



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-000280
PL-500301-SO-25

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 10 March 2026.

The Commission decided to refuse permission generally in accordance with the following reasons and considerations.

Planning Commissioner:

Mary Henchy

Date:

10th day of March 2026

Reasons and Considerations

1. It is evident from the Inspectors site visit that the structure is used for the stabling of horses, the use of the structure for the housing of animals goes beyond what could be considered the use of a garage for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling and differs to a use that is normally associated with the use of a garage. The applicant has not correctly described the nature of the structure to be retained, nor, provided adequate detail on the use of the proposed structure to be retained to demonstrate that it can be adequately serviced. The

development for retention therefore does not accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The development to be retained due to its; proximity to the public road, visibility from the public road, the level difference between the finished floor level of the structure and the public road and the scale, size and finish of the structure is considered to detract from the visual amenity of the area and therefore is not in accordance with Section 33.4.5 of the Sligo County Development Plan 2024-2030. The development for retention therefore does not accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Commission did not concur that the use of a garage for the housing of animals is a use that is incidental to the enjoyment of a house but considered that it is a use more akin to a shed, and that the applicant had not demonstrated how the existing use is being serviced. Furthermore, the Commission considered that while the structure to be retained did not impact on the adjoining property due to overlooking or overshadowing, the position of this structure did detract from the visual amenity of the area due to the position, design, finish and layout of the structure to be retained.

Note: In coming to the conclusion that the use of a garage for the housing of animals goes beyond what could be considered the use of a garage for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling and therefore differs to the use that is normally associated with the use of a garage, the Commission noted that there is no definition of Garage in the Planning and Development Act. The Commission had regard to the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 as

amended, Schedule 2, Part 1 Class 3 Conditions and Limitations 6 which states:
"The structure shall not be used for human habitation or for the keeping of pigs, poultry, pigeons, ponies or horses, or for any other purpose other than a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the house", and this provided some clarity on the term a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of a house. The Commission therefore concluded that the development for retention was more akin to a shed than a garage.