



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-314130-22

Development

The construction of (1) New Storage warehouse with canopy (2) Filling in of an existing fire water lagoon and replacing with a fire water tank and (3) Associated siteworks

Location

Oranstown, Dunboyne, Co. Meath

Planning Authority

Meath County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

212142

Applicant(s)

Mid Cork Pallets & Packaging Ltd.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant with Conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Kevin Cummins, Oliver Ryan, Pat and Finnuala Nevin.

Observer(s)

1. Paul and Helga Slevin
2. Barbara Goode
3. Pat and Kathleen Clark.

4. Tony Connolly and others

Date of Site Inspection

24th March 2023.

Inspector

Lucy Roche

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	7
3.1. Decision	7
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	7
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	9
3.4. Third Party Observations	9
4.0 Planning History.....	9
5.0 Policy Context.....	10
5.1. Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (MCDP 2021)	10
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	12
5.3. EIA Screening	12
6.0 The Appeal	12
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	12
6.2. Applicant Response	16
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	18
6.4. Observations.....	19
7.0 Assessment	21
8.0 Recommendation.....	37
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	37

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is in the rural area of Oranstown, c0.5km south of the settlement of Dunboyne and c3.3km west of the M3 and Junction 4. The site is served by and accessed off the county road to the west. The county road connects with the R157 regional road c620m to the north. The R157 connects the settlement of Maynooth (c6km to the southwest) and the M3 motorway.
- 1.2. The site has a stated area of c1.16ha and comprises part of the curtilage of an established pallet and packaging storage facility (an area of hard surfacing to the south and an area occupied by a water lagoon to the northeast corner) along with additional greenfield lands to the east. The proposed site / development will be an extension to the existing facility and will utilise the same entrance.
- 1.3. The existing warehouse facility is bounded by a mix of palisade fencing, hedgerow, and block wall. The existing roadside boundary (palisade fence) is set back from the road edge. The area between the fence and the road edge is finished in asphalt and is utilised as a hard shoulder / dwell area for vehicles. The extended site area is comprised of greenfield land to the east which is to be taken from adjoining agricultural fields. This area of land is irregular in shape and is bisected (west-east) by hedgerow and (north-south) by power lines. Boundaries to the west and south open directly onto adjoining agricultural lands. An existing agricultural laneway borders the site to the southeast.
- 1.4. With respect to the site surrounds, lands in the general area are predominantly in agricultural use. There are a number of single dwellings within the vicinity of the site including one on the opposite side of the county road and two bounding the applicants premises to the north.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission has been sought for:

- The construction of new storage warehouse building of 3,860sqm with four access points, external canopy, and concrete yard.

The proposed structure will be constructed on greenfield land to the east of the existing warehouse storage facility and will comprise a high-bay portal

frame steel structure (12.95 meters high), with Kingspan cladding panels on the roof and ceiling to match the colour of existing buildings and blockwork wall 2.5 meters tall at ground level. There will be 2 high Bay doors at the northern elevation and southern elevation. The design incorporates a canopy on the structure's north elevation the purpose of which is to protect from the weather when loading and unloading from trucks.

- Filling in of an existing fire water lagoon which is used for fire water and its replacement with a steel fire water tank.
- Associated siteworks including palisade fencing and landscaping.

2.2. Further information/revised plans received on 19th May 2022. The additional information received was deemed to be significant. The development in terms of layout and design remained substantially unchanged save for revised parking arrangements and landscaping proposals.

2.3. For ease of reference, Table 2.1 below provides a schedule of the key development details and statistics associated with the proposed development.

Table 2.1: Site / Development Details (as per plans and particulars submitted)		
Site Area:	Proposed (ext)	1.279ha
	Existing (as per case planner report)	c2.169ha
	Total	c3.04ha
GFA	Existing buildings	c6,837sqm (based on a total stated GFA of 10,697sqm)
Warehouse	Floor Area	3860sqm
<i>Dimensions</i>	Length	c108m (excluding canopy)
	Width	35.860m
	Height	13.215m (including parapet)

		12.95 meters (excluding parapet)
<i>Finish</i>	Kingspan cladding panels (grey) on roof and walls above 2.5m high blockwork wall finished in smooth render. Colour and materials match existing warehouse structures.	
Water Tank	Capacity	892m ³
	Diameter	12.5Ø
	Height	7.05m
Staff	An additional 6-8 employees	
Access	Existing entrance off county road to the west.	
Parking	Car	An additional 5 spaces proposed (15no in total)
	HGV	5 HGV parking spaces
	Bicycle	New cycle rack with space for 12 bicycles
Services:	Water Supply	Existing - Well
	Wastewater	Existing – bio-cycle unit
	Surface Water	New attenuation tank with discharge to exiting 600mm concrete pipe. Design include Interceptor and Hydrobrake.

2.4. Documentation provided with this application includes but is not limited to:

- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and associated photomontages
- Outline Traffic Movement Strategy
- Construction and Operational Traffic Management Plan
- Daylight and Sunlight Assessment
- Outdoor Lighting Report

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Meath County Council did by Order dated 26th June 2022, decide to grant permission for the proposed development subject to 10 conditions, the following of which are noted:

Condition 2 Requires compliance with the conditions attached to the previous grant of permission under MCC Ref: DA70011

Condition 4 Requires the applicant to provide 4no EV charging points.

Condition 5 Prohibits parking on the public road.

Condition 8 Requires a Waste Management Plan and a Construction and Environmental Management Plan

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The initial report of the case planner (January 2022) has regard to the locational context and planning history of the site, to local planning policy and to the third-party submissions and interdepartmental reports received. The assessment of the case planner can be summarised as follows:

- Having regard to the established character and setting of the subject site, the proposed development as presented will not negatively impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
- Regarding the issue of 'sterilisation' the case planner considers that the applicant should be afforded an opportunity to address same.
- It is determined that neither an EIAR nor a Stage 2 appropriate assessment is required in this instance.
- The report concludes with a request for further information regarding the sterilisation of the lands and landscaping. The applicants were also requested to address the issues raised in the third-party submissions.

