



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-315346-22

Development	Alterations and extension to rear of dwelling house, construction of agricultural shed, upgrade of effluent treatment system, and associated site works.
Location	Derrynameel, Toorglass West, Belmullet, Co. Mayo
Planning Authority	Mayo County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	21/1256
Applicant(s)	Hanneke Mooji
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refusal
Type of Appeal	First Party -v- Decision
Appellant(s)	Hanneke Mooji
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	7 th March 2023
Inspector	Hugh D. Morrison

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy and Context.....	6
5.1. Development Plan.....	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	7
5.3. EIA Screening	8
6.0 The Appeal	8
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
6.2. Planning Authority Response	9
6.3. Observations	9
6.4. Further Responses.....	9
7.0 Assessment.....	9
8.0 Recommendation.....	17
9.0 (i) Reasons and Considerations.....	17
10.0 Conditions	18
11.0 (ii) Reasons and Considerations	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located 6.2km to the east of Belmullet on the L-52581-0, which runs between the R314 in the north and the R313 in the south. This site lies on lands that are the subject of gentle/moderate gradients, which rise generally in easterly and southerly directions. Three wind turbines dot the higher slopes. These lands are a mixture of fields and bog, which together form a rural area that is open and expansive in character. They are punctuated by one-off dwelling houses and accompanying outbuildings.
- 1.2. The site itself is of regular shape and it extends over an area of 0.52 hectares. This site lies at a lower level than the adjoining local road and it presently accommodates a traditional cottage (60 sqm) and two outbuildings, one of which lies to the south-west of this cottage and one of which lies further to the south of it. The site is accompanied by a small, fenced field to the west, which is in the applicant's ownership.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Under the proposal, the existing cottage (60 sqm) would be extended to the rear (westwards elevation) to provide 155 sqm of floorspace over two-levels. This extension would be of rectangular form under a double pitched roof with straight gabled ends. It would be attached to the cottage by means of a flat-roofed single storey link element. In conjunction with the construction of the extension, the cottage would be altered internally to provide three double bedrooms, while the extension would provide mainly daytime accommodation with an additional double bedroom on a mezzanine floor.
- 2.2. Under the proposal, the existing shed to the south-west would be retained, while the existing shed further to the south would be replaced with a larger, lean-to, agricultural shed (123 sqm) with vehicular and pedestrian doors in its northern elevation.
- 2.3. Under the proposal, too, an existing septic tank to the west of the cottage would be de-commissioned once a new domestic waste water treatment system (DWWTS) is

installed to the north. This three-stage DWWTS would incorporate a filter system composed of a raised gravel bed over imported sand/silt soil.

- 2.4. The proposal was amended under further information. Thus, each of the windows in the existing cottage would be replaced, and the link element would be extended to incorporate a w.c. The proposed extension would be re-sited slightly to the north and at a lowered level in relation to the cottage. Its width would be reduced, its length would be increased, and its overall height would fall. Likewise, the roof pitch for the proposed replacement agricultural shed would be eased and a second vehicular door would be introduced.
- 2.5. At the appeal stage, the applicant has submitted an alternative version of the proposal to that submitted under further information. This version would entail the specification of straight gables to the cottage, which presently has fully hipped gables.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was refused for the following reason:

Based on the details submitted in this application, it is considered that the proposed domestic extension, by reason of its excessive scale, design, and finish in an elevated location and visible from a scenic route, would, if permitted, fail to integrate effectively into the local setting and receiving rural landscape.

Furthermore, the proposed large agricultural shed within the curtilage of an existing residence has not been adequately substantiated, and together with its scale and design is considered out of character with the residential nature of the site.

Therefore, the proposed development, if permitted, would be at odds with the Mayo Rural House Design Guidelines and would contravene Objective BEO15 of the current Mayo County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 in relation to extensions to traditional buildings.

