



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP 303159-18.

---

<b>Development</b>	House, garage and sewage treatment system.
<b>Location</b>	Drumenan, Newmills, Letterkenny. Co Donegal.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Donegal Co Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	1851266.
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Sinead Mc Devitt.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	To Grant Permission.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party.
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Desmond Mc Daid.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	February 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2019.
<b>Inspector</b>	Breda Gannon.

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located to the west of Letterkenny in Co. Donegal. It comprises a rectangular area of ground with frontage onto the adjoining regional road (R250). The rear and lateral site boundaries are formed by hedgerows. The site is adjoined to the east by an existing dwelling and there are other residential properties to the west. Ground level is close to road level at the front of the site, falling marginally towards the centre of the site and rising again to the rear. A stream located along the western boundary crosses under the road and discharges into the River Swilly to the north. Parts of the site have been cleared and it is currently vacant pastureland.
- 1.2. The area is one of undulating rural countryside. Ground levels fall dramatically on the opposite side of the regional road towards the valley formed by the River Swilly. The area has experienced pressure for one-off rural housing resulting in ribbon development on the south side of the carriageway.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal is to construct a dwelling house and domestic garage on the site, which has a stated area of 0.4 Ha. The house (215.6m<sup>2</sup>) would be set back into the site and located c. 58m from the roadside. It would be single-storey with an elongated rectangular plan and a pitched roof. It would have a finished floor level of 101.9m and a ridge height of 5.8m. The external finishes would comprise a smooth painted render with natural stone to selected elevations. The roof covering would consist of blue/black slates. The garage would be positioned to the rear of the house close to the eastern site boundary. It would have similar finishes and provided with a pitched roof with a ridge height of 5.7m. Foul effluent from the house would be discharged to a treatment system /percolation area located to the front of the house.
- 2.2. Further information on the application was sought by the planning authority on 4/10/18 on matters relating to rural housing need and visibility splays at the site entrance. The response of 28/10/18, which included Drawing No 9-005 Rev – A was to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to grant permission for the development subject to 16 no. conditions. Apart from standard construction/engineering conditions, the decision includes the following conditions of note.

**Condition No 2** – Enurement clause.

**Condition No 3** – Roadside boundary treatment.

**Condition No 9** – Visibility splays of 160m to be provided in each direction from the site access.

**Condition No 11** – Controls on the use of the garage.

**Condition No 13** – Boundary and on-site planting.

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The **Planning Officer's** report of 14/11/18 considered that the further information addressed the outstanding matters. The applicants rural housing bone fides and the revised site plan detailing visibility splays was considered acceptable. It was concluded that the previous reasons for refusal were addressed and that it was appropriate and reasonable to grant permission for the development. The proposed development would not injure the amenities of the area, would not be prejudicial to public health and would not endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard.

#### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

The **E.E Roads, E.E Water and Environmental Services** in their respective reports of 22/8/18, 13/9/18 and 4/9/18 raised no objection to the development.

**Road Design** in their report of 17/9/18 stated that they had no comments to make on the application.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Irish Water raised no objection to the development.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

An observation was submitted to the planning authority, which raised similar issues to those raised in the appeal.

## 4.0 Planning History

4.1. **Reg Ref No 14/51424 – PL 05E.244854.** The planning authority's decision to grant permission was overturned by the Board. Permission was refused for 4 no. reasons relating to the unsuitability of the site for the disposal of domestic effluent, traffic hazard, unsubstantiated local housing need, impact on the visual amenities of the area and exacerbation of an emerging suburban pattern of development in the rural area. A copy of the Board's order is appended to the back of the report.

## 5.0 Policy & Context

### 5.1. National Planning Framework

5.1.1. The National Planning Framework which was published in 2018 is a strategic plan to guide development and investment out to 2040. It is envisaged that the population of the country will increase by up to 1 million by that date and the strategy seeks to plan for the demands that growth will place on the environment and the social and economic fabric of the country.

5.1.2. With regard to protecting Ireland's rural fabric it is recognised that *'there is a continuing need for housing provision for people to live and work in the countryside. Careful planning is required to manage demand in the most accessible countryside around cities and towns, focusing on the elements required to support the sustainable growth of rural economies and rural communities'*. It is also recognised that *'it is important to differentiate, on the one hand, between rural areas located within the commuter catchment of cities and larger towns and centres of employment and, on the other hand, rural areas located outside these catchments'*.

