

Board Direction BD-012250-23 ABP-312573-22

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 23/05/2023.

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

Reasons and Considerations

It is an objective of the planning authority that there will be a general presumption against allowing ribbon development, that is, greater than 5 houses in a row over 250 metres of road frontage, as indicated in objective RHO 7 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 which is the statutory applicable development plan at the time of making this decision. Taken together with the existing and permitted dwellings at this location, the proposed development would be the sixth dwelling in a row within 250 metres of road frontage and would thus conflict with the said objective.

Taken in conjunction with existing and permitted housing in the area, the proposed development would create and extend a pattern of undesirable ribbon development along the public road, would constitute an excessive density of housing development in this rural area, would be contrary to the recommendations of the "Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities" issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in April 2005 and the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028, would detract from the character of the area, would lead to demands for the uneconomic provision of services and facilities and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note: The Board noted that the Inspector's report referenced concerns with respect to wastewater treatment, in terms of the concentration of effluent treatment systems in this area and the potential cumulative impacts on groundwater quality and that the potential for prejudice to public health is notable. While the Inspector noted that this is a "new issue" in terms of the appeal, and ordinarily this would warrant further consideration or information, given the substantive reason for refusal set out above, the Board decided not to pursue this issue in the context of this appeal.

Board Member Mary Credo

Date: 23/05/2023