



Board Direction

Ref: 16.QD0022

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on March 28th , 2017.

The file was considered at the same meeting as SU16.SU0098, a substitute consent application in respect of the same quarry operation.

The Board decided to refuse permission generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons and considerations set out below.

REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

In making its decision the Board had regard, inter alia, to the following:

- (a) the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, and in particular Section 37L,
- (b) the 'Quarry and Ancillary Activities, Guidelines for Planning Authorities' issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in April 2004,
- (c) the provisions of the Mayo County Development Plan 2014 - 2020,
- (d) the report and the opinion of the planning authority under section 37L(12)(a),
- (e) the submissions made in accordance with regulations made under Article 270(1) of the Planning and Development (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations 2015,
- (f) the planning history of the site,
- (g) the pattern of development in the area,

- (h) the decision of the Board to refuse substitute consent in respect of the subject quarry under Ref. 16.SU0098,
- (i) the nature and scale of the development the subject of this application for further development of the quarry, and
- (j) the report of the Board's Inspector,

It is considered that:

1. The proposed development would involve the further development of the existing quarry which has been refused substitute consent (under ABP reference 16.SU.0098) and is therefore an unauthorised development in accordance with s177O(5) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). To permit an extension of the quarry would therefore not be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The access road serving the site is deficient in width, alignment, structure and surface condition and is not capable of carrying the traffic that the proposed development would generate, which would therefore endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and the obstruction of road users.
3. The proposed development would seriously injure the landscape and the scenic amenities of the area in a manner that was contrary to policy LP-01 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2014-2020 and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Board Member: _____ Date: 31st March 2017
Conall Boland