



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-305747-19

---

<b>Development</b>	Demolish cottage and construct a replacement house with an on-site wastewater treatment system
<b>Location</b>	Killadangan, Westport, County Mayo
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Mayo County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	P19/610
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Brid Doyle
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First-Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Brid Doyle
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> January 2020
<b>Inspector</b>	Colm McLoughlin

# Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0 Proposed Development .....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	4
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy & Context .....	6
6.0 The Appeal .....	8
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	8
6.2. Planning Authority Response .....	9
6.3. Observations .....	9
6.4. Further Submissions .....	9
7.0 Assessment.....	10
7.1. Introduction .....	10
7.2. Traffic, Parking & Access .....	10
7.3. Design & Visual Amenity .....	13
7.4. Wastewater Treatment.....	14
8.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	15
9.0 Recommendation.....	18
10.0 Reasons and Considerations .....	18

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1.** The appeal site, known as Beechcroft, is in the rural townland of Killadangan, approximately 4.5km southwest of Westport town centre in County Mayo. The site is situated at the base of the foothills leading to Croagh Patrick, overlooking Clew Bay to the north. The immediate area is characterised by a patchwork of small fields, bordered by stonewalls and mature trees, interspersed with rural housing.
- 1.2.** The site measures a stated 0.13ha and has direct access onto the R335 regional road, which bounds the northern boundary of the site. Currently on site is a vacant single-storey pitched-roof cottage, which is set back from the front roadside boundary by approximately 3m and with single-storey east side and rear flat-roof extensions. Adjoining the cottage to the east is a single-storey stone-built agricultural building, which is not within the site. The roadside boundary is formed by a low stonewall supplemented by planting, with extensive vegetation overgrown throughout the site. The remainder of the site boundaries are formed by stonewalls supplemented by hedgerows and trees. Lands in the area drop steeply from the southwest towards the coastline to the north, with a 6m drop in levels from the rear to the front of the appeal site.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1.** The proposed development comprises the following:
  - demolition of a house with a stated gross floor area (GFA) of 103sq.m and site clearance works;
  - construction of a split-level part single and two-storey house comprising four bedrooms and a garage, with a stated GFA of 380sq.m,
  - provision of a repositioned replacement vehicular access;
  - provision of an on-site wastewater treatment system, landscaping, including retaining wall structures and revised boundary treatments, and associated development works.
- 2.2.** In addition to the standard planning application documentation and drawings, the application was accompanied by a site suitability assessment report addressing on-

site disposal of effluent, 3D images of the proposed development and a design statement.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

3.1.1. The planning authority issued a notification of a decision to refuse to grant permission for the proposed development for three reasons, which can be summarised as follows:

Reason 1 – creation of a new vehicular access onto a strategically-important route;

Reason 2 – substandard visibility at the proposed vehicular entrance;

Reason 3 – the site is located along a designated scenic route and the design of the proposed development would be obtrusive in the landscape.

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

3.2.1. Planning Report

The report of the Planning Officer (September 2019) reflects the decision of the planning authority and noted the following:

- a previous application under Mayo County Council (MCC) Ref. P18/727 for the extension and renovation of the cottage and the use of the existing vehicular entrance was recommended for refusal of planning permission based on poor sight visibility onto a strategically-important route, prior to being withdrawn;
- a speed limit of 80km/hr applies along the R335, which has a continuous white line fronting the site;
- the proposed house would be significantly larger than the existing cottage and the proposed development fails to adequately consider the design of the existing cottage.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Environment Section – no response;
- Road Design – refusal recommended;
- Area Engineer – no response.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- An Taisce – no response;
- Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht – no response.

### 3.4. Third-Party Submissions

3.4.1. None received.

## 4.0 Planning History

### 4.1. Appeal Site

4.1.1. As noted above, the planning authority refer to a planning application (MCC Ref. P18/727), comprising extensions to the house on site, which was subsequently withdrawn by the applicant. I am not aware of any other applications relating to the appeal site.

