



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP – 304829 – 19.

Development	Construction of a dormer dwelling house, a detached domestic garage/fuel store, installation of an effluent treatment system/polishing filter and all associated site works.
Location	Rattin, Kinnegad, Co. Westmeath.
Planning Authority	Westmeath County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	186349.
Applicant	Amanda Judge & Finian Newman.
Type of Application	Planning Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant with conditions.
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant	Angelika De Barra.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	23 rd September, 2019.
Inspector	Patricia-Marie Young.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies/Consultations	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
5.1. National Planning Policy Provisions	6
5.2. Local Planning Policy Provisions.....	6
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	7
6.0 The Appeal	8
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
6.2. Applicant Response	8
6.3. Planning Authority Response	9
7.0 Assessment.....	9
8.0 Recommendation.....	16
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	16

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The irregular shaped 0.310ha appeal site lies c3.3km to the south west of the suburban fringes of Kinnegad and c2.2km to the south west of Junction 2 of the M6 Motorway, both as the bird would fly. It lies in the townland of Rattin on the southern side of a T-junction between two local roads (i.e. L5010 which bounds the western side of the site and the L5011 which bounds the northern boundary of the site).
- 1.2. The site consists of part of a larger undulating open field which appears to be in use for grazing. Its eastern boundary is setback from the banks of a water course (Note: Kinnegad River). This bank contains a number of mature trees, indigenous plant species, hedgerow type planting and water loving plants. There is also contains a small bridge crossing which provides access to another area of pastureland and near this bridge livestock access this watercourse for drinking. At the time of inspection there was a steady flow of fast-moving water running in a northerly direction in this water course. The southern boundary is not physically delineated and the land to the south consists of pastureland. It also includes an enclosed area that contains a number of dilapidated structures that appear to be in part used for storage.
- 1.3. Near the north-easternmost corner of the site is 'Codds Bridge'. This restricted in span humped in shape stone finished bridge traverses the aforementioned watercourse.
- 1.4. Access to the site is currently via an agricultural entrance that is located alongside the south westernmost corner of the site. This access is set back from a restricted in width, undulating in horizontal alignment and poorly surfaced local road (L5010). It lies c75m to the south of the T-junction with the L5011. I observed no traffic on this road during my time on site. Whereas the local road that runs alongside the northern boundary of the site is also restricted in its width, has an undulating horizontal alignment and is poorly surfaced accommodated a steady stream of traffic.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Construction of a dormer dwelling house (279m²) a detached domestic garage/fuel store (73.35m²), installation of an effluent treatment system/polishing filter and all

associated site works. The documentation submitted indicate that a new entrance would be provided on the western boundary of the site and that existing hedgerow between trees would be removed and that a new splayed post and rail fence erected to entrance piers on both sides with native planting along the fence line. A water supply will be provided via a new private well. Accompanying this planning application is several documents including but not limited to the following: 1) letter of consent from the landowner; 2) a Site Characterisation Form; and, 3) a completed Westmeath County Council Local Needs questionnaire.

- 2.2. On foot of a request for further information the applicant submitted a number of revisions and clarification in relation to the proposed development. This submission was received on the 22nd day of May, 2018, by the Planning Authority, and it includes the relocated position for the proposed detached garage structure and revisions to the external detailing of the proposed detached dwelling.
- 2.3. This submission is accompanied by details relating to one of the applicant's history of all homes occupied by her in the past; a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA); and, an arboriculture assessment of the site. This submission also indicates that the applicant's preference is to use the proposed new access onto the public road as indicated in their initial application as they contend that the other entrance to the south is an agricultural entrance which serves as a right-of-way for a number of landowners.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The Planning Authority granted permission subject to conditions including:

Condition No. 2:	Elevation revisions.
Condition No. 6:	Section 48 Contribution.
Condition No. 7:	Restricts use of garage.
Condition No. 8:	Occupancy clause.
Condition No. 9:	Road entrance and roadside boundary.
Condition No. 10:	Surface Water.

