



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-312491-22

Development	Retention of existing single storey office/utility area.
Location	The Cottage, Ward Lower, The Ward, Co Dublin, D11 CP44.
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	FW21B/0161.
Applicant(s)	Maude Joyce.
Type of Application	Retention Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse.
Type of Appeal	First Party.
Appellant(s)	Maude Joyce.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	11 th & 31 st day of August, 2022.
Inspector	Patricia-Marie Young.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
5.1. Development Plan - Fingal County Development Plan, 2017-2023.	8
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	9
5.3. EIA Screening	10
6.0 The Appeal	10
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	10
6.2. Planning Authority Response	11
6.3. Observations	11
7.0 Assessment.....	11
8.0 Recommendation.....	17
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	18

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The rectangular shaped appeal site has a stated 0.022ha and it is located in the 'Ward Lower' Townland, in north County Dublin, c0.7km to the east of the M2 corridor, in north County Dublin.
- 1.2. Having inspected the site and its setting I consider that the Site Location and Description as set out by the Boards Inspector in recent appeal case ABP-309381-21 is still applicable. It reads:

"The appeal site is located on the western side of the R135, approximately 500m to the north of the roundabout at the Ward Cross / junction with the R121. The area is rural in character and surrounding lands are in agricultural use. The site is bounded by a high wall with two large timber gates, one at either end of the site. The Ward River runs along the northern boundary of the site.

Internally the site is divided into two sections, both of which have separate vehicular access from the R135. A tyre business operated from the northern section of the site and the vehicular entrance for this area is set back from the main road. On the occasion of the site visit this gate was closed.

The planning application relates to a structure located within the southern section of the site. It is positioned against the internal dividing wall, on an east-west access and opening onto the internal shared courtyard. Access to the site was restricted on the occasion of the site inspection but the roof of the structure is visible behind the boundary wall".

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for **Retention** of an existing single storey, playroom/study/home office/utility area with associated site works.
- 2.2. According to the planning application form the structure for which retention is sought has a stated 67.5m² gross floor space. The gross floor space of existing buildings on site is given as 395m² and it is indicated that the site is served by an existing connection to public mains alongside the existing waste water management treatment is by way of existing connection to public sewer.

- 2.3. The submitted plans indicate that the structure is gable shaped with a ridge height of 4.45m, a width of 5.5m and a length of 14.4m

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 9th day of December, 2021, the Planning Authority decided to refuse retention permission for the following stated reasons:

- “1. *The site is located in a rural area that is zoned Greenbelt in the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023, with an objective to protect and provide for a greenbelt. On the basis of the information submitted the Planning Authority is not satisfied the development proposed for retention would be in compliance with the Development Plan zoning objective. Furthermore, it is considered the development proposed for retention would represent a haphazard and piecemeal development within the Greenbelt zone. The development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
2. *The Planning Authority is not satisfied, on the basis of the information submitted in relation to foul and surface water drainage and flood risk, that the development proposed for retention would not be prejudicial to public health or pose an unacceptable risk of environmental pollution or be subject to flood risk. The development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planning Officer’s report is the basis of the Planning Authority’s decision, and it includes the following comments:

- This is a repeat application for development that has been subject to several previous applications for retention permission.
- Reference is made to the planning history of the site.

- Reference is made to the history of enforcement with the most recent indicated as being Enforcement Notice Reference 16/81B which is indicated to have been issued on the 23rd day of February, 2017, relating to the following unauthorised development on site and seeking their removal within two months. The unauthorised structures are noted as 2 unauthorised dwellings, 1 unauthorised playroom, 1 unauthorised large storage shed, 1 unauthorised shed used as a commercial tyre sales operation and an unauthorised 2m high front boundary wall. It is indicated that enforcement investigations and proceedings are still ongoing.
- Having regard to the size and design of the structure it is capable for separate residential occupation and the applicant would need to demonstrate compliance with the rural settlement strategy of the Development Plan in this circumstance.
- The applicant has failed to provide full clarity on the purpose of the building to which this application pertains. This adds to the issues with regards to the zoning and rural settlement concerns.
- The site is not served by any public drainage and there is no foul drainage or surface water drainage details. There is insufficient information to assess these matters and it is considered that the proposal would be prejudicial to public health.
- There are two existing site entrances onto the R135, and sightlines have not been indicated from either.
- Further information would be required in relation to on site layout for car parking and the like.
- The planning application indicates that they are unaware of any valid planning applications pertaining to the site despite the significant number of applications made.
- Concern is raised that there is potential of a hydrological connection between the retention application site and Malahide Estuary SAC and Malahide Estuary SPA. In the absence of demonstrating safe disposal of foul drainage it cannot be excluded that there is no likelihood of significant impacts on the conservation objectives of these sites arising.
- As there are no material differences between this and the previous application P.A. Ref. No. FW20B/0154 there can be no alternative conclusion.

