



Board Direction

Ref: PL04.245763

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on March 30th 2016.

The Board decided to refuse permission generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, for the following reasons and considerations.

Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the existing pattern of development in the vicinity, including the significant level of individual houses in an unserviced rural area outside of any designated settlement, it is considered that the proposed development would exacerbate the haphazard and unplanned form of development, would intensify urban sprawl and would militate against the preservation of the rural character of the area. Furthermore, having regard to the density of existing development in the vicinity, reliant on individual wastewater treatment systems, in an area identified by the Environmental Protection Agency as being at very high risk from domestic waste water pollution, it is considered that the proposed development would be prejudicial to public health. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the existing pattern of development in the area, and to the backland nature and layout of the proposed development, particularly in terms of the proposed access to the site over a narrow private lane surrounding an existing house on two sides with the proposed driveway within the site along a third side, it is considered that the proposed development would seriously injure the amenities of existing residential properties in the area, and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. Having regard to the vertical and horizontal alignment of the public road, onto which the proposed development would take access, the Board is not satisfied that adequate sight distances are available to serve the proposed development. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard arising from the additional traffic turning movements that would be generated on this public road where sightlines are restricted. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Board Member: _____ Date: 30th March 2016
Philip Jones