



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-310765-21

---

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Development</b>                  | Construction of a dwelling house on an un-serviced site together with all associated works and services. |
| <b>Location</b>                     | Frefans Great, Trim, County Meath.   |
| <b>Planning Authority</b>           | Meath County Council.  |
| <b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b> | 21211.   |
| <b>Applicant</b>                    | Stephen Whyte.   |
| <b>Type of Application</b>          | Planning Permission.   |
| <b>Planning Authority Decision</b>  | Grant with conditions.   |
| <b>Type of Appeal</b>               | Third Party.   |
| <b>Appellant</b>                    | Conor Moran.   |
| <b>Observer(s)</b>                  | None.  |
| <b>Date of Site Inspection</b>      | 16 <sup>th</sup> day of October, 2021.   |
| <b>Inspector</b>                    | 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 .....               | 5  |
| 3.4. Third Party Observations .....        | 5  |
| 4.0 Planning History.....                  | 6  |
| 5.0 Policy & Context .....                 | 6  |
| 5.1. Local Planning Policy Provisions..... | 6  |
| 5.2. National Planning Provisions.....     | 7  |
| 5.3. Natural Heritage Designations .....   | 7  |
| 5.4. EIA Screening .....                   | 7  |
| 6.0 The Appeal .....                       | 8  |
| 6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....               | 8  |
| 6.2. Applicant's Response.....             | 8  |
| 6.3. Planning Authority Response .....     | 9  |
| 7.0 Assessment.....                        | 9  |
| 8.0 Recommendation.....                    | 18 |
| 9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....        | 18 |

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The appeal site has a stated 0.31ha area and it is located in the Townlands of 'Frefans Great' which is located c5km by road from the historic town centre of Trim, in County Meath. It is located on the eastern side of the local road L-62021-0 to which it benefits from road frontage that extends to a linear strip that runs along the road frontage that was subject to a recent grant of permission under P.A. Ref. No. TA190877 for a detached dwelling house. With which it forms part of an agricultural field that is bound by a detached dwelling house on its southern side. This adjoining detached dwelling house is one in a group of three detached dwellings that align with the eastern side of L-62021-0 and behind which there are farm buildings. There are a number of agricultural buildings and farmsteads within this area. Despite the substandard nature of the L-62021-0 along its length it serves not only farmland and farmstead but also a significant number of one-off dwellings. The rural landscape setting is relatively flat with deep drainage ditches being evident along field and road boundaries.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Planning permission is sought for:

- Construction of a 2-storey type dwelling.
- Provision of an effluent treatment system.
- All associated site works.

This application is accompanied by a 'Local Needs Application Form' and associated documentary evidence; EPA Site Assessment and Computer Generated Images of the Dwelling on a Terrain Model of the Site.

The accompanying planning application form indicates that the applicant is the 'son of landowner'; the gross floor space of the works proposed are 202m<sup>2</sup>; that the dwelling would be served by a new well and by a new proprietary waste water treatment system.

2.2. On the 30<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2021, the applicant submitted their further information response which essentially consisted of a revised site layout detailing the revised siting

of the dwelling house parallel to the public road and in line with the adjacent dwelling house to the south.

- 2.3. On foot of this the Planning Authority sought new public notices and the applicant submitted proof of the revised public notices on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2021.

### 3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

#### 3.1. **Decision**

- 3.1.1. On the 9<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2021, the Planning Authority decided to grant planning permission subject to 17 no. conditions, including:

Condition No. 2: Omits the use of certain external materials and requires the final palette of external materials to be agreed in writing prior to the commencement of the development. The given reason is in the interests of visual amenity.

Condition No. 3 & 4: Deals with the installation and maintenance of the waste water treatment system. The given reason is in the interests of public health and the protection of the environment.

Condition No. 5 & 14: Deals with the matter of sightlines. The stated reason is in the interest is in the interests of traffic and road safety.

Condition No. 6: Sets out an occupancy clause. The stated reason is in the interest of restricting this type of rural development to meeting essential local rural need.

Condition No. 13: Deals with the matter of landscaping. The stated reason is in the interest of visual amenity and the protection of the rural character of the area.

Condition no. 15 to 17: Sets out the financial contributions payable. The stated reason is that it is considered reasonable that the developer should contribute towards the cost of providing these services.