- Concludes with a recommendation of refusal.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Water: Additional Information requested. I note the following comments contained in this report:

- The site is not served by public main drainage.
- The applicant is required to submit floor plan and foul drainage site layout drawings clearly indicating any/all connections.
- The applicant should be requested to provide an engineering report to address a number of foul drainage concerns, including detailing the existing waste water treatment system and percolation area, photographs, and conditional survey through to demonstration of compliance with EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems, 2021. This shall include the provision of a site suitability assessment.
- Compliance with principles of SuDS and the GDSDS is requested.
- The site is located in close proximity to the River Ward and according to the flood maps compiled under the Fingal County Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in support of the current Development the subject site is partly located within Flood Zone B, i.e., within an area which is at risk of flooding. It is requested that a commensurate flood risk assessment be carried out in accordance with the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2009.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. **Irish Water:** No objection, subject to safeguards.

3.3.2. **DAA:** This submission notes that the site is situated within Noise Zone B and a condition should be attached in this regard.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. None.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Site

4.1.1. This appeal site has an extensive planning history that relates to the development that is subject of this retention application. That is to say the retention of a single storey structure for use as a playroom/study/utility/ home office area together with all associated site works. In this regard, the applicant has sought permission for this development on 8 different occasions to date. Five of which have been before the Board by way of First Party Appeals for determination with the Board as set out below refusing permission for this development for the same substantive reasons and considerations. The following is an overview of relevant Board decisions:

- **ABP-309381-21 (P.A. Ref. No. FW20B/0154)**

On the 2nd day of June, 2021, the Board **refused** permission for a development described as retention of a single storey playroom / study / home office / utility area with associated site works (Note: 67.7m²) for the following two stated reasons and considerations:

“1. The site is located in a rural area that is zoned as Greenbelt in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023, with an objective to ‘protect and provide for a greenbelt’. The Board is not satisfied, on the basis of the information submitted with the planning application and in response to the appeal, that the development proposed for retention is in compliance with the Development Plan zoning objective and that it would not represent a haphazard or piecemeal form of development within the Greenbelt zone. The development proposed for retention would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The Board is not satisfied, on the basis of the information submitted in relation to foul and surface water drainage and flood risk, that the development proposed for retention would not be prejudicial to public health or pose an unacceptable risk of environmental pollution. The development proposed for retention would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

4.1.2. The Board refused the same development as sought under this application under the following appeals for the same reasons and considerations:

- **ABP-307495-20 (P.A. Ref. No. FW20B/0034)** - retention permission refused on the 3rd day of November, 2020.
- **ABP-305944-19 (P.A. Ref. No. FW19B/0103)** - retention permission refused on the 25th day of February, 2020.
- **ABP-303640-19 (P.A. Ref. No. FW18B/0133)** - retention permission refused on the Permission refused on the 15th day of May, 2019.
- **ABP-PL06F.248409 (P.A. Ref. No. FW17B/0007)** - retention permission refused on the 11th day of September, 2017.

4.1.3. The Planning Authority refused permission for the same development for similar reasons and considerations under the following planning applications:

- **P.A. Ref. No. FW19B/0081** – Permission refused on the 26th day of July, 2019.
- **P.A. Ref. No. FW18/0125** – Permission refused on the 16th day of October, 2018.
- **P.A. Ref. No. FW17A/0223** – Permission refused on the 6th day of February, 2018.

