



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-300246-17

Development

Proposed construction of a garage type structure with attached office area, parking, entrance, boundary fence/wall, proposed connection to the existing mains foul sewer network located in the adjacent road and all ancillary works.

Location

Granardkill, Granard, Co. Longford

Planning Authority

Longford County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

16/300

Applicant

Raymond Farrell

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

REFUSE

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant

Raymond Farrell

Observer(s)

Linda Higgins

Date of Site Inspection

16th February 2018

Inspector

Niall Haverty

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated site area of 0.341 ha, is located in the townland of Granardkill, on the western outskirts of Granard, Co. Longford. The appeal site is roughly rectangular in shape and currently comprises undeveloped agricultural grassland. It is relatively flat with a slight fall from north to south.
- 1.2. The appeal site is located on the northern side of the R194 Longford Road and is bounded by agricultural lands to the north and west, the R194 to the south and an existing warehouse/industrial type structure and associated yard area to the east. A row of detached houses are located on the southern side of the R194 and further to the west of the appeal site. A number of industrial/warehouse type developments are also located several hundred metres to the south west of the appeal site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, as described in the statutory notices consists of the construction of a garage type structure with attached office area, parking, entrance, boundary fence/wall, proposed connection to the existing mains foul sewer network located in the adjacent road and all ancillary works. On foot of a request for further information it is also proposed to provide a surface water collection system and underground storage tank.
- 2.2. The proposed garage structure has a maximum ridge height of 6.586m and a stated gross floor space of 325 sq m. It features a nap plaster finish to a height of c. 2.4m with green/grey coloured cladding panels above this, and on the roof. The front elevation of the proposed structure features two large roller shutter doors, with a further roller shutter on the side (west) elevation. Separate pedestrian doors are located on the front and rear elevations. The proposed front boundary wall comprises a 1m high natural stone wall with a 1m high steel railing on top, as well as 2m high stone pillars at regular intervals.
- 2.3. The stated owner of the site is Mr John Petit, and a letter of consent was submitted with the application. A letter was also submitted from an adjoining landowner, Mr

Thomas Petit, consenting to the blocking up of the existing entrance to the east and removal of the existing front wall boundary and its replacement with a concrete post and rail fence in line with the existing fence further to the east.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Longford County Council decided to refuse permission for three reasons, summarised as follows:

1. Proposed development would adversely affect the operation and safety of the Regional Road network by adverse impact on the Regional Road.
2. Sight distances required by NRA Road Geometry Handbook are not achievable, and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users due to the movement of extra traffic generated.
3. Proposed entrance does not have sufficient width and depth to allow vehicles to enter and leave the site safely. Proposed development would be injurious to public health. It is the Policy of the Planning Authority as set out in ROADS 2 of the CDP to provide a safe and efficient road network. The proposed development would result in a hazard to all traffic due to the surface water run-off running directly onto the road.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. The Planning Officer's final report can be summarised as follows:

- Proposed development is substantively in keeping with the zoning objective.
- The site is not located within any NHA, SAC, SPA or Broad Zones.
- Policy ROADS 2 is to provide a road network which is safe and efficient. Sight distances are not achievable and the proposed development would result in a traffic hazard.

- On the basis of the report received from the Road section, the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- As the 9 month period has passed there is no available time to seek further clarification of further information.
- Having regard to the very serious concerns with regard to traffic safety issues, permission should be refused.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Municipal District Engineer:
 - Sightlines are not achievable due to obstacles.
 - Proposed entrance is inadequate for safety reasons.
 - Topography of site is towards the road but drawing suggests falls away from the road without stating how this will be achieved.
 - Water from the petrol interceptor is likely to contain pollutants and discharge would require a discharge licence.
 - Proposed 4m high sound barrier would be visually intrusive and gives rise to potential accidents on the regional road.
- Chief Fire Officer: No objection, subject to conditions.
- Environmental Health Officer: No objection, subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. Irish Water: No objection.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. A number of third party observations were made at application stage and following the receipt of further information. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Site should not have been rezoned to industrial.
- Errors on drawings.

