

Board Direction BD-000727-18 ABP-301047-18

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 18/07/2018.

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

Reasons and Considerations

- Having regard to the topography of the site, the proposal to remove hedgerows, and the extensive earthworks associated with the proposed dwelling and associated raised soil polishing filter, and by reason of the bulk, scale and design of the proposed dwelling, it is considered that the proposed development, notwithstanding the proposed landscaping proposals, would form a discordant and obtrusive feature on the landscape at this location, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would fail to follow the contours of the site and sit naturally within it, and that it would therefore be contrary to Policy RDP 6 of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2013-2019.
- 2. Having regard to the topography of the site, the poor percolation characteristics of the soil, the relatively high winter water table and 'extreme' groundwater vulnerability rating, it is considered that the applicant has not adequately demonstrated that the proposed wastewater treatment system and soil polishing filter would be capable of treating and discharging effluent without risk to public health, to the quality of groundwater and/or surface water, or to the environment. Furthermore, given that testing has indicated that the site is unsuitable for a standard septic tank and percolation area, it is considered that the applicant has not demonstrated that the existing

percolation area within the appeal site would not be prejudicial to the health of future occupants of the proposed dwelling. The proposed development would therefore be prejudicial to human health and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note: The Board is not satisfied, based on the documentation submitted as part of the application and appeal, that adequate sightlines are available at the location of the proposed vehicular access, and accordingly could not be satisfied that the proposed development would not be likely to endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, but decided not to include this as a third reason for refusal, having regard to the substantive reasons for refusal set out above.

Board Member

Date: 19/07/2018

Michelle Fagan

Please attach a copy of the Board Direction with the Board Order.