Furthermore, the proposed development does not conform to Development Management Standard 2.7 Rural Extensions and 2.8 Rural Garages/Sheds contained in the Mayo County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 which (in general) requires extensions/sheds to be subordinate to the existing dwelling/shed unless in exceptional cases – will consider larger size/scale subject to a high quality contemporary and innovative design.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development, if permitted, would interfere with the character of the rural landscape which is necessary to preserve and would seriously injure the visual amenity of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The following further information was sought:

- Submission of a Stage 1 screening for appropriate assessment, and a Stage 2 Natura Impact Study, as appropriate.
- The re-siting of the proposed DWWTS in a position where suitable percolation may arise, and the submission of a cross section of the DWWTS, including the raised filter bed, and specification of the DWWTS.
- Details of the soak pit.
- A revised design solution for the extension, i.e., it should be single storey and commensurate with the cottage in scale, form, fenestration, and finish, and with a roof of similar form.
- In the light of the size of the proposed agricultural shed, the submission of documentary evidence of any farming activities, the nature of the need prompting the size of shed, and photographic evidence of vehicles and machinery to be stored therein.

The Planning Authority expressed satisfaction with the further information submitted with respect to the first, second, and third points, but not the fourth and fifth points, where its concerns were not overcome – hence its reason for refusal.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Mayo County Council

- Environment: Following receipt of further information, no objection.
- Area Engineer: Requests improvements to the roadside frontage of the site, i.e., wall set back from carriageway and drainage arrangements.
- Architect: Objects, suggestions made concerning a different design approach.

4.0 Planning History

- 96/1126: Septic tank: Permitted.

5.0 Policy and Context

5.1. Development Plan

Under Appendix 2 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (CDP), the County Landscape Appraisal shows the site as lying within the Landscape Character Area (LCA) C known as the North-West Coastal Bog and in the Policy Area 1 known as Montane Coastal Zone. The relevant critical landscape factors are listed as being smooth terrain, and low vegetation.

The LCA shows the site as lying within a sensitive peat bog area wherein the following policy applies:

These areas have a distinctive, homogenous character, dominated by natural processes. Development in these areas has the potential to create impacts on the appearance and character of an extensive part of the landscape. Applications for development in these areas must demonstrate an awareness of these inherent limitations by having a very high standard of site selection, siting layout, selection of materials and finishes. Applications in these areas may also be required to consider ecological, archaeological, water quality and noise factors insofar as it affects the preservation of the amenities of the area.

The LCA also shows the R314, which runs on an east/west axis to the north of the site, as being a scenic route with scenic views.

The Planning Authority's reason for refusal cites the following:

- *Built Environment Objective (BEO) 15:*

To ensure that conversions or extensions of traditional buildings or the provision of new adjoining buildings, are sensitively designed and do not detract from the character of the historic building.

It also cites the following Development Management Standards:

- *2.7: Rural Housing Extensions shall:*
 - *In general, be subordinate to the existing dwelling in its size, unless in exceptional cases, a larger extension compliments the existing dwelling in its design and massing.*
 - *Reflect the window proportions, detailing and finishes, texture, materials and colour of the existing dwelling, unless a high quality contemporary and innovatively designed extension is proposed.*
 - *Not have an adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining properties through undue overlooking, undue overshadowing and/or an over dominant visual impact.*
 - *Carefully consider site coverage to avoid unacceptable loss of private open space.*

Where an extension increases the potential occupancy of the dwelling, the adequacy of the on-site sewage treatment (in unsewered areas) should be demonstrated by the applicant.
- *2.8: Rural Housing Garages / Sheds shall:*
 - *In general, be subordinate to the existing dwelling in its size, unless in exceptional cases, a larger garage / shed compliments the existing dwelling in its design and massing.*
 - *Not have an adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining properties through undue overlooking, undue overshadowing and/or an over dominant visual impact.*
 - *Carefully consider site coverage to avoid unacceptable loss of private open space.*

The Planning Authority's request for further information also cited the following:

Objective LP-01: It is an objective of the Council, through the Landscape Appraisal of County Mayo, to recognise and facilitate appropriate development in a manner that has regard to the character and sensitivity of the landscape and to ensure that development will not have a disproportionate effect on existing or future character of a landscape in terms of location, design and visual prominence.