Of note the Planning Authority also raised traffic hazard as an additional third reason for refusal.

4.2. **Enforcement:**

P.A. Ref. No. 16/81B - Enforcement notice issued in respect of two unauthorised dwellings, 1 unauthorised playroom, 1 unauthorised storage shed, 1 unauthorised shed used as a commercial tyre sales operation and unauthorised 2m high front boundary wall. (Note: Issued 23rd day of February, 2017/Status: proceedings on-going).

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Development Plan - Fingal County Development Plan, 2017-2023.**

5.1.1. The site is located within an area zoned '*GB*' – Greenbelt. The land use objective for such lands is to 'protect and provide for a Greenbelt' and the vision for such land is to create a rural/urban Greenbelt zone that permanently demarcates the boundary (i) between the rural and urban areas, or (ii) between urban and urban areas. The role of the Greenbelt is to check unrestricted sprawl of urban areas, to prevent coalescence

of settlements, to prevent countryside encroachment and to protect the setting of towns and/or villages. The Greenbelt is attractive and multifunctional, serves the needs of both the urban and rural communities, and strengthens the links between urban and rural areas in a sustainable manner. The Greenbelt will provide opportunities for countryside access and for recreation, retain attractive landscapes, improve derelict land within and around towns, secure lands with a nature conservation interest, and retain land in agricultural use.

- 5.1.2. Residential development is '*permitted in principle*' in this zone subject to compliance with the Rural Settlement Strategy. Persons who are deemed to meet the applicant categories set out in the Development Plan will be considered for a house in the Greenbelt zone, subject to a maximum of one incremental house per existing house.
- 5.1.3. Table 12.4 of the Development Plan sets out 'Design Guidelines for Rural Dwellings'. It addresses site assessment, siting and design, materials and detailing, boundary treatments, assess and sight lines, surface and wastewater treatment and landscaping.
- 5.1.4. Objective Z06 of the Development Plan seeks to ensure that developments ancillary to the parent use of a site are considered on their merits.
- 5.1.5. Objective CH38 of the Development Plan requires the size, scale, design, form, layout and materials of extension to vernacular dwellings to be in keeping and sympathetic with the existing structure.
- 5.1.6. The site is located within the Dublin Airport Outer Noise Zone. Objective DA07 of the Development Plan seeks to control inappropriate development and require noise insulation where appropriate in this zone.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The site is not located within or directly adjacent to any Natura 2000 site or other site designated domestically for nature conservation purpose. The Ward River bounds the site to the north and flows into the Broadmeadow / Malahide Estuary SPA and SAC, which is approx. 9.5km to the east of the site.

5.3. **EIA Screening**

- 5.3.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and nature of the receiving environment, 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.

5.4. **Built Heritage**

- 5.4.1. There are a number of recorded monuments in the vicinity of the site. The nearest lies c208m to the south west (DU04953, Classification: ENCL).

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

- 6.1.1. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:
- The site is already home to a cottage for c100years and the zoning of it as greenbelt given the land to the north is zoned 'RU' – Rural and 'RB' Rural Business to the east is questioned.
 - If permission is not granted for people to build houses in the area they grew up in it will kill the community and make people settle in areas of unfamiliarity.
 - There is currently a housing on site and if there is a foul and surface water drainage currently in place is not ok is it therefore ok to let people live there. In addition, sufficient information could have been provided by way of additional information on these matters had it been requested by the Planning Authority.
 - Lack of information in itself does not warrant a refusal of permission.
 - There are only two reasons for refusal given now by the Planning Authority and it is questioned why the third reason given by them to previous applications for this development has disappeared.
 - The reasons for refusal relate to issues that could be addressed by further information and as such the refusal of permission for this development should be overturned by the Board.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

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

- This application was assessed having regard to relevant planning policy provisions.
- There are no material differences between this development and that sought previously under P.A. Ref. No. FW20B/0034 which was refused on appeal to the Board under ABP-307495-20. Therefore, no alternative conclusions or recommendations could be made.
- The Planning Authority remains of the opinion that permission should be refused for the development sought under this application.
- The Board is requested to uphold its decision.
- In the event of a grant of retention permission a Section 48 Contribution should be imposed.

