



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-310993-21

---

<b>Development</b>	Construction of a two storey extension to provide five bedrooms.
<b>Location</b>	Cliff House Hotel, Middle Road, Dysert, Ardmore, Co. Waterford.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Waterford City & County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	21/501
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Arkle
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant, subject to 11 conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party -v- Decision
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	John Brabazon
<b>Observer(s)</b>	An Taisce
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	25 <sup>th</sup> May 2022
<b>Inspector</b>	Hugh D. Morrison

# Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0 Proposed Development .....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	4
3.1. Decision .....	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....	4
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy and Context.....	5
5.1. Development Plan.....	5
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations .....	6
5.3. EIA Screening .....	6
6.0 The Appeal .....	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	7
6.2. Applicant Response .....	8
6.3. Planning Authority Response .....	9
6.4. Observations .....	9
6.5. Further Responses.....	10
7.0 Assessment.....	10
8.0 Recommendation.....	17
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	18
10.0 Conditions .....	18

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on cliffs to the south of Ardmore Bay and in the eastern outskirts of the village of Ardmore. This site is served by Cliff Road, which rises from the Main Street in the centre of the village to the west north-west. It lies at the end of a cul-de-sac, Middle Road, which continues to the east as Ardmore Cliff Walk, a public footpath to St. Declan's Well and Church and other local places of interest. The site is on the northern side of this cul-de-sac and an accompanying car park is on the southern side. A further road to the south, New Line, serves individual houses, which are sited at higher levels on rising land to the south.
- 1.2. The site itself is of roughly regular shape and it extends over an area of 0.01 hectares. This site lies at the eastern end of the existing Cliff House Hotel, and it presently comprises a steeply sloping area of open space, which is accessible by means of external steps and walkways. These steps and walkways provide access to a viewing deck of Ardmore Bay and an emergency exit onto the turning head to the above cited cul-de-sac.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal would entail the construction of a two-storey extension (178 sqm) at lower ground floor level and upper ground floor level at the eastern end of the existing hotel (5355 sqm) to provide 5 no. new bedrooms with associated balconies, i.e., 1 no. at lower ground floor level and 4 no. at upper ground level. This extension would be facilitated by the reorganisation of the internal layout of an existing space (60 sqm) denoted as the pavilion, i.e., 1 no. of the 4 no. bedrooms would be laid out in this space. It would comprise a green roof, which would continue the profile of the adjoining existing hotel roof and extensive glazing to the northern, seaward elevation.
- 2.2. This proposal would entail the de-commissioning in-situ of the existing disused below ground septic tank, and the demolition of an existing terrace at lower ground floor level and the existing wrap-around deck (20 sqm) at upper ground floor level, and an existing store. It would also entail the reworking of the site's levels, landscaping and boundary treatments, and the provision of services to the new extension.

2.3. The description of the proposal makes explicit that no additional car parking is proposed.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Permission granted subject to 11 conditions.

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The case planner discusses the zoning of the site and gives weight to the provisions of Section 10.57.2 of the CDP, which are set out below under the fifth heading of my report. In his discussion of car parking, weight is given to the scenario wherein additional bedrooms would reduce the availability of restaurant seats to non-residents, and so an overall increase in the need for car parking may not arise.

#### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage: Recorded monuments lie c. 90m to the west of the site, i.e., a church, St. Declan's well, and a cross (WA040-011001, 006 & 005): Archaeological monitoring/supervisory conditions requested.
- An Taisce: Objects, see under Observer.
- Waterford City & County Council:
  - Environmental Services: No objection, subject to a construction, demolition, and by-product management plan.