Section 3.1 of the Mayo Rural Design Guide, which addresses house form.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- Broadhaven Bay SAC (000472)

- Mullet/Blacksod Bay Complex SAC (000470)
- Blacksod Bay/Broad Haven SPA (004037)

5.3. EIA Screening

The proposal is for an extension, which is not a class or type of development for the purpose of EIA.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The proposed extension:

- While it would not be subordinate, the overall scale and massing would be appropriate. The new dwelling house on the seaward side of the R314 is cited as a comparable project (20/379).
- While its roadside elevation would be compatible with the cottage, if deemed necessary, then the cottage's hipped gables could be replaced with straight ones.
- The site is a considerable distance away from the R314 (scenic route). The proposed extension would not be conspicuous and, insofar as it would be seen, it would be against the backdrop of Glencastle hillside and within the context of other dwelling houses.

The proposed shed:

- Its description as "large" by the Planning Authority is contested: At 123 sqm it would not be a large agricultural shed.
- Its site would be lower than the adjacent local road and so its height would be less than 2m above this road.
- Its design would be appropriate for the site: sheds of all shapes and sizes have been permitted in the Mayo countryside.
- Its visibility would be limited, as it, too, would be seen against the backdrop of Glencastle hillside.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

None

6.3. **Observations**

None

6.4. **Further Responses**

None

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. I have reviewed the proposal in the light of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (CDP), relevant planning history, the submissions of the parties, and my own site visit. Accordingly, I consider that this application/appeal should be assessed under the following headings:

- (i) Need for an agricultural shed,
- (ii) Landscape and visual impacts,
- (iii) Water, and
- (iv) Stage 1 Screening for Appropriate Assessment.

(i) Need for an agricultural shed

7.2. The site has an area of 0.52 hectares. It overlaps with lands that have a stated area of 1.78 hectares on the Ordnance Survey extract submitted as a location plan. The greater part of these lands is a fenced field. At present the cottage has within its curtilage two outbuildings: one to the south-east and one further to the south. The former would be retained as a stable and fodder/tack room, and the latter would be replaced with a larger building, which would have a mono-pitched roof, and, as amended, two vehicular doors in its front (north-facing) elevation.

7.3. The proposed replacement building is described as being an agricultural shed. Under further information, the Planning Authority, enquired as to the need for this shed, which would have a gross internal area of 123.25 sqm, i.e., 14.5m x 8.5m, and

a height between 3m and 4.77m (4.28m under the revised plans). The applicant was asked to state how this shed would be used and to submit documentary and photographic evidence of the need for it. She stated that it would be used as a dry store and for the storage of machinery and equipment. She submitted a set of photographs which show two horses in her field and the exterior and the interior of the outbuilding to be retained. These photographs also show a Land Cruiser type of vehicle and a horse box trailer. They were taken elsewhere than on the site. The implication is that they would be stored in the proposed shed.

- 7.4. The applicant's Stage 1 Appropriate Assessment Screening states that the proposed agricultural shed would be split in half with one side being used as a garage and the other side for stabling three horses.
- 7.5. During my site visit, I did not observe any animals either on the site or on the adjoining field. Likewise, I did not observe either the above cited vehicle or trailer. I did observe that both existing outbuildings appeared to have been recently re-roofed and that the one proposed for demolition is built of stone. Clearly, it is possible that my site visit coincided with any animals and this vehicle and trailer being elsewhere.
- 7.6. In the light of the above, a degree of confusion surrounds the use of the proposed agricultural shed and the need for it in conjunction with the retention of one of the existing outbuildings remains to be properly substantiated.
- 7.7. In the light of the above, I conclude that the applicant has not satisfactorily explained why an agricultural shed of the size, siting and design proposed would be needed.

