



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

**Board Direction**  
**BD-006567-20**  
**ABP-307369-20**

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 23/09/2020.

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

### **Reasons and Considerations**

1. On the basis of the information submitted with the application and appeal including the statutory notices, the Board is not satisfied that the details of the proposed development and the development for which retention permission is sought, are sufficiently clear, or describe the full nature and extent of development carried out to date on this site, specifically with regard to the use of the site and elements of signage. In this context, the Board is, therefore, precluded from granting permission for the proposed development and the development for which retention permission is sought.
2. On the basis of the information submitted with the application and appeal, the Board is not satisfied that the proposed development and the development for which retention permission is sought, would not seriously injure the amenities of adjoining residential properties, by reason of, light pollution, noise, visual impact and the absence of appropriate visual buffers along the perimeters of the site. In this regard, the proposed development and the development for

which retention permission is sought, would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

**Note:** The Board noted the recommendation from the Inspector for a third reason for refusal namely that, notwithstanding the nature, scale and scope of the development sought under this application it is considered that the archaeological significance of the site is such that any development of the site, including the provision of a concrete yard, in advance of a comprehensive archaeological assessment, carried out to the requirements of the appropriate authorities, would be premature and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. However, given the substantive reasons for refusal set out above and noting that this constituted a new issue in the context of the appeal, the Board decided not to pursue this matter further in the current appeal.

**Board Member**

**Date:** 28/09/2020

---

Chris McGarry