- Existing warehouse site is used as a staging post/maintenance yard for HGVs with an unacceptable level of noise, air and light pollution and road safety issues. Refuelling activities take place there and it is unclear if interceptor, trap etc. is in place.
- Permitted use of the warehouse is for 'warehouse light industrial purposes only'.
- Impact on residential and visual amenity.
- Contrary to Objective ECON 13.
- Warehouse site is in poor condition with surface water running onto public road, oil, fire debris and parking all over the site.
- HGVs use the warehousing site on a 24 hour basis and vehicle repair is happening at night.
- There are 9 industrial zoned sites within Granard which would be suitable. There is no justification for the development on a greenfield site.
- Negative impact on the environment with no consideration of pollution dangers.
- Applicant is proposing to close an existing entrance to the adjoining site which is outside the red line site boundary.
- Impact on public water supply and public foul sewer network.
- There is no surface water sewer or surface water discharge point available to the applicant. Proposed use of holding tank give rise to risk of groundwater pollution.
- It is not feasible for a company maintaining and operating trucks not to require an area to clean them down.
- Holding tank is insufficiently sized. Services are not provided on the site and require an unreliable and insufficient disposal of surface water.
- No justification test provided, despite Planning Authority requests.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

- 4.1.1. **Reg. Ref. 16/55:** Withdrawn application for proposed construction of a garage type structure with attached office area, wash bay, parking, entrance, boundary fence/wall, proposed connection to the existing mains foul sewer network located in the adjacent road and all ancillary works.

Adjacent Sites

- 4.1.2. I am not aware of any recent relevant planning history in the surrounding area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Longford County Development Plan 2015-2021

- 5.1.1. Granard is identified as a Key Service Town in the settlement hierarchy for County Longford. The appeal site is zoned as 'industrial' in the Granard zoning map contained within Appendix 1B of the Longford County Development Plan 2015-2021.
- 5.1.2. The stated zoning policy for 'Industrial / Commercial / Warehousing' in Granard is as follows:

"To primarily provide for industrial/workshop, warehouse and commercial or business development including compatible uses such as offices and distribution.

Zonings of industrial nature are indicative and are adaptable to the nature, size and requirements of future employment/ industrial development. The creation of local employment opportunities is the primary aim of this zoning. Hi-tech business/ office, and light industrial developments will be considered within this zoning. In certain instances brownfield sites of a strategic nature may be considered for business use subject to compliance with all relevant development control standards. The term 'Commercial' does not include traditional commercial functions that should locate within the town core.

Where appropriate, development design proposals shall provide for further access to adjacent zones of industrial lands in order to facilitate their future access and development.”

5.1.3. The following Economic Development Policies are noted:

- **ECON 1:** The Planning Authority will encourage the development of industrial, commercial and business developments at appropriate scales and locations having regard to the settlement strategy of the County. Generally, where the proposed development is considered to be a large scale employer or considered intensive in nature, such developments shall preferably locate within Longford Town or Core Strategy settlements as defined in the settlement hierarchy or on lands zoned for these purposes, as part of this plan. In certain circumstances, it may be appropriate for particular industries, businesses (non-retail), tourism and recreational projects and other land uses tied to a fixed resource and/or requiring extensive sites or specific locations to locate in rural locations subject to normal planning criteria and the requirements of environmental legislation including the Habitats Directive and Water Framework Directive.
- **ECON 2:** It is the policy of the Council to assist, insofar as it is empowered, anyone who wishes to establish or expand industrial, commercial or other undertakings providing increased employment opportunities in the county, subject to normal development management requirements and technical criteria.
- **ECON 9:** Sites to be developed for industrial and commercial purposes shall be designed to the highest architectural standards to provide quality environments with adequate provision for landscaping, car and truck parking and circulation and the disposal of foul and surface water following appropriate treatment.
- **ECON 13:**
 1. The following information should be submitted as part of any application for industrial/commercial/business development:

- a. Details of the nature and scale of the proposed operation, to include opening hours and anticipated traffic levels.
- b. Availability of adequate services to serve the development or the ability of the applicant to provide these services in a manner which does not adversely impact on surrounding properties or the broader environment.
- c. Proposals for the safe storage and disposal of waste in a manner which is visually and environmentally acceptable.
- d. Storage should generally be confined to the rear of the premises – height should be such that the materials stored are adequately screened either by the building unit or alternative screening method. Landscaping measures shall be detailed at application stage and should utilise native, non-invasive plant species.
- e. Compatibility of existing adjacent land uses with the proposed development and mitigation measures to preserve and protect the amenity of the adjacent uses, should this be necessary.
- f. Availability of adequate sight lines (or ability of applicant to provide same) as per the relevant NRA Standards and safe road access for anticipated levels of traffic to be generated by the proposed development. Generally, only one vehicular access point will be permitted.
- g. Adequate parking (as per Section 5.1.2) and circulation areas should be provided by the applicant within the curtilage of the proposed development unless otherwise agreed with the planning authority.
- h. Substantial developments may require prior consultation with relevant service providers, e.g. ESB.

