

## **Board Direction BD-000828-18 ABP-300947-18**

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 30/07/2018.

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

## **Reasons and Considerations**

- 1. It is considered that the proposed dwelling would be contrary to Policy RH-P-2 of the Donegal County Development Plan 2018-2024 on the grounds that the proposed development with two storey extension would not adequately integrate successfully into the landscape and would further erode the rural character of the area. It is also considered that the proposed development in conjunction with other dwellings in the vicinity would exacerbate the suburban pattern of development in this rural area and would give rise to the demand for uneconomic provision of infrastructure in the hinterland of Carrigart Village which would be contrary to Rural Housing Objective RH-0-4. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 2. Having regard to the sloping nature of the land, the soil conditions and to the significant level of site works proposed to support the percolation area, in addition to the proximity to a stream connected to Sheephaven Bay SAC, 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 or 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.

Note: The Board was not satisfied that the applicant had demonstrated sufficient housing need. However, given the substantive reasons for refusal, it was not considered necessary to pursue this matter further.

<b>Board Member</b>		Date:	31/07/2018
	Stephen Bohan	•	