



An
Bord
Pleanála

Board Direction
BD-002070-19
ABP-301913-18

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 07/01/2019.

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

Reasons and Considerations

1. The application site is located within a sensitive area, including the visually vulnerable areas designated around Lough Arrow and the designated scenic routes along the public road network to the west, south and east, where additional restrictions on one-off rural housing are provided for under section 5.3.1 of the Sligo County Development Plan 2017-2023, including within Rural Areas In Need of Regeneration where rural housing policy P-GBSA-HOU-1 applies. The applicant has not demonstrated compliance with this policy. The proposed development is considered to be contrary to the provisions of the County Development Plan 2017-2023, including its rural housing policy and would constitute inappropriate housing development in a rural area, giving rise to an uneconomic demand for the provision of public services and facilities and, as such, would be contrary to the ppsd of the area
2. The proposed development, by reason of its location overlooking the shores of Lough Arrow, which are designated as visually vulnerable, would significantly affect the landscape character of the area contrary to Development Plan Policy P-LCAP-1 to protect the physical landscape,

including visually vulnerable areas and along scenic routes, and Policy P-LCAP-2 to discourage development that would be detrimental to the unique visual character of designated visually vulnerable areas. As such the proposed development would be contrary to the ppsd of the area.

Board Member

Date: 09/01/2019

Terry Prendergast

Note:

The Board is not satisfied that, in the absence of demonstration that sightline distance can be achieved at the proposed entrance to current standards applicable to rural roads outside of the 60kph speed limit, the proposed development would not endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard. Given the substantive reasons for refusal above, it did not consider it necessary to circulate this matter to the parties for comment.