Condition No. 11: Sewage Treatment and disposal.

Condition No. 12: Water.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The **final Planning Officer's report** is the basis of the Planning Authority's decision.

The **initial Planning Officer's report** concluded with a request for further information on the following matters:

Item No. 1: Clarification was sought on the location of all homes occupied by the applicant Amanda Judge together with dates and ages of occupation.

Item No. 2: A Flood Risk Assessment is requested.

Item No. 3: An Arboricultural Assessment is requested. It is also requested that the applicants consider the relocation of the garage and the use of an existing access to the south of the site as opposed to providing a new access.

Item No.4: Concern was raised in relation to the design of the proposed dwelling.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Engineers Report: Final report raised no objection subject to the imposition of conditions to deal with roads, surface water, sewage & polishing filter disposal system, water and service cables.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies/Consultations

- 3.3.1. **Meath County Council:** Raised no objection; however, noted that the site was in a low development pressure area with a high sensitivity and value landscape. They also noted that the site was adjacent to a flood risk zone and that there were no archaeological monuments or protected structures within 1km in County Meath area.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. The appellants submitted an observation in relation to the proposed development which alongside raising flooding concerns also raised an objection to the orientation

of the dwelling and in their view the proposed design was not in keeping with the Westmeath Rural Design Guidelines.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Site and Setting

- 4.1.1. The appellant refers to a previous application pertaining to this site, i.e. P.A. Reg. Ref. No. 18/6285. In relation to this application I note to the Board that the applicants made a similar application to the Planning Authority for their determination, i.e. the construction of a dormer type dwelling house, a detached domestic garage/fuel store, installation of a waste water treatment system and all associated site works. According to the Planning Authority's website this application was an incomplete application.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Planning Policy Provisions

- National Planning Framework.
- Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities.
- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines.

5.2. Local Planning Policy Provisions

- 5.2.1. The Westmeath County Development Plan, 2014 to 2020, is applicable Development Plan. Under this plan the site is located within an un-zoned rural area with the nearest settlement being Kinnegad (a Tier 3 – Service Town as set out under Map Ref 15 of the County Development Plan).
- 5.2.2. Section 9.9 of the Development Plan recognises that the frequency, pattern and severity of flooding are expected to increase because of climate change and that it is more important than ever to take account of flood risk in spatial planning. It also indicates various actions that can be taken to minimise the impact of an increased future flood risk including avoidance of development in floodplains subject to flooding, except in very limited circumstances.

- 5.2.3. Policy P-CS6 of the Development Plan states that the Planning Authority will seek “to restrict development in areas at risk of flooding in accordance with the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities”.
- 5.2.4. Policy P-FL2 of the Development Plan states that the Planning Authority will seek “to ensure that a flood risk assessment is carried out for any development proposal on lands at risk of flooding, in accordance with the “Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities” (Department of Environment, Community and Local Government/Office of Public Works, 2009).”

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- The appeal site is located c4.1km to the south east of Natural Heritage Areas Milltown Pass Bog NHA (Site Code: 002323).
- The appeal site is located 5.4km to the south west of Special Area of Conservation Hevey Bog SAC (Site Code: 002342).

5.4. EIA Screening

- 5.4.1. The proposed development comprises a ‘project’ for the purposes of environmental impact assessment and falls within a class of development set out in Part 2, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended).
- 5.4.2. Having regard to the development sought under this application, I consider that whilst the general principle of the proposed development which is modest in its nature and scale would give rise to a very limited environmental impact and I note that the site itself is significantly removed from any sensitive sites, however, having regard to the ground conditions of the site, the OPW flood maps, the high water tables, the proximity of the site and in particular its waste water treatment infrastructure to the Kinnegad River with this river potentially having hydrological links to sensitive sites, together with the ground levels proposed for this infrastructure and the finished ground levels of the proposed dwelling, and the likelihood that the site would be cut of in an extreme fluvial event as has been the case in the past based on the precautionary principal I am not satisfied based on the information provided that I can conclude that there would be no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development, if permitted.

