



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP 317728-23

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Development | Retention of 4 steel containers on site for the purpose of agricultural machinery and all ancillary items and all associated site development works. |
| Location | Rush, Dunboyne, Co. Meath. |
| Planning Authority | Meath County Council |
| Planning Authority Reg. Ref. | 23/554 |
| Applicant(s) | David Ryan |
| Type of Application | Retention |
| Planning Authority Decision | Refuse |
| Type of Appeal | First Party |
| Appellant(s) | David Ryan |
| Observer(s) | Dr Thomas & Mrs Monica Feighery |
| Date of Site Inspection | 20 th June 2024 & 19 th August 2024 |
| Inspector | Aisling Dineen |

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1.0 Site Location and Description | 3 |
| 2.0 Proposed Development | 4 |
| 3.0 Planning Authority Decision | 4 |
| 3.1. Decision | 4 |
| 3.2. Planning Authority Reports | 5 |
| 3.3. Prescribed Bodies | 6 |
| 3.4. Third Party Observations | 6 |
| 4.0 Planning History..... | 6 |
| 5.0 Policy Context..... | 7 |
| 5.1. Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 (the plan)..... | 7 |
| 5.2. Natural Heritage Designations | 8 |
| 5.3. EIA Screening | 8 |
| 6.0 The Appeal | 8 |
| 6.1. Grounds of Appeal | 8 |
| 6.2. Applicant Response | 9 |
| 6.3. Planning Authority Response | 9 |
| 6.4. Observations | 10 |
| 6.5. Further Responses..... | 10 |
| 7.0 Assessment..... | 10 |
| 8.0 Recommendation..... | 18 |
| 9.0 Reasons and Considerations..... | 19 |

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is situated in a rural area, off a local road, Rooske Rd., c. 1.5 km south of Dunboyne and 2 km west of Clonee in Co. Meath. There is an old cemetery, called Rooske Cemetery, on the site immediately adjacent to the appeal site along its west boundary. The general area of the site is a rural area with one-off residential dwellings situated on both sides of the road. There are three dwelling houses positioned along the south boundary of the site, fronting the serving road, which are east of the subject site access.
- 1.2. The entrance of the site is situated on a bend in the serving road and it contains slightly recessed large steel gates and high fencing, which appear to have a high security purpose. Just inside the entrance gates along the boundary with the public road there is a container (not indicated on documents lodged) which is attached to an enclosed and fenced off yard, which appears to be used for storing various items of equipment. Just beyond this container and also inside the boundary with the public road there is a small shed on a concrete foundation, which appears to be used for dog/greyhound use. In the west front corner of the site, there are a few dog-runs with kennels.
- 1.3. Running along the spine of the site, there is a central access road constructed using hard core materials. To the west of this internal access road there are a number of paddocks and a number of animal husbandry structures, all of which are constructed on concrete foundations.
- 1.4. There were 2 No ponies on one of the paddocks and there was 1 No grey hound dog in one of the dog runs (visible at the time of inspection).
- 1.5. Moving towards the north of the site along the central access road there is a large earth berm running east-west, which appears to be in excess of 2 metres in height. This earth berm appears to cordon off the northern area of the site.
- 1.6. The area beyond the earth berm is predominantly covered in hard-core materials and the area enclosing the stated '4 No' steel containers, the subject of retention, is positioned in the northeast area of the site within a locked enclosure. This area also contains a polytunnel and a large skip and in total this area contains 5 large steel

containers (not 4 as per public notices). This area is also surfaced with hard-core material.

- 1.7. Circa half way across the northern boundary of the site there is another earth berm and there is a concrete foundation in situ, which measures c. 60 square metres. There is a sizable area of land covered in hard core materials in the northwest area of the site. This space/feature and concrete foundation is not indicated on documents lodged.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development seeks permission for retention for 4 steel containers on site for the purpose of the secure storage of agricultural machinery and ancillary items and all associated site development works. The area where the 4 steel containers is located in an enclosure in the NE area of the site. (It should be noted that there are 5 steel containers and a polytunnel and a large skip also located in this enclosure on a hard-core surface).

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority made a decision to refuse retention permission on the 18th July 2023, for the following reasons:

1. It is an objective of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 to require all applications for agricultural buildings to comply with (DM OBJ 62) particularly the following text '*In the case of new farm enterprises, a clear evidence base must be provided which demonstrates the need for the proposal and details of how any buildings proposed form part of a comprehensive business plan for the farm holding supported by Teagasc*'.
2. The proposed development by reason of the absence of a sufficient agricultural justification for the development, its location accessed off a local route, and its design, would materially contravene said objective of the development plan of the Development Plan, would establish an undesirable

future precedent, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. Having consideration to the nature of the proposed development as indicated on the plans and particulars submitted including an associate entrance onto a narrow local road where the applicant has failed to demonstrate adequate sightlines, the Planning Authority is not satisfied that the development proposed, if permitted, would not endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and would be in compliance with TII Document DN-GEO-03031 due to the absence of appropriate sightlines both for emerging from an entering the site. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The Chief Executive's decision reflects the planner's report.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The storage units were not accessible for inspection on the date of site inspection.
- The accessway and shipping containers are not visible from the entrance and appear to be well screened from the road.
- The placement of 4 No steel shipping containers without detailed justification of their use and their requirement on site is not considered to be acceptable.
- All applications for agricultural buildings and structures shall address the criteria set out within the DMOBJ 62, Chapter 11 of the County Development Plan.
- An appropriate justification has not been provided.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Transportation Department

- The proposed development is located on the local primary road L 2221, within the 80 kph speed limit.