### 4.2. Surrounding Sites

4.2.1. Reflective of the rural character of the area, recent planning applications in the neighbouring area relate to one-off housing, replacement housing and domestic extensions, including the following:

- MCC Ref. P19/970 – application lodged on the adjacent property to the west in December 2019 for retention permission for alterations to a house and a domestic garage. A decision is due on this application in February 2020;
- MCC Ref. P17/677 – permission granted by the planning authority in January 2018 for the demolition and removal of ruins, and the construction of a house

with an on-site wastewater treatment system, on a site located approximately 170m to the southeast of the appeal site;

- MCC Ref. P17/209 – permission granted by the planning authority in November 2017 for partial demolition, renovations and extension to a house with an on-site wastewater treatment system and a new vehicular access, on a site located 240m to the southeast of the appeal site.

## **5.0 Policy & Context**

### **5.1. Mayo County Development Plan 2018-2024**

- 5.1.1. The site is situated 2km to the southwest of the Development Plan boundary for Westport town and environs. Mayo County Development Plan 2014-2020 is the statutory plan for this area. Volume 1 of the Development Plan primarily contains planning policies and objectives for the County. Map 3 of the Development Plan addressing 'rural-area types', identifies the appeal site as being within a 'rural area under strong urban influence'. As part of the Settlement Strategy (Volume 1), the replacement or renovation of existing structures for residential use is encouraged in preference to new build development.
- 5.1.2. Section 4 of Volume 1 to the Development Plan outlines the planning authority's strategy with respect to the 'Environment, Heritage and Amenity', including the following landscape protection objectives:
- LP-01 – ensure development is appropriate to the landscape;
  - LP-02 – consider development in the context of landscape sensitivity;
  - LP-03 – protect the landscape;
  - VP-01 – ensure development does not adversely interfere with features of interest, including the coastline.
- 5.1.3. Section 1.3 of Volume 2 to the Plan states that the replacement of dwellings or development of other structures to habitable homes will be considered in all areas, subject to normal planning considerations, including the availability of services, the adequacy of ground conditions for the disposal of effluent from the development, traffic safety, residential amenity and visual amenity.

- 5.1.4. Section 7.3 of Volume 2 to the Plan states that rural housing shall be designed in accordance with the Council’s Design Guidelines for Rural Housing and that consideration will be given to minor deviations from the Guidelines where it can be demonstrated that the deviation would not have an adverse visual impact on the landscape or on residential amenity.
- 5.1.5. Section 16.3 of Volume 2 to the Plan addresses access visibility requirements and standards to be applied. The Plan references the need to adhere to the Spatial Planning and National Roads Planning Guidelines where development is proposed along strategically-important routes, including a number of roads of regional status.
- 5.1.6. Section 20.2.2 of Volume 2 to the Plan states that in unserved rural areas, where a proposed house cannot connect to the public sewer, a site suitability assessment will be required. The assessment must be carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Code of Practice for Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses (population equivalent  $\leq 10$ ) (2009), taking into account the cumulative effects of existing and proposed developments in the area.

**5.2. Natural Heritage Designations**

- 5.2.1. The nearest designated sites to the appeal site, including Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs), are listed in table 1 below.

**Table 1.** Natural Heritage Designations

<b>Site Code</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Distance</b>	<b>Direction</b>
001482	Clew Bay Complex SAC	35m	north
000471	Brackloon Woods SAC	2km	south

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

- 5.3.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that the issues arising from the proximity and connectivity to European Sites can be adequately dealt with under the Habitats Directive (Appropriate Assessment), as there is no likelihood of other significant effects on the environment. The need for

environmental impact assessment 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. The first-party grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- the existing three/four-bedroom cottage dates from the 19<sup>th</sup> century with extensions dating approximately from the 1980s and was occupied until two to three years ago;
- the applicant withdrew the previous planning application (MCC Ref. P18/727), as they were advised by the planning authority that it would be refused on the grounds that it would constitute a traffic hazard;
- a copy of the previously stated withdrawn proposals (MCC Ref. P18/727) are included;
- the existing access allows for parking of one car on site with no space for visitor parking, while also requiring vehicles exiting to reverse onto the roadside with limited on-site manoeuvrability;
- during pre-application consultations the planning authority was satisfied that it would be reasonable to replace the existing house;
- the primary reason for proposing the replacement development was to address the space needed for access arrangements;
- road safety concerns cannot be fully eliminated, but can be significantly improved as part of the development on site, including sufficient on-site parking and sightlines of over 160m to the west and 70m to the northeast from the repositioned vehicular entrance;
- the resultant sightlines would be comparable with those permitted for neighbouring houses in similar roadside contexts in the immediate area along the R335 regional road, including MCC Refs. P17/677 (70m visibility) and