5.4.3. I therefore consider that the need for environmental impact assessment cannot be excluded at preliminary examination and I am not convinced that a screening determination is not required in this case.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The application site was completely flooded in 2012.
- The relevant flood map which includes the site indicates that most of the site is located within a flood zone.
- It is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area to locate a residential property within a vulnerable site.
- The site is part of a floodplain associated with a tributary of the Kinnegad River which runs immediately to the east of the site.
- The proposed development would be contrary to Policy P-CS6 of the Development Plan.
- The proposed development would be contrary to Policy P-WET1 which seeks to ensure that floodplains are protected for their biodiversity and flood protection value.
- Reference is made to the Flood Risk Management Guidelines and its requirements.
- Reference is made to the planning history of the site.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. The applicant's response can be summarised as follows:

- The matter of flooding has been expertly examined by a Senior Environmental Engineer and his Flood Risk Assessment along with his other documentation show that this concern is unfounded.

- No flooding has occurred on the subject site in the past including in 2012.
- If flooding was an issue at this site, we would not wish to build a dwelling there.
- It is felt that this appeal is vexatious and not based on any evidence.
- This response is accompanied by a letter and an FRA prepared by a Senior Environmental Engineer of ORS. This report concludes that the flood risk to the proposed development is low and that the development is unlikely to increase flood risk elsewhere.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

6.3.1. None received.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. **Introduction**

7.1.1. I consider the substantive issues in this appeal case can be dealt with under the following headings:

- Principle of the Proposed Development/Rural Housing Need.
- Flooding.
- Design and Visual Impact.
- Residential Amenity Impact.

7.1.2. The matter of appropriate assessment also requires examination.

7.2. **Principle of the Proposed Development/Rural Housing Need**

7.2.1. The National Planning Framework includes an objective relating to the subject matter of rural housing, i.e. Objective 19. This objective seeks to ensure that in providing for the development of rural housing, like that proposed under this application, that a distinction is made between areas under urban influence i.e. within the commuter catchment of cities, large towns, centres of employment and the like. It indicates that in rural areas under urban influence that such developments be facilitated in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrating economic or social need to live in a rural area. It further indicates that for such developments regard

should be had to the siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements

- 7.2.2. The Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines and the County Development Plan both indicate that the subject site is located on land under significant urban influence. The said Guidelines indicate that these areas exhibit characteristics such as proximity to the immediate environs or close commuting catchment of large cities and towns. It indicates that they have rapidly rising population and evidence of considerable pressure for development of housing due to proximity to such urban areas, or to major transport corridors with ready access to the urban area as well as pressures on infrastructure such as the local road network.
- 7.2.3. Section 11.6 of the Development in a manner consistent with the said Guidelines indicates that the objective in strong rural areas under significant urban influence is to maintain a stable population base within a strong network of villages and small towns and to facilitate housing development by people who have strong links to the particular rural area and who are intrinsic part of the rural community. It is a policy of the Planning Authority *“to accommodate demand from individuals for permanent residential development in strong rural areas who have strong links to the area and who are an intrinsic part of the rural community, subject to good planning practice, environmental carrying capacity and landscape protection considerations”* (Note: Policy P-SRA1).
- 7.2.4. In relation to the local housing need of such areas Policy P-LHN1 sets out that the Council will permit residential development in areas outside of the development boundaries of the settlement hierarchy subject to a number of circumstances. One of the applicants, i.e. Amanda Judge, appears to fall under circumstance 3 which she is a member of a landowner’s family; however, of concern under this circumstance it indicated that the *“landowner for this purpose being defined as persons who owned the land in question since the year 2000”*.
- 7.2.5. The documentation submitted with this application indicates that the applicant is not the owner of the land and she has the consent of her father who is legal owner of the land to make this application. Question 7 of the Westmeath County Council seeks the date on which “you” became the beneficial owners. The response to this question is 2006. In my view gives rise to a level of un-certainty in terms of

satisfying without doubt the circumstances set out under Policy P-LHN1 where residential developments may be permitted and whilst the site appears to be in agricultural use the applicant as part of their response to the Planning Authority's further information alluded to multiple rights of way existing to access onto the local road from the entrance bounding the south westernmost corner of the site.

