



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

**Inspector's Report**  
**ABP-300462-17**

---

<b>Development</b>	Permission to construct a Dwelling, Detached Domestic Garage, Wastewater Treatment Unit and Percolation Area and Associated Site Works.
<b>Location</b>	Greenmount, Kilsaran, Castlebellingham County Louth
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Louth County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	17/620
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Sinead McGill
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant of Permission with Conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Mark and Claire Boyle
<b>Observer(s)</b>	none
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	22 <sup>nd</sup> March
<b>Inspector</b>	Suzanne Kehely

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The site of 0.65 hectares is in a rural area about 1km south of Kilsaran a small settlement immediately south of Castlebellingham. It is located just off the R132 on an old section the former N1 (Dublin – Dundalk Road) which is now a slip road with a cluster of houses fronting onto it. There are three houses on smaller sites to the north of the site and a larger established house on extensive grounds to the south and which is set back behind mature woodland and an avenue of approximately 150 metres in length. The gates to this property are included in the Record of Protected Structures and NIAH. The house to the north is that of the appellant and is set back in the order of 25m from the road and its southern gable, there are a few upper level windows and a solar panel. There is a sunroom to the rear on its southern side. The site relates to the southern end of an original field marked by mature hedgerows which form the southern and eastern boundaries and small section of the remaining 22m site frontage. The northern boundary is marked by a fence and newer boundary planting between the adjacent dwelling to the north and remainder of the original field. The site has a farm gate in the road frontage and is under grass. An overhead electricity cable supported on wooden posts traverses the site. The ground appears to be well drained – there was no water in the trial hole at the time of inspection.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Drawings lodged 17<sup>th</sup> August:

- A 206 sq.m. two storey dwelling is proposed in the centre of the site and set back about 34.5m – the façade broadly aligning with the rear elevation of the dwelling to the north.
- The facade in the style of a traditional two storey farmhouse – being three bays, with symmetrically arranged and vertically proportioned openings and material are a mix of render stone and brick with blue black slates.
- The house is of more complex design to the rear with a partially extending slope and mix of ridges where the house incorporates dormers and an extensive single storey projection to the rear.

- The overall dimension is: depth of 20m, width of 12m (narrow to 4.6m to rear) and Ridge height 8.2
- A detached 60 sq.m. single storey garage is proposed along the northern boundary.

2.2. Amended elevations were submitted on 27<sup>th</sup> October 2017 to the Planning authority which internalise the chimney breast and alter the roof profile to the rear.

2.3. A more detailed site layout context was submitted with the applicant's response to the grounds of appeal.

### 3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

#### 3.1. **Decision**

3.1.1. Following submission for further information to satisfaction of the planning authority notification of a decision to grant permission was issued subject to 6 conditions:

Condition 1 subject to revised plans

Condition 2 occupancy restriction

Condition 3 financial contribution

Condition 4 landscaping

Condition 5 Detailed conditions for waste water treatment system

Condition 6 surface water, construction management and public roads/entrance.

#### 3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Having regard to the provisions of the Development Plan assessment criteria for rural housing further information was requested in respect of a rural housing need, notwithstanding the information provision demonstrating the application residency in the area, no current house ownership and being within 6km of parents' home.

Further information was also requested in respect of design detail in relation to the roof profile and chimney. Other matters of detail were of a nature that could be dealt with by condition. The proposal was otherwise acceptable in terms of ribbon

development, integration of site by landscaping, scale, design site layout, light pollution and relationship with adjacent properties.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Environment Department: No objection subject to conditions

Infrastructure: No objection subject to conditions

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Irish Water: No objections subject to conditions

Development Applications Unit: No submission received.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

One letter of objection was submitted and referred to issues concerning, residential amenity of their property, traffic impact, principle of a fourth house at this location, water supply and precedent for a 6m set back from northern boundary in the neighbouring house (objector). Points made and not subsequently elaborated upon in grounds of appeal include

- Exacerbation of traffic on a small stretch of road where there are 9 dwellings and a farm business.
- No further dwelling should be permitted in this greenbelt area
- House was built based on no further dwellings
- Breach of building line – contrary to planning authority guidance
- Concerned about Light pollution and absence of details considering council policies. (Env 8 and Env 9 apply)

## 4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. PA ref. 031384 refers to a withdrawn application for a house at Greenmount. PA ref. 98864 refers to a completed application for a house at Greenmount. No further details provided by the planning authority on these cases.
- 4.2. The appellant refers to the planning history whereby permission was permitted for the appellants house as a third dwelling in a row and allegedly the final house – with reference to a planning authority staff officer confirming that no further dwelling would be permitted to the south.