(ii) Landscape and visual impacts

- 7.8. Under the CDP's County Landscape Appraisal (CLA), the site is shown as lying within an area of rising bogland, which is characterised by its smooth terrain and low vegetation. The sensitivity of this open and expansive landscape to development is acknowledged. As development is not easily absorbed and may be widely visible, the need for "a very high standard of site selection, siting layout, selection of materials and finishes" is advised. The CLA designates the R314, which passes 285m to the north of the site, as a scenic route.
- 7.9. During my site visit, I approached the site along the L-52581-0 initially from the south and then from the north. This local road rises, plateaus, and falls as it passes the site on its way to meet the R314. Due to the open and expansive nature of the landscape

views in all directions are available, including to the north along the coastline. From the R314, the site appears in the middle distance, and it is seen against the rising hillside to the east. From a very few points, the existing cottage appears on the localised skyline. These views are fleeting and intermittent. As the site adjoins the local road, views of it from this road are extensive, and notwithstanding the lower siting of the existing cottage and outbuildings in relation to it, they are clearly visible.

- 7.10. The existing cottage on the site is small in size, elongated and low-slung in form, and of traditional design. The two outbuildings are sited within its curtilage, and they are ancillary in scale to this cottage. In sum these buildings maintain a relatively discrete presence within the landscape.
- 7.11. Under the proposal, the cottage would be extended by means of a parallel building to its rear, which would be connected to it by a link element. As originally submitted, this building would have been sited wholly to the rear of the cottage. However, its size borne of its width and height would cause it to be much larger than the cottage. As revised under further information, the new building would be re-sited slightly to the north, such that it would project beyond the cottage. It would be reduced slightly in width and its ground floor level would be lowered slightly. Consequently, it would not be as large, and its relationship with the cottage would be eased somewhat.
- 7.12. The Planning Authority refused the proposal. In doing so it cited BEO 15 of the CDP, which undertakes to ensure that extensions to traditional buildings are “sensitively designed and do not detract from the character of the historic building.” It also cited Section 2.7, which addresses rural housing extensions, and requires that they be subordinate in size, unless a larger one would complement the existing dwelling in its design and massing, and reflect the existing dwelling, unless a high-quality contemporary design is proposed. The Planning Authority judged that the proposed extension would not meet these provisions of the CDP.
- 7.13. The applicant has responded to the Planning Authority’s refusal by acknowledging that the proposed extension would not be subordinate. She, however, contends that its scale and massing would be appropriate. In this respect, she draws attention to the dwelling house permitted under 20/379, which is nearing completion on the seaward side of the R314. The form and design of this dwelling house would be similar to her proposal. She also proposes to re-specify straight gables to the

cottage, instead of the existing hipped ones, to ensure greater compatibility with the proposed extension.

- 7.14. During my site visit, I observed the comparable cited by the applicant. Insofar as it entailed the replacement of an existing dwelling house with a new one, it differs from the current proposal, which is for the extension of an existing cottage. With respect to the applicant's gables proposal, I consider that part of the character of the cottage arises from the existing hipped gables, and that this character would be eroded by the applicant's proposal to straighten them. Furthermore, Section 2.7 does not envisage changing the "point of reference", but designing any new build extension to complement what already exists.
- 7.15. I have considered the proposed extension under its original and revised versions. While I consider that the progression from one version to the other has eased somewhat the relationship that would exist between the old and the new, I remain concerned that the proposed extension would continue to detract from the character of the traditional cottage. Specifically, it would compete with rather than complement this cottage, due to its size, particularly its width and height, roof shape, and design, which continues to entail a mezzanine floor with associated fenestration. Consequently, this extension would upset the relatively discrete array of buildings on the site, by introducing an eye catching and discordant addition.
- 7.16. Turning to the proposed agricultural shed, it would be over four times the size of the building it would replace. This shed would be of utilitarian form, design, and finish. As amended, access/egress to the additional vehicular door would be constrained by the proximity of the outbuilding to be retained (c. 5m away). The shed would replace a relatively discrete outbuilding of stone construction with one that would be visible from the adjacent local road. It would be larger than the cottage and its siting would obscure/compete with views of the cottage presently available to northbound users traveling along the adjacent local road.
- 7.17. The Planning Authority's reason for refusal refers to the proposed agricultural shed, too. In this respect, Section 2.8 of the CDP is referred to, which addresses rural sheds. As with extensions, such sheds should be subordinate to existing dwelling houses, unless as larger structures their design and massing would be complementary.

