



Board Direction

Ref:PL05.246871

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were further considered at a Board meeting held on 19th December 2016.

The Board considered that the proposed works did not come within a class of development described in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 and that therefore EIA did not apply. Further, the Board did not consider the proposed works to constitute an extension of the works already granted permission on site and therefore did not consider that the EIA submitted in respect of that development required to be revisited.

The Board decided to grant permission in accordance with the following reasons, considerations and conditions.

Reasons and Considerations

The Board completed an Appropriate Assessment in relation to potential impacts on Natura 2000 Sites and having regard to the NIS and the Inspector's report and submissions on file, the Board concluded that on the basis of the information available that the proposed development either individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not adversely affect the integrity of the European site no.000197 (The West of Ardara/Maas Road Special Area of Conservation) in view of the site's conservation objectives.

The Board concurred with and adopted the screening assessment carried out by the Inspector in relation to the subject of environmental impact assessment. The Board was satisfied that significant effects on the environment are not likely to arise from the subject development, either alone or in combination with the permitted wind farm, and therefore an EIS is not required in support of the planning application.

Having regard to the permitted development on site, to the pattern of development in the area and to the limited nature of the proposal to serve

an already permitted development, the Board considered that the proposed works would not be injurious to the visual amenities of the area and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to refuse permission, the Board considered that the proposed revisions to hardstanding areas and turning circles would have a minor impact in visual terms, particularly given the already permitted development which they propose to serve. Further, the Board was satisfied that no further technical justification for the proposed works was necessary as they represented practical measures to facilitate completion of the permitted project.

Conditions

1. Plans Partic
2. Lands to be re-instated on decommissioning of windfarm which they serve. Reason: In the interests of orderly development
3. S48 Unspec.

Board Member: _____ Date: 21st December 2016
Michael Leahy