6.3. Observations

6.3.1. None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. This is a First Party Appeal against the decision of Fingal County Council to refuse permission for a development consisting of the retention of an existing structure of 67.5m² that is described as a single storey playroom/study/home office/utility room and associated site works on these lands. Of note the documentation provided with this application does not show what associated works are sought. It could be probable that the associated site works related to site construction works carried out on site to facilitate the construction of the subject building which I note to the Board having examined the drawings submitted with this application includes a bathroom. Notwithstanding, the documentation provided with the application and on appeal does not show how the subject structure is serviced in terms of either water supply and foul drainage or if these services to the structure have been provided in accordance with required standards and that the site itself given the quantum of development thereon

has the spare capacity to absorb this development without being prejudicial to public health and/or give rise to pollution.

- 7.2. The documentation provided with this application does not demonstrate that any of the water supply connections and associated works have been carried out with Irish Water agreement or in compliance with required standards.
- 7.3. Of further concern the planning application form appears to suggest that water supply and foul drainage is via a connection to public infrastructure. This fact has not been demonstrated by any evidence in the documentation provided with this application and on appeal. Nor in terms of public information available on this matter for the location of the appeal site which is situated in the Townland of the Ward Lower, north County Dublin.
- 7.4. The Planning Authority's interdepartmental reports would suggest that there is no foul drainage of this site.
- 7.5. Despite this being raised as a concern in eight separate planning applications relating specifically to the retention of the subject structure, with five being subject to First Party Appeals with the Board, together with foul drainage being one of the stated reasons and considerations for refusal, the applicant has again opted not to clarify or addressed this issue to show that there is appropriate foul drainage on site to the required standard to cater for the quantum of development on the subject site. The provision of such information is essential to provide assurance that the development sought for retention would as said prior not be prejudicial to public health or give rise to environmental contamination, in itself and/or in-combination with the other development that has occurred on site.
- 7.6. Yet at the time the appellant contends that such a matter should have been requested by the Planning Authority rather than it being used as a reason to support refusal of retention of the subject structure. They also decided not to demonstrate by way of their appeal submission to the Board that this reason could be overcome by providing this information they contend they could have provided if they had been requested by the Planning Authority by way of further information.
- 7.7. With this concern being further added to not only by the significant number of buildings on site with the curtilage of the site appearing to be mainly hard surfaced with no evidence to suggest any surface water drainage measures. But also, by the fact that

the northern boundary of the site which at its closest point is within 35m of the Ward River and to the fact that the flood maps compiled by the Planning Authority as part of their preparation of the Strategic Flood Assessment for the current development plan concluded that the site is in part located within Flood Zone B, i.e., between 1% and 0.1% AEP, which effectively means it is at risk of flooding. This fact is supported by the OPW Flood Maps.

- 7.8. The applicant as part of the information provided with this application has provided no Flood Risk Assessment as part of the documentation supporting this file.
- 7.9. Having regard to the extensive planning history of this site, having regard to the information on file and to the site conditions I consider that the second reason for refusal as given by the Planning is a substantive basis for permission to be refused for the retention of the development sought under this application.
- 7.10. In relation to the principle of the development sought under this application, the site is located within an area zoned for Greenbelt uses in the current development plan for the area.
- 7.11. In addition, no information has been provided to satisfy the Board that the development to be retained is in compliance with the Development Plan zoning objective for this Greenbelt area, or that it would not represent a haphazard or piecemeal form of development within the Greenbelt zone. With this Greenbelt land use zone being the most sensitive to change land use in the site's rural landscape setting. I therefore consider that the previous findings of the Board in this regard remain valid. With this conclusion being made by the Board in their determination of the five previous appeal cases, i.e., ABP-309381-21, ABP-307495-20, ABP-305944-19, ABP-303640-19 and ABP PL06F.248409.
- 7.12. For clarity all five of these appeal cases related to the same specific development and were determined under the same local planning provisions, i.e., the Fingal County Development Plan, 2017-2023.
- 7.13. In addition, the Fingal County Development Plan, 2017-2023, is the applicable Development Plan under which the Board will be determining this appeal case.
- 7.14. Moreover, the Planning Authority refused retention permission for the same development under P.A. Ref. No. FW19B/0081; FW18/0125; and, FW17A/0223 also

during the period that the Fingal County Development Plan, 2017-2023 was applicable. I note to the Board that these particular Planning Authority decisions were not appealed.

