



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Direction
CD-020025-25
ABP-321988-25

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 24/06/2025.

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

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to Objective RHO 4 and Objective NEO 26 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028, which requires applicants with housing applications within Mayo's Coastal Areas and Lakeshores, and within areas along scenic routes with designated scenic views, who demonstrate a long-standing social link to the area concerned, to ensure that the development proposed does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area, cannot be considered at an alternative location, meets high standards in siting and design, satisfies all other criteria with regard to, inter alia, servicing, public safety, and environmental considerations, and demonstrates enhancement to the local landscape character and ecological connectivity, and having regard to the extent of the works proposed including permanent removal of naturally occurring woodland, cutting and filling a steep slope in a scenic area, and construction of a permanent structure in a sensitive landscape, it is considered that the proposed development at this location would impinge on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area and would not enhance the local landscape character. The proposed development would contravene objectives RHO 4 and NEO 26 and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note: The Board noted the comments of the Inspector that on the basis of the information received with the application, inadequate information was provided to enable a determination to be made that adverse effects on site integrity of the Clew Bay Complex Special Area of Conservation can be excluded, and that reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects on the integrity of a European Site. While, ordinarily, this would warrant further consideration and a request for further information, in this instance given the substantive reason for refusal above, it was decided not to pursue this matter under the current appeal.

Planning

Commissioner:

Date: 24/06/2025



MaryRose McGovern