## 4.0 Planning History

The Cliff House Hotel has been the subject of a considerable number of planning applications to do with its redevelopment and subsequent alterations and extensions to the new building. The following applications are of particular relevance to the current one:

- **04/1925:** The parent permission for the redeveloped hotel building.
- **06/1124:** The addition of two pavilions (65 sqm): Permitted.
- **12/434:** Extensions to the hotel bar and restaurant: Retention permission granted.
- **19/237:** The provision of a single storey extension (165 sqm) at lower ground floor level to the east of the existing hotel. The de-commissioning in-situ of the existing disused below ground septic tank and the demolition of the existing wrap-around deck to the north-east of the hotel. The proposed extension will facilitate the re-location and re-organisation of the existing bar and restaurant facilities currently accommodated in the hotel premises. No additional car parking is proposed. The development will also include green roof provision; all piped infrastructure and ducting; services provision; changes in level; site development and excavation works above and below ground. Permission was granted.
- **2021/37:** Pre-application enquiry for the current proposal was made, as an alternative to 19/237.

## 5.0 Policy and Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

Under the Waterford County Development Plan 2011 – 2017 (CDP), the footprint of the existing hotel and the site are shown as lying, variously, in unzoned lands and in an area zoned open space and amenity. Under the latter zone, the objective is “To preserve and enhance open space areas and amenity areas for passive and active recreational uses, including the preservation of grass verges, hedgerows and tree stands.” Under this zone, hotel accommodation is not permitted. Section 10.57.2 is relevant in this respect:

*Existing minority (pre-existing, non-conforming) uses within any Land-Use Zone, shall be supported except where such use is incompatible with the major user in the area. In such event the minority use will be encouraged to relocate. In the same light, the expansion of existing minority Tourism/Commercial/Industrial uses will be allowed where such use*

*conforms to sustainability principles and good planning practice and contributes to the economic and social well-being of the area as a whole.*

*While the policy will be to secure conformity of use through discouragement of a continuation of non-conforming uses, it is recognised that from time to time, it may be necessary to allow minor building extension and alterations within a non-conforming use area to allow for continuity of use, provided that the continued use does not prejudice the proper planning and development of the area and the preservation and improvement of amenities thereof.*

*Where commercial/employment/industrial enterprises exist as non-conforming but long-established uses, it is the policy of the Council to facilitate their continued operation where appropriate. Where such uses have ceased, the Council will generally only consider redevelopment for new uses that conform with the land use zoning for the area or on unzoned lands, shall conform to the predominant use in the area.*

Under the CDP, Middle Road is shown as a “streetscape of distinctive character” and the north facing cliffs to Ardmore Bay are shown as being the subject of scenic views.

## **5.2. Natural Heritage Designations**

- Ardmore Head SAC (002123)
- Helvick Head to Ballyquin SPA (004192)

## **5.3. EIA Screening**

Under Class 10(b)(iv) of Part 2 of Schedule 5 to Article 93 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 – 2022, the redeveloped hotel would have fallen within this Class of development. Consequently, the proposed extension would fall within Class 13, which covers extensions to such development. However, both the redeveloped hotel and now the proposed extension would fall well below the thresholds of these Classes that require mandatory EIA. Furthermore, this extension falls well below the thresholds of Class 13, and so I conclude, that based on its nature, size, and location, there is no real likelihood of significant effects upon the environment and so the preparation of an EIAR is not required.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

#### Visual vulnerability

- Attention is drawn to the parent permission for the hotel, which was granted to 04/1925. An artist's impression of the original proposal shows the current application site as being developed. However, revised plans omitted the 4 two-bed suites originally shown. The appellant believes that these suites were omitted at the Planning Authority's instigation, due to their proximity to St. Declan's Well, the Ardmore Head SAC, their contribution to the size of the overall development and attendant impact upon visual amenity. Accordingly, the current proposal should, likewise, be considered unsuitable.

#### Close proximity to Ardmore Head SAC

- Contrary to the applicant's estimate of 20m, the SAC would be less than 7m away from the proposed extension to the hotel. Such proximity would mean that this extension may significantly affect the flora and fauna of this SAC.
- The extent of the applicant's ownership to the east has been questioned. The Planning Authority did not seek/receive clarification in this respect. Likewise, a tree in the contested area should be retained and hence protected during any construction stage.
- Concern is expressed over the impacts that would arise during any construction stage, e.g., the use of a crane and visual amenity, and noise and obstruction from vehicles.