P17/209 (100m visibility). A selection of internal consultation reports relating to MCC Refs. P17/677 and P17/209 are included with the grounds of appeal;

- asides from the construction phase, it is unclear as to how the proposed development replacing an existing house with a new house would result in increased traffic, particularly when compared with the conclusions of the assessments under MCC Refs. P17/677 and P17/209;
- the proposed new access would improve and replace an existing substandard access and therefore cannot be considered to lead to the proliferation of accesses onto the regional road;
- if the two-storey scale of the proposals was flagged as a concern at pre-planning stage, the applicant would have reverted to a single-storey approach in order to address the landscape impact concerns;
- the site is not an existing greenfield, as it accommodates a cottage and merit should be applied to this in the visual element of the assessment.

## **6.2. Planning Authority Response**

6.2.1. The planning authority did not respond to the grounds of appeal.

## **6.3. Observations**

6.3.1. None received.

## **6.4. Further Submissions**

6.4.1. Following consultation by An Bord Pleanála with the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, The Heritage Council and An Taisce, no further submissions were received.

## **7.0 Assessment**

### **7.1. Introduction**

7.1.1. The proposed development would involve the demolition of a single-storey house and its replacement with a two-storey house, as well as the provision of a repositioned vehicular entrance and an on-site wastewater treatment system. I am satisfied that the applicant does not need to demonstrate a housing need, as there is an existing house on the site, which is in reasonable habitable and structural condition. The Mayo County Development Plan 2014-2020 encourages the replacement or renovation of such structures for residential use, in preference to new development, but with due consideration for planning and environmental standards, including visual amenity, adequacy of ground conditions for disposal of effluent and road safety. Consequently, I consider the substantive planning issues arising from the grounds of appeal and in the assessment of the application and appeal, relate to the following:

- Traffic, Parking & Access;
- Design & Visual Impact;
- Wastewater Treatment.

### **7.2. Traffic, Parking & Access**

7.2.1. The planning authority decided to refuse permission for two reasons related to the impact of the proposed development on road safety. The first reason referred to concerns regarding the creation of a new access onto a strategically-important road, while the second reason referred to the restricted sight visibility at the proposed access. Both of these reasons for refusal refer to the potential implications for road safety arising from additional traffic generated by the proposed development. The grounds of appeal assert that road safety concerns cannot be fully eliminated, but that they can be significantly improved as part of the development.

7.2.2. The appeal site is positioned on the inside of a bend situated along a winding section of the R335 regional road, which connects Westport town with rural communities, settlements and various attractions to the west, including Croagh Patrick visitor

centre and Louisburgh village. This road has a speed-limit restriction of 80km/h and a continuous white-line marks the centre of the road fronting the appeal site, while the hard shoulder on the opposite side of the road is used as part of a formal cycling and walking route.

- 7.2.3. The grounds of appeal assert that replacing the existing house with a new house would not result in increased traffic and for the planning authority to consider otherwise was inconsistent with the conclusions relating to two recent neighbouring permissions for development along the R335, including a replacement house (MCC Ref. P17/677) and the extension of a house and provision of a replacement vehicular access (MCC Ref. P17/209). While the house does not currently appear to be occupied, minimal interventions would be required to allow its reoccupation, and I am satisfied that with the exception of the construction period, the proposed development would not result in additional vehicular movements or substantial intensification in use of the site. Furthermore, the proposed development could not reasonably be considered to result in the proliferation of entrances onto the R335, given that it would only provide for a replacement vehicular access and not an additional vehicular access.
- 7.2.4. The existing site layout provides space for one vehicle to park within the site, as the footprint of the house restricts movement to open areas within the site. The grounds of appeal also assert that cars have to reverse onto the roadside when exiting the site due to the current layout. The proposed development would address this by providing sufficient space on site for parking and manoeuvring, thereby also negating on-street parking. Consequently, I am satisfied that the proposed development would lead to improvements in parking provision on site.
- 7.2.5. The appeal site is served by a vehicular entrance directly onto the R335 at the eastern boundary of the site. The grounds of appeal assert that this entrance is substandard. Visibility from this access is largely impeded to the east by mature hedgerows on lands that are not stated to be in control of the appellant, while visibility to the west is primarily impeded by overgrown planting along the front boundary of the site. The grounds of appeal assert that the appellant had previously submitted an application (MCC Ref. P18/727) to demolish the side and rear extensions and construct extensions to the house, with the existing vehicular access maintained. Both the planning authority and applicant state that this application was