- Adequate sight lines to the nearest edge of the at the entrance are not demonstrated.
- The applicant should be requested to show unobstructed sight distances.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

No responses received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

The following issues raised were raised under the application, in summary:

- A hardcore roadway has been installed and 3 separate hardcore areas have been created. HGVs have been using the site.
- An application for an EBS 3 phase connection has been submitted.
- Industrial gates and fencing in excess of 2 metres is installed and mounding of earth at entrance. The field looks like an industrial compound over an agricultural field.
- Concerns regarding a skip on site and potential for use as a waste facility and/or a commercial facility.
- There is no visibility at site entrance and it is particularly bad on leaving site towards Dunboyne side.
- The planning application is for 4 steel containers when there are 5 steel containers on site.
- There is a large skip and rubbish strewn across the field along with chemical barrels.

4.0 **Planning History**

Enforcement Notice UD 20089 issued on the 30th November 2022.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 (the plan).

Chapter 11, Section 15, Para 11.16.7 of the plan. The area is a Rural Area (RA), where it is an objective 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.

ED POL 19 To support and facilitate sustainable agriculture, agri-food, horticulture, forestry, renewable energy and other rural enterprises at suitable locations in the County.

RUR DEV SO 8 To support and protect the existing economic base and seek to diversify the economy through both inward investment and the promotion of agriculture, forestry and tourism related industries in rural areas.

Chapter 11, Section 11.6.8 Agricultural Buildings & Structures: The design, scale, siting and layout of agricultural buildings should respect, and where possible, enhance the rural environment.

DM OBJ 62: All applications for agricultural buildings and structures shall address the following criteria as part of a planning application;

- To require that buildings are sited appropriately in order to minimise obtrusion on the landscape, having regard to the Landscape Character Assessment contained in Appendix 5.
- The use of dark coloured cladding, for example dark browns, greys, greens and reds are most suitable for farm buildings, and roof areas should be darker than walls.
- Developments shall comply with the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, (GAP Regs 2014).
- All planning applications for agricultural development shall be accompanied by comprehensive details of all land holdings and herd number(s), if applicable.

- All new and existing agricultural developments will be required to contain sufficient detail which demonstrates that all effluent, including yard run-off, is collected and stored within the confines of the development.
- In the case of new farm enterprises, a clear evidence base must be provided which demonstrates the need for the proposal and details of how any buildings proposed form part of a comprehensive business plan for the farm holding supported by Teagasc.

RD POL 43 To ensure that the required standards for sight distances and stopping sight distances are in compliance with current road geometry standards as outlined in the NRA document Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) specifically Section TD 41-42/09 when assessing individual planning applications for individual houses in the countryside.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The closest European Site is the Rye Water Valley/Carlton SAC (Site Code 001398) approx. 5km west of the site and there are no direct hydrological connections from the site to this conservation site.

5.3. EIA Screening

Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development and the absence of any connectivity to any sensitive location, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- The 4 steel containers are not visible from the public road and appear to be well screened from the road.

- The current agricultural storage is over 138 meters from the roadside with a hedgerow planted around it to avoid any intrusion on the landscape.
- A sheep pen is proposed to replace one of the agricultural stores and will primarily be used for housing sheep.
- To date there have been ponies, horses and sheep on the land but the applicant is currently assessing the viability of pedigree Suffolk rams as part of a business plan for the farm, which is a niche market and which requires research as to its viability. The applicant has used the Teagasc my farm my business plan template.
- The applicant is taking a step back from his involvement in his fathers' farm to obtain a work/life balance but wants to retain involvement in the agriculture industry on a smaller scale.
- The entrance serving this agriculture land has been in existence for over 60 years and has not been altered in any way.
- The retention of the proposed development in no way effects or requires the existing entrance to be altered.
- It is submitted that this is not a new farm enterprise and the use of agricultural land for grazing of horses, cattle and sheep has been carried out on these lands for a substantial period of time. The 4 steel containers are used solely for the purpose of security of agricultural machinery and ancillary items on this agricultural land.
- The containers are located 71.7 metres from the nearest dwelling.

6.2. Applicant Response

The appellant is the applicant.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- The proposed development was not considered to be consistent with the policies and objectives of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027.

- The planning authority refer the Board to the previous planner's reports associated with the application.
- The Board is respectfully requested to uphold the decision of the planning authority and refuse planning permission.

6.4. **Observations**

Dr Thomas & Mrs Monica Feighery

This is the second refusal made by Meath County Council.