#### Car parking

- Middle Road suffers from congestion between "The White House" and "St. Joseph's", due to on-street parking mainly by hotel staff. A submitted photograph shows such parking at 16.50 on a quiet Monday 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021.
- The proposal would lead to an extra 5 bedrooms and attendant additional staff. Under this scenario, on-street parking would be exacerbated. Instead,

the Planning Authority should have sought increased off-street parking provision to address the pre-existing congestion.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

### Visual vulnerability

- The applicant is acutely aware of the visual sensitivity of the site. Consequently, 5 photomontages of the proposal were submitted, which show that it would have a negligible impact upon visual amenity, and it would be screened from St. Declan's Well by existing vegetation.
- Attention is drawn to existing development on the site, e.g., a de-commissioned septic tank, a deck area, and external steps. Attention is also drawn to the extant permission granted to 19/237 for a similar size and design of extension to that which is now proposed. This permission establishes a precedent for the current proposal.
- An extract from the case planner's report is cited, which refers to the 3-D modelling of the proposal. Visual impact was, therefore, considered.
- The appellant refers to the parent permission for the hotel. The assessment of that proposal entailed a different design from that which has transpired on the site, and it occurred under a different planning and development context. Views taken then should not be considered to be binding now.

### Ardmore Head SAC

- Notwithstanding the appellant's counterclaim, the applicant is satisfied that the SAC is 20m away from the site. Furthermore, the submitted Screening Report makes clear that the nearest qualifying interests are 200m and 400m away, and no impact pathways run between the site and these interests. Accordingly, the Report concludes that there would be no significant effects upon them.
- The appellants reference to land ownership should be set aside as it amounts to hearsay, the applicant is satisfied as to its legal interest in the site, and the planning system does not adjudicate upon land ownership disputes.



- The applicant would seek, under a construction management plan, to avoid any unnecessary damage to existing trees. Such a plan would also address noise and traffic matters.

#### Car parking

- Under the CDP's car parking standards, each bedroom should be accompanied by 1 space. Under the proposal, the number of bedrooms would increase by 5, from 39 to 44. The hotel would continue to be served by 55 spaces. While the standards also refer to bar and restaurant space, in the case of the Cliff House Hotel, residents tend to be the majority users of these facilities. Accordingly, the existing provision of spaces would suffice.
- The appellant attributes the vast majority of on-street parking along the identified portion of Middle Road to hotel staff. This is challenged on the basis that it is effectively conjecture on the part of the appellant. The parking could be attributed to others, e.g., users of nearby holiday homes or day trippers to the village.
- The applicant confirms that staff travel to and from the hotel by a variety of means, e.g., foot, bicycle, drop-off, as well as car.
- The proposal would not give rise to additional demand for staff such that new parking provision would be required.

### 6.3. Planning Authority Response

None

### 6.4. Observations

An Taisce

- Ardmore and more especially the Cliff House Hotel are unsustainably dependent upon private cars with consequent congestion and dis-amenity to the historic village. The proposed extension would worsen this situation and jeopardise the underlying attractiveness of the village for visitors.
- The design and finishes of the proposal would require to be mitigated.

- Likewise, the potential ecological impacts of any construction stage upon the SAC would need to be mitigated.

## 6.5. Further Responses

None

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1. I have reviewed the proposal in the light of the Waterford County Development Plan 2011 – 2017 (CDP), relevant planning history, the submissions of the parties, and my own site visit. Accordingly, I consider that the current application/appeal should be assessed under the following headings:

- (i) Land use, sustainability, and zoning,
- (ii) Amenity,
- (iii) Parking,
- (iv) Water, and
- (v) Appropriate Assessment.

### **(i) Land use, sustainability, and zoning**

7.2. The site lies within the existing site of Cliff House Hotel. The proposal is for an extension to this Hotel, which would serve to increase the number of bedrooms by 5 (12.82%), from 39 to 44. This proposal would not entail any change of use of the overall site, i.e., it would represent an expansion of its existing use as a hotel only.