withdrawn, because the planning authority advised that it would be refused permission based on poor sight visibility onto a strategically-important route. Consequently, given the need to address the traffic safety concerns, the appellant sought to reposition the access to improve sight visibility.

- 7.2.6. The Mayo County Development Plan 2014-2020 identifies the R335 Westport to Louisburgh road as a strategically-important route, with objective RD-01 of the Plan protecting the capacity and safety of this road, based on standards in the Spatial Planning and National Roads Planning Guidelines (January 2013). The Plan states that, subject to a road safety audit, development along strategically-important routes will be restricted outside the 60km/hr speed limits, unless it can be demonstrated that traffic safety would not be interfered with, and that the development can fall into specific categories, including b) the provision of a new house where an existing inhabited house is in need of replacement and provided the existing house will not be used for further habitation or c) extensions to existing houses or domestic garages. The Spatial Planning and National Roads Planning Guidelines state that a planning authority may decide to dispense with the requirement for a road safety audit in the case of applications for an individual dwelling proposal in the case of lightly-trafficked sections of national secondary routes. As substantial additional traffic movements would not arise, I am satisfied that a road safety audit is not necessary based on the anticipated traffic movements. The existing house is capable of being occupied in a short timeframe and its replacement is justified based on the need to provide alternative access arrangements.
- 7.2.7. To address the need to demonstrate that traffic safety would not be interfered with, it is proposed to reposition the entrance approximately 20m to the west. The site layout plan drawing (no.07) illustrates sightline visibility at the proposed entrance amounting to 200m to the west and 72m to the east. It is asserted by the appellants that these sightlines would be comparable with permitted neighbouring developments in similar roadside contexts along the R335, including MCC Refs. P17/677 (70m visibility) and P17/209 (100m visibility).
- 7.2.8. Standards relating to 'access visibility requirements' are set out in Section 16.3 of Volume 2 to the Development Plan. Access visibility standards for roads with a speed-limit restriction of 80km/h are not listed in the Plan. The Plan does outline that a minimum visibility splay of 120m would be required from a position setback 2.4m

from the back edge of the road, where a 70km/h design speed applies. Having visited the site and reviewed maps for this area, I am satisfied that a design speed of 70km/h for the local road would be appropriate in assessing the access visibility requirements. Visibility to the west onto the regional road from the proposed access would be acceptable and would offer a significant improvement when compared with visibility from the existing access. Visibility to the east would be below the minimum requirement of 120m, however, there would be a significant improvement in visibility as a result of the set back provided by the replacement house, and subject to a condition permitting only low-level boundary treatments and landscaping within the visibility splays.

- 7.2.9. In conclusion, the proposed development would provide improved and safer vehicular access arrangements for the site and would not result in additional interference with traffic safety. Accordingly, permission for the proposed development should not be refused for reasons relating to traffic, parking and access.

### **7.3. Design & Visual Amenity**

- 7.3.1. The third reason for refusing permission referred to the site being located along a designated scenic route and that the design of the proposed development would be obtrusive in this landscape. Map 4 of the Development Plan illustrates that the R335 regional road is a scenic route with highly-scenic views to the north towards the coast and to the south towards Croagh Patrick. The Plan outlines that the visual impact of developments will be assessed with respect to the Landscape Appraisal for County Mayo, which identifies the entire county coastline, including the area approximately 50m to the north of the appeal site, as a sensitive or vulnerable location. Objectives LP-02, LP-03 and VP-01 of the Development Plan seek to preserve and protect the scenic amenity of the county and the character of scenic areas. To the southeast of the site along the south side of the R335 there are single-storey cottages and a two-storey house, which would be of similar scale and siting to the proposed house on the appeal site. There is a house on higher ground to the southwest of the site, and while this would be visible from the wider area, it is not highly visible from the R335.