The second report of the case planner (June 2022) has regard to the further information and third-party submissions received. The assessment of the case planner can be summarised as follows:

- Following a review of the planning history associated with the site, the case planner is satisfied that the previous grants of planning permission did not include a condition requiring the sterilisation of land to prevent further development.
- The revised landscaping plan which includes proposals for boundary treatment along the eastern side boundary is considered to be acceptable.
- The proposed development represents an extension to an operational commercial premises and therefore no development contributions are applicable in this instance.
- The report concludes with a recommendation to grant permission subject to 10no. conditions

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Water Services: Report dated 02/12/2021. No objection subject to six conditions

Environment: Report dated 05/01/2022: No objection subject to condition. A review of the authorization currently in place under Waste Management (Facility Permit and Registration) Regulations may be required. No increase in the material as described can be imported to the site until the requisite authorisation is in place.

Transportation: Report dated 22/12/2021. The impact of the anticipated additional 10 truck movements per day is not considered significant. No objection subject to conditions re: the provision of electric vehicle charging points and that parking on public road/hard shoulder is not permitted.

Public Lighting: Report dated 24/11/2021. No comments

Chief Fire Officer: Report dated 29/11/2021: A Fire Safety Certificate application is required for the proposed development. Fire safety issues

with regard to the design, layout and construction of the proposed buildings etc will be examined in more detail by the fire officer at the fire safety certificate application stage.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Irish Water No objection subject to condition

3.4. Third Party Observations

The planning authority received a number of submissions during their determination of the application. The issues raised are similar to those set out in the grounds of appeal and can be summarised as follows:

- Compliance with Development Plan – Strategic Objective RUR DOV S06
- The scale of development is incompatible with the rural area and is unsustainable. It should be located on zoned lands.
- The proposed development will impact the visual amenity and rural character of the area.
- Traffic Safety - increased traffic and lack of adequate parking
- Impact on residential amenities.
- Insufficient infrastructure
- Environmental impact and biodiversity loss
- Fire hazard

4.0 Planning History

MCC PL Ref:211054

Permission granted (2021) for the installation of 195 photovoltaic solar panels over an area of circa 417.8 square metres on the roof of the existing mid cork pellets and packaging commercial building and all development works.

MCC PL Ref: DA70011 Permission granted (2007) for a new warehouse (4,222sq.m.) to the rear of their existing factory/warehouse, a store (42.5 sq. m.) revised entrance layout, revised car parking layout for 22 cars and 3 HGV trucks, etc.

MCC PL Ref: DA60209 Permission refused (2006) for the construction of a new warehouse (4,222 sqm) to the rear of their existing factory/warehouse, additional car parking for 43 cars, additional parking for 4 HGV trucks, etc, for 2 reasons: (1) excessive scale of development in a rural area and (2) traffic hazard.

ABP Ref: 17.121313 Permission granted (2001) for the demolition of existing building and construction of warehouse, workshop, offices, car park, storage yard, 2 oil storage tanks, biocycle unit and water storage lagoon for manufacture and storage of timber pellets.

Condition 1: The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the details received as further information by the planning authority on the 23rd day of June, 2000, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (MCDP 2021)

- 5.1.1. Zoning: The site is in the rural area outside of designated settlements. The rural area is zoned 'RA' in the MCDP 2021. The zoning objective for the 'RA' rural area is to protect and promote in a balanced way, the development of agriculture, forestry and sustainable rural-related enterprise, community facilities, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and the built and cultural heritage.

5.1.2. Landscape:

Table 5.1 Landscape Character Type	
Character Area	LCA11- Southeast Lowlands
Value	Very High
Sensitivity	Medium
Importance	Regional

5.1.3. Chapter 4 - Section 4.11.1 Rural Enterprise

ED POL 26: Meath County Council shall positively consider and assess development proposals for the expansion of existing authorised industrial or business enterprises in the countryside where the resultant development does not negatively impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area. In all instances, it should be demonstrated that the proposal would not generate traffic of a type and amount inappropriate for the standard of the access roads. This policy shall not apply to the National Road Network

5.1.4. Chapter 9 - Section 9.1 Rural Development context

RUR DEV SO 1: To support the continued vitality and viability of rural areas, environmentally, socially, and commercially by promoting sustainable social and economic development.

RUR DEV SO 6: To protect and enhance the visual qualities of rural areas through sensitive design.

RUR DEV SO 10: To promote rural economic development by recognising the need to advance the long term sustainable social and environmental development of rural areas and encouraging economic diversification and facilitating growth of rural enterprises.

5.1.5. Chapter 11 – Section 6 Employment and Development Standards is relevant.

DM OBJ 61: States that any planning application for industrial, office, warehousing and Business Park Development shall address various development assessment criteria.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The site is not located within or directly adjacent to any designated site. The Rye Water Valley/Cartron SAC (site code:001398) is located c3.6km to the south. There are no other designated Natura 2000 sites within 15km.

5.3. **EIA Screening**

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development comprising the construction of a new storage warehouse building of 3,860sqm etc associated with an established pallet and packaging facility, in the rural location and the nature of the receiving environment, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environment 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**

This is a third-party appeal, lodged on behalf of:

- (1) Kevin Cummins and Oliver Ryan of the Birches, Castlefarm, Dunboyne
- (2) Pat and Fionnuala Nevin of Castlefarm, Dunboyne

The appeal has been lodged against the decision of Meath County Council to grant permission for the development of lands at Obanstown, Co. Meath. The grounds of appeal have been set out under various headings and can be summarised as follows:

Inadequate completion of the application form and associated impact on the planning assessment:

- The floor area of existing buildings has not been given. This is relevant in respect of traffic generation etc.
- Inadequate information has been submitted in relation to water supply and wastewater and surface water disposal.
- It is contended that based on the above errors/omissions a full assessment of the application was not made, that the application as submitted and decision to grant is invalid.

Planning History, Land Use and Zoning:

- Reference is made to the planning history of the site, the decision to refuse permission under MCC Ref: DA60209 and the rationale for permitting the existing development (MCC Ref: DA70011) which relied on an established commercial use (sawmill) on site since 1958 etc. The same rationale cannot be used to support the proposed development as it comprises the extension of the development onto virgin agricultural lands, in separate ownership.
- Developments of this scale and their associated impacts (traffic, noise, and visual impact) should be appropriately located on zoned land within the urban envelope. The proposed development would be contrary to MCDP Objective RUR DOV S06.
- There are sufficient suitably zoned lands within Dunboyne / Clonee to facilitate the proposed development.