## 5.0 Policy Context

- 5.1. Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines, 2005
- 5.1.1. The current statement of government policy relies on:
- Adopting a more ‘analytically based and plan led approach’.
  - Following a process of research and analysis on development trends in rural areas, development plans should include the identification of ‘Rural Area Types’ as set out in the NSS, such as -
    - (a) Rural Areas under strong urban influence.
    - (b) Stronger rural areas.
    - (c) Structurally weaker rural areas.
    - (d) Areas with clustered settlement patterns.
  - Having defined the ‘Rural Area Types’, the development plan should address:
    - 1) The different housing requirements of urban and rural communities.
    - 2) The varying characteristics of rural areas.Planning policies need to make the distinctions in (1) and (2) above to avoid ribbon (example and definition cited in the guidelines) and haphazard development in rural areas close to towns / cities.
- 5.1.2. The site is with an area under pressure of urban generated housing.
- 5.2. Louth County Development Plan 2015-2021

### 5.2.1. Settlement Strategy

- SS 1 To maintain the settlement hierarchy within the County and to encourage residential development within each settlement that is commensurate with its position in the hierarchy and the availability of public services and facilities.
- SS 9 To promote and facilitate limited development within Level 3 Settlements that is commensurate with the nature and extent of the existing settlement, to support their role as local service centres and to implement the policies and objectives relative to each settlement as provided for in Appendix 2, Volume 2 (a).
- SS 18 To permit rural generated housing to support and sustain existing rural communities and to restrict urban generated housing in order to protect the visual amenities and resources of the countryside, subject to the local needs qualifying criteria as set out in Section 2.19.1 below.

### 5.2.2. One-Off Rural Housing Policy (section 2.19)

- One-off housing refers to individually designed, detached houses primarily located on large unserviced sites in the open countryside. The overriding aim of the Council's approach to one-off houses in the countryside is guided by the ***Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines, 2005, DECLG*** wherein rural generated housing relates to those who have spent a substantial period of their lives living in a rural area as members of the established rural community. This approach seeks to accommodate, within rural areas, people who are functionally or socially part of the rural community and to resist demand for urban generated housing in the countryside.

### 5.2.3. Rural Housing Development Management

- Development Zone 5 - To protect and provide for the development of agriculture and sustainable rural communities and to facilitate certain resource based and location specific developments of significant regional or national importance. Critical infrastructure projects of local, regional or national importance will also be considered within this zone.

## Criteria

1. Applicant(s) is the son/daughter of a qualifying landowner. The applicant must demonstrate a rural housing need and show that they do not already own a house or have not owned a house within the rural area of the County for a minimum of 5 years prior to making an application,

**Or**

**2. That they have lived for a minimum period of 10 years in the local rural area (including cross-border), they have a rural housing need, they do not already own a house or have not owned a house within the rural area of the County for a minimum of 5 years prior to making an application,**

**Or**

3. That the applicant is actively and significantly involved in agriculture and that the nature of the agricultural activity, by reference to the area of land and/or the intensity of its usage, is sufficient to support full time or significant part time occupation. Where the applicant is employed in a part time basis, the predominant occupation shall be agriculture. In all Chapter 2 Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy cases, supporting documentation outlining that the nature of the activity is sufficient to support full-time or significant part time work shall be provided. The proposed dwelling shall be on a site immediately adjacent to or within the boundaries of that agricultural enterprise.

**Or**

4. That the applicant is actively and significantly involved in the bloodstock and equine industry, forestry, agri-tourism or horticulture or rural based enterprise, that the nature of the activity is sufficient to support full time or significant part time occupation and that the applicant can demonstrate a specific functional need to live at the site of their work. Where the applicant is employed in a part time basis, the predominant occupation shall be bloodstock and equine industry, forestry, agri-tourism or horticulture sectors or rural based enterprise. In such cases supporting documentation outlining that the nature of the activity is sufficient to support full time or significant part time work shall be provided. The proposed dwelling shall be on a site immediately adjacent to or within the boundaries of that enterprise.