- 7.3.2. The 'Mayo Rural Housing Design Guidelines' (2008) that are appended to the Development Plan, set out the principles to be adhered to when designing a house in the countryside, and Section 7.3.1 of the Development Plan requires rural housing to be designed in accordance with the Design Guidelines. The Design Guidelines encourage high standards in the design and construction of housing.
- 7.3.3. Positioned on the inside of a bend along the R335, set back approximately 10m from the roadside and featuring a two-storey element to the front, with single-storey rear element stepping into the hill to the rear, the proposed house would be highly visible from the scenic route, the R335, and within this sensitive landscape situated between Croagh Patrick and the coast. The existing house on site is of modest single-storey scale and area and I am satisfied that a single-storey house would be significantly less obtrusive in this scenic context.
- 7.3.4. In conclusion, having regard to the existing cottage on site and the scale and floor area of the proposed house, the proposed development on a prominent site along a designated scenic route, would represent a discordant entry into the landscape and would interfere with the character of views of special amenity value, the protection and preservation of which is provided for under the Development Plan.
- 7.3.5. I note that the applicant has stated that they would have reverted to a single-storey house design if this had been flagged at preplanning stage. The Board has the option to request revised house designs to address the visual impact concerns raised above, should they consider this necessary and appropriate in the circumstances. A replacement house should be designed cognisant of the scale and floor area of the existing cottage, as well as Development Plan policy and local and national guidelines.

#### **7.4. Wastewater Treatment**

- 7.4.1. The Site Suitability Report submitted with the planning application notes that the site is located in an area with a poor aquifer category and where groundwater vulnerability is moderate. This report submits that no watercourses are located within 250m of the site, while recognising the proximity to coastal waters. The coastline is situated approximately 50m to the north of the proposed wastewater treatment system. Bedrock was not encountered in the 2.5m-deep trial hole, while

the water table was noted at a depth of 2.1m. Details of existing wastewater treatment for the house on site are not provided with the planning application.

- 7.4.2. A T-value of 7 was calculated based on tests undertaken in December 2018. A P-value of 8 was calculated for the upper silt/clay layer. The test results indicate that the site is suitable for treatment and disposal of domestic foul effluent to ground by means of a conventional septic tank system and a polishing filter. Details submitted clarify that a wastewater treatment system with secondary treatment would be installed, and that this would be followed by tertiary treatment in the form of puraflo or ecoflo type filter units directly above a 300mm-deep gravel distribution layer, having regard to the proximity to coastal waters. Details provided on the proposed site layout plan indicate that the system would comply with the EPA Guidelines minimum separation distances to features of interest. I am satisfied that the assessment and the proposed development design details comply with those required within the 'Code of Practice - Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems serving Single Houses (population equivalent  $\leq 10$ ) (EPA, 2009)'. A surface water collection channel diverting surface water to a soakaway should be installed uphill of the system and this should be included as a condition, in the event of a permission arising.
- 7.4.3. In conclusion, the proposed development would not be prejudicial to public health and would not be likely to cause a deterioration in the quality of waters in the area. Permission should not be refused for reasons relating to wastewater treatment.

## **8.0 Appropriate Assessment**

### **8.1. Stage 1 - Screening**

- 8.1.1. The site location is described in section 1 of this report above. A description of the proposed development is provided in section 2 of this report and expanded upon below where relevant. Neither a screening report for appropriate assessment nor a Natura Impact Statement was submitted with the application. Consultation was undertaken with the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, as referenced above in section 6.4, and no response was received.

## 8.2. Is the Project necessary to the Management of European sites?

8.2.1. The project is not necessary to the management of a European site.

## 8.3. Direct, Indirect or Secondary Impacts

8.3.1. The potential direct, indirect and secondary impacts that could arise as a result of the proposed works, which could have a negative effect on the qualifying interests of European sites, include the following:

- impacts on water quality, for example via the release of suspended solids, accidental spills or release of contaminants from made ground, including wastewater.