- 7.18. The applicant has responded to the Planning Authority's reason for refusal by drawing attention to the site of the proposed agricultural, which would be lower than that of the adjacent road. She also draws attention to the variety of shapes and sizes exhibited by sheds throughout the Mayo countryside.
- 7.19. I consider that, notwithstanding the level of the site, the proposed agricultural shed would be clearly visible from the local road. Given its siting within the curtilage of a traditional cottage, its relationship with the same is of importance. Due to its size, siting, and design, this relationship would be problematic. Its size would cause it to be larger than this cottage and so not subordinate to it. Its siting would cause it to obstruct views of the cottage and thus reduce its legibility from the adjacent local road. Its utilitarian design would detract from the setting of the cottage and hence its character.
- 7.20. I conclude that the proposed extension and the proposed agricultural shed would detract from the character and setting of the traditional cottage on the site. They would fail to be subordinate to this cottage and, unlike the existing buildings on the site, they would stand out within the landscape as discordant additions to the site, which would be seriously injurious to the visual amenities of the area.

(iii) Water

- 7.21. The applicant has not stated by what means water is supplied to the existing cottage. Her Site Suitability Assessment states that there are no wells within 250m, and so I deduce that water is supplied either by means of the public mains or a group water scheme.
- 7.22. Under the OPW's flood maps, the site is not shown as being the subject of any identified flood risk.
- 7.23. Under further information, the applicant submitted drawing no. PL(30)01, which shows the proposed stormwater drainage system that would serve the proposed extension to the cottage. This system would incorporate a soak pit, which would be sited to the west of this extension, and which would have an overflow to an adjacent land drain. Details of how stormwater from the proposed agricultural shed would be handled have not been submitted. If the Board is minded to grant, then these details should be conditioned.

- 7.24. The existing cottage is served by a conventional septic tank, which is sited adjacent to the western boundary of the site. Under the proposal, a new DWWTS would be installed in the northern portion of the site and the existing septic tank would be decommissioned.
- 7.25. The applicant acknowledges that site conditions are poor, due to the prevalence of bog and the incidence of a high-water table during winter months. She explains that the siting of the new DWWTS would reflect where the least peat cover pertains and ease of access for future maintenance. She emphasises that her proposal is to replace an existing septic tank with an upgraded DWWTS.
- 7.26. The applicant has submitted a Site Suitability Assessment (SSA). This SSA advises that a trial hole was dug to a depth of 2.5m. While a layer of potential gravel and clay was detected beneath the initial peat, the water table was above this layer. Consequently, “T” and “P” tests could not be conducted. The SSA recommends that, as a replacement to the existing septic tank, a tertiary treatment system be installed, and an infiltration/treatment area be formed. The former would be a Tricel Novo treatment unit, which would discharge to tertiary Puraflo units, and the latter would entail the formation of a raised mound comprising a 90 sqm gravel bed to a minimum depth of 300mm laid on geotextile over imported sand/silt soils (“T” value greater than 50) to a minimum depth of 900mm. The surface and sides of the mound would be finished in soils dislodged from site excavations.
- 7.27. I conclude that, provided the proposed stormwater drainage arrangements are extended to serve the proposed agricultural shed, too, they would be satisfactory. I conclude, too, that, as a replacement to the existing septic tank, the proposed, higher performing DWWTS would represent an improvement on how waste water is handled on the site at present.

