



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-310015-21.

Development	Construction of part single storey part two storey house , shed, effluent treatment unit, pumping chamber and percolation area, vehicular entrance and all site works. .
Location	Colla West, Schull, Co. Cork.
Planning Authority	Cork County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	21/00079.
Applicant	Paula Fleming and Per-Fredrik Hagermark.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant.
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant	John O'Driscoll.
Observer	None.
Date of Site Inspection	6 June 2021.
Inspector	Mairead Kenny.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
5.1. National Planning Framework, 2018	8
5.2. Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2005	8
5.3. Development Plan.....	8
5.8. Natural Heritage Designations	9
6.0 The Appeal	9
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	9
6.2. Applicant Response	11
6.3. Planning Authority Response	12
6.4. Observations	12
6.5. Further Responses.....	12
7.0 Assessment.....	13
7.1. Issues.....	13
7.2. Principal of development.....	13
7.12. Rural housing settlement policy	15
7.13. Wastewater Treatment.....	16

7.19. Roads and traffic.....	17
7.20. Landscape impact and Design.....	17
7.25. Appropriate Assessment.....	19
8.0 Recommendation.....	20
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	20

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is in a rural area approximately 5 km west of Schull in west Cork. The access to the site is by way of a narrow cul-de-sac road which runs parallel to the coast. There are an estimated 18 no. dwelling houses served by this cul de sac road. The subject site, which is of stated area of 0.218 ha comprises a long narrow piece of land which is aligned perpendicular to the local road. The site levels vary between 26.2 m OD at the roadside frontage and 31mOD at the rear. In the centre of the site at a contour level of 29 m OD the site narrows to a width of 16 m. The roadside frontage is 28 m wide.
- 1.2. Photographs of the site and surrounding area which were taken by me at the time of inspection are attached.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is stated to be for permanent occupancy by the applicants who have long-standing connections with the area as described in a letter enclosed. The land is under contract to purchase.
- 2.2. The proposed house would be located at the narrow point of the site. It would extend for almost the full width of the site at this point save for two small circulation areas adjacent the house.
- 2.3. The significant elements of the proposed house design are:
 - the house is of stated floor area of 192 m² and comprises a part single storey part two storey dwelling house in contemporary design idiom
 - it contains a first floor living room box feature, which is orientated to maximise views
 - external finishes include metal cladding, rubble stonework and render
 - low pitched sedum roofs follow the slope of the site
 - the design and external finishes are stated to ensure landscape integration.
- 2.4. The submitted landscape plan shows that at the roadside frontage a swale drainage channel would be constructed on a widened roadside margin. Behind this a sod and

stone ditch would be constructed. The majority of the available planted area is proposed to be set out in lawn with screen hedge planting around patio spaces and at the boundaries a number of trees are shown.

- 2.5. The house is stated to be 50 m from the nearest dwelling to the west and 55 m from the nearest dwelling to the east. It is at a lower level than these houses and thereby will not adversely affect residential amenity of these houses.
- 2.6. The proposed development would be served by an effluent treatment unit, pumping chamber and percolation area, located to the rear of the house.
- 2.7. The development incorporates a new vehicular access and all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to grant permission subject to conditions including:

- site landscaping in accordance with details submitted
- water supply and wastewater facilities to be adequate and connection agreement to be entered into with Irish Water in relation to water supply
- entrance to be recessed 4.5 m from front boundary fence
- other engineering requirements
- the proposed septic tank and percolation area shall be designed, constructed, laid out and maintained to conform with the EPA CoP 2009
- financial contribution in amount of €2,894.08.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The main points of the planner's report dated 30 March 2021 are:

- During pre-application consultations the overall principle of allowing development in the GB 1-2 was agreed.
- The design concept was also discussed and agreed.