**Or**

5. That the applicant is providing care for an elderly person or a person with a disability who lives in an isolated rural area and who does not have any able-bodied person residing with them. One house only will be allowed on this basis and the site must be adjacent to the dwelling in which the older persons or person with the disability resides.

**Or**

6. That the applicant is required to live in a rural area for exceptional health reasons. Such applications must be accompanied by a medical consultant's report and

recommendation outlining the reasons why it is necessary for the applicant to live in a rural area and also be supported by an appropriate disability organization of which the applicant is a registered member.

### 5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- Dundalk Bay (SPA and SAC) – site codes 004026 and 000455 – are within 5km east of the site. The River Dee is about 500-600m south of the site and flows into the Bay about 5km-10km downstream.
- Stabannan-Braganstown SPA- site code 0040901 - is about 3km west of the site.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. Agents for the neighbouring residents of the property to the north of the site have lodged an appeal based on the following grounds:

- **Impact on residential amenity** on basis of profound and detrimental impact arising from overbearing nature, overshadowing, loss of light and privacy and disturbance. This is due to the site layout, window positioning and particularly aggravated by position of garage and due to appellant's house/site layout, e.g. Sunroom and patio. It is stated that if the garage was relocated to this other side this would be acceptable.
- **Inadequate justification of housing need.** Failure to substantiate rural housing need. The address of the applicant is queried in context of another address, absence of statement from parents, location of work 11.5 miles away.
- **Inadequate information and assessment in relation to site entrance and consequent impact on a protected structure.** No reference to new entrance structures despite exempted development restriction in this regard and requirements for boundary treatment under guidance document 'Building Sensitively in the Landscape'. No details of trees and hedges to be removed.

6.1.2. The appeal is appended with documentation demonstrating application place of occupation in Knockbridge 11.5kn north east of the site.



## 6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. In a letter received on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2018 the applicant clarifies that:

- Separation distance between existing and proposed dwelling is 17m
- The garage is 1.44m from the boundary and set back 3.75m from the dwelling façade as proposed.
- The entrance is positioned at the farm gate.
- The proposed house is to south and east of the existing dwelling and there is no first-floor window in the north elevation that would give rise to overlooking
- The south facing first upper levels windows in the appellants house will overlook the front garden of the proposed house.
- The position of the proposed dwelling will not give rise to any overlooking – the opposite is the case.
- The position of the proposed dwelling will not give rise to overshadowing - the offsetting of the proposed dwelling from the existing dwelling so that overshadowing cannot occur.
- The applicant has lived for 26 years with her parents 1.5km away in Milestown and continues to do so. Numerous documents have been submitted in support of demonstrating a residency and connections.
- The listed structure/monument LHS015-045 comprises gates and railings in the neighbouring property to the south Greenpoint Lodge and it is confirmed that this does not form part of any of the proposed development.
- A site layout drawing attached includes the sunroom extension to the rear of the appellant's property.

## 6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. In a letter received on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2018 the planning authority responds to the issues raised and states that:

- It is satisfied that the proposed development would not adversely impact in terms of overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing.

- The proposed development Will not result in light pollution and will not cause undue glare. Requiring details would be unduly onerous for the scale of development proposed.
- It has no objection to the location of garage and there are no valid planning reasons to seek it relocation.
- The development description is adequate and the terms site works is accepted to include entrance amongst other parts of the development.
- The proposed development would not adversely impact on any protected structures.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

### 7.1. **Issues**

- 7.1.1. This is a third-party appeal based primarily on issues of impact on residential amenity and insufficient justification for a rural housing need. Reference in the letter of objection is also made to the principle of an additional house in the context of controlling ribbon development along this stretch among other issues. The application has been subject to a request for further information in relation housing need and detailed design matters. The appellant also raises building conservation issues regarding the protected Gates associated with the adjacent Lodge and Demesne grounds. Finally, there is concern about the adequacy of the description and submitted details regarding the entrance and boundary alterations. In view of these matters raised and the submissions on file, I consider the issues to be considered primarily centre on, principle of house, impact on residential amenity, impact on a protected structure and procedural matters. Consideration of the need for Appropriate Assessment is also a mandatory requirement.

