

Board Direction BD-002257-19 ABP-302068-18

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 30/01/2019.

The Board decided to refuse permission for the following reasons and considerations.

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the high volume of traffic recorded on the local road, the Board considered that the proposed development would add to a proliferation of vehicular entrances on this rural road and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard. Furthermore, the Board considered that the proposed removal of a significant part of a hedgerow to gain access to the site and to achieve the sightlines would have a detrimental effect on the rural character of the area and would be contrary to Policy SS63 of the Louth County Development Plan.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Board considered that the creation of a new entrance on this heavily trafficed rural road would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area.

Board Member		Date:	30/01/2019
	Michelle Fagan	-	

Note 1 - The Board had regard to the soil conditions and high water table, and is not satisfied, on the basis of the submissions made in connection with the planning application and the appeal, and given that the area is designated by the Environmental Protection Agency as being a zone of high risk from domestic waste water pollution, that effluent from the development can be satisfactorily treated and disposed of on site, notwithstanding the proposed use of a proprietary wastewater treatment system. The proposed development would, therefore, be prejudicial to public health. This is a new issue in the context of the appeal and the board decided not to include it as a reason for refusal.

Note 2 – The Board is not satisfied that the Applicant had demonstrated a social and economic need to live at this location, in accordance with Objective 19 of the National Planning Framework, but decided not to include as a reason for refusal, as it constitutes a new issue in the context of the appeal.