- There are a number of other dwellings in the area and at pre-planning stage.
- The GB 1-2 policy and other planning policy relevant to design and landscaping of new dwellinghouses and protection of the character of views and prospects are quoted.
- The decision of the local authority to deviate from the strict greenbelt policy refers – there is no specific requirement to attach residential clauses – perhaps these issues should be addressed in future development plans.
- This is a highly sensitive coastal site.
- The issues relating to erosion of rural character have some credence, but this is subjective.
- Permission recommended.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Area Engineer:

- Given the number of dwellings there are a number of entrances where vehicles can pass.
- Entrance details specified.
- Surface water management required.
- Existing field drains present allow for water to collect at the lower end of the land. This should be carefully considered when installing the wastewater disposal.
- A site suitability assessment has been carried out and recommendations made.
- Permission recommended.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. An Taisce

- Contrary to the provisions of the NPF and EU Water Directive.
- NPO 19 and section 4.5 of the SRHG apply.

- Proximity to SAC – proliferation of wastewater treatment systems.
- Contribution to dispersed rural settlement and car dependency.

Irish Water – standard requirements are set out.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

A total of 5 no. third party observations were received from local residents.

The issues raised are summarised as follows:

- Isolated rural area is very heavily developed with rural housing – 19 dwellings on the cul de sac – completely overdeveloped although it is supposed to be a scenic area.
- Site subject to flooding – so much so that the Council had to install a culvert at the roadside edge.
- Inadequate water supply in the area.
- No opportunity for local people to build a house so that they can live in the area – any future permissions should be for local people.
- Road unsuitable for the level of development accommodated and the danger to children would be exacerbated – even now meeting an oncoming car is a frequent occurrence and there are no passing places.
- The proposed house would obstruct views from neighbouring properties and thereby detract from residential amenity.
- House design is inappropriate including the living room box structure – will disrupt the unique natural surroundings and be of out character.
- Residents were unaware of the change in the zoning to GB 1-2.

4.0 **Planning History**

To aid the Board and the identification of the sites I have provided an extract of the planning register map of Cork County Council.

Under reg. ref. 20/714 an application for permission for a dwelling house at a site to the south of the current site was granted permission.

Under reg. ref. 19/267 an application for permission for a large extension at a dwelling house to the west of the site was granted permission.

Under reg. ref. 00/7499 an application for permission for a dwelling house at an adjacent site was refused permission for reasons of the green belt and landscape impact. This predates the designation of the GB 1-2 zone.

Pre-application consultations on this application took place under PPW 20/747.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Planning Framework, 2018

- 5.1.1. Under National Policy Objective 19 it is policy to facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of a demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.

5.2. Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2005

- 5.2.1. Section 4.5 refers to protection of water quality. The key to protecting water quality in the context of providing new dwellings in un-sewered rural areas is to ensure that new development is guided toward sites where acceptable wastewater treatment and disposal facilities can be provided, avoiding sites where it is inherently difficult to provide and maintain such facilities, for example sites prone to extremely high water tables and flooding or where groundwater is particularly vulnerable to contamination.

5.3. Development Plan

- 5.4. RCI 8-11 of the development plan refers to greenbelts around settlements. These are described as having the objective of retaining the identity of towns, prevention of sprawl and ensuring a distinction in character between built-up areas and the open countryside by maintaining the green belts around the individual towns. In these areas the objective is to reserve generally for use as agriculture, open space or recreational uses the lands that lie in the immediate surroundings of towns. It is an objective to discourage strongly new individual housing from being located in green

belts around the main towns, but the restriction will be relaxed for local rural housing needs in accordance.

- 5.5. The site is within a small area of land to the west of Schull which is designated greenbelt 2 / objective GB 1-2, which is quoted below.

'In some parts of the green belts around towns it will be possible to accommodate limited numbers of individual houses in an appropriate rural setting provided:

- The character of the area as a whole will remain predominantly rural and open
- Proposals will not cause linear roadside frontage development (ribbon development); and,
- the proposal is consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.'

- 5.6. RCI 6-1 refers to design and landscaping of new dwellings in rural areas and the policy is to encourage new dwellinghouse design that respects the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and that fit appropriately into the landscape.

- 5.7. Policy RCI 6-2 is to ensure that septic tanks or proprietary treatment systems comply with the EPA approved guidelines.

5.8. **Natural Heritage Designations**

Roaringwater Bay and Islands SAC is a large site and the designated area includes the immediate coastal area close to the site.

