



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-318055-23

Development	Change of use from commercial to residential. Six apartments and all associated site works.
Location	No. 64 Barrack Street, Waterford, X91 YD37.
Planning Authority	Waterford City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	221012
Applicant(s)	Dunrobin Leisure Limited T/A Doyle's Bar.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Carol O'Shaughnessy.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	10 th October 2024
Inspector	Peter Nelson

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Planning History	6
5.0 Policy Context	7
5.1. Development Plan	7
5.4. Natural Heritage Designations	11
5.5. EIA Screening	11
6.0 The Appeal	11
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	11
6.2. Applicant Response	13
6.3. Planning Authority Response	13
6.4. Observations	13
7.0 Assessment	13
8.0 AA Screening	17
9.0 Recommendation	18
10.0 Reasons and Considerations	18
Form 2	22
EIA Preliminary Examination	22
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on Barrick Street, Waterford, less than 1km from the city centre. Barrick Street is mainly a residential street with some commercial units. The subject site consists of a terraced two-storey building that is currently a vacant public house. At this section of Barrack Street, the street widens with perpendicular parking on the northern side of the street. There is a spar supermarket with residential above to the southwest directly adjoining the appeal site. On the northeastern side of the site is a dwelling, No.64, the appellant's property. The rear boundary consists of a stone rear boundary of the newly renovated courtyard building, which is part of the redevelopment of the adjoining convent complex.
- 1.2. The appeal site contains a vacant pub covering most of the site, except for a small courtyard. The upper floor, which was previously extended, contains pub storage and offices. The adjoining supermarket covers most of the site on the ground floor. No.62 and No.63 have rear gardens.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the change of use of a commercial unit to 6no apartments. The apartments will include 3no. studio apartments, 3no. one-bed apartment over two floors. Access to the apartments will be from Barrack Street.
- 2.2. Works will also include select demolition works and reconfiguration of the structure and facades of the existing licensed premises. The development will also include the construction of a two-storey extension at the rear of the existing building.
- 2.3. No resident parking is proposed.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 2nd February 2023, Waterford City and County Council requested the applicant submit further information relating to the following: a reduction in the height and scale of the two-storey extension, a revised site plan, eastern and western elevations and a pre-connection enquiry from Irish Water.

On the 5th May 2023, Waterford City and County Council requested the applicant to submit public notices stating that further information was submitted.

On the 8th June 2023, Waterford City and County Council requested the applicant to submit clarification of further information relating to the following: the upper floor residential use of No.65 Barrack Street, clarification of the relationship of the proposed development to No.63 & No.65 Barrack Street, the submission of eastern and western elevation drawings and a pre-connection enquiry response from Irish Water.

On the 21st August 2023 Waterford City and County Council granted permission for the proposed development subject to 6 no. conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The main points of the first planning report, dated 2nd February 2023, can be summarised as follows:

- The principle of the development is in accordance with the area's zoning.
- The proposed mix of apartments and the floor areas of the apartments comply with the Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2022.
- The amenity space is deemed acceptable, given the location of the site.
- The two-storey rear extension will have an overbearing impact on and overshadow adjoining properties.
- The documents submitted are insufficient to enable a decision, and further information is required.

The second planning report, dated the 7th June 2023, states that not all points of further information were answered and, therefore, clarification of further information is required.

The main points of the third planning report dated the 3rd August 2023 can be summarised as follows:

- The applicant confirmed that there is an apartment on the upper floor of No.65 Barrack Street.
- Revised plans and elevation drawings indicating the proposal's relationship to adjoining properties have been submitted along with revised elevational drawings.
- A condition dealing with an Irish Water connection approval can be dealt with by condition.
- Having regard to the site's urban location and the nature of the proposed development, it is considered the proposed development would not unduly detract from the residential amenity of adjoining properties.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Report from the Environment Section dated the 3rd January 2023 has no objection subject to 3no. conditions.

3.2.3. Conditions

- The grant of permission was subject to 6no standard conditions, including a financial condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

One observation was received. The main points raised can be summarised as follows:

- The bin store is too close to No.63 and can create a health hazard.
- The courtyard will cause light pollution.
- The courtyard could result in its use as an emergency exit, impacting the safety and security of the residents of No.63.