2. Building layout and design

- a. Building design should be compatible with its surroundings. Buildings in existing industrial estates/commercial areas may be required to conform to an overall architectural and landscaping

theme. Screening may be required in order to break up a large expanse of façade and additional landscaping required to large expanses of hard surface area such as parking provision.

- b. Building finishes should be of the highest quality and exterior colours should be sedate and unobtrusive.
- c. Building height should be restricted to that required for the normal operation of the premises. Buildings of excessive height will not be permitted.
- d. Detailed landscaping proposals will be required as part of any application, with particular attention to landscaping and screening on greenfield sites proposed for development.
- e. Advertising signage shall be detailed at planning application stage and shall be sympathetic in size, scale, design, materials and colour with the surrounding landscape/streetscape.
- f. Where a development forms part of an industrial estate, the proposal may be required to co-locate signage in association with the remainder of the buildings within the estate, e.g. locational signage restricted to one sign at estate entrance.
- g. Lighting shall be unobtrusive and shall not adversely affect traffic safety on adjacent roads. Specific lighting standards may be required in particular instances.

5.1.4. The following roads policies and objectives are noted:

- **ROADS 2:** To provide a road network which is safe and efficient for all road users, cognisant of the requirements of all traffic, including motorised vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists.
- **ROADS 11:** Routes of strategic importance within the County, as outlined below, shall be protected from further access creation and intensification of existing accesses and development on national routes shall be actively discouraged. Development on the Regional Routes outlined below shall be carefully considered to preserve their strategic role and safeguard the strategic function of the national road network, in accordance with the

provisions of the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines (2012).

- N4 to Dublin and Sligo & N5 to Castlebar
- N55 to Cavan and Athlone & N63 to Galway
- **R194 Longford to Virginia**
- R198 Longford/Arvagh
- R392 Lanesboro/Mullingar
- R393 Longford to Ballynacarrigy/Mullingar
- R395 Edgeworthstown to Castlepollard/Delvin
- R396 Granard to Castlepollard
- R397 Longford/Ballymahon
- R398 Derraghan to Brickeens
- R399 Ratharney to Kilcurry

Works to accesses along these routes shall be assessed according to the relevant technical criteria, including the NRA Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB).

5.1.5. The following surface water Policies are noted:

- **SW 2:** Surface water storage measures shall be provided where it is considered that the surface water run-off levels exceed permissible discharge rates. Storm water run-off design should be carried out in accordance with Sustainable Urban Drainage Standards (SUDS), “Dublin Corporation Stormwater Management Policy Technical Guidelines” and “Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works” incorporating “Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study, Volume 2, New Developments” or any future updates.
- **SW 3:** Surface water and drainage measures shall be provided in a manner that is appropriate to the site and cognisant of potential effects on public health, safety, the environment and the amenity of the area.

- **SFRA 5:** Maintain and enhance, as appropriate, the existing surface water drainage system in the County, ensure that new developments are adequately serviced with surface water drainage infrastructure and promote the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems in all new developments. Surface water runoff from development sites will be limited to predevelopment levels and planning applications for new developments will be required to provide details of surface water drainage and Sustainable Drainage Systems proposals.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. A first party appeal was submitted on behalf of Raymond Farrell. The issues raised in the appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Lands are zoned 'industrial'.
- The applicant's transport companies primary place of employment is Kiernan Milling, 500m to the west of the site along the same road. This is the reason that the applicant is seeking permission on the site, which is within the 60kph speed limit zone for Granard.
- Adjoining landowner to the east gave written consent to block up the existing entrance and replace front wall boundary with post and rail fence.
- Road issues were not raised at RFI or CFI stage, but all three refusal reasons relate to road issues.
- Applicant is willing to accept any conditions regarding widening of the proposed entrance or positioning of the front boundary wall.