Site Sterilisation

- While not included as a condition in the grant of permission under ABP Ref: 17.171213, the appellants are of the view that as the then applicants, MCP Packaging, indicated that they were willing to sterilise the undeveloped section of their holding from further industrial development in their submission under the application, that this commitment forms an integral part of the conditions of the grant as covered by Condition 1. Condition 1 requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application.

Traffic and Associated Issues

- There is no report on the current file from the Transportation section of Meath County Council and no comments on the issue of traffic in the executive planner's report.
- The proposed development is to be located on a rural road which is substandard in width, alignment and carrying capacity to cater for the type and volume of traffic that would be generated by the proposed development. The proposed development would therefore give rise to serious concerns for traffic safety and have a serious traffic impact on the receiving road environment and would be contrary to proper planning and development of the area.
- The 'Outline Traffic Movement Strategy' submitted by MHL & Associates Ltd is inadequate and falls short of IHT recommendations. No proper survey of the traffic generated by the existing development was carried out.
- The TIA should consider 'worst case scenario' for example in the event of a change of ownership and subsequent use of the facility whereby additional traffic is generated.
- The existing HGV delivery system is causing major impact and nuisance with truck arriving before opening time.
- Some traffic enters /leaves the site via a southerly direction which is not mentioned in the MHL submission.
- Proposals for a traffic plan coordinator and DMS are not practical. The TPC would have no control over outside / third party traffic.
- No survey was carried out among staff in respect of the feasibility of car sharing. Given low staff numbers any potential gain would be minimal.
- Insufficient parking on site

On-site services:

- The site is served by an on-site well and not public mains. No information on the capacity or quality of this well to serve the proposed development has been submitted.

- The site is served by a proprietary effluent treatment system approved under MCC PL Ref: DA70011. Standards have changed yet no assessment was undertaken to show compliance with current standards. The proposed development will result in an increased loading.
- Issues raised by the Water Services Department in relation to the collection and disposal of surface water should have been addressed prior to the granting of permission.

Impact on Residential Amenity:

- The proposed warehouse, due to its scale and height and its proximity to the appellants' properties, will have a devastating impact on their residential amenity, by way of
 - Visual impact
 - Overshadowing
 - Nuisance from noise and light generated by HGV traffic.
 - Loss of privacy.
 - Depreciation of value

Other Issues

- Further information is required on the quantity and type of material stored in the warehouse.
- Are there existing facilities on site or proposed for the fuelling of HGV's.
- In relation to fire safety – is the proposed tank suitably sized? What measures are to be put in place to address the issue of the construction of the new water tank and the filling in of the existing water pond.
- What type of attenuation tank is proposed and where will it be located.
- The disposal of surplus soil from construction will require waste certificate / permit.

Note:

- The appeal documentation is accompanied by a USB drive / CD Rom which provides video clips of opposing HGV vehicles on the county road to the north of the site.

6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal is set out in correspondence prepared by Lynch and Associates Consulting Engineers and Project Management and received on the 16th of August 2022. The submission includes a report from M.H.L and Associates Ltd along with proposals for the provision of passing bays on the county road to the north of the appeal site (a plan and section of the proposed passing bays, a site plan of the existing road layout showing the location of the proposed passing bays).

The submission can be summarised as follows:

- Lynch and Associates disagree with the contention that perceived omissions from the planning application form have led to the improper assessment of the application by the local authority.
- The entire floor area of warehousing on site will be 10,697sqm.
- The outline Transport Management Plan submitted with the application considers the traffic generated from both the existing development and proposed extension.
- It is suggested that 15no. car parking spaces are appropriate to serve the number of staff on site.
- It is proposed to connect to the outfall from the new underground surface water attenuation tank to the existing surface water outfall pipe work on site. The applicants agree with the points raised under Condition 7 of the PA's decision.
- The nature of the operations carried out on site and the low number of staff employed ensures a low demand on existing water supply and a low loading on the on-site proprietary effluent treatment system.

- The proposed fire water storage tank is sized in accordance with NFPA 1124 to provide enough water to fight the largest potential fire within the site. There is no required recharge rate and thus no additional loading on the water supply.
- There is no planning condition requiring the sterilization of the site.
- The independent reports submitted with the application have determined that the proposed development will have a minimal negative impact on the local residents and on the landscape.
- The predicted traffic increase on the local road as a result of the proposed development equates to 4.7% of the total traffic volume along the local road.
- The traffic implications from the entire development have thoroughly been examined and the reports submitted with the application and appeal are in compliance with TII's traffic and transport assessment guidelines.
- The applicant will implement a delivery management system where interaction of inbound and outbound HGV traffic generated by the site will be mitigated against. They have no control over any other HGV's using the local road therefore in order to avoid such an occurrence it is proposed that passing bays are created at locations which will allow HGV's travelling in opposite directions to pass each other safely. The final location of these passing bays to be agreed with the residents and the local authority.
- The hard shoulder fronting the site will be landscaped to prevent unauthorised short-term parking. In order to avoid the event where HGV arrives early and parks on the road outside the gate, a communication system will be installed at the gate to allow the driver to contact a manager who can authorise the opening of the gates remotely allowing the vehicle to enter the site.
- A record of the Daily Delivery Management Plan will be maintained by the applicants on site and made available for inspection by the local authority, in the event of any complaint lodged.
- The report from Kellehers Electrical and Lighting Design shows that the development will not result in light pollution. The daylight / sunlight

assessment shows that the proposed development has imperceptible daylight sunlight and or overshadowing impact on neighbouring properties.