7.3. The observer expresses the concern that Cliff House Hotel is unsustainably dependent upon private cars, with their attendant congestion and dis-amenity to the historic village of Ardmore. Under the proposal, such dependency would increase.

7.4. I note the concern of the observer with respect to the congestion that Ardmore faces from car-borne visitors, especially during the height of the summer season. I note, too, that the existing Cliff House Hotel contributes to this congestion. However, insofar as the current proposal would be for a minor increase in the number of bedrooms in this Hotel, I do not consider that it would add appreciably to such

congestion. In these circumstances, I consider that the easing of it would require village-wide measures.

- 7.5. Under the CDP, the footprint of the existing hotel and the site are shown as lying, variously, in unzoned lands and in an area zoned open space and amenity. Under the latter zone, the objective is “To preserve and enhance open space areas and amenity areas for passive and active recreational uses, including the preservation of grass verges, hedgerows and tree stands.” Under this zone, hotel accommodation is not permitted. Section 10.57.2 is relevant in this respect:

*Existing minority (pre-existing, non-conforming) uses within any Land-Use Zone, shall be supported except where such use is incompatible with the major user in the area. In such event the minority use will be encouraged to relocate. In the same light, the expansion of existing minority Tourism/Commercial/Industrial uses will be allowed where such use conforms to sustainability principles and good planning practice and contributes to the economic and social well-being of the area as a whole.*

*While the policy will be to secure conformity of use through discouragement of a continuation of non-conforming uses, it is recognised that from time to time, it may be necessary to allow minor building extension and alterations within a non-conforming use area to allow for continuity of use, provided that the continued use does not prejudice the proper planning and development of the area and the preservation and improvement of amenities thereof.*

*Where commercial/employment/industrial enterprises exist as non-conforming but long-established uses, it is the policy of the Council to facilitate their continued operation where appropriate. Where such uses have ceased, the Council will generally only consider redevelopment for new uses that conform with the land use zoning for the area or on unzoned lands, shall conform to the predominant use in the area.*

- 7.6. The Planning Authority acknowledges that the hotel use of the site is a non-conforming one under the CDP’s open space and amenity zone. It, therefore, gives weight to the above cited Section 10.57.2 of the CDP, which entertains the expansion of hotel uses, where sustainability, good planning practice, and the socio-economic well-being of the area would arise and where amenities would not be prejudiced. I have discussed sustainability above. I will discuss amenity below and, in sum, my assessment will discuss good planning practice. The applicant employs 40 staff, and it attracts visitors to Ardmore, which support local businesses, and so it contributes to the socio-economic well-being of the area.

7.7. I conclude that, under Section 10.57.2 of the CDP, the proposal would not warrant objection on the grounds of land use, sustainability and zoning.

**(ii) Amenity**

- 7.8. The proposal would entail the construction of a two-storey extension to the eastern end of the existing Cliff House Hotel. This extension would be sited on a steeply sloping site and so it would comprise upper and lower ground floors. It would align with the principal elevation of the existing space denoted as the pavilion, which only extends a short distance down its site (12.5m). (The major terraced portion of the hotel building to the west extends further down the slope of its site (29m)).
- 7.9. The proposed roof design would represent a continuation of that exhibited by the adjoining hotel building. Its principal elevation to the north would overlook Ardmore Bay. This elevation would comprise terraces and extensive glazing. It would be accompanied by realigned steps and walkways, which would continue to provide an emergency escape route to the turning head at the end of the adjacent cul-de-sac.
- 7.10. The appellant draws attention to the parent permission for the redeveloped hotel (04/1925) and in particular to an artist's impression of this hotel, which shows how, as originally proposed, the terraced portion of the building would have extended over the current application site and the lower slope to the north of it. He recalls that this portion was scaled back to omit the development of the site and the adjoining slope in order to reduce the overall size of the hotel building in the interests of visual amenity. He, therefore, contends that the current proposal is seeking to reinstate what was previously omitted.
- 7.11. The applicant has responded to the appellant by stating that the parent permission was granted under an earlier CDP and that the approach adopted then should not be considered as being binding now. It also states that precedent for the current proposal has been established by the permission granted to 19/237 for a similar size and design of extension. The submitted photomontage illustrates that this proposal would have a negligible impact upon visual amenity from Ardmore Beach and public vantage points further to the north along the R673. It would also be screened by vegetation from the Ardmore Cliff Walk further to the east.
- 7.12. I note from the planning history of the overall site that the space denoted as the pavilion (06/1124) was "added back" into part of the space that had been left free of

