

Board Direction BD-003492-19 ABP-303794-19

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 7/8/2019.

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

Reasons and Considerations

- 1. Having regard to the location of the site outside a designated settlement on lands zoned Greenbelt, its location adjacent to a National Primary Route with access proposed from same and its unserviced nature, it is considered that the proposed development would conflict with current policies of the Waterford County Development Plan 2011, as varied, regarding holiday home development, would constitute ad-hoc and substandard tourism development and as such would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.'
- 2. The proposal would give rise to an increase in trip generation and traffic movements on a section of the N25, National Primary Route, where the maximum permitted speed limit applies, resulting in a negative impact on the traffic safety and carrying capacity of this National Road. The proposed development, by itself and the precedent it would set, would be contrary to the policies and objectives of the Waterford County Development Plan 2011, as varied, and be contrary to the Spatial Planning and National Roads, Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2012 which seek to direct such development to appropriately zoned lands and service centres. The proposed development would therefore give rise to a traffic hazard and establish an

undesirable precedent for similar type development contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note: On the basis of the information submitted with the application and appeal, the Board is not satisfied that the subject site in combination with the existing septic tank and percolation area serving the existing dwelling, is suitable for the safe disposal of foul effluent arising from the proposed three number holiday let apartments. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development would be prejudicial to public health and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In addition to this issue which the board considered was a new issue, the Board also considered that there was insufficient information on bin storage facilities, private and communal facilities and parking and set-down arrangement arrangements for the proposed development to determine whether the development would provide satisfactory residential amenities for the existing and proposed developments. However, in the context of the substantive reasons for refusal set out in 1 and 2 above, the Board decided not to issue a section 132 notice to the applicant requesting the applicant to submit additional information for consideration.

Board Member		Date:	08/07/2019
	Maria FitzGerald	•	

ABP-303794-19 Board Direction Page 2 of 2