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The main points of the third party appeal and the accompanying original observation to the planning authority are:

- the planning authority failed to address some of the issues raised in submissions/observations

- I am resident all my life in this small remote cul-de-sac. It has now developed to a point where it has a line of houses that would not be out of place in a city.
- The site regularly floods there is a danger to groundwater.
- The road is unsuitable for the number of houses existing and the result in traffic as it stands and so for the development is not appropriate. There is already an unsafe amount of reversing and manoeuvring into driveways when two cars meet or reversing the entire length of the road when farm machinery is added in – this endangers the lives of local children.
- The proposed development would be the 19th house on a cul-de-sac of 500m.
- The development will result in ribbon development as defined – there are already five houses within 250 m on the opposite side of the road.
- An Taisce has appealed at least one previous planning application in this area on the grounds of nature conservation and landscape impacts subsequent to which the SAC was defined in 2011.
- The change in the status of lands from GB1-1 to GB1-2 was not sought by local residents, who were not consulted.
- The policy is quoted – it is self-evident that the proposal does not satisfy the required conditions – a grant of permission would not meet the criteria that the ‘character of the area as a whole will remain predominantly rural and open’.
- The development cannot be described as sustainable when the road in question and the water source are already beyond capacity.
- Concerns about lack of refuse collection of the proposed site have not been addressed in the planner’s report.
- The area is already overdeveloped, and it is difficult to see where the next generation of local people will live – perhaps no future development at all should be allowed in this location or if allowed it should be only for long-standing local people.
- The percolation tests show that the site is wet and that unsaturated soils extend only to a depth of 40 cm – this combined with the proximity of a number of sensitive receptors means that provision of water treatment will

involve substantial works – there are a number of private wells in the vicinity and it is not clear that these have been adequately considered.

- There has been a failure to address the legal requirements pertaining to public notices and the application is invalid.

6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant's response includes the following points:

- There are no obvious features that would give rise to flooding in the immediate area and the site is not in a designated flood zone. The landscape proposals include retention of existing swales, which will ensure surface water from the site and the development will be directed to soakways.
- The proposal complies with RCI 6-2 which seeks to ensure that septic tanks or proprietary treatment systems comply with the EPA approved guidelines. The site characterisation indicated that ground conditions are suitable for the treatment of wastewater without presenting an associated risk to groundwater. The percolation area is in excess of minimum distances from the proposed dwelling and nearby permitted dwellings and site boundary.
- The road is typical of rural areas and is in good condition and does not pose a safety risk. 50m sightlines are available. The area engineer had no objection. The proposed setback of boundary will further benefit all users of the road.
- By concentrating development in specially designated areas the GB 1-2 objective aims to ease development pressure around Schull.
- The proposal will not result in a significant change to the character of the area as it is separated from neighbouring dwellings and significant landscaping is proposed. The house will sit within a landscape which will maintain a predominantly rural and open feel.
- The proposal will not result in ribbon development as there are no dwellings on either side of the site. There are three dwellings with a 250 m strip and these houses are adequately separated.

- The house design respects the existing pattern of development in the Colla area, fits appropriately into the landscape and will include high-quality surface finishes. The development will be visible only from immediately to the front of the site. The scenic route on the road to the east will not be affected. The green roof will provide a seamless landscape integration.
- The design meets objective GI 1-6 as it seeks to protect the existing ridge and skyline of the area through a design that follows the gradient of the lands.
- Public notices are valid.
- The appeal is without merit. The appellant is concerned with wider issues.
- Since the adoption of the development plan in January 2015 a total of 3 no. permissions for a one-off house have been granted within this portion of GB 1-2 in Colla. At the time of adoption of the plan they were already 34 houses within the zoned area.
- The development plan is there to provide a level of certainty. Extensive pre-application consultations took place. All guidance has been followed.
- The applicant's intention is to reside permanently in the dwelling house and one of the applicants has a maternal grandmother from west Cork and strong connections to the area have been maintained since the 1940s.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

None.

6.4. Observations

None.

6.5. Further Responses

None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Issues

7.1.1. I consider that the relevant issues in this appeal are:

- principle of development
- rural housing settlement policy
- wastewater treatment, water supply and surface water
- road and traffic
- landscape impact and house design.