built form under the parent permission (04/1925). I note, too, that the current proposal would represent a continuation of the pavilion and as such it would be a more modest form than that which was omitted under the parent permission. Furthermore, its glazed principal elevation would be considerably lighter in appearance than that which was omitted. Given then its size, siting, and design, I consider that its visual impact would be slight, and its presence would be capable of being accommodated within the overall context of the existing hotel and its landscape setting without harm to the visual amenities of the area.

- 7.13. The appellant expresses concern over the impact of any construction phase upon amenity. Specifically, he refers to the visual impact of any crane that maybe deployed, possible noise nuisance, and the risk of obstruction to vehicles. The applicant has responded by stating that these latter two matters would be cable of being addressed under construction management and construction traffic management plans. I recognise that the visual impact cited by the appellant would be temporary in nature and that the plans cited by the applicant would fulfil the purposes cited. I recognise, too, the importance of ensuring that pedestrian access to the Ardmore Cliff Walk is maintained during any construction phase.
- 7.14. During my site visit, I observed the specimen tree to the east of the site, which the appellant draws attention to as one that should be protected. This tree occupies a prominent position above a rocky inlet, and it assists in screening the site from public vantage points further to the east. Its retention would indeed be important. The applicant recognises this, and it undertakes to address the needed protective measures in its construction management plan.
- 7.15. I conclude that the proposal would be compatible with the visual amenities of the area and that the amenity issues raised by any construction phase would be capable of being satisfactorily addressed.

### **(iii) Parking**

- 7.16. The existing hotel has 39 bedrooms and, under the proposal, this would increase by 5 to 44 bedrooms. This hotel also has a bar/food area with a capacity for 50 guests and a restaurant with a capacity for 60 guests. The latter facility is being remodelled to have a capacity for 18 guests at each of two evening sittings, i.e., 36 in total. The hotel employs up to 40 staff during maximum occupancy. It is served by a total of 55

car parking spaces, which are laid out in a surface car park opposite the hotel (31) and in a basement car park to the hotel (24).

- 7.17. The appellant draws attention to the incidence of on-street parking in the vicinity of the hotel. He has submitted a photograph of such parking on Middle Road to the west of the hotel, which was taken at 16.50 on a quiet Monday 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021. He contends that most of this parking can be attributed to hotel staff. He anticipates that the proposal would lead to increased staffing and so additional pressure on finite on-street parking spaces, with its attendant congestion, would arise.
- 7.18. The applicant has responded by questioning the appellant's contention that the cited parking can be largely attributed to hotel staff. It states that staff travel to and from work by a variety of means, e.g., foot, bicycle, drop-off, as well as car. It also states that the current proposal would not lead to the employment of any additional staff.
- 7.19. Under Variation 1 to the CDP, revised car parking standards were introduced. These standards require the provision of 1 space per hotel bedroom. They also require the provision of 1 space per 20 sqm of net floor space in hotel bars, lounges, and function rooms. Although not explicitly stated, I assume that this standard applies to hotel restaurants, too. If these standards are applied to the existing hotel with the proposed extension, then 44 spaces would be needed to provide for the bedroom spaces. The submitted plans do not show the existing hotel bar and restaurant. However, plans submitted under 12/434 do show these facilities, e.g., drawing no. 2037-P-102, and, while their net floorspaces are not explicitly stated, they appear to approximate to the need for the remaining 11 car parking spaces.
- 7.20. Notwithstanding the foregoing paragraph, the applicant has presented a scenario wherein it envisages that at full capacity, i.e., 88 guests, the hotel's bar and restaurant facilities would be needed to meet the likely demand for meals arising from these guests and so they would have no room for "non-residents". Consequently, the 44 spaces allocated to overnight guests would suffice.
- 7.21. I note that the CDP's car parking standards address non-operational parking rather than operational parking, e.g., deliveries and staff parking. I note, too, that the applicant has stated that staff travel to and from work by a variety of means. During my site visit, mid-day on Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> May 2022, I observed that all but 4 spaces in the surface car park were in use and streets in the vicinity of the hotel did exhibit a

