



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Direction
CD-021560-25
ABP-320009-24

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 21/11/2025.

The Commission decided to refuse substitute consent for the following reasons and considerations.

**Planning
Commissioner:**

Date: 12/12/2025

Tom Rabbette

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

1. The application site is located within the landscape character area 'Coastal Landscape' as indicated on Map 8.1: Landscape Character Areas and in an area with a landscape sensitivity of 'Class 3 – Special: High sensitivity to change' as indicated on Map 8.2: Landscape Sensitivity of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028. In areas of high landscape sensitivity, the design and the choice of location of proposed development in the landscape will be critical considerations as indicated in Policy Objective LCM 3 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028. It is also a Policy Objective of the planning authority to strictly control the nature and pattern of development

within coastal areas and ensure that it is designed and landscaped to the highest standards and sited appropriately so as not to detract from the visual amenity of the area, as indicated in Policy Objective MCD 2. Furthermore, DM Standard 46 of the said development plan, restricts development in this area to, *inter alia*, family farm business and locally resourced enterprises (subject to site suitability and appropriate scale and design) including those with substantiated cases for such a specific location.

Having regard to the exposed, prominent, coastline location of the application site and the siting of the agricultural storage sheds on this exposed site, and also having regard to the scale, height, floor area and finish of the structures, it is considered that the proposed development would adversely impact on the visual amenities of this sensitive landscape, would be contrary to Policy Objective LCM 3 and Policy Objective MCD 2, would fail to comply with DM Standard 46 and would set an undesirable precedent for similar developments in the area. Furthermore, the Commission was not satisfied that the applicant had satisfactorily substantiated the case for the scale of the development proposed at this sensitive location given the nature of the agribusiness as described in application documentation and the Commission did not consider that the development constituted a family farm business on this site. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant substitute consent, the Commission considered that the structures would adversely impact on the visual amenities of this exposed, sensitive coastal location which the planning authority seeks to protect as indicated in the statutory development plan for the area. The Commission was not satisfied that the applicant had substantiated the agribusiness case for the structures at this location and a grant of substitute consent would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in this area that has a high sensitivity to change as indicated in the statutory development plan. The Commission agreed with the planning authority's concerns relating to the principle of the development at this location in the absence of a substantiated case and

further agreed with the authority's concerns in relation to the visual impact of these isolated structures on an open and exposed site.