



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-001243
PL-501454-MN-26

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 11th September 2026.

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

Planning Commissioner:



Emer Maughan

Date:

21st day of September 2026

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations:

Having regard to the Objective TWP 1 of Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031 which seeks to minimise the loss of trees and hedgerow associated with any development proposal and to encourage the retention of mature trees and hedgerows in new developments, it is considered that it has not been

satisfactorily demonstrated in the documentation lodged at application and appeal stages that the proposed development and development proposed to be retained, by reason of the extent of lowering of the previously existing ground level, absence of detail for the stabilisation and retention of c. 5.5m high embankment, tree root protection and/or compensatory planting of native tree species, that the development proposed to be retained would accord with Objective TWP 1, and 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 permission, the Commission did not share the view of the Inspector that the development proposed to be retained would be an acceptable form of development in a rural area, that it would not adversely impact the character of the area or that it would not be seriously injurious to the environmental visual or residential amenities of the area. The Commission considered that it had not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the existing prefabricated modular building would accord with Objective RSDP1 or that it could be upgraded and refurbished to accord with Table 15.3 'Guidelines for Siting and Designing a Rural House in the Vernacular Style', in terms of form, layout, roof pitch and materials, roof to wall proportion, fenestration design and material finishes, and further noted that RSDP1 states that sites requiring excessive excavation, filling and/ or removal of natural vegetation should be avoided. The Commission also considered that the development proposed to be retained constituted backland development and therefore had regard to Section 15.2.5 Backlands Sites which states inter alia that piecemeal developments of individual plots will generally not be permitted unless it is satisfactorily demonstrated that any proposed development shall not compromise the comprehensive redevelopment of adjoining sites. Although,

ordinarily, these issues 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 these matters under the current appeal.

(Note to be included in Order)