



An
Bord
Pleanála

Board Direction
BD-002697-19
ABP-302982-18

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on March 27th 2019.

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 location of the site within an area identified as under the influence of Sligo town where housing is restricted to persons who can demonstrate rural-generated housing need and '*where such persons can demonstrate that the home they propose is in the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area*' in accordance with policy P-RAUI-HOU-1 of the Sligo County Development Plan 2017-2023, and having regard to National Policy Objective 19 of the National Planning Framework issued by the Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government in February, 2018 which, for rural areas under urban influence, states that it is policy to "*facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area...having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements*", it is considered that the applicants have not demonstrated an economic or social need to live in this rural area in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan and with national policy. Furthermore, the Board is not satisfied that the applicants'/appellants' housing needs could not be satisfactorily met in an established smaller town or village/settlement centre (such as Strandhill). The proposed development, in the absence of any definable or

demonstrable based need for a house in this rural area, and having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements, such as Strandhill, would contribute to the encroachment of random rural development in the area, and would militate against the preservation of the rural environment and the efficient provision of public services and infrastructure. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note:- The Board concurred with the view of the Inspector that the proposed development would represent a traffic hazard, as set out in her recommended second refusal reason. However, it considered that this matter would, as noted by the Inspector, represent a new issue in the context of the appeal, and decided not to use its powers under Section 137 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, and not to include it as a reason for refusal, having regard to the substantive reason for refusal as set out above.

[Please issue a copy of this Direction with the Board order to the parties.]

Board Member

Date: 27th March 2019

Philip Jones