

Board Direction BD-000283-18 ABP-300288-17

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on May 8th 2018.

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

Reasons and Considerations

- 1. Section 2.3.4 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2014-2020 states that in areas along the sea, estuaries and lake shorelines (referred to as scenic areas) only planning permission for replacement housing, extensions, or where a farmer has no other land except in those areas, will be allowed and the scenic views will be protected as much as possible. This policy is considered reasonable. On the basis of the documentation submitted with the application and appeal, including landholding maps, and having regard to the coastal location and prominence of the site, it is considered that the proposed development would constitute an unnecessary obtrusive feature on the landscape, and would therefore interfere with the character of the landscape at this location, which it is necessary to preserve, and would be contrary to section 2.3.4 of the Development Plan. The proposed development of the area.
- 2. Having regard to the positioning of the proposed development along the coast, the topography of the site, and the level of cut and fill proposed, it is considered that the proposed development would fail to be adequately absorbed and

integrated into the natural landscape and would contravene materially Objective LP-01 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2014-2020. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. Having regard to the slope of the site, the ground conditions observed on site, and the proximity to the Clew Bay Complex Special Area of Conservation (site code 001482), and having regard to the proposed waste water treatment arrangements, including the pumping of effluent, and to the significant level of proposed site works, the Board is not satisfied, on the basis of the submissions made in connection with the planning application and the appeal, that effluent from the development can be satisfactorily treated and disposed of on site, notwithstanding the proposed use of a proprietary wastewater treatment system, and accordingly the Board cannot be satisfied that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans and projects, would not be likely to have a significant effect on this European site, in view of the site's conservation objectives. The proposed development would, therefore, be prejudicial to public health, would pose an unacceptable risk of environmental pollution, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Board Member

Date: 8th May 2018

Philip Jones