



Board Direction

Ref: PL21.246833

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 4th October 2016. The Board decided to refuse permission generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, and in accordance with the draft reasons and considerations set out below. The Board also decided not to award costs, as set out below

REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The spatial development principles of the planning authority are set out in Section 3.2.2 of the Sligo County Development Plan 2011-2017, and specific spatial development policies are set out accordingly. These policies broadly support employment growth in the Gateway City of Sligo and, in areas outside the Gateway, seeks to direct growth into towns and villages. Provision is also made for supporting rural communities through facilitating sustainable activities or uses in rural areas. Section 4.1.4 of the Development Plan supports industry and enterprise locations in Sligo City and its satellite towns, as well as in key support towns and other settlements. Policy provision is also made in Section 4.1.4 for development that needs to locate near a natural resource, as well as in Section 4.2 in relation to rural development and enterprise policies, including specific provision for rural resource-based enterprise, and in Section 4.2.3 in relation to the diversification of agricultural activity. Finally, under Section 12.4.19 of the Development Plan, industry will normally only be permitted on lands zoned for business/enterprise/industry. It is considered that the development proposed to be retained would not comply with these policies, by reason of its rural location, its nature, which is not locally resource-based, its substantial scale, the potential presented for traffic congestion and hazard on narrow rural roads, and due to the incongruous quasi-industrial appearance of the structures, which are obtrusive in this visually vulnerable and scenic coastal location. Accordingly, it is considered that the development proposed to be retained would interfere with the character of the landscape, and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard. The proposed development and the development proposed to be retained would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Having regard to the planning history of the site, the nature of the current application and of the appeal, the submissions made on file, the request made for costs, the provisions of Section 145 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, and to the discretion afforded to the Board in this matter, it is considered that particular circumstances do not apply in this case that would justify the award of costs against the planning authority.

Board Member: _____ Date: 7th November 2016
Fionna O' Regan