- 5.1.3. Under the provisions of National Policy Objective 19 with regard to rural areas outside areas under urban influence, the objective is to facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.

## 5.2. Development Plan

The operative development plan is the **Donegal County Development Plan 2018-2024**. Section 6.3 is dedicated to rural housing. The overall aim is;

*'To accommodate development that addresses genuine rural housing need of the rural communities throughout the county in a manner with due regard to environmental considerations'*.

Under **Objective RH-O-3** the planning authority seeks to ensure that new residential development in rural areas provides for genuine rural need.

Three types of rural areas are identified in the county. The site is located in an area designated 'Stronger Rural Area'. (Map 6.2.1). Within these areas one-off rural generated housing will generally be facilitated subject to compliance with relevant policies and provisions of the plan. Relevant policies include;

**Policy RH-P-3** – It is a policy of the Council to consider proposals from prospective applicants in need of housing within an area defined as Stronger Rural Area, provided they demonstrate that they comply with other relevant policies of the plan, including Policy RH-P-1 and RH-P-2 and provided they can demonstrate that they have a genuine need to reside in a particular area.

**Policy RH-P-9** refers to siting and design standards and the requirement that all new dwellings are designed in accordance with the principles set out in *'Building a House in Rural Donegal - A location, Siting and Design Guide'*, contained in Appendix 4 of Part 2 of the development plan.

The site is located in an area designated 'High Scenic Amenity' (Map7.1.1).

**Policy NH-P 7** - Within areas of 'High Scenic Amenity' (HSC) and 'Moderate Scenic Amenity' (MSC) as identified on Map 7.1.1: Scenic Amenity', and subject to the other objectives and policies of this plan, it is the policy of the Council to facilitate

development of a nature, location and scale that allows the development to integrate within and reflect the character and amenity designation of the landscape.

### **5.3. Environmental Impact Assessment - Preliminary Examination**

- 5.3.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the nature of the receiving environment, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for EIA can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

#### 6.1.1. Introduction

- 6.1.2. Owns the house immediately to the east of the appeal site and both properties abut the Regional Road R250.

#### 6.1.3. Previous history

- An Bord Pleanála previously refused permission on this site. The current proposal does not address the substantive reasons for refusal, with the exception that the new building proposal is more modest in size. It is considered that the technical improvements required are outside the control of the applicant.

#### 6.1.4. Traffic safety and principles

- There are significant considerations with regard to the regional road to which the planning authority have not had regard. The proposed development will generate additional traffic onto an already heavily trafficked road. The applicant operates a heavy duty haulage business and the 40ft trucks will be parked on the site and will increase heavy traffic movements on the road. The site is within 80 km/h speed limit with continuous white line at the front of the site. There is a proliferation of private entrances onto the road and the new entrance would compromise the level of service and carrying capacity of the

road, which is designated a Strategic Road, where carrying capacity and safety must be protected.

- The applicants have not carried out a full technical appraisal of the regional road in the vicinity of the site with respect to the required vision lines. The further information submitted is misleading and incorrect as the vertical alignment is not presented correctly and there is a hollow/dip in the road that presents a blind spot for road users (Photos 1- 4).

#### 6.1.5. Foul effluent treatment and public health

- The site is not suitable for the disposal of foul effluent despite recent ground improvement works, which were unspecified and not supervised and consisted of raising the ground levels with unsuitable landfill.
- There are significant considerations which the planning authority have not taken into account. The site is partly located with an area designated Flood Zone A. It is located in an area identified by the EPA as being sensitive and at very high risk in relation to domestic wastewater pollution. The ground is unsuitable for effluent treatment due to a high water table and the impervious nature of the underlying soils and recent unapproved landfill works. The Crossogs Burn runs along the western boundary of the site and is a tributary of the River Swilly and ultimately flows into an SAC and there is a high concentration of dwellings in the locality which are dependent on individual wastewater treatment systems.
- The proposal would therefore be prejudicial to public health and give rise to water pollution in an area at risk of flooding. The proposal to undertake significant interventions to site drainage and soils cannot address the inherent unsuitability of the site (Photo 5).