- Pending a grant of permission from ABP the applicants will prepare a detailed fire safety certificate application which will be submitted to the local building control authority for review and approval prior to any construction commencing on site.
- As per the requirements of Conditions 8 and 9 attached to MCC's grant of permission, the applicants will prepare a Waste Management Plan and the Construction and Environmental Management Plan and submit them to the local authority for approval prior to the commencement of construction on site.
- The information provided in the planning application documents addresses the concerns raised by the residents. The implementation of the recommended delivery management plan together with revision of passing bays along the local road will mitigate the most significant traffic concerns. The proposed development will not have a negative impact on residents.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority's response to the third-party grounds of appeal is set out in correspondence received on the 15th of August 2022 and is summarised below:

- The Planning Authority is satisfied that the supporting documentation presented with the application is acceptable and enabled the planning authority to make a full and informed planning assessment of the proposed development.
- The application was deemed to be valid and in accordance with planning regulations.
- The Planning Authority is satisfied that all matters outlined in the appeal were considered in the course of its assessment of the planning application as detailed in the planning officers' reports.
- The proposed development, as presented, is considered to be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and permission should therefore be granted.

6.4. Observations

6.4.1. Observations have been received from:

- Paul and Helga Slevin (07/08/2022)
- Barbara Goode (16/08/2022)
- Pat and Kathleen Clark (16/08/2022)
- Tony Connolly, Jude Leonard, and Alison Leonard (16/08/2022).

The issues raised in the observations received are similar to those set out in the grounds of appeal. The issues raised have been grouped and summarised as follows:

- *Traffic safety:* - additional HGV traffic on this rural road will make it unsafe for other road users including - pedestrians, cyclists, and children. The local road is unsuitable to cater for additional HGV traffic; it is not wide enough to allow two opposing HGV's to pass. A full independent traffic survey, based on the worst-case scenario, should be carried out. The site is not served by public transport.
- *Nature and Scale of development:* – unsuitable for this rural area and should be located on zoned land. Further expansion of the premises will result in industrial creep and the erosion of the rural setting; the proposed structure will result in a dominant feature in the landscape.
- Inaccuracies in the traffic report – the site is not location on the L2227, but on a small road off the L2227. The site is not located near the R617. Clarification is required in relation to the figures used in the assessment in the impact of traffic on the road.

6.5. Further Responses:

Submissions received in response to the applicant's submission can be summarised as follows:

The Planning Authority:

- The first party response to the third-party appeal has been examined by the planning authority and the content of same is noted.
- The proposed development, as presented is considered to be consistent with proper planning and sustainable development of the area and permission should therefore be granted.

Kevin Cummins, Oliver Ryan and Pat and Fionnuala Nevin (Third-Party Appellants)

- The content of the applicant's submission fails to address the contents of the appeal.
- The provision of passing bays is an inadequate solution to a problem that can only be solved by full realignment and widening of the receiving road from the site to the Dunboyne / Maynooth Road.
- All the passing bays require the development of existing grass verges which are in the ownership of residents. The local authority only has a public right of way over the area between the fences and do not own the roadway. There is no consent from any of the landowners to include the location of any of the bays in this planning application.
- There has been no consultation or agreement with any of the landowners of the verges where the passing bays are proposed.
- The proposed passing bays are purely indicative and as such the drawings submitted cannot be considered as definitive proposals.

Patrick Clark (Observer)

- Mr Clark refuses to accept any proposal to build passing bays on or adjacent to his lands.
- One of the proposed passing bays is proposed at the entrance to his farm which is unacceptable. HGV's will not and should not pull into the entrance of a working farm as this is a major health and safety issue.
- The provision of passing bay will involve removal of hedgerow and natural boundaries and effective drainage of adjacent fields.

Tony Connolly, Jude Leonard, and Alison Leonard (Observers)

- The documents submitted by MCP do not address the road safety issues associated with increased traffic volumes in any meaningful way.
- The applicants' proposals would make the roads more dangerous, particularly for pedestrians.
- Their suggestion to provide passing bays is an improvised solution to avoid the proper road upgrade needed in order to accommodate potential increase in traffic.

Paul and Helga Slevin (Observers):

- The documents submitted by MCP do not address concerns relating to road safety and traffic management; industrial creep into an agricultural area, well water or Waste Management and Environmental Plans.
- The suggestion of providing passage bays only highlights the fact that the road is not suitable or will be able to accommodate an increase in HDV traffic.
- Passing bays represent a significant danger to road users who use the grass verge to move out of the way of oncoming traffic.
- The traffic assessment should be carried out by a third party.
- The traffic assessment was carried out in March when agricultural traffic is low.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the submissions received in relation to the appeal, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Legal, Procedural and Other Matters:
- Principle of Development
- Traffic and Related Matters

- Water Services
- Residential Amenity
- Health and Safety and Other Matters
- Appropriate Assessment.

I am satisfied that all other issues were adequately addressed by the Planning Authority and that no other substantive issues arise.

7.2. **Legal, Procedural and Other Matters:**

7.3. At the outset it is noted that the third-party appellants have raised procedural and legal issues pertaining to the validity of the application and to the sterilisation of land. It is the belief of the appellants that errors / omissions in the information contained in planning application form, relating to the floor area of existing buildings and to water services, impacted on the proper assessment of the application and they contend that the application, as submitted, is invalid on this basis. In my opinion, procedural issues such as the validation (or not) of a planning application is, in general, the responsibility of the Planning Authority and I note that in this instance the Planning Authority took the view that the information / documentation submitted with the application satisfied the minimum regulatory requirements. The applicants, in response to the grounds of appeal, have clarified that the entire floor area of warehousing on site (existing and proposed) will be 10,697sqm. The applicant's proposals for water supply, wastewater treatment and surface water drainage shall be considered later in this report.

7.3.1. On the matter of sterilisation. I have reviewed the information on file and the planning history of the site. It would appear from the information available that MCP Packaging, the applicants under the previous planning application, ABP Ref: PL171213, did indicate that they would be willing to enter into an agreement under Section 38 of the Local Government (Planning & Development) Act, 1963, to preserve the remainder of the landholding from any industrial/commercial or any non-agricultural development and that the Board Inspector did recommend a condition to this effect be included in the grant of permission. However, such a

condition was not included in the Board's decision, and I am not aware of any planning condition requiring the sterilisation of lands associated with the appeal site. Furthermore, I do not think that it would be reasonable to interpret an applicant's stated willingness to enter into a Section 38 agreement, as a commitment to do so. Nor do I agree with the contention of the appellant, that applicant's stated willingness to enter into a Section 38 agreement forms part of the 'particulars' of the development covered by and enforceable under Condition 1 as attached to ABP Ref: PL171213 or any subsequent grant of permission.