- The proposed development will overlook no 63.
- No northeastern elevation has been submitted.
- No method of heating has been indicated.
- Issues with the proposed street entrance.
- The lack of entrances will result in a fire hazard to the residents and the adjoining properties.
- The proposed roof works could breach the integrity of the roof of No.63.
- There is no provision for wheelchair access.
- There is an objection to any ground works or foundations that may undermine the foundations of No.63 or other properties.

4.0 Planning History

P.A. Ref: 21/704:

Permission was refused on 14th September 2021 for the development of the partial change of use from commercial (licenced premises/public house) to residential comprising 1no. one-bedroom apartment on the ground floor, 1no. one-bedroom apartment on the first floor. The proposed construction of 2 no. one-bedroom apartments on the first floor, 2no. one-bedroom apartments on the second floor and 2no. one-bedroom apartments on the third floor. Works will comprise select demolition works and reconfiguration of the existing structure with modifications to existing facades, the construction of an extension, and all associated site works.

Permission was refused for the following reason:

“It is considered that the proposed development by reason of its design scale height and relationship with adjoining properties, would constitute the overdevelopment of the site and an over-dominating presence in relation to the adjoining residential properties, which would seriously injure the amenities of the area and property on either side by reason of visual obtrusiveness overshadowing overlooking and loss of privacy. Furthermore, it is considered that the development as proposed would integrate poorly within the context of the setting of the site and the surrounding

receiving environment. The proposed development would, therefore, seriously injure the amenities of the property in the vicinity and depreciate the value of such properties and thus would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

Adjoining Site to Rear

P.A. Ref: 2460369:

Permission is sought for retention of alterations to works approved under planning ref. 20/871 which include – Substitution of the as approved new and replacement windows throughout the development for u-PVC to match existing. Changes to location and addition of new dormer windows to the roof of the Convent Building. Replacement natural slate finish to the roofs of the Convent Building, Presbytery House and School and Courtyard Building in lieu of existing. Alterations to Courtyard Buildings as approved including the removal of timber cladding to select areas and change to the permitted external stairs to metal in lieu of masonry. Alterations to footpaths and internal roads layouts including retaining walls and adjustment of site levels. A decision has yet to be made on this application.

P.A. Ref: 20/871:

Permission was granted on the 18th August 2021 for the change of use of the existing buildings & grounds from religious (a convent & ancillary buildings) to residential use for the delivery of 71 no. residential units & community facilities.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The Waterford City and County Development Plan is the operational plan for the area. It came into operation on the 7th June 2022.

The application site is in an area zoned GB- General Business. The objective is to *‘provide for and improve General Business uses; this includes suburban district retail and local neighbourhood centres.’*

Policies

CS 03 Compact Growth

In a manner consistent with NPO 34 and 35, we will promote and support an efficient, equitable and sustainable pattern of residential and other development that delivers compact growth and critical mass for sustainable communities in Waterford, by managing the level of growth in each settlement.

CS 07 Urban Regeneration

We will collaborate with state agencies such as the LDA and SRA to deliver quality regeneration projects across our urban settlements in a way that supports the achievement of compact growth and sustainable placemaking for urban and rural communities.

W City 13

In order to provide opportunities for the growth of a sustainable City Centre neighbourhood we will apply the following when assessing proposals for development:

- In order to maintain existing residential communities and attract new residents to the City Centre permission we will discourage the conversion of residential properties to non-residential use. However, on the main entry routes to the City Centre, consideration may be given to the conversion to commercial use of the ground floor of large residential properties where the residential use can be retained.
- A separate access to the above ground floor accommodation will be required where upgrade works are proposed to ground floor retail/commercial uses.
- The retention of residential accommodation on the upper floors of city centre properties will be encouraged.
- An innovative application of residential standards in line with Ministerial Guidelines. In terms of securing sustainable City Centre living spaces across the building stock we will be favourably disposed to the amalgamation of existing substandard sized residential units with a view to providing better living space.
- New infill development across the core shopping area and its peripheral streets should be designed to facilitate flexibility in terms of multiple uses over

time, for example higher floor to ceiling heights to enable easy conversion between retail/commercial/residential use if the demand so necessitates. The feasibility of developing alternatives such as live work units and professional services/own door offices in such infill schemes will also be investigated.