#### 6.1.6. Planning policy & ribbon development

- Refers to Policy RH-P-2 of the development plan. To permit the proposed development would constitute undesirable ribbon development and would exacerbate an emerging suburban pattern of development in this rural area (Photo 6). The development would also militate against the preservation of the

rural environment and against the efficient provision of public services and infrastructure.

- The applicant does not satisfy the requirements for a rural generated housing need. The applicant is the current owner/occupier of a house at Galdonagh, Manorcunningham Co Donegal (F92 T3KC and Folio DL63458F) and it is difficult to understand the applicant's need in this rural area.

#### 6.1.7. Loss of residential amenity

- The set back of the house will result in overlooking and loss of privacy to appellants property.
- Concerns that refrigerated lorries will be parked being powered overnight resulting in noise and disturbance to local residents.

#### 6.1.8. Unauthorised development

- Site clearance and development works have been carried out without the benefit of planning permission resulting in the change of levels and the character of the ground.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

### 6.2.1. Previous history

- It is incorrect to state that the previous reasons for refusal have not been addressed.

### 6.2.2. Traffic safety and principles

- Acknowledge that the R250 is a busy route and that there will be traffic movements into the site but the entrance meets and exceeds the requirements for a domestic entrance.
- The fact that the applicants father has a family run haulage business is irrelevant to the application. The applicant's father has ample space where lorries are parked c.350m from the subject site. There is no reason why articulated vehicles would be parked on the site.
- There is no provision in the CPD that precludes the crossing of a white line to enter a property particularly where the required vision lines exist and it is safe



to do so. The stopping sight distance required on this road is 160m and this is achievable in both directions as shown on the enclosed map.

- The single domestic entrance and its associated traffic movements will not have a serious effect on the road network and will not affect the carrying capacity or safety of the road.
- The information submitted on vision lines is not misleading and is correct. The vision lines are shown on the attached drawing. There is no blind spot along the stretch of roadway in which a vehicle could be hidden as viewed from the site entrance. Vision lines cross the verge to the roadside of appellants front boundary wall and that of the property to the west, but no works are required to the verges to facilitate the vision lines. The adjoining roadside boundary walls have been set back from the road edge.
- The Area Engineer has no issue with the proposal. Appendix B contains photographs which show the vision lines and road alignment. Vehicles can clearly be seen from the vision line points and the exceeded 230m vision line point approaching the site from the southwest.

### 6.2.3. Public health

- A site assessment was carried out in accordance with the Environmental Code of Practice by a qualified and experienced Site Assessor. It was evaluated by Donegal Co. Councils Environmental Health Officer and both are satisfied that the proposals recommended for on-site treatment are satisfactory.
- Contrary to the appellant's claims the works were carried out on the advice and direction of the site assessor. The works consisted of the clearing of established drains and the formation of new drains. No filling material was brought onto the site nor has the site been raised to disguise the water table. The site improvements were successful and the water table reduced significantly from the previous application. The proposals do recommend a partially raised soil polishing filter constructed with suitable imported soil as necessary but this work has not yet been carried out. The system will be far superior than existing systems in the vicinity.

#### 6.2.4. Planning policy and ribbon development

- Appellant is being selective in the information is quoting from the CDP and not giving light to the definition and guidelines which would allow this development to be granted.
- This is an infill site located between existing development and does not extend or exacerbate ribbon development.
- The applicant fulfils the criteria of Policy RH-P-5 of the CPD. The original family home is less than 100m to the east and the family built a new home approximately 350 to the west where her parents live. Both in her own right and in addition to that of her family, the applicant complies with the minimum 7 year rule and is therefore fully entitled to a dwelling in this area as described in CPD policy.

#### 6.2.5. Loss of residential amenity

- The appellant's amenity is not affected by the proposed development. The location in line with the rear of appellants property, with no windows in the eastern elevation and boundary screening means that there is no opportunity for overlooking.

#### 6.2.6. Unauthorised development

- Clearance of vegetation was carried out on the site and some drainage works to improve the site and does not require planning permission. Natural levels were not changed during the works.