## 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The final Planning Officer's report, dated the 9<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2021, concluded that the proposed development as revised by the further information received by the Planning Authority to be in accordance with the current Development Plan, subject to safeguards.

The **initial Planning Officer's report**, dated 26<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2021, concluded with a request for further information on the following matters:

Item No. 1: Design and Siting of the proposed dwelling relative to the public road as well as requiring it to be in line with the dwelling house permitted under P.A. Ref. No. TA/190877.

Item No. 2: Sets out that new public notices will be required where revisions are deemed to be significant.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

**Transportation:** No objection subject to safeguards.

## 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. None.

## 3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. The 3rd Party's made two submissions to the Planning Authority during the course of its determination of this planning application. I have read these two submissions and I consider that the issues raised therein correlate with those raised in their appeal submission to the Board which I have summarised under Section 6.1 of this report below.

3.4.2. In addition to this a local Councillor lodged a submission to the Planning Authority indicating their support for the proposed development based upon the applicant's strong local need.

## 4.0 Planning History

### 4.1. Site:

4.2. None.

### 4.3. In the Vicinity:

**ABP-310232-21 (P.A. Ref. No. 2162):** There is a concurrent appeal with the Board on an irregular shaped site located to the north and north east of this appeal site. The proposed development before the Board under this particular appeal case consists of:

- Alterations and additions to 'Freffans House'.
- Alterations and renovations to existing courtyard buildings to include living accommodation and private office use.
- Extension to existing courtyard buildings, including the provision of car port.
- Installation of a new waste water treatment plant.
- Construction of a replacement dwelling, in lieu of Freffans lodge, which is to be demolished as per grant of permission P.A. Ref. No. TA/200830.
- Provision of a new waste water treatment plant for the replacement dwelling.
- All associated landscaping and site development works.

**P.A. Ref. No. TA190877:** Planning permission was **granted** subject to conditions for the construction of a storey and a half type dwelling, effluent treatment system and associated site works. This application was made by the applicant's sister Marcella Whyte. Date of decision: 20/05/2020.

## 5.0 Policy & Context

### 5.1. Local Planning Policy Provisions

5.1.1. The Meath County Development Plan, 2013 to 2019, is the applicable development plan.

5.1.2. Chapter 10 of the Development Plan deals with the matter of rural development.

- 5.1.3. Section 10.3 of the Development Plan sets out the policies for rural area types and it includes policies for Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence.
- 5.1.4. Section 10.7 of the Development Plan includes design criteria for residential development in rural areas including ancillary structures.
- 5.1.5. The site forms part of an unzoned rural land identified as being a 'Strong Rural Area' and forms part of the 'Central Lowlands Landscape Character Area'. It is recognised under the said Plan as being of high value and of moderate sensitivity.

## 5.2. National Planning Provisions

- Project Ireland 2040 - National Planning Frameworks, 2018.
- Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines, 2005.

## 5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. This appeal site lies c2.5km to the south of the River Boyne & River Blackwater SAC (Site Code: 002299) and SPA (Site Code: 004232).

## 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 set out in Part 2, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, (as amended), Infrastructure Projects, construction of more than 500 dwelling units.
- 5.4.2. This proposal consists of a modest in nature and scale development of essentially one residential dwelling unit and garage served by a proprietary wastewater treatment system together with its associated site development works. As such the proposed development will give rise to very limited environmental emissions subject to standard safeguards and appropriate required maintenance of the proprietary wastewater treatment system.
- 5.4.3. The site itself does not form part of nor is it near any European site. Moreover, there is no connectivity between it and the nearest European sites, i.e., the River Boyne & River Blackwater SAC and SPA (Site Codes: 002299 and 004232 respectively). Having regard to the above, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the

environment arising from the proposed development. 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 grounds of this 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed development would seriously injure the visual amenities of this open rural area and would be in material contravention of RD POL 9 of the Development Plan.
- The proposed development is located in an area under strong urban influence in close proximity to the settlement of Trim.
- Permission previously has been granted for a house to the south of the family home.
- Reference is made to location and national planning provisions in relation to this type of development.
- The proposed dwelling is a modern 2 storey house of suburban type which would, if permitted, be in serious conflict with the Rural House Design Guide and Policy RD POL 9 due to this and the open aspect of its setting with inadequate screening to shelter and visually soften it.
- The core consideration at this location is demonstratable economic or social need to live in a rural area. Yet this has not been demonstrated by the applicant in the documentation provided. As such the proposed development would be contrary to National Policy Objective 19 of the National Planning Framework in an area under strong urban influence.