- The retail function of the City Centre's core shopping area will be protected, and we will discourage non-retail uses on the ground floors of properties fronting these streets. However, in order to facilitate a more resilient City Centre, proposals for other commercial uses will be considered on their own merits with a view to ensuring vibrancy and vitality. Furthermore, the use of an entire building for residential purposes will be considered in terms of the extent of vacancy on the relevant street and the intended tenure and mix of residential units proposed to be developed. There will be a preference for owner occupation in order to enhance the resilience of the City Centre community; and,
- Proposals for commercial development which encroach on established residential areas in the centre will be considered in terms of the nature of the use, its hours of operation and the material impact on residential amenity relevant to the location.

H02 In granting planning permission, we will ensure new residential development:

- Is appropriate in terms of type, character, scale, form and density to that location.
- Is serviceable by appropriate supporting social, economic and physical infrastructure.
- Is serviceable by public transport and sustainable modes such as walking and cycling.
- Is integrated and connected to the surrounding area in which it is located; and,
- Is designed in accordance with the applicable guidance and standards of the time:
- Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (2009).
 - Delivering Homes, Sustaining Communities (2007).

- Urban Design Manual A Best Practice (2009).
- Permeability Best Practice NTA (2015); and,
- Design Manual for Urban Roads (DMURS) (2020) or any update thereof.
- National Disability Inclusion Strategy (NDIS) 2017-2022.
- United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCPRD).

H20 Protection of Existing Residential Amenity Policy Objectives

Where new development is proposed, particularly on smaller suburban infill sites (< 1 ha in area) we will ensure that the residential amenity of adjacent residential properties in terms of privacy and the availability of daylight and sunlight is not adversely affected.

We will support lower density type development at these locations. We will require that new development in more established residential areas respect and retain, where possible, existing unique features which add to the residential amenity and character of the area, such features include front walls, gates, piers, railings, and stone/brick/render work.

5.2. National Policy

National Planning Framework – Project Ireland 2040

The government published the National Planning Framework (NPF) in February 2018. Objective 3a is to deliver 40% of all new homes nationally, within the built-up footprint of existing settlements. Objective 11 is to prioritise development that can encourage more people to live or work in existing settlements whilst Objective 33 seeks to prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location. Objective 35 is to increase residential density in settlements through a range of measures including restrictions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights.

5.3. Ministerial Guidelines

- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2023).
- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is approximately 1km from the Lower River Suir Special Area of Conservation.

5.5. EIA Screening

See completed Form 2 on file. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The main grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- There are inaccuracies in the application form regarding whether a pre-planning meeting occurred.
- The proposed development is contrary to the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028, General Housing Policy H20.
- Although requested, no amendments were made to the proposed development at the further information or clarification stage of further information stage to the plans to improve the residential amenity of the adjoining property, and the planner did not address this.

- There are serious issues relating to the fire safety of the proposed development.
- The Council is overlooking the requirements of the planning regulations by relaxing certain aspects of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities, specifically those relating to single-aspect apartments and bicycles.
- The development as proposed is not designed with disability access in mind.
- There are inaccuracies in the Further Information response.
- There is no record of any meeting with the applicant and the planner as required by the request for further information.
- The planner's conclusion is flawed and based on breaches of regulations and errors in the planning process.
- The proposed communal open space is less than required in the guidelines and will be reduced with the requirement of condition no.2 to provide bin storage.
- Condition no.3 requires a Connection Agreement from Irish Water. This was requested during the planning application process but not supplied.
- The appellant will not accept the egress of any waste or stormwater from the development into No.63.
- The development does not include any provision for sustainable use or recycling of storm or rainwater.
- The planning authority does not have a process for ensuring that all the applied conditions have been adhered to.
- The proposed development does not take into consideration any impact on the historic boundary stone walls.
- The proposed development does not enhance, improve or contribute to the amenity of the area and would seriously injure the amenities of nearby property.

6.2. **Applicant Response**

None

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

None

6.4. **Observations**

None

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report/s of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows.

- Principle of Development
- Residential Amenity of Adjoining Properties.
- Residential Amenity of Occupants: **New Issue**
- Other Matters

7.2. **Principle of Development.**

The site is zoned as General Business in the Waterford City and County Development Plan. Residential development in this zoning, subject to compliance with the relevant policies, standards and requirements set out in the development plan, is generally acceptable. I consider that the conversion of this premises to residential use complies with the Development Plan Core Strategy Policy Objective CS03 and Policy W City 13, which promote compact growth.