#### 6.2.7. Conclusion

The application has met all the required standards set out in the CPD. There is very little substance within the appellants submission and no hard evidence to back up the statements made.

### 6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

No response to the grounds of appeal were submitted by the planning authority.

7.0

## 8.0 **Assessment**

### 8.1. Introduction

8.1.1. I consider that the main issues that arise for determination in respect to this appeal relate to the following;

- Rural housing policy.
- Road safety.
- Site Drainage.
- Ribbon development.
- Impacts on residential amenity.
- Appropriate Assessment.

### 8.2. **Rural housing policy**

The site is located in an area designated 'Stronger Rural Area' under the housing provisions of the development plan. Under the provisions of Policy RH-P-3 housing in these areas will be facilitated for three categories of applicants as follows;

- Persons whose primary employment is in a rural-based activity with a demonstrated need to live in the locality.
- Persons with a vital link to the rural area by reason of having lived in this community for a substantial period of their lives (7 years minimum), or by the existence in the rural areas of long established ties (7 years minimum) with immediate family members, or by reason of providing care to a person who is an existing resident (7 years minimum),
- Persons who, for exceptional health reasons can demonstrate a genuine need to reside in a particular rural location.

8.2.1. The applicant contends that she qualifies for consideration for a house in the area on the basis that her parents have lived in the area for in excess of 7 years. The application is supported by correspondence from Joe Mc Hugh TD who states that the applicant is originally from Crossogs, New Mills, where her family live and work.

The previous application was supported by similar documentation and a Supplementary Housing Application Form which stated that the applicants was resident in Crossogs for over 20 years.

- 8.2.2. The Planning Officer noted the Board's previous reason for refusal and considered that clarification was required on applicant's locally based need to reside in the area. The submitted information indicates that the applicant currently resides in Galdonagh Manorcunningham (located a significant distance from the site to the east of Letterkenny) but that she was brought up in the same townland as the proposed site and lived there for in excess of 15 years. The family then built a new house in the adjacent townland of Crossogs approximately 350m from the application site.
- 8.2.3. While the applicant has indicated that she is the owner of the subject site, she has failed to demonstrate a genuine need to reside in this particular area under the provisions of Policy RH-P-3. The original proposal on this site was assessed under the provisions of the previous county development plan and I note that the Inspector's report referred to the lack of documentary evidence clearly indicating compliance with Policy RH-P-3 relating to housing need in this area. The Board accepted this position in its third reason for refusal. There has been no substantial change to Policy RH-P-3 policy under the current development plan and the applicant has not provided any additional information which I consider would warrant a reversal of the Board's previous decision in this regard.

### 8.3. **Traffic Safety**

- 8.3.1. In its second reason for refusal on the previous proposal on this site, the Board raised issues relating to traffic safety. It noted the important regional function served by the regional road, the traffic turning movements that would be generated by the proposed development, which by itself and in combination with the proliferation of direct private entrances onto the road would compromise the level of service and carrying capacity of the regional road. It was also concluded that the proposed entrance would constitute a traffic hazard at a point on the regional road where there is a continuous white line and where a speed limit of 80 km/h applies.
- 8.3.2. The current proposal is not materially different from the previous proposal. It also proposes the creation of a new vehicular entrance onto the regional road in a similar position as previously proposed and there have been no changes to the carriageway

in the vicinity of the site, its width and alignment remains unchanged. While a new development plan has been adopted in the interim, the importance of the R250 as part of the Strategic Road network continues to be recognised (Section 5.1.1). While the grounds of appeal suggest that the attainment of 160m vision lines at the proposed site entrance is relevant, similar visibility splays were proposed as part of the original proposal. There is, therefore, no change to the current proposal which would warrant a reversal of the Board's previous decision regarding road safety considerations.