7.3.2. The Third-Party Appellant also raises concerns in relation to fire safety and in relation to the disposal of waste, which they consider would require the consent of a third party and a Waste Licence / Permit. On the issue of fire safety, I refer the Board to the comments of the Chief Fire Officer in their report to the planning authority (dated 29/11/2021) in which they state that a Fire Safety Certificate application is required for the proposed development and that fire safety issues with regard to the design, layout and construction of the proposed buildings etc will be examined in more detail by the fire officer at the fire safety certificate application stage. In relation to the management of waste, I note from the report of the Environment Section of Meath County Council (Dated 05/01/2021) that the existing development is subject to authorisation currently in place under Waste Management (Facility Permit and Registration) Regulations and that a review of the authorisation currently in place may be required. As issues relating to fire safety/ Building Regulations and the management of waste will be evaluated under separate legal codes, these matters need not concern the Board for the purposes of this appeal.

7.3.3. The following assessment represents my de novo consideration of all planning issues material to the proposed development.

7.4. Principle of Development

7.4.1. This proposal is for a new storage warehouse in association with an existing warehouse facility at Oranstown, Dunboyne, Co. Meath. The appeal site is in the rural area outside of designated settlements. Rural areas are listed as a land use

zoning category in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (MCDP 2021). Section 11.14.6 of the MCDP 2021 sets out the details of each zoning category, including the specific zoning objective, permitted uses and uses open for consideration. The zoning objective for 'RA' Rural Areas is '*...to protect and promote in a balanced way, the development of agriculture, forestry and sustainable rural-related enterprise, community facilities, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and the built and cultural heritage.*'

- 7.4.2. Warehousing is not listed as a use in the permissible or open for consideration categories for the 'RA' zoning and is therefore deemed not to be acceptable in principle. However, the MCDP 2021 does recognise, in Section 11.14.2, that there are instances across the County of established uses that do not conform to the zoning objective for the particular location. In such instances the MCDP 2021 states that proposals for the expansion, improvement, or alteration of such uses will be considered on their individual merits. Section 4.11.1 of the MCDP 2021 relates to Rural Enterprise and includes various policies. Regard is had to Policy ED POL 26 which states that:

Meath County Council shall positively consider and assess development proposals for the expansion of existing authorised industrial or business enterprises in the countryside where the resultant development does not negatively impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area. In all instances, it should be demonstrated that the proposal would not generate traffic of a type and amount inappropriate for the standard of the access roads. This policy shall not apply to the National Road Network.

- 7.4.3. While I note the contention of third-party appellants and observers to this appeal, that developments of this nature should be located on zoned and serviced lands within designated settlements, I am satisfied having regard to the nature of the proposed development, which comprises the expansion of an existing authorised warehouse / storage facility in the rural area and the provisions of the Meath County Development Plan, namely Policy ED POL 20, that the proposed development would be acceptable in principle at this rural location. However, I would note that Policy ED POL 20 does not in itself suggest a positive presumption towards a grant of

permission, as this must be tempered by the fact that the policy clearly requires the resultant development to be of a nature and extent that remains appropriate to the area.

7.5. Traffic

- 7.5.1. One of the main issues associated with this development, as raised by the appellants and observers to this appeal, relates to traffic, in particular the type (HGV's) and volume of traffic generated and its impact on the local road network.
- 7.5.2. The site is accessed from the existing development entrance off the county road to the west. This entrance is located c700m south of the junction of with the R157 Regional Road. The R157 connects with the M3 at Junction 5, a further c 3km to the north and to the settlement of Maynooth, c7.5km to the south. The c700m section of the county road between the appeal site and the junction with the R157, is relatively narrow (c5m) and poorly aligned with limited passing opportunities. Much of the road is bounded by drainage ditches and minimal grass verges. There are no pedestrian facilities.
- 7.5.3. The applicants existing operations on site relate to the construction, collection and distribution of pallets and customised packaging. The process of delivery and transit of the business is carried out by Heavy Good Vehicles (HGV's). The proposed additional warehouse storage facility would increase the capacity of the applicant's business at this location, resulting in a likely increase in HGV traffic on the local road network.
- 7.5.4. On the issue of traffic, the applicants submitted an Outline Traffic Movement Strategy (OTMS) prepared by MHL and Associates Ltd and a Construction and Operational Traffic Management Plan (TMP) prepared by Lynch Associates, at further information stage. A supplementary report, prepared by MHL and Associates Ltd, was submitted as part of the applicant's response to the grounds of appeal.
- 7.5.5. The Outline Traffic Movement Strategy (OTMS) is described as a 'live' document that is to be used by the applicant's management team as part of operational

management process. The aim of the OTMS is to identify and understand the nature and requirements of the freight activity to the site; to establish as far as possible the preferred haulage routing/ network and to outline the most appropriate ways to reduce negative impacts of freight movement in the locality. The strategy sets out travel and transport proposals for the development which, in accordance with the details submitted, are designed to ensure that the traffic impact of the proposed development on the surrounding road network will be effectively managed, particularly during peak periods.

- 7.5.6. The OTMS identifies the County Road serving the site as the R2227. In accordance with the information provided by Observers to this appeal, the road in question is not the L2227, but on a small road off the L2227 and they wish to establish that the traffic count was carried out on the road the development is to occur and not the L2227. Having reviewed the document in question I am satisfied that the traffic count was carried out on the county road serving the appeal site and that any incorrect reference to this road as the R2227 would represent a minor discrepancy with no real bearing on the assessment or its conclusions.
- 7.5.7. As part of the OTMS, peak hour traffic flows were recorded by Traffinomics Ltd for the nearby local road, with these traffic counts recorded for the week between the 01/03/2022 and 07/03/2022. Peak traffic periods fall between 8-9am in the morning and 5-6pm in the evening. Results of the traffic count found that the local road is moderately trafficked with a business day mean of under 1000 vehicles. The predominant mode of travel is the private car (73.3%). The highest daily HGV flow was recorded on Thursday the 3rd of March 2022 with a total of 39no trips recorded, equating to 3.9% of the total traffic volume. The majority of these trips occurred between 9am and 1pm outside of peak hour traffic. Of the 39 HGV movements recorded, 27no (15 inbound and 12 outbound) are attributed to the applicant's site. This equates to c2.7% of the total traffic volume along the road. I note that there are likely seasonal variances in the volume of HGV traffic on the local road network, arising in particular from the agricultural sector; however, in my opinion such variances would be temporary and would not have a significant impact on the validity or findings of the traffic count.