### **6.2. Applicant's Response**

6.2.1. None received.



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

6.3.1. The Planning Authority's response includes the following comments:

- They are satisfied that all matters outlined in the appellants submission have been considered in the course of their assessment of this planning application.
- The Board is requested to uphold their decision.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

### 7.1. **Introduction**

7.1.1. Having undertaken an inspection of the site and its environs, having had regard to all relevant planning policies and provisions, having had regard to the nature, scale, and extent of the proposed development together with having examined all documents on file including the content of submissions and responses received by the Board during the course of its determination of this appeal case, I consider that the substantive issues pertaining to this appeal case are:

- Principle of the Proposed Development
- Visual Amenity Impact

7.1.2. The matter of 'Appropriate Assessment' also requires examination and it is in my view appropriate to examine other sundry issues under the broad heading of 'Other Matters Arising'. These are examined at the end of my assessment below.

### 7.2. **Principle of the Proposed Development**

7.2.1. The subject appeal site is located on unzoned and un-serviced land in a Rural Area of County Meath c4.5km to the historic heart of Trim in an area identified as being under Strong Urban Influence under the current Development Plan and the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authority's, 2005. This is likely due to a number of locational factors including but not limited to its proximity to a number of large urban areas, in particular Dublin. The site is in easy reach to a number of principal national transportation corridors including the M3 and M4 which for example provide connectivity to the M50. Through to this site is within easy reach of Dublin Airport.

7.2.2. The National Planning Framework states that the "*Irish countryside is, and will continue to be, a living and lived in landscape focusing on the requirements of rural*

*economies and rural communities, while at the same time avoiding ribbon and over-spill development from urban areas and protecting environmental qualities”.*

7.2.3. It also recognises that there is a continuing need for housing provision for people to live and work in the countryside and it indicates that careful planning is required to manage the demand in our most accessible countryside around cities and towns. In this regard it advocates focusing on the elements required to support the sustainable growth of rural economies and rural communities.

7.2.4. It goes on to state that *“it will continue to be necessary to demonstrate a functional economic or social requirement for housing need in areas under urban influence, i.e. the commuter catchment of cities and large towns”* with this being subject to site and design considerations.

7.2.5. In keeping with this National Policy Objective 19 states inter alia: *“ensure, in providing for the development of rural housing, that a distinction is made between areas under urban influence, i.e. within the commuter catchment of cities and large towns and centres of employment, and elsewhere:*

- *In rural areas under urban influence, 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 and siting and design criteria for rural areas and siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements”.*

In addition, National Policy Objective 3a sets out an objective to deliver at least 40% of all new homes nationally within the built-up footprint of existing settlements.

7.2.6. In relation to the local planning policy provisions Chapter 10 of the Meath County Development Plan, 2013 to 2019, sets out the planning policy approach for rural development with it setting out its key strategic objectives as including RUR DEV SO 6 which seeks *“to protect and enhance the visual qualities of rural areas through sensitive design”.*

7.2.7. It also includes strategic policies such as RUR DEV SP 1 under which the Planning Authority advocates a tailored approach to rural housing in order to distinguish between rural generated and urban generated housing alongside recognising the individual rural area types.