6.1.2. A Traffic Report, prepared by ORS was submitted with the appeal. It can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed development will not generate any significant additional traffic on the R194 as the majority of vehicles are currently on the network as a result of Kiernan Milling's existing operations in the area.

- Adequate sightlines are comfortably achievable. The posted speed limit is 60kph.
- Proposed development is in keeping with the 'industrial' use description contained in the CDP.
- Planning Authority have not outlined how the proposed development would adversely affect the Regional Road network. Site is zoned for industrial use and will not result in any increase in HGVs on the public road network as it is primarily used for maintenance and servicing of vehicles associated with Kiernan Milling.
- There is precedent in the area, including Kiernan Milling to the west and the neighbouring warehouse to the east.
- NRA Road Geometry Handbook requires sightlines of 4.5m x 90m in a 60kph zone. This can be comfortably achieved if the access arrangements are augmented slightly. The applicant has a letter of consent from the neighbouring landowner which will allow the sightlines to be achieved.
- Autotrack analysis confirms that the site has sufficient depth to allow vehicles to enter and leave the site safely. The site access may require slight revision to make accessing the site easier for HGVs however this can be comfortably achieved.
- All of the issues raised by the Planning Authority could have been addressed by way of RFI.
- Proposed development will not be a significant traffic generator and will not adversely impact on the operation of the R194 Regional Road.
- Applicant and designers are cognisant of residential amenity and have incorporated planting to the front of the site to screen the operation of the garage facility and maintain residential amenity.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1. None.

6.3. Observations

6.3.1. One observation was received from Linda Higgins. The issues raised in the observation can be summarised as follows:

- Application does not satisfy ECON 12 and ECON 30 of the CDP.
- Site may be zoned industrial, but it is located in a well-established residential area and will have an adverse impact on residential amenity.
- Traffic projections were not provided.
- Sight distances cannot be achieved. Figures 3.2 and 3.3 in the ORS report are not from the proposed entrance. The proposed entrance point is at a narrower point on the road and on the crest of a hill.
- Proposed entrance is unsafe.
- Proposals do not deal with pollution and do not refer to any requirement for a discharge licence.
- Proposed sound barrier would be visually intrusive.
- Observer does not accept that the proposed development will not result in increased HGV movements.
- Applicant is currently occupying the site adjacent to the appeal site. That site does not appear to have appropriate planning permission for its current use.
- ORS Autrotrack drawings are not on the planning file.
- Entrance to Kiernan Milling site is not comparable. It is a significant distance from existing houses.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. I consider that the key issues in determining this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of proposed development.
- Access and traffic.
- Surface water management.

- Residential amenity.
- Appropriate Assessment.

7.2. Principle of Proposed Development

- 7.2.1. The appeal site is zoned as 'industrial' under the Granard zoning map contained within the Longford County Development Plan 2015-2021. The stated zoning policy for 'Industrial / Commercial / Warehousing' in Granard is "to primarily provide for industrial/workshop, warehouse and commercial or business development including compatible uses such as offices and distribution".
- 7.2.2. Having regard to the proposed use of the appeal site, which comprises a base for a distribution business with associated garage and offices, I consider that it is compatible with the zoning objective for the site and is therefore acceptable in principle, subject to further consideration of the planning issues identified in Section 7.1 above.
- 7.2.3. With regard to the economic development policies set out in the Development Plan, I note that the Planning Authority is generally supportive of such developments, subject to the provision of a high quality design and layout. While the issue of a justification test was raised by the Planning Authority and third parties at application stages, I do not consider that there is any requirement under the Development Plan to provide such justification on suitably zoned lands.

7.3. Access and Traffic

- 7.3.1. All three of the Planning Authority's reasons for refusal related to access and traffic issues. The Planning Authority considered that the proposed development would adversely affect the operation and safety of the Regional Road network, that the required sight distances are not achievable, that the proposed entrance does not have sufficient width and depth to allow vehicles to enter and leave the site safely and that the proposed development would result in a traffic hazard due to surface water run-off running directly onto the road.
- 7.3.2. With regard to traffic generation, the applicant has not quantified the number of HGV movements associated with the proposed development on the basis that the HGVs

are currently on the local road network as a result of the existing Kiernan Milling operation to the south west. The Site Layout Plan indicates seven HGVs parked on the site and the applicant indicates that 15 persons are employed in the business. Given that the proposed development is reliant on HGV movements between the appeal site and the Kiernan Milling operation to the south east, and noting both the presence of a residential area between the two sites, and the strategic importance of the R194 Regional Road, as identified in Policy ROADS 11, I consider that the proposed development has the potential to significantly impact upon traffic safety and the efficient operation of the R194.

