



Board Direction

Ref: 06D.246223

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 23rd, June 2016.

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

REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

1. The proposed development would result in a significant intensification of traffic exiting the proposed development onto the Falls Road, which is a local (urban) road, narrow in width and without footpaths. This would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction of road users. Furthermore, the proposed development is considered to be premature as there is an existing deficiency on the Falls Road in terms of the lack of adequate, safe pedestrian facilities, which renders it unsuitable to carry the increased pedestrian traffic likely to result from the proposed development. The proposed development, if permitted, by itself or by the precedent that the grant of permission for it would set for other relevant developments, would adversely affect the use of the Falls Road by traffic. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The proposal is premature pending the provision of coordinated and wider planning strategy/framework for the area and pending upgrading of the existing local network to facilitate increased traffic and pedestrian levels as well as facilitating better linkages to the public transport infrastructure in the area. A coordinated approach is needed in order to avoid piecemeal and haphazard development. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Board Member: _____ Date: 24th, June 2016
Paddy Keogh

Note: The Board shared the Planning Inspector's concerns with regard to certain engineering issues relating to surface water, disposal of foul water, sediment management and details of the proposed interception system beneath the attenuation tank. The Board considered that these matters might be addressed by way of the issuing of a Section 132 Notice, but decided not to pursue these matters in the context of the current appeal in light of the substantive reasons for refusal as set out above.

[Please issue a copy of Board Direction with Board Order]