- 7.2.6. In addition, looking at the other circumstances in which residential development may be permitted in strong rural areas under significant urban influence it would also appear that the neither applicant satisfy circumstance 1), i.e. persons who are actively engaged in agriculture, horticulture, forestry, bloodstock and peat industry.
- 7.2.7. In relation to circumstance 2), i.e. members of farm families seeking to build on the family farm, I am not satisfied that either applicant meets this circumstance for reasons relating to the limited size of the family landholding and there is no evidence submitted that supports that this limited in size landholding independently or as part of a larger landholding is functionally used by either applicants family as a family farm.
- 7.2.8. In relation to circumstance 4), i.e. persons employed locally whose employment would provide a service to the local community, neither applicant works in the immediate or wider vicinity of the site with Amanda Judge working c28km to the north east of the site in Kildalkey, Co. Meath, and Finian Newman working c16km to the south east of the site in Edenderry, Co. Offaly. I do however acknowledge that the site is located closer to the applicants work but I do not consider that either occupant can be considered to be working locally.
- 7.2.9. In relation to circumstance 5), i.e. persons who have personal family or economic ties within the area, including returning emigrants, it would appear that the site is located c0.9km to the north east of one of the applicants, i.e. Amanda Judge's, family home, and is near this applicant's uncle. It would therefore appear that this applicant would appear to meet circumstance 5) of Policy P-SRA1.
- 7.2.10. In relation to the final circumstance listed 6) this relates to persons returning to farming and who buy or inherit a substantial farm-holding which is kept intact as an established farm unit. Based on the documentation submitted neither applicant meets this criterion.

- 7.2.11. While I acknowledge that the applicant meets circumstance 5) of Policy P-SRA1 of the Development Plan I raise a concern that Policy P-SRA1 indicates that this type of development is also subject to demonstrating good planning practice and environmental carrying capacity considerations. On these matters I raise concerns in my assessment below.
- 7.2.12. Based on the above considerations I consider that one of the applicants has demonstrated that they have a social link to this locality; however, neither applicant has demonstrated any genuine economic or social need for the proposed dwelling at a location that is subject to strong urban influence and is outside of any settlement with serviced lands. In addition, having regard to good planning practice and environmental capacity issues raised I am not convinced that the proposed development is consistent with local and national planning policy provisions. In particular, Policy P-SRA1 of the Development Plan and Objective 19 of the National Planning Framework. I would also raise a concern in relation to the proliferation of one-off dwellings in areas under strong urban influence and in the vicinity of major transport routes like M6 and junctions to such motorways.

7.3. **Flooding**

- 7.3.1. The applicant proposes to serve the development by way of a new private well which would be located roughly half way between the northern elevation of the dwelling and the local road bounding the northern boundary of the site and an effluent treatment system and polishing filter located towards the southern portion of the site.
- 7.3.2. The appellant raises significant concern in relation to the suitability of the site for the proposed development based on flooding concerns and contends that the site itself was completely flooded in 2012. They also raise a concern that the site forms part of an area of land associated with the floodplain of the Kinnegad River and this further adds to its unsuitability for the type of development proposed.
- 7.3.3. On foot of the Planning Authority's further information request the applicant submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which acknowledges that the PFRAP Map shows that a significant portion of the site will be impacted during a 100 and 1000year storm event and indicates that there have been no reported flooding incidents at the site by the landowner who they contend have been in possession of this land for over 70-years. They propose that the finished floor level of the dwelling

will be 74.016mAOD and that based on the highest modelled water level results for a 100-year and 1000-year storm event including making a provision for a 50% blockage of the culvert gave rise to a 72.52 and 72.55mAOD levels respectively. Based on this modelling they considered that there would be a difference of 1.46m between the finished floor level and this highest water level. They considered that this would not impact on the footprint of the dwelling even with substantial blockages to the on-site culvert. This report therefore concluded that the flood risk of the proposed development is considered low.

