



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-001255
PL-501332-TY-26

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 14 September 2026.

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

Planning Commissioner:

Mary Gurrie

Mary Gurrie

Date: 14/09/2026

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the location of the site in the rural area on unzoned and unserviced land outside of a designated settlement, and to the nature and scale of the operations on the site, it is considered that it has not been satisfactorily

demonstrated that the proposed development and development proposed to be retained would constitute a small scale rural enterprise or that it could not be located on appropriately zoned land within towns or villages. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Section 8.4.4. and Policy 8-5 (Start-up Enterprise in the Open Countryside) of the Tipperary County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the nature and length of the proposed access road from the R494, the lack of information in relation to the works required to upgrade it, to the requirement to provide sightlines at the site entrance to the public roadway in accordance with the provisions of Section 6.1 and Tables 6.1 and 6.2 of Appendix 6, Volume 3 of the Tipperary County Development Plan 2022, the lack of legal certainty as to the ability of the developer to maintain the sightlines on an on-going basis, and to the status of the R494 as a Strategic Transport Corridor in the Tipperary County Development Plan 2022-2028, the Commission was not satisfied that it has been demonstrated that suitable sightlines can be maintained and that the site can be accessed safely, and considered that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction to road users. The proposed development and development proposed to be retained would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note: The Commission considered that there was a lack of information on the file in relation to the nature of the materials to be stored on site and any

processing or handling of same in order to allow for an assessment of any potential environmental impacts. While ordinarily this would warrant further consideration and a request for further information, in this instance given the substantive reasons for refusal above, it was decided not to pursue these matters under the current appeal.