#### **8.4. Site drainage**

- 8.4.1. In its previous decision on this site, the Board concluded that the proposed development was not suitable for the disposal of foul effluent due to the unacceptable percolating characteristics of the ground. The site suitability assessment indicated that the trial hole was excavated to a depth of 2.1m and that the water table was encountered at 1.2m. The soil 'P' value was 43.19. Photographs were produced showing the excavated trial hole and percolation test holes. The Environmental Health Officer recommended standard type conditions in the event of permission been granted, which included a requirement that the soil polishing filter be constructed by the addition of filling material to ensure a t-value of 41-50.
- 8.4.2. Under the current proposal foul effluent from the house would be treated in a mechanical aeration system and soil polishing filter prior to discharge to ground. The site suitability assessment report on the file indicates that the trial hole was excavated to a depth of 2.0m and that the water table was encountered at 1.7m. Percolation tests indicated a 'P' value of 27.64. Photographs showing the excavated trial hole/percolation tests holes were not submitted. The Environmental Health Officer recommended standard type conditions in the event of permission been granted, which included a requirement that the soil polishing filter be constructed by the addition of filling material to ensure a t-value of 21-40.
- 8.4.3. The main difference between the current and previous assessment is that the trial hole/ percolation tests holes were excavated further north within the site i.e. closer to the front boundary. Another difference is that the original site investigations took place in November, while the more recent tests took place in June 2018, when the

country was experiencing an unprecedented and prolonged period of dry and very warm conditions.

- 8.4.4. The applicant states that site improvement works have been carried out on the site which included clearing drains and the formation of new drains. While the assessment may indicate that the improvement works have reduced the water table, my concern is that at the time of my site inspection, there was evidence of ponding along the front and eastern boundary of the site and the vegetation present in this area is indicative of impeded drainage conditions. I would also have concerns that the most recent site investigations took place when conditions on the site may not indicate the highest on-site water table.
- 8.4.5. It is proposed to install the percolation area in the lowest section of the site. It is accepted in the assessment that to attain sufficient percolating medium it will be necessary to construct a partially raised percolation area with additional land drains around the perimeter to prevent ingress of surface water. This will require a significant level of physical intervention on the site. While the EPA Guidelines make provision for site improvement works 'in certain circumstances' (Appendix F), it is a highly specialised and skilled operation and there are logistics involved in terms of the achievement of suitable t-values, suitable compaction, supervised installation etc. There are questions therefore regarding the efficacy of the measures proposed and there is no guarantee that they will be successful.
- 8.4.6. The site is identified by the EPA as being sensitive and at very high risk in relation to domestic waste water pollution. Having regard to existing conditions on the site and the location of the watercourse to the west, in the event that the percolation area is not properly constructed or the failure of the system, the proposed development is likely to result in ponding on the surface of the site, posing a threat to surface water which is particularly significant in the context of the sensitivities of the site. I am not persuaded that the applicant has addressed the previous concerns raised by the Board to warrant a reversal of its earlier decision. I recommend that permission for the development be refused on the ground of unsuitable ground conditions to adequately and safely treat domestic effluent prior to discharge to ground.

## 9.0

### 9.1. **Ribbon development**

- 9.1.1. Under the provisions of Policy RH-P-2 the planning authority seeks to ensure that a proposed development will not create or add to ribbon development. Ribbon development is defined as 5 houses or more on any side of 250m road frontage. There are currently two houses to the east and three houses to the west of the subject site, spanning a distance of c. 250m along the regional road. The proposed development, if permitted, would fill the gap between the two sets of houses forming a continuous line in the area, creating ribbon development and the expansion of a suburban type development in this rural area, which is contrary to Policy RH-P-2 of the development plan.

### 9.2. **Impacts on residential amenity**

- 9.2.1. The issues raised relate to overlooking and noise and disturbance. While the proposed house will be recessed behind appellant's house, there are no windows in the side elevation which would give rise to overlooking. The main living areas of the house are located on the opposed side and coupled with the orientation of the house which would only facilitate oblique views from bedroom windows, I do not consider that there are any significant issues regarding overlooking and loss of privacy.
- 9.2.2. Whilst it is noted in the grounds of appeal that the applicant's father operates a haulage business and concerns are expressed regarding potential impacts on residential amenity from the overnight parking and powering of articulated trucks, the application before the Board is for a dwelling house and effluent treatment system. Any issues concerning the potential unauthorised use of the site for any other use is purely speculative at this point and any future issues in this regard is a matter for the planning authority to control.