(iv) Stage 1 Screening for Appropriate Assessment

- 7.28. The requirements of Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive as related to screening the need for appropriate assessment of a project under Part XAB, Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 – 2023, are considered fully in this section.
- 7.29. The applicant has submitted a screening report for appropriate assessment as part of the application. This report reached the following conclusion:

Having examined the works in respect of the Natura 2000 network, no impacts either direct, indirect or cumulative are predicted on the habitats or species for which the SAC and SPA is designated to protect. The project as described is said to screen out for Appropriate Assessment.

- 7.30. The project is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European site and therefore it needs to be determined if the development is likely to have significant effects on a European site(s).
- 7.31. The proposed development is examined in relation to any possible interaction with European sites designated Special Conservation Areas (SAC) and Special Protection Areas (SPA) to assess whether it may give rise to significant effects on any European site.
- 7.32. The applicant provides the following description of the project on page 6 of the AA screening report: Alterations and extension to rear of dwelling house, construction of agricultural shed, upgrade of effluent treatment system, and associated site works.
- 7.33. The applicant also provides a description of the site habitats on page 12 of the AA screening report.
- 7.34. Taking account of the characteristics of the proposed development in terms of its location and the scale of works, the following issues are considered for examination in terms of implications for likely significant effects on European sites:
- Construction phase: uncontrolled surface water run-off bearing silt and pollutants, and
 - Operational phase: waste water generated by the residential use of the developed site.
- 7.35. The development site is not located in or immediately adjacent to a European site. The closest European site is the Broadhaven Bay SAC (000472) and the Blacksod Bay/Broad Haven SPA (004037), which lie c. 0.8km to the north.
- 7.36. The EPA's map of the area surrounding the site show a stream passing to its south and west. The applicant's site plan (PL(30)(01) shows a drainage ditch, which is sited centrally within the site and runs westwards, and it indicates that the direction of groundwater flow is to the north-west. Accordingly, there maybe a hydrological link(s) between the site and the aforementioned SAC and SPA.

7.37. The Broadhaven Bay SAC has the following qualifying interests:

- *Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide* [1140]
- *Large shallow inlets and bays* [1160]
- *Reefs* [1170]
- *Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae)* [1330]
- *Submerged or partially submerged sea caves* [8330]

In each case the conservation objective is to maintain the favourable conservation condition of the qualifying interests.

7.38. The Blacksod Bay/Broad Haven SPA has the following qualifying interests:

- *Red-throated Diver (Gavia stellata)* [A001]
- *Great Northern Diver (Gavia immer)* [A003]
- *Slavonian Grebe (Podiceps auritus)* [A007]
- *Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota)* [A046]
- *Common Scoter (Melanitta nigra)* [A065]
- *Red-breasted Merganser (Mergus serrator)* [A069]
- *Ringed Plover (Charadrius hiaticula)* [A137]
- *Sanderling (Calidris alba)* [A144]
- *Dunlin (Calidris alpina)* [A149]
- *Bar-tailed Godwit (Limosa lapponica)* [A157]
- *Curlew (Numenius arquata)* [A160]
- *Sandwich Tern (Sterna sandvicensis)* [A191]
- *Dunlin (Calidris alpina schinzii)* [A466]
- *Wetland and Waterbirds* [A999]

In each case the conservation objective is to maintain the favourable conservation condition of the qualifying interests.

7.39. Potentially, during the construction phase, water borne pollutants from the site could affect the qualifying interests of the SAC and the SPA. Potentially, too, during the operational phase, sewage from the site could affect these qualifying interests.

- During the construction phase, the use of standard construction practices would ensure that water borne pollutants do not enter the existing drainage ditch on the site.