7.2. Principal of development

7.3. I consider that the relevant issues in relation to the principle of development are:

- The GB 1-2 objective
- NPO 19 of the NPF and other considerations relating to settlement policy.

7.4. GB 1-2

7.5. GB 1-2 covers a linear coastal area about 5 km to the west of Schull and overlooking Long Island. The adjacent GB1-1 area is a very restrictive policy and terms of the provision of rural housing. Within GB 1-2 the policy is to accommodate development in limited numbers in an appropriate rural setting subject to criteria.

7.6. I consider that the GB 1-2 designation is a relevant matter being adopted development policy to which the Board is bound to have regard. I therefore assess the principle of development in the first instance with reference to the criteria set down in the policy.

7.7. The first point I would note is the applicant's comments in relation to the limited growth which has occurred in the area since the adoption of the development plan objective in January 2015. The applicant statements that since that date an additional 3 no. houses have been permitted within the designated area appears to be accurate. I note however the comment in the planner's report which refers to other ongoing pre-application consultations. I consider that it is evident even from

examination of the planning register map that the area is highly developed with housing and is under pressure for further development. The pattern of development in the overall area can only reasonably be described as suburban. In my opinion significant parts of the designated GB 1-2 zone no longer have a rural character as there is no remaining agricultural lands or evidence of rural land uses or activities.

- 7.8. In terms of the level of development within the area zoned GB 1-2 the stated overall area according to the County Council maps is 24.21 ha and I estimate that this land area overall presently accommodates approximately 40 residential units. There are 18 no. houses along the cul de sac serving the site.
- 7.9. The above sets the context for the subject development and is relevant to the overall area. However, the subject site and its immediate environs do retain a rural character. It may be reasonably concluded that the development of a single house at the site in the context of the undeveloped nature of surrounding lands would meet the criteria of maintaining the predominantly rural and open character, subject to appropriate design and landscaping on a suitably defined and adequate site.
- 7.10. The appellant refers to the development as constituting a clear case of ribbon development. The Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines are relevant in this respect and I refer the Board to the contents of Appendix 4. While the guidelines are frequently referenced as being prescriptive in defining ribbon development (5 houses on one side of at given 250 m of road frontage), in fact Appendix 4 focuses on the need to arrive at a balanced and reasonable view and to interpret any case based on the criteria set down. These criteria referred to the type of rural area and circumstances of the applicant, the degree to which the proposal might be considered infill development and the degree to which existing ribbon development would be extended or whether distinct areas of ribbon development would coalesce as a result of the development.
- 7.11. A grant permission for the subject development would result in 3 no. houses to the north of the local road with direct access from the road. There are other houses in the general vicinity, which are accessed from other areas. The coastal side of the road when taking into account a recently permitted development will have 6 no. houses in a row on a road frontage of under 250 m. On balance, as proposed

development does not trigger the SRHG guidance of 5no. houses along 250m road frontage I consider that the criteria of ribbon development is met in this instance.

- 7.12. The criteria of consistency with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area relates to roads, wastewater and other facilities and is assessed in the remainder of this section of this report.
- 7.13. **Rural housing settlement policy**
- 7.14. Objectors including the appellant raise issues relating to the provision of housing for local persons in this area, stating that if there is to be more residential development perhaps it should be strictly for local people. Under GB 1-2 there is no requirement that applicants have a need to reside in the relevant rural area and there is no requirement for occupancy conditions or other measures.
- 7.15. There is no ambiguity in the adopted policy provisions of the development plan. The Area Planner appears to express some concern relating to the policy but implies that any review is a matter for the development plan process.
- 7.16. The provisions of national policy however also have to be considered by the Board. There is a conflict in this regard and a significant issue for the Board is whether the GB 1-2 objective should take precedent over other objectives in particular NPO 19.
- 7.17. The area has been effectively designated for residential development subject to certain criteria being adhered to. The Board could therefore accept the conclusions of the planning authority with respect to the proposed development and conclude that the issue of economic or social need is not relevant.
- 7.18. On the other hand, the Board could take the view that national policy has to be adhered to. This would be sympathetic with the view expressed by objectors that any remaining capacity for development in this area should be protected for local residents. In that case a refusal of permission for reasons of lack of demonstrated social or economic need to reside at this location would be appropriate.
- 7.19. The applicant has indicated that the proposed house will be a permanent place of residence. I consider that the submitted information in this respect is limited but the matter could be further explored if the Board was minded to grant permission.
- 7.20. Having considered the matter, my conclusion is that the provisions of NPO 19 should take precedent and I recommend that permission be refused on this basis.