### 7.2. **Principle of House- Housing need**

- 7.2.1. Being in the N1 corridor, the location is strategically located in an area defined in a regional and national context as being under urban influence. In the context of the county development plan it is in a rural area where housing is restricted to supporting the agricultural sector and rural communities.

- 7.2.2. In the current development plan the site is in zone 5 where the objective is to protect and provide for the development of agriculture and sustainable rural communities and in such areas housing need must be justified based on one of five scenarios being met.
- 7.2.3. The applicant in this case is a school teacher who is a member of the fourth generation of her family to live in Milestown just north of the site. The house location is not provided but Milestown is partly within the development boundary of Catlebellingham/Kilsaran. The applicant has submitted various documentation supporting her residency and attended the national school in Kilsaran as did her father. She previously taught there and according to a former school principal's statement in the further information, the applicant now teaches in a neighbouring area although the location is not stated by the applicant in any submission. This however is stated by the appellant to be Knockbridge 11.5miles north east as evidenced by supporting documentation and is undisputed. The applicant is in her 20s and wishes to live near her parents to care for them in future years. It is confirmed she has no house and continues to live at home and now needs her own house. Other than this there is no elaboration on the need for a dwelling in this rural part of the environs of her former home. The application is not on a family landholding nor is it stated to be associated with a site/land specific use such as farming. The ties to the area are based on social circumstances.
- 7.2.4. While the planning authority sought further information in respect of housing need, the applicant only confirmed house ownership status and elaborated on establishing past residency by way of supporting statements but did not elaborate on a rural housing need. The planning authority was nevertheless satisfied that the applicant has a housing need and accordingly meets with the development criteria.
- 7.2.5. Having regard to the circumstances the applicant's 'qualifying' criteria has been generally accepted by the planning authority to fall into scenario no.2 whereby 'they have lived for a minimum period of 10 years in the local rural area (including cross-border), they have a rural housing need, they do not already own a house or have not owned a house within the rural area of the County for a minimum of 5 years prior to making an application,'

- 7.2.6. Having reviewed the submissions and guidance together with the location of the site and the family home location I have reservations about the rural housing need criteria being met and the potential conflict with housing strategy.
- 7.2.7. It is specifically stated in Section 2.18 of the CDP 2015 – 2021 that 'Whilst the Council acknowledges the role of rural housing in sustaining rural communities, it also recognises that uncontrolled and excessive one-off urban generated housing in the countryside is not sustainable in the long-term and accepts that measures need to be put in place to regulate this form of development. A concern arises that if one-off rural housing is permitted at the current levels, then irreparable damage will be done to the environment and the legitimate aspirations of those brought up in the countryside to continue to live within their own communities will be compromised'.
- 7.2.8. The site is less than 1km south of the Castelbellingham and Kilsaran development area which is a level 3 settlement area where development is targeted in line with regional and national planning frameworks. There is a plentiful supply of land in this town in land banks for both current residential development demand and strategic development. Policy for Level 3 Settlements and specifically policy SS9 of the Louth County Development Plan 2015 – 2021 is a relevant consideration.
- 7.2.9. It appears that if the applicant were to locate in the town she would equally satisfy social needs by the proximity to the family home(parents) in Milestown – a townland which forms part of the development area for Castlebellingham/Kilsaran. To build a house for a resident just outside a town in which there is provision for residential development and away from a potential location of employment in a rural area would result in what would appear to be unwarranted car dependency and would in my opinion, exacerbate development in a rural area under strong urban influence, would lead to demands for the provision of further public services and community facilities where none are proposed and would by itself and by the precedence it would set, in strategic terms, undermine the current development plan objectives for the consolidation of a level 3 settlement area. For these reasons I consider the need for housing to be questionable in terms of compatibility with sustainable development.
- 7.2.10. Arguably the development could also be construed to constitute ribbon development being one of five adjacent houses within a collective frontage of less than 250m, (in the context of the Appendix guidance of the Sustainable Rural Housing guidelines).