- 7.2.8. Policy RD POL 1 of the Development Plan is particularly relevant in relation to this proposed development. It seeks to ensure that individual house developments satisfy the housing requirements of persons who are an intrinsic part of the rural community in which they are proposed, subject to normal planning considerations.
- 7.2.9. Further policies RD POL 2 and RD POL 3 of the Development Plan are also relevant. Policy RD POL 2 seeks to direct urban generated housing to towns and villages in the area of the Development Plan; and, Policy RD POL 3 seeks to protect areas falling within the environs of urban centres in this Area Type from urban generated and unsightly ribbon development alongside maintaining the identity of these urban centres.
- 7.2.10. Cumulatively these three policies set out a local planning policy approach that is consistent with national planning policy provisions that set out a general presumption against the principle of such developments on un-serviced lands outside of settlements except in the limited circumstances where a robust evidence based demonstrable economic and/or social need is proven by the applicant.
- 7.2.11. Whilst I am cognisant that the Planning Authority considered that the applicant had demonstrated such circumstances were present based on the documentation submitted with the planning application, I am not convinced this to be the case. The documentation that is presented does appear to support that the appellant has tangible social links to his local area. With this being simply shown by way of letters from the Principal of 'Dangan, National School' stating that the applicant attended this school between 1986 to 1994 (Note: this school is located over 7km in a southerly direction from the site); and, a letter for support from the Secretary of 'Kiltale Hurling Club' (Note: this club appears to be over 7km to the north east of the site).
- 7.2.12. In terms of demonstrating a substantive social need for a dwelling house at this location in my view lacks this documentation lacks substance and it is not sufficiently robust to support that the applicant in this case has a substantive social need for a dwelling house as opposed to a desire. As well as in turn that their housing need could not be met in the locality, in particular in nearby settlements where this type of development is deemed to be acceptable and can be supported by public infrastructure through to benefit from easy reach of other existing land uses that would be synergistic to this type of development.

- 7.2.13. I therefore do not concur with the Planning Authority that the applicant has demonstrated a genuine local need based on their social circumstances.
- 7.2.14. In terms of demonstrating an economic need I raise further substantive concerns.
- 7.2.15. In this regard, I note that the 'Local Need Form' indicates that the applicant has resided in the family home for 38 years. There is no substantive robust evidence to support this contention outside of the provision of individual bank statement pages relating to the years between 2020 back to 2014.
- 7.2.16. It is not uncommon for persons to maintain bank accounts to a family home but yet to be residing elsewhere as such statements contain sensitive information that one would decide to be sent to as secure a location as possible. These statements do not in my view demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that the applicant has as stated resided at the family home for the past 38 years and in the years prior to the making of this application.
- 7.2.17. In terms of employment the Local Needs Form it does not support that the applicant is employed or connected in any meaningful way to any rural activity in this locality or otherwise.
- 7.2.18. Of concern it indicates that the applicants place of work is significantly remote from this locality with his 'Actual Place of Work' given as 'Mullagh, Co. Cavan' and 'Malahide, Co. Dublin'. Based on the shortest and quickest routes the applicants place of work is c45km and c55km respectively remote from this location with the journeying time given on the quickest routes outside of peak traffic as 45mins and 50mins respectively. No clarity is given on the type of work the applicant is engaged in. There is no easy public transportation available in proximity of the site to make either journey without use of a private car.
- 7.2.19. I therefore do not concur with the Planning Authority that the applicant has demonstrated a genuine local need for a dwelling house at this location based on their economic circumstances.
- 7.2.20. Based on the documentation provided I am of the view that the applicant has simply demonstrated a desire for a rural dwelling house at this location. A location where the family landholding appears to relate to the modest pocket of agricultural land that comprises of the field in which the applicant's site is located. A field that includes a

site which adjoins the main southern boundary of the subject site as well as a linear strip of land that runs along the roadside in order for this application to demonstrate the required sightlines in a southerly direction from the proposed entrance which was recently permitted by the Planning Authority under P.A. Ref. No. TA/190877. As previously noted in this report this application appears to have been made by the applicant's sister Marcella Whyte. I consider that the applicant has not demonstrated robustly and with sufficient evidence based documentation a genuine local rural housing need based on their economic and/or social circumstances or indeed a need that could not be met elsewhere i.e. within a settlement and/or from dwelling houses for sale within this locality.

- 7.2.21. Having regard to local and national planning policy provisions as set out above and more broadly which together clearly seek to regulate rural housing alongside consolidate development within serviced urban/suburban land, to permit the proposed development sought under this application would be contrary to them. It would also be contrary to the public good and the proper planning as well as sustainable development of this particular rural locality whose public road network is characterised in the vicinity of the site by a strong proliferation of one-off and ribbon development resulting from such *ad hoc* developments in the past that have diminished the rural function and visual character of this area.
- 7.2.22. It also pertinent in my view to highlight that this is an un-serviced rural location that is under significant pressure due to its commuter location and proximity to a number of key settlements with the residential developments in its immediate and wider vicinity being dependent on proprietary waste water treatments systems as well as individual potable water supplies.
- 7.2.23. Moreover, it is an intensively farmed location with fields and road boundaries containing deep drainage ditches that at the time of inspection appeared to demonstrate along the roadside boundary of the site the likelihood of a high-water table.
- 7.2.24. Furthermore, the provision of another one-off dwelling at this location with no demonstrable economic and/or social need is not in my view consistent with channelling such developments to serviced land within the footprints of existing settlements and would conflict with the proper planning and sustainable development

