



## Board Direction

---

**Ref: 16.SU0098**

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

The Board considered this application for substitute consent at the same meeting as the application for permission for further quarrying development under ABP file ref no. QD16.QD0022.

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

### REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Having regard to:

- The nature and scale of the quarry operation for which substitute consent is sought, and its planning history;
- The pattern of development in the area including proximity to a number of houses;
- The nature of the access road serving the site, which is considered to be inadequate to cater for the significant volume of heavy goods vehicles accessing the operational quarry;
- The documented instances when the amenities of the area were injured by reason of noise, dust and general disturbance when the quarry was operational;
- The inadequate surface water management measures in place to cater for silt-laden run-off from the site and access road, which polluted water subsequently drained to local watercourses in an uncontrolled manner;
- The elevated nature of the site and visual scarring and negative landscape impacts caused by the quarry excavations;
- The limited environmental monitoring or management measures in place at the site when it was in operation, which are considered inadequate;

It is considered that the operation of the quarry at this location gave rise to significant environmental effects, which seriously injured the residential amenity of dwellings in the area, seriously injured the amenities of other users of the access road, had unacceptable negative impacts on the visual amenity of the area, gave rise to an unacceptable risk of water pollution and that the quarry caused a danger to public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users. To permit substitute consent, would, therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The Board decided not to issue a draft Direction under s177L of the Planning & Development Act, given that the site in question is not in operation, the planning status is clear, and satisfactory powers are available to the planning authority to deal with the site.

Board Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017  
Conall Boland