The appellant party makes the case that no further housing should be permitted to the south of their residence by reference to previous comments associated with history files, however this is not binding and in any event, is superceded by current guidance and development plan provisions.

- 7.2.11. I note there are three one-off houses set back about 25m to the north on house-only sites and this would be the fourth, however, the fifth site, which adjoins the south of the site, is different and not strictly directly adjacent. As noted by the planning authority, it relates to a mature and visually segregated house on extensive wooded grounds – Greenmount Lodge and is setback 150m as compared to the more finely grained frontage development of the single house sites. This segregation is aided by a mature belt and copse of trees. I concur with its assessment and do not consider the development to wholly constitute excessive ribbon development.
- 7.2.12. Conclusion: I have strong reservations about the need for a rural dwelling house at the proposed location having regard to the absence of a land based association with the site and having regard to the availability of land for development in the development area to the north as set out in the development plan for Castlebellingham/Kilsaran which includes a significant portion of Milestown townland where the applicant currently lives with her parents. While I accept that the applicant has social ties to the area it is my opinion, that in the wider context of planning policy, there is insufficient justification for a rural housing need notwithstanding being within 6km of the family home. The objective of sustaining a rural community would not be compromised by refusing permission as the housing need could be readily satisfied in nearby serviced land and near the family home. Moreover, a refusal of permission would be more likely to protect agricultural resources and facilitate the consolidation of a planned and serviced settlement area. Accordingly, I do not consider that the applicant has made a sufficient case to demonstrate a rural housing need in unserviced lands in line with housing policy for zone 5 having regard to the other development plan policies which seek to regulate rural housing and consolidate development in line with its settlement hierarchy. The proposed development would be contrary to the provision of the development plan in respect of its settlement strategy and would accordingly be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7.2.13. Notwithstanding my recommendation to refuse permission based on housing need, the other issues are addressed should the Board decide to grant permission.

### 7.3. **Impact on residential amenity**

7.3.1. The appellant has raised many concerns relating to the direct impact of the proposed dwelling on residential amenity. The planning authority remains of the view that the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

#### 7.3.2. Overshadowing/Overbearing

7.3.3. The appellant is concerned about the site layout which positions the house 12m from the party boundary. This is further compounded by stepping back of the dwelling to a building line of 35m, its depth and by the siting of the garage about 1-1.4m from the boundary, as these structures are due south of the boundary. The layout of appellant's established house benefits from the southerly aspect. There is therefore considerable concern about the overshadowing impact. The appellant is particularly concerned due to the location of their patio and habitable space to the rear near the boundary and the apparent absence of due regard to these specific impacts.

7.3.4. I accept that the orientation and existing house layout is potentially exposed to development to the south. In this case the garage has a ridge height at 4.9m, however, with a 2.5m high eaves, the structure, at 1.4m from the boundary would cast minimal shadow, for example when the angle of sun is very low such as in winter months or very early morning and shadows would be for short duration. I accept however that any undue impact is unwarranted in view of the potential layout options for the applicant and in this rural context and I consider a marginal increase in setback may be warranted. A 2m setback would more readily facilitate a hedge and trees (and maintenance access) in keeping with the rural landscape. I do not consider relocation of the garage to the other side to be reasonably within the scope of permission having regard to third party rights, nor do I consider it entirely reasonable having regard to the extensive curtilage of the appellant's property.

7.3.5. The appellant is also concerned about the position and proximity and the consequent overlooking and disturbance arising from both first-floor windows and from ground floor openings including that of the garage. The applicant argues that the angle will be oblique and so direct overlooking would not arise.

7.3.6. While I accept overlooking would be oblique and minimal, I consider the alignment of the proposed façade with the rear elevation of the house to the north is discordant in terms of harmonising with the existing building pattern. I also consider the northern gable elevation to be somewhat overbearing. I consider it appropriate that a stepping forward of the proposed house by about 5m would allow for a more harmonious alignment.