high incidence of on-street car parking. If it is assumed that the surface car park is reserved for the use of guests, then the likelihood is that at least some of the on-street car parking is attributable to staff. I, therefore, consider that the applicant should prepare a mobility management plan to promote alternatives to individual car usage on the part of its staff. Such a plan could be the subject of a condition.

7.22. I conclude that the proposal would be capable of adhering to the CDP's car parking standards. I also conclude that the applicant should submit a mobility management plan in a bid to ease the evident pressure upon finite on-street car parking spaces.

#### **(iv) Water**

7.23. The existing hotel is served by the public water mains and the public foul water sewerage system. The applicant has submitted an "Engineering Planning Report", which confirms that, under the proposal, no new connections would need to be made to the public mains and sewerage system. This Report confirms that any additional load would still be within the limits set by its discharge licence. It also confirms that the increased impervious surface would have only a negligible impact on the total surface water run-off from the site into the sea.

7.24. The OPW's flood maps do not show the site as being the subject of any identified flood risk.

7.25. Under the proposal, no water issues would arise.

#### **(v) Appropriate Assessment**

7.26. The site is adjacent to the Ardmore Head SAC (002123). The applicant estimates that it would be 20m to the east of this site, while the appellant estimates that it would be 7m. I consider the latter estimate to be more accurate than the former one. The applicant has submitted a Screening Report and the Planning Authority has undertaken a Project Screening Assessment. I will draw upon these in my own screening, which is set out below. I will also draw upon the NPWS's website and my own site visit.

7.27. Under a Stage 1 Screening for Appropriate Assessment, the test to be applied is as follows: Is the project likely to have a significant effect either individually or in combination with other plans and projects on a European Site(s)? This test entails six steps, which I will work through below.

#### Step 1

7.28. The project would entail a two-storey extension (178 sqm) to the existing Cliff House Hotel (5355 sqm). This extension would provide bedroom accommodation and it would entail the development of a sloping site that has previously been used to service the hotel. The footprint of the extension would come within 7m of the nearest European Sites, i.e., Ardmore Head SAC (002123).

#### Step 2

7.29. Apart from the aforementioned SAC, there is another European Site in the wider area of Ardmore, Helvick Head to Ballyquin SPA (004192), on the far (northern) side of Ardmore Bay from the application site. Potential source/pathway/ receptor routes run between the application site and these European Sites via Ardmore Bay.

#### Step 3

7.30. The SAC has the following qualifying interests and conservation objective:

- Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic coasts, and
- European dry heaths.
- To maintain the favourable conservation condition of these qualifying interests.

7.31. The SPA has the following qualifying interests and conservation objective:

- Cormorant, Peregrine, Herring Gull, Kittiwake, and Chough.
- To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of these bird species.

#### Step 4

7.32. At present surface water run-off from Cliff House Hotel is to the sea. Under the project's operational phase, such run-off would continue. During its construction phase, such run-off would be intercepted by standard best practice construction methodologies, which would be designed to ensure that the quality of sea water is safeguarded rather than to avoid harmful effects on European Sites.

