

ABP-310352-21 (Sligo) A. Doherty

Jennifer Carleton

From: Bord
Sent: Tuesday 20 July 2021 16:01
To: Appeals2
Subject: FW: Re exempted development Ed 420 for 14 the drive
Attachments: response letter 9.7.21.pdf

From: David Kenny [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday 20 July 2021 15:58
To: Bord <bord@pleanala.ie>
Subject: Re exempted development Ed 420 for 14 the drive

Fao Lisa quinn

Hi,

Please see response letter to letter received from an bord pleanala recently.

Thanks
David

FAO: Lisa Quinn
An Bord Pleanála
64 Marlborough St
Rotunda
Dublin 1
D01 V902

bord@pleanala.ie

20 July 2021

RE: Exempted development ED 420 for 14 The Drive, Ocean Links

Dear Lisa,

I refer to my original correspondence dated 22 May 2021, in addition to your letter dated 8 July 2021 and Terranova letter dated 16 June 2021.

In Terranova letter, they note that from Mid-March 2021 there began a series of correspondences between ourselves and Sligo County Council. This is factually incorrect as I alluded to in my letter dated 22 May 2021, that we had numerous email correspondences with Sligo County Council dating back to July 2020 when Dominic and Stephanie Galwey noted their intentions to build an extension. We also had the issue of not been notified by Sligo County Council that we could submit our own Section 5 referral which was kindly noted by one of your colleagues in An Bord Pleanála.

I would like to highlight, myself and my wife Orla had numerous discussions with the Galwey's including two meetings in their house, expressing our issues with the proposed extension as we will be directly affected by the extension due to its proximity to our garden. It should also be pointed out that the extension will also affect number 12 The Drive and 11 The Drive as it will be visible from their gardens also. We offered suggestions to the Galwey's as to changes we would like them to consider such as reducing the roof height or consider a hip roof that would work for all parties involved, however no changes happened to the plans following these discussions.

I would also like to address issues which Terranova highlighted one to three in their letter below:

- 1) The extension steps up 0.45m (c. 1.5 foot) to a floor which is 1.5 foot higher than ground floor. Whilst Terranova note that our neighbour's property is lower than 13 the Drive, this does not change my interpretation that the Galwey's will be stepping onto a different floor. Could Terranova, please clarify how a 1.5-foot jump is going to be made from the existing ground floor to the new floor as I would expect steps will need to be installed to get to this level strengthening my view that it is another floor to the house/extension.

I would like to reiterate that, per Government planning guidelines, once you go above a single storey which I deem this to be, their needs to be 2m (6.6ft) from your neighbours boundary and there is only 5.6ft from our boundary fence. The proximity to our garden is covered in point 2 of the letter.

I still have an issue with a window which will be on the side facing our garden given Terranova note the difference in site levels and it is also referred to in government guidelines.

- 2) Due to the proximity of the 12 foot flat roof (3.1m) – c. 5.6 feet from our boundary fence , we feel that it will lead to a loss of light and overshadowing into our garden. The extension will block our evening sun which makes its way around to our property at c. 6pm – 8pm and it is very hard to determine what drawings Terranova have provided actually prove given they are computerised and therefore not accurate reflection of real life events. The inspector will be able to make their own assessment and the proximity to our garden on their site visit.
- 3) Terranova note that they do not understand our comment “not inkeeping with the estate”). We are very firm in our belief that the very bulky flat roof extension and does not fit into the landscape in Strandhill which is a place of natural beauty with the sea one side and Knockarea Mountain the other side.

The extension in its current state will be visible from 7 rear gardens in our estate and will either block a sea or mountain view. All of the other extensions along this row are of a hip roof nature and complement the landscape better and are more inkeeping with the estate than a bulky 12 foot flat roof extension.

I would like to note that planning permissions in Strandhill have not been granted given they directly affect views to the sea and the mountain being Knocknarea. I would like to think the inspector will consider this concern irrespective of whether it is an extension at the back of a house or a new planning permission.

If you have any queries on the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

David Kenny

David Kenny