- During the operational phase, the upgrade of the effluent treatment system would entail the replacement of the existing septic tank with a three-stage domestic waste water treatment system. The existing risk of sewage entering the groundwater would be reduced thereby.

These measures would be undertaken to safeguard water quality regardless of the European Sites cited above.

- 7.40. I am not aware of any other plans or projects in the area surrounding the site, which could in combination with the current project affect the SAC and SPA.
- 7.41. No measures designed or intended to avoid or reduce any harmful effects of the project on a European site have been relied upon in this screening exercise.
- 7.42. The proposed development was considered in the light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 – 2023. Having carried out screening for appropriate assessment of the project, it has been concluded that the likely project individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on European Sites Nos. 000472, & 004037, or any other European site, in view of the sites' conservation objectives, and appropriate assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on the following:

- The efficacy of standard construction practices, which ensure that pollutants are not borne into the existing drainage ditch, and
- The upgrade of the effluent treatment system that serves the site.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. That the application be the subject of a split decision in which (i) the upgrade of effluent treatment system is permitted, and (ii) the alterations and extension to the rear of the dwelling house and the construction of an agricultural shed are refused.

9.0 (i) Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the planning history of the site, it is considered that, subject to conditions, the proposed upgrade of the effluent treatment system would ensure an

improvement in the handling of waste water on the site over that which occurs at present. Such improvement would accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The proposed upgrade of the effluent treatment system shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 1st day of November 2022, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of the upgrade and the upgrade shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed upgrade of the effluent treatment system shall be amended as follows: The new effluent treatment system shall serve the existing cottage.</p> <p>Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
3.	<p>(a) The treatment plant and polishing filter shall be located, constructed and maintained in accordance with the details submitted to the planning authority on the 1st day of November, 2022, and in accordance with the requirements of the document entitled "Code of Practice - Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses (p.e. ≤ 10)" – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021. No system other than the type proposed in the submissions shall be installed unless agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>(b) Certification by the system manufacturer that the system has been</p>

	<p>properly installed shall be submitted to the planning authority within four weeks of the installation of the system.</p> <p>(c) A maintenance contract for the treatment system shall be entered into and paid in advance for a minimum period of five years from the date that the treatment plant is first commissioned and thereafter shall be kept in place at all times. Signed and dated copies of the contract shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority within four weeks of the installation.</p> <p>(d) Surface water soakways shall be located such that the drainage from the dwelling and paved areas of the site shall be diverted away from the location of the polishing filter.</p> <p>(e) Within three months of the date that the treatment plant is first commissioned, the developer shall submit a report from a suitably qualified person with professional indemnity insurance certifying that the proprietary effluent treatment system has been installed and commissioned in accordance with the approved details and is working in a satisfactory manner and that the polishing filter is constructed in accordance with the standards set out in the EPA document.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
4.	<p>Within 4 weeks of the date that the new treatment plant is first commissioned, the existing septic tank shall be decommissioned.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>

11.0 (ii) Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Mayo County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, especially the County Landscape Appraisal, Built Environment Objective BEO 15, and Development Management Sections 2.7 and 2.8, and the unsubstantiated need for the proposed agricultural shed on the site, it is considered that neither the proposed

extension to the existing cottage nor the proposed agricultural shed within the curtilage of the cottage would be either subordinate to this cottage or complementary to its traditional character. Instead, the proposed extension would, due to its size and design, compete with this character, and the proposed agricultural shed would, due to its size, siting, and design, detract from its setting and obscure views of the cottage from the adjacent local road. Together, they would constitute oversized and discordant development, which would stand out within the landscape, and which would be seriously injurious to visual amenity. Consequently, Objective BEO 15 and Sections 2.7 and 2.8 of the County Development Plan would be contravened. The proposed extension and the proposed agricultural building would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

Hugh D. Morrison
Planning Inspector

5th April 2023