7.3. **Residential Amenity of Adjoining Properties**

The appellant states that the development is in breach of Policy Objective H20 of the Waterford City and County Plan 2022-2028 as it will not ensure the residential amenity of adjacent residential properties in terms of privacy and the availability of daylight and sunlight.

I note that the planning authority request for further information states that the proposed first-floor 2-storey rear extension to the boundary will have an overbearing impact and overshadow the adjoining properties. The applicant was invited to submit a revised proposal significantly reducing the height and scale of the 2-storey extension. As part of the further information submitted, a shadow study was submitted. No alterations to the extension were proposed.

While I appreciate that there may be an element of overshadowing in tighter urban areas, there is potential for the proposed development to create significant overshadowing to the amenity areas and rear windows of the adjoining properties to the northeast. The submitted drawings do not demonstrate that the proposed development will not create significant overshadowing and loss of daylight to the neighbouring property.

I also consider that the proposed development, consisting of a two-storey extension on the entire length of the site boundary with No. 65 and most of the site boundary with No.63, would appear overbearing when viewed from these neighbouring residential properties.

To conclude, I consider that the proposed development would be seriously injurious to the residential amenity of the adjoining properties due to its overshadowing and overbearing impact.

7.4. Residential Amenity of Future Occupants: New Issue

- 7.4.1. I note that the proposed apartments meet the minimum standards for apartment sizes, room width and storage as required in the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments - Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2023.
- 7.4.2. For the studio apartments, the Guidelines requirement is to provide 4sqm of private open space and 5sqm of private open space for a one-bed apartment. No private open space has been provided for any of the units.

- 7.4.3. For four studio apartments and two one-bed apartments, to comply with the Guidelines, a total of 26 sqm of communal open space is required for the development. A 15.6 sqm courtyard area has been proposed. This area will also accommodate the bin store and bicycle storage, which occupies most of the courtyard. Given the proposed two-storey extension and the existing stone boundary wall, this area will receive a very limited amount of daylight. This can be seen in the submitted Shadows Studies, which show the courtyard in shadow for all times of the winter and summer solstice and spring and autumn equinox save for a small section of the courtyard, which contains the bin store, at noon on the summer solstice. I consider that this area has no amenity value, and therefore, the proposed development does not provide any communal open space.
- 7.4.4. I note that the Apartment Guidelines request Planning authorities to practically and flexibly apply the general requirements of these guidelines in relation to refurbishment schemes, and planning authorities must prioritise the objective of more effective usage of existing underutilised accommodation, including empty buildings and vacant upper floors commensurate with these building standards requirements. However, while the change of use to residential of this pub is welcomed, I consider the combined lack of private and communal open space would be injurious to the residential amenity of the future residents.
- 7.4.5. The rear studio ground floor apartment has only one window. This window faces the rear courtyard. The ground floor rear apartment has one window for the L-shaped living/dining/kitchen and one window in the bedroom. These windows also face the courtyard. As noted above, this courtyard will be in shadow for most of the time. Therefore, I consider that there will be inadequate sunlight entering the rear studio and ground floor apartment. The Guidelines state that living spaces in apartments should provide direct sunlight for some part of the day. The amount of sunlight reaching an apartment significantly affects the amenity of the occupants. Therefore, I consider that the proposed development would be injurious to the residential amenity of future residents.
- 7.4.6. The windows on the ground and first-floor rear studio and bedroom and living/dining/kitchen windows of the one-bed apartments have a separation distance of 5.2 and 3.m. While I accept that this site is in a central and accessible urban location, I consider this level of overlooking, especially for a studio apartment with

only one window, would be seriously injurious to the residential amenity of future residents. This is a new issue, and the Board may wish to seek the views of the parties.

- 7.4.7. The appellant states that the proposed apartments do not comply with the Apartment Guidelines as all of the apartments are not dual aspect. The Guidelines allow discretion to consider dual aspect unit provision at a lower level than 33% for refurbishment schemes subject to achieving overall high design quality in other aspects. Due to the issue of overlooking and lack of sunlight entering the apartments, I consider that the proposed development is not of sufficient high design quality to allow for discretion in the dual aspect provision.
- 7.4.8. The appellant states that inadequate cycle parking spaces have been provided. The submitted ground floor plan shows the provision of two-cycle parking spaces. The Apartment Guidelines include a general minimum standard of 1 cycle storage space per bedroom. For studio units, at least one cycle storage space is required. Visitor cycle parking shall also be provided at a standard of 1 space per 2 residential units. The guidelines require that any deviation from these standards be justified with respect to factors such as location, quality of facilities proposed, and flexibility for future enhancement/enlargement. I consider that the provision of two car parking spaces for 6no. apartments is insufficient, and any additional cycle space would reduce the limited communal open space.