- 7.5.8. Section 5 of the report considers the recorded collision statistics and notes that no collisions were recorded on the local road between 2005-2016 and only 1 collision recorded at the junction of the Maynooth Road, in 2006. This is seen as an indicator that the local road has successfully catered for the applicants traffic movements throughout the operation period. While I acknowledge the findings of the OTMS in relation to the absence of recorded collision statistics on the county road, I am aware of the concerns raised by third-parties which relate to the substandard nature of the local road, in terms of width and alignment, and the difficulties that arise when two opposing HGV's meet (congestion, dangerous reversing movements, erosion of the grass verge etc) and I am cognisant that an increase in HGV traffic movements on the local road does have the potential to exacerbate such concerns.
- 7.5.9. In terms of trip distribution, the OTMS assumed that all HGV traffic exiting the site will head north towards the junction with the R156. While I acknowledge the point by made by third parties that it would it is possible for vehicles to head south, given the nature of the development and the proximity of the site to the regional and national road network, I consider it reasonable to assume that the vast majority of HGV traffic would exit the site in a northerly direction.
- 7.5.10. The likely number of trips generated from the proposed development was garnered from the traffic survey and from TRICS data. The proposed extension is expected to generate an additional 20no HGV trips per day (10no entry/10no exit) on the nearby road network. The extended warehouse facility would thereby generate a total of c47no HGV trips per day, or 4.7% of the total traffic volume along the local road. The volume of traffic generated by the development falls below the threshold at which the production of Traffic and Transport Assessments is recommended (as per TII's PE-PDV-02045, Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines) and I note that the Transportation Department, in their report to the Planning Authority dated 22nd of December 2022, raised no objection to the proposed development stating that the anticipated additional 10 truck movements per day is not significant.
- 7.5.11. While I agree that the anticipated volume of HGV traffic generated by the existing and proposed development is low in comparison to total traffic volume along the road, the additional HGV trips generated will, I consider, increase the likelihood of

two opposing HGV's meeting on the county road. To address this issue the applicants are proposing to operate a Communication Travel Management Plan / Delivery Management System (DMS) whereby all drivers are to be in regular contact with the warehouse base via company mobile phones and email. Drivers will be assigned appropriate pickup /drop off routes and collection / delivery times with vehicular movements to and from the site, prioritised to minimise movements in peak traffic periods. A Mobility Manager is to be appointed to promote measures for monitoring and continuous improvement. In accordance with the details provided, DMS have proven effective in the management of flow of traffic by reducing the number of vehicles that arrive at any one time.

7.5.12. While the implementation of the proposed DMS will regulate the level of interaction between inbound and outbound HGV traffic from the site, the applicants acknowledge that they have no control over any other HGV vehicles using the local road. Therefore, as part of their response to the grounds of appeal, they have provided suggested passing bay improvements along the county road which they state they are willing to fund. The provision of passing bays as proposed would necessitate works on lands outside of the applicant's control. Such works did not form part of the application as presented to the Planning Authority and have not been directly assessed or commented on by the Planning Authority or by the Transportation Department of Meath County Council. For these reasons and in light of the issues raised by the observers, I am not satisfied that the provision of passing bays as proposed is feasible within the context of this current application.

7.5.13. Notwithstanding, I agree with the OTMS and the Transportation Department of Meath County Council, that the anticipated volume of traffic (20 HGV/day) is not significant. While I acknowledge the substandard nature of the local road serving the site, I note the proximity of the site to the regional road network (c700m / c1 minute truck transit), and I am satisfied that the implementation of the movement strategy measures outlined in the OTMS and TMP would be sufficient to mitigate the impact of HGV traffic (existing and proposed) from this facility. The adjoining regional and national road network is I consider adequate to cater for the additional traffic movement generated.

7.5.14. I therefore conclude that the development as proposed would not have a significant negative impact on the safety or carrying capacity of the local road network. While I note the concerns raised by the Third-Party Appellant regarding the potential for additional traffic to be generated in the event of a change of ownership / use of the warehouse facility, I would be of the opinion that this concern could be addressed by way of condition. On this matter I refer the Board to Condition 6 as attached to the previous grant of planning permission MCC Ref: DA/70011 which restricts the use of the warehouse then permitted for the storage of packaging associated with the existing business on site etc. and I recommend that a similar condition be included in the event of a grant of permission.

Parking:

7.5.15. The proposed scheme (as amended) includes proposals for the provision of 5no additional car parking spaces (15no in total), a designated parking area for HGV vehicles to the north of the site and proposals for bicycle parking (12no.) to the front (west) of the site. While car parking provision is below the recommended standard set out in the MCDP, I am satisfied, having regard to the nature of the development proposed and the anticipated number of staff (14) that on-site parking proposals would be sufficient. Furthermore, I am satisfied that there is sufficient hard surfaced area within the confines of the site to accommodate overflow parking should the need arise.

7.6. Water Services:

7.6.1. The appeal site is served by an existing on-site wastewater treatment and disposal system and bored well. The third-party appellant has raised concerns regarding the capacity of the existing WWTS to cater for the additional load generated by this development, as well as concerns relating to the yield and quality of the water supply, which is to serve as a drinking water supply, general supply (toilets / cleaning etc.) and as a source for the fire water tank. However, the applicants, as set out in their response to the grounds of appeal, are satisfied that the nature of the operations carried out on site (warehouse storage) together with the low number of

staff numbers, ensures that there is a low loading on the onsite WWTS and a low demand on the existing water supply. They have also clarified that as there is no required discharge rate from the fire water tank, there is no additional demand on the water supply.