- 7.3.3. It is proposed to provide a new access point on the R194 to serve the proposed development. This will entail the removal of the existing grassed embankment and a portion of stone wall, and the construction of a 1m high stone wall with 1m high metal railing on top and a sliding electric gate across the splayed access point. It is also proposed to close off an existing access point to the adjoining site to the east, and to replace the concrete wall at this location with a set back concrete post and rail fence and planting. I note that while a letter of consent was provided by the adjoining landowner in respect these works, they are outside of the red line boundary for the planning application.
- 7.3.4. The submitted Site Layout Plan indicates that a 160m x 3m sightline is achievable in both directions at the proposed access point, however the Planning Authority considered that these sightlines were not achievable due to obstructions outside of the planning application boundary. While I would concur with the Planning Authority in this regard, I note that, notwithstanding the current rural fringe character of the appeal site and surrounding area, the appeal site is located within the 60kph speed limit zone for Granard and is within the development boundary of the town as per the zoning map. I therefore consider that the provisions of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) can be applied to the appeal site, rather than the more onerous provisions of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.
- 7.3.5. The required visibility splays for a 60km/h road under DMURS are 59m at an x-distance of 2.4m. Having inspected the site, I consider that these sightlines can readily be achieved.

- 7.3.6. With regard to the access itself and HGV circulation within the appeal site, I note that the ORS traffic report submitted with the appeal would appear to confirm that the access arrangements as proposed are not adequate and may require revision, however no such revised drawings or details were submitted with the appeal.
- 7.3.7. I note that while the ORS report states that Autotracking analysis has been carried out for the maximum legal HGV trailer, the associated Autotrack drawing provided in Appendix D of the report is based on a 10m long rigid truck. The Site Layout Plan indicates substantially larger articulated trucks parked in the parking bays, and I noted on my site inspection that there was an articulated HGV present in the adjoining site to the east, which observers have claimed the applicant is currently utilising. Photographs provided by observers also show articulated tanker vehicles. Articulated HGVs have a maximum legal length of 16.5m, and having regard to the very narrow site entrance proposed with a sliding gate c. 7m set back from the edge of the carriageway, I am not satisfied that the entrance arrangement as proposed can allow a HGV waiting to access the site to do so without obstructing the Regional Road. Similarly, without accurate Autotracking of articulated HGVs, I am not satisfied that the site layout and access arrangements are adequate to safely facilitate the level of HGV traffic that is likely to arise without impacting on other road users or on the safe operation of the R194. I therefore consider that the development, as proposed, would be contrary to Policies ROADS 2 and ROADS 11 of the Development Plan and would result in the creation of a traffic hazard and I recommend that permission be refused on this basis.

7.4. Surface Water Management

- 7.4.1. On foot of a request for clarification of further information, the applicant is proposing to collect all surface water runoff from both the hardstanding yard area and the concrete HGV parking bays (i.e. the entirety of the site excluding the building footprint) and hold this in an underground storage tank, to be taken by tanker to Granard for disposal to the public surface water system. The proposed storage tank would have a capacity of 129,000 litres when 75% full, at which point an alarm would be triggered to alert the applicant to tanker the water off-site. The applicant has also stated that this water could be utilised to wash down vehicles in the future, subject to a further grant of planning permission.

- 7.4.2. Having reviewed the Site Layout Plan, it is not entirely clear how the proposed system is intended to operate, since the site falls from north to south, and the petrol/oil interceptor and storage tank appear to be fed from a high point on the system.
- 7.4.3. Both the Municipal District Area Engineer and the observer have raised concerns that the water from the petrol interceptor is likely to contain pollutants and that it would therefore require a Discharge Licence from the Local Authority and an agreement with Irish Water to take and treat the contaminated water.
- 7.4.4. Notwithstanding the issue of a Discharge Licence, I consider the proposed approach to surface water management with its reliance on the tankering of water off-site for disposal to be entirely unsustainable and inconsistent with good practice as per established SuDS principles. In this regard I note Policies SW 2 and SFRA 5 of the Development Plan, which require SuDS to be incorporated in development proposals, and Policy SW 3 which requires surface water measures to be cognisant of potential effects on public health, safety and the environment.
- 7.4.5. Given the large volume of water to be stored on site, and the proposed use of a petrol/oil interceptor, I would have concerns that failure to empty the tank in a timely manner, for example as a result of a malfunction in the alarm system, could result in contaminated water escaping to groundwater or surface water bodies or into surrounding lands and the public road.
- 7.4.6. In failing to provide an adequate sustainable drainage system for managing surface water collected on site, I consider that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies SW 3 and SFRA 5 of the Development Plan, and I recommend that planning permission be refused on this basis, and that the proposed development would give rise to a potential source of water pollution and would be prejudicial to public health.