- 7.3.4. I note that the Planning Authority considered that the FRA submitted by the applicant as part of their further information response satisfied their concerns on the matter of flooding.
- 7.3.5. Having examined the documentation, having visited and having regard available OPW flood maps, in particular, the OPW Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) I am satisfied that the proposed development is located within the floodplain of the Kinnegad River and that it is identified as an area that is vulnerable to fluvial flooding within an indicative 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) for 100-year event. This vulnerability appears to extend to the north, east and south of the site. As such the site and access to it in the immediate vicinity would be cut of via the local road to the north, the site access would be cut off to the west though access via the local road that bounds the west of the site would appear to be achievable to the south west of the site. I also note that this risk also appears to extend onto land bounding the western boundary and potentially the appellants property.
- 7.3.6. I also observed during my visit of the site that the watercourse level of the Kinnegad River which lies near the eastern boundary of the site was high. Though the ground conditions of the site were firm underfoot in most place there were areas of the site in which water was laying on the ground.
- 7.3.7. In relation to the documentation on file I raise a concern that the FRA makes no comment in terms of the potential impact of an extreme fluvial event on the infrastructure that is proposed to serve the dwelling house, i.e. the water supply and the effluent treatment system. It also doesn't clarify nor is it accompanied by drawings that demonstrate the finished floor levels match the FFL mAOD's indicated in its conclusions correlate with one another.

- 7.3.8. In relation to the Site Characterisation Form, it indicates that the Groundwater Protection Response of R1; that the site lies over an aquifer of moderate vulnerability; that the Kinnegad River lies 38m from the percolation area; and, the percolation 'T' -Test result was 20.39min/25mm. Having regard to the site-specific conditions a packaged wastewater system is proposed with discharge to a polishing filter by pump arrangement. No rising of the ground is proposed and the inverted of pipes would be located below ground.
- 7.3.9. The Development Plan indicates that the Planning Authority shall seek *“to protect and enhance the county’s floodplains and wetlands as a valuable habitat, which provides space for storage and conveyance of floodwater, enabling flood risk to be more effectively managed and reducing the need to provide flood defences in the future”* (Note: Policy P-FL6); *“to ensure new development does not increase flood risk elsewhere, including that which may arise from surface water run off”* (Note: Policy P-FL5); *“to ensure that floodplains, wetlands and watercourses, are protected for their biodiversity and flood protection value”* (Note: Policy P-WET1); *“to maintain good ecological status of wetlands and watercourses in support of the provisions of the Water Framework Directive and Ramsar Convention”* (Note: Objective O-WET3); through *“to promote the provision of safe and secure wastewater infrastructure to ensure that public health is protected and permitted development is within the environmental carrying capacity and does not negatively impact upon habitat quality or species diversity”* (Policy P-WST1).
- 7.3.10. Having regard to the above local planning policy provisions which are consistent with the Flood Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2009, I consider that there is a presumption against this type of development within floodplains and I am not convinced that the proposed development, if permitted, would not give rise to a reduction in floodplain land and that it would not result in some increase in the potential for flooding outside its confines. Therefore to permit the proposed development would be contrary to the above stated local policies and objectives of the Development Plan (Section 7.3.9 above). In turn, I am also not satisfied that it is consistent with guidance set out in ‘The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines, 2009.
- 7.3.11. I am also not satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the proposed development, if permitted, should an extreme fluvial event occur, that it would not give rise to any

public health issues or contamination issues which also have the potential to adversely impact on biodiversity. Moreover, it could in such circumstances because of the hydrological links of the Kinnegad River together with the fact that soils in this area overlay limestone give rise to diminishment of the water quality of the Kinnegad River (which I note forms part of the Boyne Catchment) through to diminishment of European Sites despite the significant separation distance between them and the site. Finally, in such an event the immediate public road network would not be accessible.