- 7.6.2. Following a review of the planning history associated with this site, the existing development would appear to be served by a Bio-Cycle unit, permitted in 2001 under the previous grant of permission, ABP Ref. PL17.121313 / (MCC PL Ref:99/2594). This system is shown on the site layout plans submitted to be located to the southwest corner of the applicant's business premises, in an area finished in concrete. In accordance with the details provided, the expanded facility, once fully operational, will employ 5no. additional employees to the 9no present on site. This represents an increase of c55% in staff numbers and a corresponding increase in loading on the WWTS. In addition, the proposed development will increase the level of activity on site with additional collections and deliveries, which also has the potential to result in an increase in loading on the WWTS. The Board will note that the facility was previously expanded in 2007 on foot of the grant of permission under, MCC PL Ref: DA70011. The impact of this expansion, if any, on the existing WWTS, in terms of loading etc, is unclear.
- 7.6.3. No details have been provided in relation to the size / capacity of the existing WWTS nor has it been demonstrated as part of the application that this system is operating effectively in accordance with relevant EPA standards. In the absence of this information, it is not possible to determine that the existing WWTS is adequate to cater for the additional loading likely to be generated by the proposed development or that it would not result in the contamination of soils, sub-soils, and water bodies.
- 7.6.4. In relation to water supply, no information has been provided in relation to the yield and quality of the supply required to facilitate the proposed development.

Drainage

- 7.6.5. With respect to drainage, it is proposed that all the storm water from hard surface areas within the proposed development site be collected via a series of gullies, drains and pipework. All new yard / road stormwater shall pass through petrol/oil interceptor. A new 300sqm underground surface water attenuation tank will receive stormwater from the roof of the new building and from the outfall of the petrol / oil interceptor. Storm water from the attenuation tank will then discharge to a 600mm concrete surface water pipe site. Storm water calculations along with design details of the interceptor and attenuation tank were included with the application.
- 7.6.6. MCC's Water Services Section in their report to the PA dated 02/12/2021 state that the development as proposed broadly meets their requirements with respect to the orderly collection, treatment, and disposal of surface water. However, they have listed several issues that they consider need to be addressed prior to the commencement of development. They have raised concerns regarding the design and sizing of the proposed attenuation tank, which they consider to be undersized and have stated the need for a trial hole to be excavated to determine the level of the water - the findings of which may influence the design of the attenuation system. They have also queried the existence and capacity of the existing surface water drain to which the applicants are proposing to discharge.
- 7.6.7. The issues raised by MCC's Water Services Section have been addressed by the Planning Authority by way of condition (Condition 7); however, given the scale of the development proposed (in terms of site coverage/extent of hard surfaced areas), the inadequacies identified in the design and sizing of the proposed attenuation system and the uncertainties regarding the existence and capacity of the existing surface water drain, I am not satisfied on the basis of the information available, that proposals for the collection and disposal of surface waters on site are adequate to cater for the proposed development and would not result in the contamination of ground / surface waters.

7.7. Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

- 7.7.1. The proposed structure has a high-bay portal frame steel construction, with Kingspan cladding panels on the roof and ceiling and blockwork wall 2.5 meters in height at ground level. The structure has a stated GFA of 3,860sqm and a height of 13.015m (including parapet). The structure in terms of its design and material finish is I consider reflective of a large-scale agricultural building. The proposed structure is in the rural area to the rear (east) of two existing warehouse structures of similar design, but of a lesser height (c7.5m to 8.5m). The structure is set back c115m from the public road. The landscape plan (Drawing No. 20104/PL07/Rev B), details proposals for a new hedgerow along the site's eastern boundary. The predominant land use in the immediate vicinity of the site is agricultural with farm buildings c80m to the southeast and c250m to the northwest. There are also a number of one-off dwellings in the vicinity. The subject site does not fall within any designated scenic view.
- 7.7.2. Appendix 5 of the MCDP 2021 includes a Landscape Character Assessment which divides the county into four main character types which are then subdivided into 20 geographically distinct Landscape Character Area. The proposed development is located within the LCA 11 - Southeast lowlands character area. This area is identified as having a 'very high' landscape value, a 'medium' landscape sensitivity and 'Regional' landscape importance. Map 4 of the Landscape Character Assessment indicates potential capacity for various development types. It is noted that LCA 11 is designated as having a "Medium" potential capacity to accommodate large-scale agricultural buildings although careful planning, considering location, appearance and landscape treatment will be necessary to avoid negative impacts.
- 7.7.3. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) prepared by Macro Works Ltd. Was submitted with the application. This document describes the landscape context of the proposed development and assesses the likely landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development on the receiving environment. The LVIA selects a 2km study area which is considered reasonable given the nature and scale of the proposed development and the nature of the receiving environment. Three viewshed reference points (VRP's) are identified as a basis for assessment. These viewpoints

are illustrated in a series of photomontages prepared by Macro Works Ltd. I have reviewed the viewpoints and photomontages submitted with the application and I have carried out an inspection of the area; I consider that the viewpoints and photomontages provided are sufficient for assessment purposes.

7.7.4. The visual impact of one of the VRP's (VP3) was deemed to be negligible due to the high degree of existing screening. The upper portion of the façade of the proposed storage unit can be seen from VP1 and VP2 while the lower portion benefits from intervening screening. The impact of the two viewpoints is deemed to be 'Slight' and 'Moderate to Slight' respectively and in the case of VP2 is a very localised effect. In terms of landscape impacts, the proposed structure is not considered to conflict unduly with the prevailing landscape character of its immediate surrounds, particularly as it will adjoin two existing structures of similar type and design. For this reason, the LVIA predicts a 'Slight' level of landscape impact for the application site and its immediate surroundings, which is likely to reduce quickly to an 'imperceptible' level of impact with increased distance.

7.7.5. Having regard to the landscape and visual impact judgements provided throughout the LVIA and having inspected the site, I am of the opinion that while the proposed storage unit in Oranstown, County Meath would be visible (in parts) from the surrounding local road network and from adjoining properties, its impact on the landscape character and visual amenities of the area would not be significant. The proposed structure is set back from the road and would form a cluster with existing buildings of similar type, design and material finish and would not disrupt projected views. I therefore do not recommend that permission be refused on this basis.

7.8. Residential Amenity:

7.8.1. It is the contention of the third-party appellants that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the rural residential amenity of their property, the single storey detached dwelling to the north of the applicants holding. They consider that the proposed warehouse structure, due to its height and scale and its proximity to their home, would have a negative impact in terms of overshadowing and visual

intrusion. They have also raised concerns of potential impacts during the operational phase of the development, in terms of noise and light pollution, loss of privacy and security issues. The depreciation in property values is also raised as a concern.