of this area. It is also questionable the sustainability of having multiple one-off dwellings permitted within one modest agricultural landholding that does not appear to be actively farmed by the applicant and appears to be farmed by an adjoining agricultural landowner. This I consider is supported by the fact that the rear boundary of the family's modest agricultural parcel of land opens onto an immediate much larger parcel of land which appears to be farmed in unison with one another.

- 7.2.25. There are also multiple negative implications of the proliferation of such developments ranging from economic through to visual impacts that go beyond the individual persons desires for such developments and run contrary to the common good.
- 7.2.26. Based on the above considerations I consider that is substantive reasons upon which planning permission should be refused for the proposed development sought under this application. This is substantive reason in itself for the Board to overturn the decision of the Planning Authority in this case.

### **7.3. Visual Amenity**

- 7.3.1. The appellant in this case raises concerns in relation to the appropriateness of the design resolution put forward for the proposed detached dwelling in an open landscape character area and in an area that lacks robust natural screening features in the form of planting.
- 7.3.2. I note that the drawings submitted with this application indicate the provision of a new native deciduous mixed hedgerow along the entirety of the modified roadside boundary with this extending to the linear strip of roadside land running along the main part of the western boundary of the recently granted development under P.A. Ref. No. TA/190877.
- 7.3.3. In addition to this, a number of new trees are proposed with these concentrated mainly on the southern and northern boundaries of the site with the garden area to the front and rear of the proposed dwelling being devoid of any robust planting. With the planting consisting of Silver Birch, Common Ash and Mountain Ash.
- 7.3.4. Additional more robust planting to the west and east of the site would in my view reduce the visual impact of the proposed development as observed in this open landscape which is in itself recognised as being of high value and of moderate sensitivity.

- 7.3.5. Moreover, it would reduce its visual impact as appreciated from the public domain of the adjoining L-62021-0 and it would help to further soften the proposed dwelling house as part of a linear group of dwellings that occupy a short section of the L-62021-0 roadside boundary on either side.
- 7.3.6. I also concur with the Planning Authority in that a more careful palette of materials than that put forward in this application which accentuates in an overt manner the 2-storey element should be agreed if the overall built form and design of this two-storey dwelling be deemed an appropriate insertion into this rural landscape setting.
- 7.3.7. I also consider that the stone finish should be carefully considered with preference for the use of local stone and not hallmark or other panel effect external stone wall finish to help assimilate and harmonious this proposed new built insertion with the local vernacular buildings as well as their palette of materials.
- 7.3.8. Moreover, I further consider that the elevations described as 'Left Elevation' and 'Rear Elevation' in drawing titled 'Elevational Views' would benefit from a greater level of visual articulation. With these elevations being simply finished in stark white nap plaster finish these in an open landscape setting would be visually out of character and unduly prominent. These elevations need reconsideration in terms of their articulation and use of palette of materials.
- 7.3.9. Should the Board be minded to grant planning permission for the proposal I recommend that conditions be attached to deal with these concerns.

#### **7.4. Appropriate Assessment**

- 7.4.1. Having regard to nature and scale of the proposal, I consider that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

#### **7.5. Other Matters Arising**

##### **7.5.1. Public Health – Services**

I am cognisant that the Planning Authority raised no particular issue on the matter of the wastewater and potable water provision on site to service the proposed dwelling. Notwithstanding this, having inspected the site and its setting there is a significant

abundance of one-off dwellings adjoining and in the immediate surroundings of the site. These are all served by similar proprietary wastewater treatment systems.

There also appears to be intensive agricultural land use.

I also observed the poor ground conditions on the site and around its perimeter boundaries poor with the ground being heavy underfoot.

I further observed the presence of water in the drainage ditches adjoining the site and in the immediate area of the site.

I therefore raise a concern that the further proliferation of one-off detached dwellings could be prejudicial to public health in this locality, a locality that appears to be also dependent on individual potable water provided on site and in the absence of any substantiated beyond doubt demonstrable need.