- With respect to the SAC, the NPWS have identified the vegetated sea cliffs in Map 2 of their statement of Conservation Objectives. These cliffs begin over



400m to the east of the site. Likewise, the dry heaths begin over 200m to the east of the site. Insofar as the sea in Ardmore Bay is a potential pathway, it would typically not reach the vegetated portions of the cliffs and the dry heath beyond.

- With respect to the SPA, it lies 3km away from the site on the northern side of Ardmore Bay. The intervening expanse of water and its dilution properties would effectively negate the effects of any potential pathway.

#### Step 5

7.33. I am not aware of any other plans and projects in Ardmore which could in combination with the subject project give rise to significant effects upon the identified European Sites.

#### Step 6

7.34. The proposal was considered in the light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. Having carried out Screening for Appropriate Assessment, it has been concluded that the proposal individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on European Sites Nos. 002123 and 004192, or any other European site, in view of the site's Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on the following:

- Lack of meaningful ecological pathways between the proposal and the SAC and the SPA, and
- Distance of the proposal from the SPA.

In making this screening determination no account has been taken of any measures intended to avoid or reduce potentially harmful effects of the project on a European site.

## 8.0 Recommendation

8.1. That permission be granted.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Waterford County Development Plan 2011 – 2017 (as varied and extended) and the planning history of Cliff House Hotel, it is considered that the proposed two-storey extension to provide five additional bedrooms would be justified under Section 10.57.2 of the Development Plan. This extension would be compatible with the visual amenities of the area, and it would, subject to conditions, be capable of being constructed in manner consistent with the other amenities of this area. Any increase in the need for parking would be met in conjunction with a mobility management plan for staff. No water or Appropriate Assessment issues would arise. The proposal would, therefore, accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed extension shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.</p>
3.	<p>The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management and Traffic Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to</p>

commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including:

- (a) Location of the site and materials compound(s) including area(s) identified for the storage of construction refuse;
- (b) Location of areas for construction site offices and staff facilities;
- (c) Details of site security fencing and hoardings;
- (d) Details of the timing and routing of construction traffic to and from the construction site and associated directional signage, to include proposals to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads to the site;
- (e) Measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network;
- (f) Measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network;
- (g) Arrangements to be put in place for pedestrians to ensure that access to the Ardmore Cliff Walk is maintained during the course of site development works;
- (h) Details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels;
- (i) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater;
- (j) Off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste and details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil;
- (k) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter the sea.

A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan shall be kept for inspection by the planning authority.

**Reason:** In the interest of amenities, public health and safety.

4.	<p>(a) Excavations in preparation for foundations and drainage, and all works above ground level in the immediate vicinity of the specimen tree, which is identified by means of a green etching on the existing site survey layout (drawing no. 2664-P-003), shall be carried out under the supervision of a specialist arborist, in a manner that will ensure that all major roots are protected, and all branches are retained.</p> <p>(b) No works shall take place on site until a construction management plan specifying measures to be taken for the protection and retention of the tree, together with proposals to prevent compaction of the ground over the roots of the trees, has been submitted to, and been agreed in writing with, the planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To ensure that the tree is not damaged or otherwise adversely affected by building operations.</p>
5.	<p>(a) All foul sewage and soiled water shall be discharged to the public foul sewer.</p> <p>(b) Only clean, uncontaminated storm water shall be discharged to the sea.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of public health.</p>
6.	<p>Prior to the commencement of use of the proposed extension, a Mobility Management Strategy shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. This shall provide for incentives to encourage the use of public transport, cycling, walking, and car-pooling by staff employed in the hotel and to reduce and regulate the extent of staff parking. The mobility strategy shall be prepared and implemented by the management of the hotel. Details to be agreed with the planning authority shall include the provision of centralised facilities within the development for bicycle parking, shower and changing facilities associated with the policies set out in the strategy.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport.</p>

7.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution of €3204 (three thousand, two hundred and four euro) in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. The application of any indexation required by this condition shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>
----	---

---

Hugh D. Morrison  
Planning Inspector

15<sup>th</sup> June 2022