7.21. Wastewater Treatment, Water Supply and Surface Water

- 7.22. I have referred earlier to the site topography and also to the location of the wastewater treatment system to the rear of the dwellinghouse. The applicant's submission is that the P and T values together with the separation distances would ensure that the system meets all EPA criteria under the Code of Practice. The proposal in response to the site characteristics envisages tertiary level effluent treatment as described in the Wastewater Drainage System Design Report. In response to the topography a specification for a pumping chamber is also presented and described in the documentation.
- 7.23. As a result of the high-water table encountered (0.4 m unsaturated soils) there is a requirement for improvement works to achieve the minimum depth, which would be 0.9 m. I note that the submission describes a gravel distribution layer and soil polishing filter. A section drawing is presented at the rear of the document entitled 'Tricel Puraflo 1-50 Installation' and I have had regard to this. However, the site-specific drawings are not of suitable scale or detail to demonstrate that the 300 mm deep gravel distribution layer overlying the soil polishing filter of 300 mm depth is adequate in the context of the high-water table. I also consider that there is inadequate description of remedial works to the site. Further information on these aspects of the proposed development could be sought. I also note that there is no information relating to any private wells in the area, or any statement testifying as to the absence of wells.
- 7.24. I consider that it is necessary to interpret the EPA CoP with reference to the particular circumstances of any site. The site area of 0.218 ha is limited, and the topography and elongated nature give rise to serious reservations about the suitability of this site for the proposed wastewater treatment system notwithstanding the sophisticated nature of the design presented. As referenced in objections received section 4.5 of the SRHG includes avoidance of sites that are inherently difficult to provide and maintain wastewater treatment and disposal facilities. I consider that this principle is highly relevant in the circumstances of this case having regard to the high water table, the effective site area for the purposes of wastewater treatment and disposal and, thirdly, the topography within that area which

necessitates installation of a pumping chamber. I recommend that permission be refused for this reason.

7.25. There is no indication that the proposed development cannot be served by the public water supply in the area. I note the comments with respect to water pressure, but Irish Water has not indicated any objection.

7.26. There is no history of flooding of the site. I am satisfied that the surface water arising from the development and the site can be accommodated within the site and this matter can be addressed by condition.

7.27. Roads and traffic

7.28. I agree with the applicant that the nature of the road network serving the site is similar to the vast majority of roads in remote rural areas, being a single carriageway and lacking formal passing bays. Such roads are adequate to accommodate a low level of houses and agricultural activity in a rural area. The significant matter in this case relates to the number of houses which are served by this road and the consequent levels of traffic.

7.29. I note the comment of the area engineer with respect to the availability of entrances which can be used for passing purposes. There is some merit to this observation. On the other hand, I would also reference the fact that at the time of my inspection very significant numbers of pedestrians were walking for recreational purposes along the road. I also noted that some of the entrances to houses are steeply inclined or otherwise reasonably difficult to access.

7.29.1. I conclude that the development is not suitable from a roads and traffic perspective. The substantive issues relate to the overall level of development in the area and the potential for future housing. I do not recommend a specific reason for refusal related to roads and traffic.

7.30. Landscape Impact and Design

7.31. The house is positioned at mid-point on the site and the impetus for the design includes availing of views to coastal features such as Fastnet. The selected position

is a few metres below the highest point of the site, but it is nevertheless a few metres above the public road and a considerable height above sea level.