Overshadowing / Loss of Light:

- 7.8.2. A Daylight and Sunlight Assessment was submitted with the application at further information stage. The aim of the study was to record and analysis any potential daylight or sunlight impact the proposed development may have on adjacent properties, in particular the two residential properties to the north of the applicant holding and the residential property to the west, on the opposite side of the road. The report has regard to BRE Guidance.
- 7.8.3. In relation to the loss of daylight, I refer the Board to Section 2.2.4 of BRE Guidance 2022¹, which states that the loss of light to existing windows need not be analysed if the distance of each part of the new development from the existing window is three or more times its height above the centre of the existing window, as in these cases the loss of light will be small. In this instance, the proposed warehouse has a height of 13.215m and the height of a typical window above ground level is c1.5m; therefore, the effect on existing buildings more than 35.145m (3 x (13.215 – 1.5)), from the proposed warehouse structure need not be analysed. Drawing No. 201004/PL12/Rev A, submitted with the application, shows the distance between the proposed warehouse and adjoining properties. The closest dwelling, identified on the drawing as Receptor No.1, is shown to be located c79m from the proposed warehouse building. Therefore, as per BRE Guidance, the impact of the proposed structure in terms of loss of light on this property and other properties in the vicinity would be small. I am satisfied that further analysis is not required.
- 7.8.4. In terms of overshadowing, BRE guidance recommends that at least half of the rear garden of a house should receive two hours sunlight on the 21st of March. The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment includes details of an overshadowing assessment which was completed using computer software and which is presented on Drawing

¹ The Building Research Establishment's (BRE 209) Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to Good Practice' (2022 edition) ("BRE Guidance 2022").

No's: 20104/ PL 10 Rev. A, and 20104/PL11/ Rev A. This study examines the shadows cast by both the existing and proposed development, on the sensitive receptors (nearby residential properties) on March 21st equinox. The results show only a marginal impact on Receptor No.1 from the proposed water tank at 07:28am. The new warehouse structure will not cast any additional shadow on adjoining properties and all properties will retain an excellent level of sunlight on the March 21st. Overall, I am satisfied that the analysis shows the proposed development has an imperceptible daylight, sunlight / overshadowing impact on neighboring properties.

Visual Intrusion

- 7.8.5. The proposed warehouse structure is to be located to southeast of the appellants' property and to the rear of two existing warehouse structures. Following consideration of the drawings submitted with the application and having inspected the site, I am satisfied that the separation distance between the appellants property and the proposed warehouse (50+ meters) is sufficient to ensure no undue overbearing impact. In addition, while the structure will be visible (in part) from the appellant's property and would, to a degree, alter the outlook from than property, the impact of same would not in my opinion be so significant as to warrant a refusal or redesign.

Operational Impacts:

- 7.8.6. The proposed development will result in an increased level of activity on site which in turn has the potential to result in additional levels of noise and nuisance etc. Given the nature of the development a storage warehouse, the primary source of impact is. I consider, likely to result from additional traffic movements within the site and from the loading and unloading of vehicles. As previously discussed, it is estimated that the proposed development will result in an additional 20 HGV trips per day (10 inbound and 10 outbound) which is not significant. The applicants are proposing to implement a Delivery Management System to regulate HGV traffic movements to and from the site. the implementation of this system should, I consider, also help to regulate the level of noise generated within the site.

- 7.8.7. I refer the Board to the Conditions attached to the previous grant of planning permission ABP PL 17.121313, in particular, Conditions 2, 3 and 7. Condition 2 restricts the hours of operation on site, Condition 3 restricts the noise levels within the site when measured as noise sensitive locations and Condition 7 requires the development to operate so that there are no emissions (malodours, fumes, dust etc), no industrial effluent, and no noise vibration or electrical interference generated on site such as would give reasonable cause for annoyance to any person in any residence or public place in the vicinity. Compliance with these conditions should I consider help to ensure that the impacts of the development on the amenities of adjoining properties are protected.
- 7.8.8. An Outdoor Lighting Report was submitted with the application at further information stage. Following review of this document and the associated drawings (No's RE/MCP/01- Rev0 and RE/MCP/01- Rev1) I am satisfied that no additional light overspill onto adjoining residential property is likely to occur as a result of the proposed development. The boundary wall between the applicants holding and the adjoining property to the north, at c1.8m in height, should I consider, help to mitigate light spillage from vehicles. I also consider this wall to be sufficient in terms of privacy and security.

Depreciation of value

- 7.8.9. The appellants raise a concern that the development of this site as proposed would result in a depreciation in the value of their properties. However, having regard to the assessment and conclusions set out above I am satisfied that the proposed development, which comprises an extension to an established warehouse storage facility, would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the value of property in the vicinity.

Residential Amenity - Conclusion

- 7.8.10. Having regard to the assessment and conclusions set out above, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the enjoyment or value of property in the

vicinity. Accordingly, I do not recommend that the proposed development be refused for reasons relating to impacts on neighbouring amenities.

7.9. Appropriate Assessment:

7.9.1. The appeal site is not located within or directly adjacent to any European site. The closest site, the Rye Water Valley/Carton SAC (site code:001398) is located c3.6km to the south. I am not aware of any direct hydrological link between the appeal site and the Rye Water Valley/Carton SAC or any other designated site. Having regard to the nature of the development proposed comprising a storage warehouse in associated with an established warehouse facility, the nature of the receiving environment and the separation distance between the appeal site and the European Sites 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 these European sites.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend that permission for the proposed development be refused for the reason outlined below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

On the basis of the information on file in relation to proposals for foul sewerage, water supply, and surface water drainage, the Board is not satisfied that:

- The existing wastewater treatment and disposal system serving the site is adequate to cater for the additional loading that would be generated by this development.
- The water supply is adequate in terms of quality and yield to cater for the additional demand likely generated by the proposed development.
- Proposals for the collection and disposal of surface waters on site are adequate to cater for the proposed development.

The Board is therefore unable to determine that proposed development would not be prejudicial to public health or result in the contamination of ground / surface waters. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Lucy Roche
Planning Inspector

31st July 2023