

Board Direction BD-016304-24 ABP-315914-23

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 13/05/2024.

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

Reasons and Considerations

- 1. The proposed development, comprising 28 no. houses in a Rural Village where local infrastructure is not considered to be sufficiently developed to cater for development of the scale proposed, would materially contravene Objective RSVO4 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028, which specifically provides that housing development within Rural Villages is limited to individual multi-house developments of up to 12 houses, or 10% of the existing housing stock, unless it can be demonstrated that local infrastructure is sufficiently developed to cater for a larger residential development. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 2. The proposed development, due to its design, scale and the overall number of houses proposed on a prominent site at the edge of a small village, would constitute inappropriate development that would be incongruous with the prevailing residential density in the area, inconsistent with the character of the village, overbearing and would seriously injure the amenity of the area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Objective RSVO 3 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 which provides that residential development within rural villages should

ABP-315914-23 Direction Page 1 of 2

be commensurate with the nature and scale of the particular rural village or settlement. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- 3. It is considered that the proposed development, comprising 28 no houses, would result in a significant increase in traffic movements within the village and also comprises modifications to a road layout, specifically where car parking is proposed alongside the local road. It is considered that in the absence of a Road Safety Audit it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not result in traffic hazards for road users and future residents within the scheme.
- 4. Having regard to the proximity of the site to a cluster of Recorded Monuments and to the scale of the proposed development, it is considered that the archaeological potential of the site is such that any development of the site 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.

Note:

The Board noted that there was potentially a new issue that the majority of the houses proposed are situated on lands which are located outside the settlement boundary of Aughagower and are un-zoned in the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028, it is considered that the proposed development may conflict with the Core and Settlement Strategy of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, specifically Core Strategy Objective CSP1, which seeks to manage the level of growth in each settlement to ensure that future growth is in accordance with the Core Strategy and County Settlement Hierarchy, and that the proposed development may be contrary to the provisions of Objective RSVO1 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 which requires that future housing occurs in rural settlements and villages within the settlement/village boundary. However given the substantive reasons for refusal above the Board did not consider the matter further.

Board Member

Liam Bergin

ABP-315914-23

Date: 15/05/2024

Page 2 of 2