- 7.32. The relevant policy provision in relation to house design is to encourage new dwellinghouse design that respects the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and that fit appropriately into the landscape. I refer the Board to the submitted drawings which include a visual representation of the proposed house. I refer also to the photographs of the houses including the recently completed extension nearby. I consider that it is self-evident that the design is not in keeping with policy RCI 6-1 as no element of the proposed development incorporates attributes of the vernacular architectural style. In this respect I refer to the external finishes, the roof treatment and the fenestration. However, the proposed development constitutes a contemporary design and high-quality materials. If successfully integrated into the landscape I would support the proposed design notwithstanding policy RCI 6-1.
- 7.33. In view of the narrow nature of the site, the positioning of the house at an elevated location on the site and at a point where its width is particularly constrained, together with the scale of the house and the box feature element in the site context, the proposed development would add to the suburban character of the area and undermine the rural landscape setting. I note that a large proportion of the volume of the house would be at the lower ground floor level. In this respect the design does succeed in minimising impacts on the skyline. The plan incorporates significant lengths of non-native hedgerows in an attempt to provide privacy to patio areas adjacent living and bedrooms. The scheme incorporates long rows of trees in addition, which would not be a characteristic of this coastal landscape. In summary, I consider that the site size is not adequate to provide for natural screening in a natural rural landscape setting - in this context the house design proposed cannot be suitably integrated.
- 7.34. I note that the applicant states that the hedgerows along the local road will screen the house in views except at the immediate site frontage. I accept this statement with respect to the local road but consider that there will be many other vantage points from which the development will be highly visible.

7.35. I note that an objector refers to the blocking of views from existing houses and raises this as an issue in terms of residential amenity. I do not consider that this is a substantive issue in this case.

7.36. My conclusion is that having regard to the site layout, site width and the topography I do not consider that the design is acceptable. I recommend that permission be refused for reason of not adhering to policy RCI 6-1.

7.37. **Appropriate Assessment**

7.37.1. The site is very close to the Roaringwater Bay SAC. .

7.37.2. The qualifying interests are:

Large shallow inlets and bays [1160]

Reefs [1170]

Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic coasts [1230]

European dry heaths [4030]

Submerged or partially submerged sea caves [8330]

Phocoena phocoena (Harbour Porpoise) [1351]

Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355]

Halichoerus grypus (Grey Seal) [1364].

7.37.3. No information has been provided by the applicant in relation to the potential for significant effects on the European site and no screening statement for appropriate assessment has been submitted.

7.37.4. The site would appear to have a hydrological connection to Roaringwater Bay SAC. There are site-specific conservation objectives for this European site which show that the habitats and species which are qualifying interests and which are found at this particular part of the coast are

Large shallow inlets and bays [1160]

Phocoena phocoena (Harbour Porpoise) [1351]

Halichoerus grypus (Grey Seal) [1364].

7.37.5. I consider that having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and taking into account the information available on the NPWS website with respect to the qualifying interests, the Board can be satisfied that the proposed development, individually, or in combination with other plans or projects would not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the Roaringwater Bay SAC in view of the site's Conservation Objectives.

8.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be refused for the reasons and considerations below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. As set out under section 4.5 of the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines, the key to protecting water quality in the context of providing new dwellings in unsewered rural areas is to ensure that new development is guided toward sites where acceptable wastewater treatment and disposal facilities can be provided, avoiding sites where it is inherently difficult to provide and maintain.

The proposed development would be prejudicial to public health because it is considered that the site by reason of the high water table, topography and size, is unsuitable for the treatment of septic tank effluent, notwithstanding the use of a proprietary wastewater treatment system.

It is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to the site selection guidance set out in the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines and would not be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The Board considered the provisions of the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in April, 2005, which seek to distinguish between urban generated housing and rural generated housing need and the need for identification of suitable sites and noted 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 viability of smaller towns and rural settlements. The Board is not satisfied that the applicant has established a demonstrable economic or social need to live at this specific site in this rural area.

The proposed development would contribute to the encroachment of random rural development in the area, would militate against the preservation of the rural environment and the efficient provision of public services and infrastructure and would be contrary to the Ministerial Guidelines and to the overarching provisions of the National Planning Framework. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. Under policy RCI 6-1 of the Cork County Development Plan 2014 it is policy to encourage new dwellinghouse design that respects the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and that fit appropriately into the landscape. It is considered that the proposed development by reason of its detailed design and the position of the house at an elevated point on a narrow site which has limited opportunities for landscaping, would be out of character and failed to integrate appropriately into the landscape. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the provisions of the current development plan for the area and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Mairead Kenny
Senior Planning Inspector

27 June 2021