## 8.4. Description of European Sites

8.4.1. There are two European sites within 2km of the appeal site and these are listed in section 5.2 above. European sites located more than 2km from the proposed development are excluded from this assessment, based on the separation distance from the appeal site to the European sites, the location of the European sites upstream of the appeal site and the dilution effect of intervening marine waters to European sites that are downstream.

8.4.2. The following conservation objective is set for the Brackloon Woods SAC:

**Table 3.** Conservation Objective for the Brackloon Woods SAC (Site Code: 000471)

To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the Annex I habitat(s) and/or the Annex II species for which the SAC has been selected	
Code	Description
91A0	Old sessile oak woods with ilex and blechnum in the British Isles.

8.4.3. There is no connectivity between Brackloon Woods SAC (Site Code: 000471) and the proposed works site, as it is upstream of the works and due to the distance over ground between this designated site and the proposed works site.

8.4.4. The following conservation objectives are set for the Clew Bay Complex SAC:



**Table 2.** Conservation Objectives for Clew Bay Complex SAC (Site Code: 001482)

The status of Geyer's whorl snail as a qualifying Annex II species for Clew Bay Complex SAC is currently under review. The outcome of this review will determine whether a site-specific conservation objective is set for this species;
To maintain the favourable conservation condition of mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide;
To maintain the favourable conservation condition of lagoons;
To maintain the favourable conservation condition of large shallow inlets and bays;
To maintain the favourable conservation condition of annual vegetation of driftlines;
To maintain the favourable conservation condition of perennial vegetation of stony banks;
To restore the favourable conservation condition of Atlantic salt meadows;
To restore the favourable conservation condition of otter;
To maintain the favourable conservation condition of harbour seal;
To restore the favourable conservation condition of embryonic shifting dunes;
To restore the favourable conservation condition of shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (European marram grass).

- 8.4.5. Clew Bay Complex SAC is selected for a range of habitats, including tidal mudflats and sandflats, coastal lagoons, large shallow inlets and bays, annual vegetation of drift lines, perennial vegetation of stony banks, Atlantic sea meadows, embryonic shifting dunes, machairs and Old Oak Woodlands. This site is of high conservation importance owing to the presence of otter, Geyer's whorl snail and common (harbour) seal, which are listed for protection in Annex II of the EU Habitats Directive. The development site is separated from the Clew Bay Complex SAC by the R335 regional road and undeveloped lands leading down to the coastline.
- 8.4.6. The maps accompanying the site conservation objectives on the National Parks & Wildlife Service website identify that the closest habitat to the appeal site is an area of intertidal sandy mud, which has potential to be used by otter.

8.4.7. Using the source-pathway-receptor model, I do not consider, on the basis of the information submitted, that the proposed development, involving a replacement house with upgraded wastewater treatment to be installed and operated as per EPA requirements, would be likely to impact on the conservation objectives of the Clew Bay Complex SAC and other European sites.

## **8.5. In-Combination Effects**

8.5.1. As I have concluded above that the proposed development would not be likely to impact on the conservation objectives of European sites, I do not consider that there are any specific in-combination effects that arise from the development when taken in conjunction with other plans or projects.

## **8.6. Appropriate Assessment Screening Conclusion**

8.6.1. It is reasonable to conclude that on the basis of the information on file, which I consider adequate in order to issue a screening determination, the proposed development, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to have a significant effect on the Brackloon Woods SAC (Site Code: 000471), Clew Bay Complex SAC (Site Code: 001482) or any other European site, in view of the sites' Conservation Objectives, and a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment is not therefore required.

## **9.0 Recommendation**

9.1. I recommend permission should be refused for the reasons and considerations set out below.

## **10.0 Reasons and Considerations**

1. Having regard to the prominent location of the site in an area of high scenic amenity along a scenic route with views and prospects designated for protection in the Mayo County Development Plan 2014-2020 and the scale and floor area of the proposed house replacing a single-storey house, it is considered that the proposed development would form a discordant and

obtrusive feature in the landscape, would fail to be adequately absorbed and integrated into the landscape, would detract from the scenic amenities of the area, would fail to comply with objectives LP-02, LP-03 and VP-01 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2014-2020, which seek to preserve and protect the scenic amenity of the county and the character of scenic areas, and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

Colm McLoughlin  
Planning Inspector

4<sup>th</sup> February 2020