7.3.12. Based on the above considerations I recommend that the Board take a precautionary approach to the matter of flooding and I recommend refusal of the proposed development based on the concerns set out in this section of my report.

7.4. Design and Visual Impact

7.4.1. While I consider that the proposed design of the dwelling would have limited impact on the visual amenities of its setting and I acknowledge that design is subjective I am not convinced that it is consistent with the guidance for such developments as set out under the Westmeath Rural Design Guidelines, 2005, in terms of its overall built form, its fenestration detailing and the solid to void articulation of the southern elevation.

7.4.2. Of further concern I raise a concern that the creation of a new access as opposed to using the existing access point that serves the larger plot of land in which the site is located will result in a loss of mature trees and hedgerows. This will inevitably result in the proposed development, if permitted, being more visible in its landscape setting.

7.4.3. On this point I note the applicant's response to the Planning Authority's further information request which indicates that the applicant would prefer not to use the existing point of access onto the local road network due to it accommodating a number of rights of way to different 3rd Parties. However, no evidence to substantiate this has been provided.

7.4.4. Having regard to the proposed new access staggered location relative to the applicants existing entrance serving their dwelling on the opposite side of the road, its close proximity to the existing entrance serving the land in which the site is located, the limited sightlines on either side of the proposed new entrance, together

with the substandard nature of this adjoining local road, in particular its meandering alignment and restricted width, the proliferation of access points in close proximity to one another despite the low volume of traffic that appear to use this road to serve one dwelling and based on the level of intervention that would be required to accommodate it on the existing hedgerow would in my view result in a diminishment of the visual amenities of the area despite assurance of otherwise in the applicants further information response.

7.5. Appropriate Assessment

7.6. Having regard to the concerns raised in Section 5.4 and Section 7.3 of this report, in the absence of an Stage 1 Appropriate Assessment Screening Report, prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced expert, I am not satisfied or sufficiently reassured that the proposed development either individually, or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on designated European sites within a 15km radius, despite the significant lateral separation distance based on the hydrology and geology of this area, the underlying limestone bedrock and the sites limited separation distance from the Kinnegad River, which forms part of the Boyne River catchment, in a flood plan which is indicated as land with an indicative 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) for 100-year event. In these circumstances I consider that the Board is precluded from giving further consideration to a grant of planning permission.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend that planning permission be refused.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. On the basis of the information provided with the application, the Board cannot be satisfied that the proposed development individually, or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on European sites within a 15km radius of the site, in view of their Conservation Objectives. In these circumstances the Board is precluded from giving further consideration to a grant

of planning permission. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The site is situated on a floodplain, in close proximity to the Kinnegad River, in an area at risk of fluvial flooding. On the basis of the submitted documentation, the Board is not satisfied that the applicant has provided sufficient information to demonstrate compliance with the 'The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities', November, 2009, and Policies P-FL5; P-FL6); P-WET1; P-WST1 and Objective O-WET3 of the Westmeath County Development Plan, 2014 to 2020. The proposed development would, therefore, constitute an unacceptable risk of flooding, would be prejudicial to public health, would conflict with the local and national planning provisions as well as guidance on such matters, and would be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.
3. The site of the proposed development is located within an 'Area Under Strong Urban Influence' as set out in the 'Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities' issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in April, 2005 and in an area where housing is restricted to persons demonstrating local need in accordance with the Offaly County Development Plan 2014-2020.

Furthermore, the subject site is located in a rural area that is under urban influence, where it is national policy, as set out in National Policy Objective 19 of the National Planning Framework, to facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area.

Having regard to the documentation submitted with the application and appeal, the Board is not satisfied that the applicant has a demonstrable economic or social need to live in this rural area. It is considered, therefore, that the applicant does not come within the scope of the housing need criteria as set out in the Guidelines and in national policy for a house at this location.

The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the Ministerial Guidelines and to the over-arching national policy and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Patricia-Marie Young
Planning Inspector

10th October, 2019.