7.5. Residential Amenity

- 7.5.1. There are a number of detached houses facing the appeal site to the south, along the southern side of the R194, and a house is located c. 100m to the west of the appeal site. This residential development to the south and west is zoned as 'existing

residential', and it is sandwiched between two larger areas of 'industrial' zoned lands, albeit that the majority of these lands are not yet developed.

- 7.5.2. The observer has raised concerns in relation to the impact of the proposed development on residential amenity, and such concerns were also raised in the earlier observations to the Planning Authority.
- 7.5.3. The applicant is proposing to provide a 4m high acoustic barrier fence along the western boundary of the site, backplanted with semi-mature deciduous trees. I consider that such a barrier would be of limited benefit in reducing noise emissions, given that the closest house to the west is 100m distant, and I consider that the provision of a 4m high barrier at this prominent location would be visually incongruous and intrusive in the landscape.
- 7.5.4. Should the Board be minded to grant permission, I consider that a more appropriate means of protecting residential amenity would be through conditions requiring the provision of additional landscaping around the site boundaries, restrictions on hours of operation and measures to prevent lightspill from the site. Other than the noise associated with HGV movements in and out of the site, which would be similar to that for the adjoining industrial/warehousing site, the main source of noise would likely be associated with repair and maintenance work in the garage structure. The applicant states that the proposed hours for servicing the lorries would be 08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday, and 08:00 – 13:00 on Saturdays. I consider these hours to be reasonable, but consider that they should apply to the development as a whole, rather than just the garage, given the noise associated with HGV movements. Subject to a condition limiting the hours of operation of the development, and noting that the garage structure is located c. 63m from the closest residential receptor, I do not consider that the proposed development would result in an undue negative impact on residential amenity.

7.6. **Appropriate Assessment**

- 7.6.1. The closest Natura 2000 sites to the appeal site are Ardagullion Bog SAC (Site Code 002341) which is located c. 5km to the south, Lough Kinale and Derragh Lough SPA (Site Code 004061) which is located c. 6km to the east, and Moneybeg and

Clareisland Bogs SAC (Site Code 002340) and Lough Sheelin SPA (Site Code 004065), both of which are c. 9km to the east.

- 7.6.2. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, which entails development on industrially zoned lands with a connection to the public wastewater system, the characteristics of the appeal site and the separation distance from any European sites, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is the policy of the planning authority, as expressed in policies ROADS 2 and ROADS 11 of the Longford County Development Plan 2015-2021, to provide a road network which is safe and efficient for all road users, cognisant of the requirements of all traffic, and to preserve the strategic role of the R194 Regional Road. These policies are considered reasonable. The proposed development would generate a significant volume of traffic, including a high number of movements by heavy goods vehicles, and the Board is not satisfied that the access arrangements and site layout, as proposed, are capable of safely accommodating the volume and type of traffic generated. The proposed development would, therefore, be in conflict with policies ROADS 2 and ROADS 11 and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard.
2. It is the policy of the planning authority, as expressed in policies SW 3 and SFRA 5 of the Longford County Development Plan 2015-2021, to ensure that new developments are adequately serviced with surface water drainage infrastructure, to promote the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems in all new developments and to require surface water and drainage measures are provided in a manner that is appropriate to the site and cognisant of potential effects on public health, safety, the environment and the amenity of the area.

These policies are considered reasonable. The Board is not satisfied that the surface water management system, as proposed, provides for the sustainable and satisfactory management of surface water generated and consider that the proposed storage and tankering off site of surface water would give rise to a potential source of water pollution, would be prejudicial to public health and would be in conflict with policies SW 3 and SFRA 5. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Niall Haverty
Planning Inspector

23rd February 2018