



## Board Direction

---

**Ref: 27.246785**

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup>, September 2016.

The Board decided to refuse permission generally in accordance with the following reasons and considerations.

### REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

- (1) The Board was not satisfied on the basis of the documentation on file in relation to this application and appeal that the applicants/appellants comes within the housing need criteria as set out under Objective RH14 of the County Development Plan and in the 'Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities', 2005 issued by the DoEH&LG for a dwelling in an area designated as an area under strong urban influence. The proposed development would, therefore, contravene an objective of the Development Plan, would be contrary to the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- (2) Having regard to the position on site of the proposed dwelling and its location to the rear of the established pattern of development on this local road and the extent of the driveway necessary to access the proposed development, it is considered that the proposal would represent inappropriate and haphazard backland development and would set an undesirable precedent for similar patterns of development in the area. Furthermore, it is considered that the design and suburban style of the proposed dwelling would be out of character with the established pattern of development in the surrounding area. The proposed development would, therefore, seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- (3) It is considered that the applicants/appellants have not satisfactorily demonstrated how adequate sightlines as required in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, NRA, 2011 can be achieved at this location. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- (4) The Board was not satisfied on the basis of the documentation submitted with this planning application and appeal that the applicant/appellant had satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposed method of disposal of effluent by means of a septic tank was appropriate having regard to the proximity of the site to public sanitary facilities. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Board, for the reasons set out above, did not share the Planning Inspector's conclusions that the applicants/appellants had overcome, in their appeal submission, the reasons for refusal stated by the planning authority.

Board Member: \_\_\_\_\_  
Paddy Keogh

Date: 26<sup>th</sup>, September 2016