I am not convinced that it would be in accordance with National Planning Objective 33 to permit the proposed development in an un-serviced and unzoned location where the proposed development does not positively reinforce in a sustainable manner the rural function of this locality and a locality which is remote from services as well as amenities that are recognised as being beneficial to residential developments. Where amenities, services and other land uses that would be synergistic to sustaining a detached dwelling house being accessible by use of a private car given that these are not easily reached otherwise nor is this locality served with public lighting or safe connectivity for vulnerable road users.

I also note that NPO 33 seeks to prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.

The proposed development for the reasons discussed is not consistent with this approach.

Based on the above, I am not satisfied based on my inspection of the site and the documentation provided that the further proliferation of wastewater treatment systems would not be prejudicial to public health and that to permit the proposed development would be consistent with proper planning and sustainable development of the area.



I also consider that this is a **new issue** in the context of this appeal and that it adds to the concerns raised under Section 7.2 of this report above upon which my recommendation of refusal is based.

#### 7.5.2. **Road Safety and Access**

The applicant has demonstrated that sightlines can be achieved and maintained by them based on the red line area of the site shown in the documentation provided. However, of concern the red line area is not within the applicant's ownership and there is a lack in my view a lack of clarity on this matter having regard to the documentation providing boundaries which conflict with those set out for application P.A. Ref. No. TA/190877.

While I accept landownership is a civil matter there is in my opinion a lack of clarity in terms of the future control of the roadside boundary to the south if the proposed development were to be permitted.

Further, the drawings accompanying this application also indicate a modified access arrangement, size of site and a modified site boundaries for the site granted permission under P.A. Ref. No. TA/190877. These changes have not been subject to any grant of permission.

As such there is a lack of clarity and lack of certainty in terms of the documentation provided with this application that the appropriate and necessary legal agreements/land interest would be not in place to ensure that the sightline to the south is maintained in a manner to ensure safe access and egress from the site onto this stretch of public road. A substandard in width, alignment, and design local road that I observed is heavily trafficked and contains a significant number of entrances onto it.

Of further concern I raise significant doubt that the local road upon which this proposed development would be dependent upon has capacity for any additional traffic generation including any modest addition to it given its substandard width, alignment, surfacing through to horizontal alignment. In carrying out my inspection prior to arriving and again upon leaving the site I had to reverse to a safe location to allow other vehicles to pass by safely and vice versa. This in part was tricky due to the lack of safe places to do so.

I therefore consider it prudent that any future development dependent upon this local road be limited to developments that supports agricultural development along it given that this is predominant and characteristic development of this locality.

I consider that this is a **new issue** in the context of this appeal and there is already a substantive reason to refuse planning permission based on the considerations already examined under Section 7.2 of this report above. Moreover, I consider that the substandard nature of the local road is such that it would support in itself a refusal of planning permission in the interests of road safety.

### 7.5.3. **Development Contributions**

Should the Board be minded to grant permission for the proposed development it is a type of development that requires payment of certain development contributions. Therefore, conditions similar to conditions 15 to 17 should be included in any grant of planning permission.

## 8.0 **Recommendation**

8.1. I recommend that planning permission be **refused**. Reasons and Considerations No.s 2 and 3 below relate to new issues.

## 9.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

1. The proposed development, in the absence of any demonstratable locally based rural housing need that would support the provision of a one-off rural dwelling at this particular rural locality, would contribute to the encroachment of random rural development in a rural area under strong urban influence, it would exacerbate the pattern of linear residential development that prevails in this locality, it would militate against the preservation of the rural environment and the efficient provision of public services and infrastructure. The proposed development would, thus, be contrary to the provisions of the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities and rural policy provisions of the National Planning Framework. In particular, if permitted, it would conflict with the National Planning Frameworks National Policy Objective 19, which indicates that it is national policy to facilitate the provision of housing based on the core consideration of demonstrable

economic or social need to live in a rural area. The Board is not satisfied based that the appellant has demonstrated this need in the documentation provided. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. It is considered that, taken in conjunction with existing and permitted development in the vicinity, the proposed development would result in an excessive density of development served by private effluent treatment systems in the area and would, therefore, be prejudicial to public health.
3. The site is located on a minor road which is seriously substandard in terms of width, alignment and surfacing. The traffic generated by the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users.

---

Patricia-Marie Young  
Planning Inspector  
27<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2021