage, associated drainage and site. No on-site parking is included in the proposal. The stated plot ratio is 1.58 and site coverage is 70%.

### 1.3. **Observations.**

- 1.3.1. The site location is 'transitional' in being at the edge of the district centre between the commercial properties and the residential properties in the adjacent residential area subject to the 'Z1: 'residential' zoning objective – within the CDP.
- 1.3.2. Notwithstanding the 'Z4' zoning objective providing for the multiple uses which is reasonable in contributing to vitality and viability at the District Centre, it is considered that the proposal for residential use in entirety, could provide for a residential development of good quality benefitting the attainable residential amenities for the future occupants and compatible with surrounding commercial and residential development.
- 1.3.3. However, as stated in my original report of 25<sup>th</sup> April, there are serious concerns as to the zero-parking policy for the proposed development the parking requirements for which comes within Area 2 as provided for under section 16.1 of the CDP. A maximum requirement for one space per dwelling is indicated.
- 1.3.4. The outline mobility management plan has been provided places significant reliance on the private carpark on Walkinstown Road opposite the proposed pedestrian access. However, this carpark is zoned for development, and, with regard to these lands, I draw attention to the grant of permission under P. A. Reg. Ref. 4364/19 (PL 307186) and a current application for amendments, subject to third party appeals before the Board at present under P. A. Reg. Ref. 2161/21 (PL 310035)
- 1.3.5. The availability of on street parking is minimal on the street frontage, at surrounding commercial development and on street frontage within the local network of residential roads in the vicinity due to extensive development of vehicular entrances and front garden parking. It is considered that the proposed development would generate demand for long term 'overspill' parking within the area where there is little or no capacity.

- 1.3.6. Notwithstanding current and proposed options for public transport options, given the heavily trafficked suburban location it is considered that the 'zero-parking' proposal is unacceptable due to this end the recommendations for refusal of permission in the final report of the Transportation Department is fully supported. A residential development built over on-site parking for residents could be considered.
- 1.3.7. Separately, with regard to the proposed development's design, form and visual impact, subject to further modifications to the elevations, in design detail, materials and finishes, appropriate to residential use at ground level it is considered that the modifications to the proposals in the original application in building design, form and height provided for in the further information submission are warranted in order to render the proposed development compatible and complementary as an insertion into established streetscape. The Board is referred to section 6.3 of my original report in this regard.
- 1.3.8. With regard to density and qualitative standards, the Board is referred to sections 6.33-6.2.5 of the original report and to the following observations and recommendations.
- 1.3.9. There is no objection to the proposed dwelling mix at five one bed units and two, two bed units, the site coverage and plot ratio, having regard to the zoning objective and small-scale nature of the development, the site size and configuration.
- 1.3.10. With regard to the development's qualitative standards, it is agreed with the planning officer that the proposed development is satisfactory. Given the constrictive site configuration, it is reasonable to accept the inclusion west and east windows opening onto the balconies as mitigation for the predominance of north facing aspects, that private open space provision in quantum and quality which is supplemented by an adequate quantum (circa 36 square metres) communal amenity space to the westside is satisfactory.
- 1.3.11. It is noted that the submitted Sunlight and Daylight Analysis lodged with the further information submission indicated satisfactory standards for Vertical Sky Component indicated achievement of satisfactory standards for all levels, for the first and second floor balconies, for Average Daylight Factors for the first and second floors and consistency with minimum BRE 2011 standards. However, in the event of possible

favourable consideration, it may be advisable to request the applicant to arrange for an assessment for the ground floor apartments and private open space.

- 1.3.12. The ground floor units' footprint is direct onto the edge of the public footpath and use of the dwelling entrances could cause some obstruction or conflict with pedestrian circulation given the narrow width of the footpath and a projection forward of the adjoining building at the north-east corner gives rise to particular concern.
- 1.3.13. Provision for and access to cycle storage and proposals for arrangements for services vehicles access for collection of refuse, deliveries, maintenance etc. are required.
- 1.3.14. In the event of possible favourable consideration of the proposed development, it is recommended that these matters be addressed, ideally prior to determination of the decision so that it can be assured that a satisfactory solution can be achieved especially having regard to the location on the public road close to the busy roads' junction, adjacent to the narrow public footpath. These matters are raised in the report of the Transportation Division.
- 1.3.15. In view of the foregoing, it is recommended that permission be refused based on the reason which follows.

#### **1.4. Reasons and Considerations**

Due to the lack of provision for dedicated carparking provision, the proposed development would generate additional parking demand for which there are no alternative facilities and which generate additional parking on the surrounding road network where parking supply is restricted and uncontrolled. As a result, the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of obstruction of other road users and traffic hazard and would also set undesirable precedent for similar development with zero parking provision. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

**Jane Dennehy**

Senior Planning Inspector

17<sup>th</sup> August, 2021.