7.5. Other Matters

- 7.5.1. In the grounds of appeal, the appellant refers to fire safety issues and disability access. The issue of compliance with Building Regulations will be evaluated under a separate legal code and thus need not concern the Board for the purposes of this appeal.
- 7.5.2. The appellant raises concerns that the bin storage is inaccessible by any waste management company. I consider that the scale of the proposed bin storage in the rear courtyard is acceptable, and it is standard practice for refuse bins to be left on the street at collection times on terraced streets such as Barrack Street.

- 7.5.3. The appellant raises concern that the impact of the proposed development on the historic walls was not addressed. I note that it is proposed that the existing stone boundary wall between the application site and the appellant's site be retained. If permission was to be granted, a condition could be attached, ensuring the retention of the existing stone walls.
- 7.5.4. The appellant raises concerns relating to procedural issues with the Planning Authority. S.37(1b) PDA requires that the Board determines the application the subject of the appeal as if it had been made to the Board in the first instance. Therefore, the planning authority's procedural issues are irrelevant to this appeal.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the change of use of a commercial premises to apartments and an extension of the existing premises to include 6no. apartments in total in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 8.2. The subject site is located in the urban area of Waterford City and approximately 1km from the Lower River Suir Special Area of Conservation.
- 8.3. The proposed development comprises 6no. apartments.
- 8.4. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 8.5. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows [insert as relevant:
- The small scale and nature of the development.
 - Location-distance from the nearest European site and lack of connections.
 - Taking into account the screening report and determination by the planning authority.
- 8.6. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 8.7. Likely significant effects are excluded, and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be refused for the following reasons:

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposed development, by way of its design, scale, and layout, fails to meet the relevant design standards for apartment development.

The proposed separation distances between windows serving habitable rooms fail to meet the minimum standards of SPPR 1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).

No private open space has been provided, and communal open space is not of sufficient quality or residential amenity value to meet the requirements under Appendix 1 of the Guidelines for Planning Authorities - Design Standards for New Apartments (July 2023).

It has not been proven that the proposed rear ground floor apartments would provide adequate sunlight and daylight.

The proposed cycle parking provision fails to meet the minimum standards of section 4.17 of Guidelines for Planning Authorities - Design Standards for New Apartments (July 2023).

The proposed development would, therefore, provide inadequate residential amenity for future occupants and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the size of the site and the plot ratio, density, height and scale of development proposed, the proposed development would result in overdevelopment of the site, which would negatively impact on the residential amenity of existing neighbouring dwellings by reason of overshadowing and of the overbearing impact on existing dwellings. The proposed development would be contrary to Waterford Development Plan 2022-2028 Policy H20 and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Peter Nelson
Planning Inspector

23rd October 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	318055-23		
Proposed Development Summary	The development consists of the change of use from commercial to 6no. apartments. Works include select demolition works and reconfiguration of the existing structure with modification to the existing façades, as well as the construction of a two-storey extension and all associated site works.		
Development Address	64 Barrack Street, Waterford		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? <small>(that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)</small>		Yes	X
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
No		N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary Examination is required
Yes	X	10(b)(i) Infrastructure projects Construction of more than 500 dwelling units	Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	X	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	318055-23	
Proposed Development Summary	The development consists of the change of use from commercial to 6no. apartments. Works include select demolition works and reconfiguration of the existing structure with modification to the existing façades, as well as the construction of a two-storey extension and all associated site works.	
Development Address	64 Barrack Street, Waterford	
The Board carries out a preliminary examination [Ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)] of, at least, the nature, size or location of the proposed development having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.		
	Examination	Yes/No/ Uncertain
Nature of the Development Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment? Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?	The development of apartments in an urban, mixed-use area is not exceptional in the context of the existing environment. The development of 6 apartments will not result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants.	N N
Size of the Development Is the size of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment? Are there significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and/or permitted	The proposed development includes the conservation and extension of an existing property, and its size is not exceptional in the context of the existing environment. There are no significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects	N N

