

Board Direction BD-011712-23 ABP-311465-21

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 30/01/2023.

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 planning application and appeal and in the absence of a Natura Impact Statement, the Board cannot be satisfied that the proposed development individually, or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on the Shrule Turlough SAC (Site Code: 000525), or any other European site, in view of the site's conservation objectives. In such circumstances, the Board is precluded from granting permission.
- 2. The proposed development would result in the intensification of the use of an existing access onto the N84 National Secondary Road at a location where the maximum speed limit applies. The proposed development would be contrary to national policy in relation to the control of development on national roads as set out in the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government in January, 2012, which seeks to secure the efficiency, capacity and safety of the national road network, and to the relevant provisions of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028,

including policies MTP23 and MTP 24. The proposed development, by itseli, or by the precedent which the grant of permission for it would set for other relevant development, would adversely affect the use of a national road by traffic, would be contrary to these Ministerial Guidelines, would be contrary to the relevant provisions of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. On the basis of the information submitted with the application and appeal, the Board is not satisfied that minimum sightline distances of 215 metres in each direction from the access onto the N84, at a location where the maximum speed limit applies, can be achieved. It is considered therefore, that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Chris McGarry

Date: 30/01/2023