### 9.3. **Appropriate Assessment**

- 9.3.1. The closest Natura 2000 site is Lough Swilly SAC (Site Code 002287) and SPA. It includes all of the inner parts of the lough extending from Letterkenny to just north of Buncrana. The site is designated for a number of habitats listed on Annex 1 of the E.U. Habitats Directive (estuaries, lagoons, Atlantic salt meadows, Molinia meadows,

old oak woods) and for Otter. Under the E.U. Birds Directive the site is of conservation interest for a wide range of species.

- 9.3.2. Having regard to the separation distance between the appeal site and the Natura 2000 sites, there is no potential for direct impacts on the designated sites. The only potential for indirect effects that could arise would be from the proposed wastewater treatment system. The stream located on the western boundary of the site flows into the River Swilly to the north, which itself flows into Lough Swilly SAC/SPA. The potential exists on the site for ponding to occur which could result in wastewater being discharged into the adjacent stream. Having regard to the separation distance between the site and the diluting effects of the adjoining stream and the River Swilly, I do not consider that the proposed development either alone, or, in combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to have significant effects on a European site, in view of the sites' conservation objectives and that, therefore, a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and the submission of a Natura Impact Statement is not required.

## 10.0 Conclusion

- 10.1.1. The applicants have not demonstrated a genuine need to reside in this rural area in accordance with Policy RH-P-3 of the development plan.
- 10.1.2. There is no material difference between the current and previous proposal on the site in terms of impacts on the regional road and traffic safety considerations.
- 10.1.3. The site suitability assessment was carried out under conditions which were not representative of normal conditions and may not indicate the highest on-site water table.
- 10.1.4. The proposal would result in ribbon development and exacerbate an emerging suburban pattern of development in this rural area.
- 10.1.5. Whilst the design of the house has been revised and is more in keeping with the scale and character of development in the vicinity, the proposal is otherwise similar to the previous application on the site and does not address the Board's previous reasons for refusal.



## 11.0 Recommendation

11.1. Having considered the contents of the planning application, the decision of the planning authority, the provisions of the development plan, the grounds of appeal and the responses thereto, my inspection of the site and my assessment of the planning issues, I recommend that permission be refused for the development for the reasons and considerations set out below.

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The subject site is partly located within an area identified as Flood Risk A on the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment mapping issues by the Office of Public Works (2011). The site is also located in an area identified by the Environmental Protection Agency as being sensitive and at very high risk in relation to domestic waste water pollution. Having regard to ground conditions prevailing on the site, the presence of a stream along the western boundary, the high concentration of existing houses in the area dependent on individual treatment systems, and the indicative flood risk at this site, the Board considers that the site is not suitable for the disposal of foul effluent. The proposed development would, therefore, be prejudicial to public health and would give rise to the potential for water pollution in an area at risk of flooding. It is considered that the proposals to undertake intervention to the soils cannot appropriately address the inherent unsuitability of the site. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The R250 regional road fulfils an important regional function connecting Letterkenny in the east of the county with Glenties to the west. It is considered that the proposed development would generate additional traffic turning movements on the heavily trafficked Regional Road (R250), which by itself and in combination with the proliferation of direct private entrances onto the regional road in the vicinity, would interfere with the free flow of traffic on, and would compromise the level of service and carrying capacity of the road at this location, and would fail to protect public investment in the regional road network. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed entrance, where a

speed limit of 80 km/h applies, and where there is a continuous white line in the centre of the carriageway, would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. Having regard to the location of the subject site within a 'Stronger Rural Area' in close proximity to Letterkenny, where housing is restricted to persons demonstrating local need in accordance with Policy RH-P-3 as set out in the Donegal County Development Plan 2018-2024, the Board is not satisfied, on the basis of the documentation available on file, that the applicant has adequately demonstrated that she comes within the scope of the specific housing need criteria set out in the development plan for a house in this location. In the absence of an identified locally-based need for a house at this rural location, it is considered that the proposed development would contribute to the excessive pattern of encroachment of random rural development in the area, and would militate against the preservation of the rural environment and the efficient provision of public services and infrastructure. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the policies and objectives of the development plan, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
4. The proposed development would constitute undesirable ribbon development and would exacerbate an emerging suburban pattern of development in this rural area contrary to the provisions of Policy RH-P-2 of the development plan. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

Breda Gannon  
Senior Planning Inspector

15th March 2019