- 7.15. Of further concern in terms of the quantum of development on this site, the residential and commercial use, the extensive hard surfacing covering the area around the buildings on site up to the site boundaries through to the unserviced nature of the site appears to have been subject to significant unauthorised development over recent decades. With no evidence to suggest that these works had the benefit of permission. The level of unauthorised development, whilst a matter for the Planning Authority to deal with as they see fit, and an issue that is currently subject to enforcement proceedings. With these enforcement proceedings appearing in my view to be protracted by what appears to be the delay tactics of repeated planning applications made by the applicant to seek the retention of the same unauthorised structure. A structure for which is now again subject to this application before the Board for its determination and with this repeated making of the same application going back to the Planning Authority's enforcement actions taken under P.A. Ref. 16/81B in 2016.
- 7.16. Of concern is that the enforcement proceedings relate to the subject structure, 2 unauthorised dwellings, 1 unauthorised large storage shed, 1 unauthorised shed used as a commercial tyre sale operation and a 2m high front boundary wall.
- 7.17. This is a significant quantum of development to have occurred on this 'Greenbelt' zoned land that bounds the Ward River on a site that has a given 0.022ha together with the as said concern that the remaining area around these unauthorised buildings and structures is hard stand. With no evidence of surface water drainage, flood mitigation measures through to foul drainage to the required standards as well as demonstratable potable water supplies.
- 7.18. I therefore raise a concern to the Board that to permit the development sought under this application would facilitate the consolidation and intensification of the unauthorised development and land uses on this sensitive to change site on Greenbelt Land in an area of rural north County Dublin that is under significant urban pressure for development, including one-off rural dwellings.
- 7.19. Accordingly, in my considered opinion it would be inappropriate for the Board to consider the grant of a permission for the development sought in such circumstances

and also to consider the retention of this structure in isolation from the quantum of development that has occurred at this site would result in an undesirable precedent for piecemeal, *ad hoc*, haphazard, and unsustainable development.

- 7.20. With this being said I concur with the Planning Authority's first reason for refusal. A refusal reason that is consistent with the reasons and considerations given by the Board also in its determination to refuse permission for the same retention development on five separate recent occasions. I am of the view given the extensive planning history of this structure and the quantum of development that has occurred on site in the absence of permission for the same it would be appropriate and reasonable at this stage for the Board to consider including a separate reason and consideration for refusal relating to the consolidation and intensification of unauthorised development as a precaution, for clarity and in the interests of orderly development.
- 7.21. Whilst I note that in previous reasons for refusal by the Planning Authority, they considered not to include road safety hazard arising from the proposed development as an issue that did not warrant a reason and consideration for refusal.
- 7.22. Having inspected the site and observing the heavy steady stream of traffic in both directions on the R135, having regard to the planning history of the site and having regard to the quantum of land uses on this site I raise concern that despite the posted speed limit of 60kmph and the ability of the site to achieve the required sightlines onto this regional road the provision of multiple residential dwellings and commercial use together with two entrances onto this heavily trafficked section of regional road is not consistent with proper planning and sustainable development for regional roads in rural locations like this.
- 7.23. With this consideration being based on the fact that tall two meter boundary walls have been provided, no documentation supports that the required sightlines have been provided in either direction from either entrance through to the quantum of residential units where no genuine rural housing need has been demonstrated in compliance with local through to national planning policy provisions at a location under pressure from this type of development and on Greenbelt land is not consistent with channelling residential and commercial developments to appropriate locations on zoned land with capacity to sustainably absorb them.

