



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-320632-24

Development	Extension to front of dwelling and extend existing Velux windows.		
Location	The Meadows, Courtmacsherry, Co. Cork		
Planning Authority Ref.	245021		
Applicant(s)	Tim & Linda Cullinane		
Type of Application	Permission	PA Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party	Appellant	Nuala O'Farrell
Observer(s)	None		
Date of Site Inspection	22/01/2025	Inspector	Lorraine Dockery

1. Site Location/ and Description. The subject site, which has a stated area of 0.09 hectares, is located within the development boundary of Courtmacsherry, Co. Cork. It is accessed via a cul-de-sac which forms part of the Seven Heads Walk and the site has panoramic views across the bay. The site contains a detached, single storey dwelling. The cul-de-sac contains a number of dwellings.

2. Proposed development. Construction of box dormer extension to front roofslope and extension to length of existing 2 no. velux rooflights in rear roofslope, together with all associated site works. The stated floor area of the proposed works is 35m².

3. PA's Decision Grant permission, subject to 3 conditions.

4. Planning History.

21/50004 Permission GRANTED for single storey ancillary garage and retractable canopy to side/rear of dwelling

17/671 Permission GRANTED for construction of new dwelling

5.1. National/Regional/Local Planning Policy

- Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 applies, which has regard to national and regional policies in respect of residential development.
- Designated as 'Urban Area' in Rural Housing Policy Area Types
- Objective ZU 18-9- New residential development should normally respect the pattern and grain of existing urban development in the surrounding area
- Site located within High Value Landscape- Landscape Character defined as Indented Estuarine Coast
- Site visible from designated Scenic Route S67 across the bay

5.2 Natural Heritage Designations

- Site located in proximity to Courtmacsherry Estuary SAC (Site Code: 001230) and Courtmacsherry Bay SPA (Site Code:004219)

6. The Appeal

6.1 Third Party Appeal. Grounds:

- Previous planning history in area for refusal of two-storey dwelling
- Overdevelopment of site; piecemeal development; appropriateness of proposal
- Need for dormer extension
- Detrimental to surrounding landscape, village's architectural heritage and views from the sea
- Fails to comply with provisions of operative County Development Plan
- Out of keeping with CDP, other single storey dwellings in vicinity

6.2 P.A. Response

- None

6.3 First Party Response

- Refutes grounds of appeal
- Size and scale of proposed development is not comparable to referenced planning application for two-storey dwelling
- Proposal seeks to increase floor area from 126m² to 161m² – retained original ridgeline and no alterations to plan of dwelling
- Not retirement homes as contended in appeal; appellant uses as holiday home but this property (like others) is occupied as permanent, family residence
- Sought to develop site based on needs and means- reference to piecemeal development is disingenuous; genuine need for additional accommodation (reasons outlined)
- Dormer extension required to comply with Building Regulations for provision of bedroom
- Photograph submitted outlining subject dwelling relative to other existing development

7. EIA Screening:

See completed Form 1 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.

8. AA Screening:

Having regard to the modest nature and scale of development, its location in an urban area, connection to existing services and absence of connectivity to European sites, it is concluded that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise as

<p>the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.</p>
--

9.0 Assessment

- 9.1 I have read all the documentation attached to this file including the appeal, the report of the Planning Authority and responses received, in addition to having visited the site. The proposed works involve relatively minor alterations to a previously approved development and include the provision of a box dormer extension to front roofslope and extension of length of existing 2 no. velux rooflights in rear roofslope.
- 9.2 The primary issues, as I consider them, are the impact of the proposed works on visual and residential amenity of the area.
- 9.3 I note the High Value Landscape of the area and that the site is visible from the Scenic Route S67, across the bay. In terms of impacts on visual amenity, I am satisfied with the design solution put forward. I consider that the proposed works would not be excessively overbearing, incongruous or dominant in this context and would integrate well with the existing permitted development on site and with existing development in the vicinity. The subject works are relatively modest in nature and do not result in an increase to the ridge height of the existing dwelling. Comparisons made with a two-storey dwelling refused permission in vicinity (PL04.215482) are considered not to be relevant to this case and in any event, each application is assessed on its own merits. I do not agree with the third-party assertion that the proposal represents overdevelopment of the site nor that it is piecemeal in nature. The planning history of the site is noted and I do not have any issue with same. This is stated to be the full-time residence of the applicants and the need for the additional floorspace has been outlined.
- 9.4 Having examined the information before me, and noting the site orientation and levels, I am satisfied that the proposed works would not unduly overbear, overlook or overshadow adjoining properties. I consider any potential impacts to be reasonable, having regard to the need to provide additional development within an area where residential development has been accepted in principle; to the existing pattern and

scale of development within the area and to the overall scale of the development proposed.

- 9.5 I am also satisfied that any impacts are in line with what might be expected in an area such as this. The proposed works are of a scale, height and design appropriate to its location and context. The vision for Courtmacsherry is noted, as set out in section 1.9.1 of the operative County Development Plan, and I consider the proposal to be in accordance with same. The proposal is not anticipated to have any significant impact on the integrity of the surrounding landscape nor its architectural heritage and will not detract from the attractive coastal setting of the site, in accordance with Objective DB-02 of the operative County Development Plan.
- 9.6 Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that the proposed development is in accordance with the provisions of the operative County Development Plan, is in keeping with the pattern of development in the area and is in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10. Recommendation

I recommend that permission for the development be GRANTED.

11. Reasons & Considerations

Having regard to the location of the site within a residential area; to the design, layout and scale of the proposed development and the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with conditions below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of property in the vicinity and is consistent with the pattern of development in the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12. Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be
----	---

	<p>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>Reason: In the interest of clarity</p>
2.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
3.	<p>Drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the relevant Section of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management</p>

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.

Lorraine Dockery
Senior Planning Inspector
28th January 2025

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-320632-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Extension to front of dwelling and extend existing Velux windows		
Development Address	The Meadows, Courtmacsherry, Co. Cork		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		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)?			
Yes			
No	X		Tick if relevant. No further action required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes		State the relevant threshold here for the Class of development.	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No			Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	Tick/or leave blank	State the relevant threshold here for the Class of development and indicate the size of the development relative to the threshold.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)
5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No	X	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)	

Yes		Screening Determination required
-----	--	----------------------------------

Inspector: Lorraine Dockery **Date:** 28/01/2025