7.3.7. With respect to disturbance, the utility in the northern gable 12m from the appellants' boundary will provide access and there will be a degree of use but it is buffered by the garage and is unlikely to unduly diminish privacy given its ground floor level. In any event the proximity is at an acceptable distance – it exceeds rear garden depths in an urban context. I note that the ground level windows in habitable rooms are 14m from the boundary. These windows are in addition to the south facing patio door and windows serving the same habitable room and are unlikely to be the main source of use. Having regard to the layout and separation, I do not consider loss of privacy or disturbance to constitute reasonable grounds for refusal.

#### 7.4. **Light pollution**

7.4.1. The appellant raises concerns about light pollution. The planning authority has no concerns in this regard having regard to the scale of the development. I accept the position of the planning authority that this is domestic scaled development and that regulation by conditions in the context of a cluster of houses would be unduly prescriptive. This issue of excessive lighting as a nuisance to neighbouring property is more of a civil issue and it is therefore not necessary in my opinion to regulate this matter by condition.

#### 7.5. **Entrance / Boundary**

7.5.1. The appellant raises concerns about the absence of detail regarding the vehicular access and boundary treatment having regard to the proximity and potential impact on a protected structure comprising the boundary and gates of Greenmount Lodge. It is submitted that there is potential for incongruity with this feature and the rural character by reference to the planning authority guidance for building sensitively in the landscape. There are also procedural uses with respect to access to information in this regard.

7.6. The gates to Greenmount Lodge to the north I note comprise iron Gates and Gate Piers and associated walls and are included in both the Record of Protected Structures (ID No. LHS015-045) and the NIAH (13901509) and details of this listing is appended to the grounds of appeal. With respect to impacts arising, I note the subject development site relates to a residual part of a field and its original hedgerow boundaries with exception of its northern boundary from where the site separates from the other houses sites and remaining field. It is not part of any formal attendant grounds of Greenmount Lodge or directly connected to the gates. It is confirmed in the applicant's response that the proposed development would have no material impact on the protected structure and the Development Applications Unit has made no submission in reply to a request from the planning authority. I see no grounds for refusing development based on impact on the gates of the adjacent property.

#### **7.7. Procedural**

7.7.1. The appellant states that the public notices are incomplete in terms of description of development due the absence of vehicular access. I note there is an entrance existing and that it is proposed to alter this to provide an improved vehicular access to serve the proposed dwelling and garage as specified. In these circumstances I consider the term 'site works' to be an adequate description. The Board could invite the applicant to submit further details in this regard or details could be submitted for written agreement and could be specified to be in keeping with development plan guidance.

#### **7.8. Appropriate Assessment**

7.8.1. The site is within 15km of Dundalk Bay. A potential pathway could be via groundwater however in this case the application is accompanied by a detailed appraisal of the drainage capacity and the proposals to dispose of wastewater to the satisfaction of the technical divisions of the planning authority. No issues have arisen in this regard in the course of appraisal. Surface water contamination of the River Dee may arise in extreme weather conditions during construction but I am satisfied standard best practice construction methods would control this source of pollution risk.

7.8.2. In the case of the SPA site to the west the site is separated by the M1 corridor and there is no direct connection between the site.



7.8.3. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the information on the file and the nature of the receiving environment, no appropriate assessment issues arise. It is considered that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on any European Site.

## 8.0 Recommendation

8.1. Refusal of permission.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development is located in an area designated as under strong urban influence in the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in April, 2005, wherein it is policy to distinguish between an urban-generated and a rural-generated housing need in rural areas. The site is located on lands zoned Z5 in the Louth County Development Plan 2015-2021 where the objective is to protect and provide for the development of agriculture and sustainable rural communities and to facilitate certain resourced based and location specific developments of significant regional or national importance. Critical infrastructure projects of local, regional or national importance will also be considered within this zone. On the basis of the documentation submitted with the planning application and the appeal, the Board is not satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated a rural-generated housing need for a house at this location. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development would undermine the consolidation of Castlebellingham/Kilsaran development area. The proposed development would, therefore, give rise to demands for the uneconomic provision of public services and community facilities, contravene the Ministerial Guidelines and be contrary to the settlement strategy and zoning provisions of the Louth County Development Plan 2015-2021.

---

Suzanne Kehely  
Senior Planning Inspector  
11<sup>th</sup> June 2018