7.24. In particular in the case of residential where modal shift away from reliance on private vehicles can be achieved due to residential developments being located in urban settlements where they can be more sustainably absorbed as well as supported by other land uses that are synergistic to them.

7.25. In terms of visual amenity, as discussed above the site is located in 'Greenbelt' zoned land and in a rural landscape of north County Dublin that has been subject to significant visual erosion and deterioration of amenity due to *ad hoc* and unrelated to the rural function primarily residential developments. Further, the design resolution for this development and site, including development that has occurred in recent decades has had no regard to the Development Management Standards and Guidelines applicable to such developments. Further, the provision of multiple residential dwelling units and a commercial development at this location is out of character with the pattern of development and any grant of retention permission for the *ad hoc* structures which accommodate independent residential and commercial use would potentially give rise to undesirable precedent for other similar developments in the area or other similar approaches to carrying out development works.

7.26. **Conclusion**

7.26.1. Having regard to the foregoing, I concur with the two stated reasons given by the Planning Authority for the refusal of the development sought under this application. These reasons are in my view of sufficient weight to warrant refusal of this development. Notwithstanding, this as discussed above, I recommend that the Board consider adding a separate reason and consideration to refuse retention permission in relation to the development sought under this application on the matter of consolidating and intensification of unauthorised development for the reasons set out in my assessment above.

7.27. **Appropriate Assessment**

7.27.1. The Ward River runs to the north of the appeal site and provides a potential hydrological connection between the appeal site and the Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code: 000205) and the Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004025) approx. 9.5km to the east. Having regard to the nature and scale of development the subject of this application, the likelihood of significant impacts on the conservation objectives of these European sites is considered to be low. However, given the lack of information

available in relation to the treatment and disposal of wastewater, such water quality impacts cannot be excluded and in such circumstances the Board would be precluded from granting permission.

7.28. Other Matters Arising

- 7.28.1. The documentation submitted with this application do not appear to provide an accurate representation of the structure and its setting. In this regard, I note that the roof plan shows no velux rooflights despite it containing two on the northern slope and one on the southern slope.
- 7.28.2. Further the site context is not accurately depicted with the most evident of this being internal boundaries and structures within the site itself.
- 7.28.3. Of further concern there are also a number of other structures erected on site for which no permission for.
- 7.28.4. With this including two single storey flat roof structure in close proximity to the rear elevation of the subject structure, other shed type structures, the foot print of buildings that are shown in the submitted drawings do not appear to be correctly detailed and appear to have different shaped footprints through to larger footprints, there are tall metal poles along the front boundaries and within the site containing CCTV cameras and large directional lights.
- 7.28.5. In addition, CCTV cameras have been erected on public utility poles at height and there is nothing to support that the applicant has the consent of the public utility owner of the poles for these interventions.
- 7.28.6. This adds to the inadequacy concerns already raised in my assessment above pertaining to the information provided with this application through to the actual quantum of unauthorised development on site appears to exceed that for which Planning Authority's enforcement proceedings relate to.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that **retention permission** be **refused**. The Board may consider the first reason for refusal a **new issue** in their determination of this appeal case.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. On the basis of the information provided on file, the planning history of the site, the submissions made in connection with the planning application and appeal, it appears to the Board that the proposed development relates to a structure and use that is unauthorised and that development sought under this application would facilitate and add to the consolidation and intensification of unauthorised structures and uses on site. Accordingly, it is considered that it would be inappropriate for the Board to consider the grant of a permission for the proposed development in such circumstances.
2. The site is located in a rural area that is zoned as Greenbelt in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023, with an objective to 'protect and provide for a greenbelt'. The Board is not satisfied, on the basis of the information submitted with the planning application and in response to the appeal, that the development proposed for retention is in compliance with the Development Plan zoning objective and that it would not represent a haphazard or piecemeal form of development within the Greenbelt zone. The development proposed for retention would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. The Board is not satisfied, on the basis of the information submitted in relation to foul and surface water drainage and flood risk, that the development proposed for retention would not be prejudicial to public health or pose an unacceptable risk of environmental pollution. The development proposed for retention would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Patricia-Marie Young
Planning Inspector

21st day of September, 2022.