The objection is based on safety grounds. The road is residential and the lands are agricultural.

Year after year the volume of traffic is increasing on this road and the sight lines to the site do not meet safety guidelines.

Vehicles enter and exit this field on a daily basis, sometimes several times a day.

The field has been cleared for agricultural use and the question is asked why would a 6-acre field require such a large number of vehicle movements.

It is suggested that the field is being used for commercial purposes.

6.5. **Further Responses**

None.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having examined all the application and appeal documentation on file and having regard to the relevant local and national policy and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal and the planning authorities' reasons for refusal and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise. AA also needs to be considered. The main issues, therefore, are as follows:

- Validation (Planning & Development Regulations 2001 – as amended)
- Visual & Residential Amenity
- Justification

- Proposed Use
- Traffic Safety
- Appropriate Assessment

- 7.2. Validation Planning & Development Regulations 2001 – as amended
- 7.3. Having inspected the site, I have concerns about the level of details omitted on the documents submitted with the planning application/appeal on the site layout plan delineated in red.
- 7.4. While it may be possible that the structures, or some thereof, fall under Exemptions under Part 3, Rural, Planning & Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), it is not possible to assess whether exemptions apply or whether limitations on said exemptions apply, nor is it possible to assess the total cumulative floor area, regarding the totality of structures on site.
- 7.5. There is a large storage unit (steel container) and attached enclosed yard along with a grey hound enclosure and a number of 'other structures' in the front (southwest) area of the site (proximate to the public road). These have not been demonstrated on documents lodged, which are within the confines of the site delineated in red. As they are not demarcated on the site layout plan, it is not possible to interpret whether or not they are within 10 metres from the public road, which would fall under limitations on exemptions under Class 9 and Class 12 (Greyhounds) of Part 3, Exempted Development – Rural, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended).
- 7.6. There are three additional 'other structures' on paddocks along the hardcore central access road, which run through the site. These 'other structures' have not been indicated on documents lodged, therefore information on cumulative floor area is not available.
- 7.7. The retention application has not referred to the large area, which is covered in hard core, including the large space at the northern section of the site and including the enclosure, wherein the subject storage containers are, in the northeastern section of the site. This area at the northern end of the site, which is covered in hard core materials, appears to be sectioned off from the remaining land within the site by way

of earth berms. These earth berms and dimensions are not clearly indicated on the documents lodged.

- 7.8. There is a large concrete foundation constructed inside the northern boundary of the site, which would measure an estimated circa 60 sq. m., which is not demarcated on the drawings either. Accordingly, the purpose/proposed use of this foundation has not been explained.
- 7.9. It is noted that the term 'ancillary development' is included in the development description, however, considering the features/structures established on site and the requirement to assess the entire development including cumulative floor area of structures on the site, it is considered that insufficient detail is provided in order to fully assess the proposal.
- 7.10. The planning and development regulations 2001 as amended is very clear relating to items which should be demonstrated on the site layout, it refers that, *inter alia*, '....other features on, adjoining or in the vicinity of the land or structure to which the application relates shall be shown'.

See Regulation excerpts at end of this section in para 7.18. [Underline for emphasis].
- 7.11. Furthermore, the application clearly refers that the development description is for the 'retention of 4 steel containers'. There are in fact, 5 steel containers with an additional skip and a polytunnel in the northeast corner of the site (There is also an additional container along the front boundary as referenced above under para 7.5). Therefore, I am of the viewpoint that the development description as per public notices, clearly does not present an accurate description of the development on the site and therefore is not in compliance with the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended).
- 7.12. It is noted that the planners report has stated that '*the storage structures were not accessible for assessment during the site visit conducted on the 12th July 2023*'
- 7.13. The onus is clearly on the applicant to make the site, in totality, available for inspection.

- 7.14. Overall, given the dearth of detail submitted on the documents lodged relative to what is actually established on the site delineated in red, I am of the viewpoint that this application could have been invalidated by the planning authority pursuant to Article 26, Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, upon inspection. However, I note, as referred to above, the planners report noted difficulty in gaining full access.
- 7.15. The Board may defer this issue, as validation of a planning application falls within the remit of the planning authority, furthermore, there are other substantive refusal grounds recommended herewith under this recommendation.
- 7.16. It is noted that there is an ongoing enforcement process underway regarding the appeal site. The planners report states 'pending report', on this issue.
- 7.17. Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)

Plans, drawings and maps accompanying a planning application in accordance with Article 22 shall all be in metric scale and comply with the following requirements:

Article 23

(a) Site or layout plans shall be drawn to a scale (which shall be indicated thereon) of not less than 1:500 or such other scale as may be agreed with the planning authority prior to the submission of the application, the site boundary shall be clearly delineated in red, and buildings, roads, boundaries, septic tanks and percolation areas, bored wells, significant tree stands and other features on, adjoining or in the vicinity of the land or structure to which the application relates shall be shown,

(c) The site layout plan and other plans shall show the level or contours, where applicable, of the land and the proposed structures relative to Ordnance Survey datum or a temporary local benchmark, whichever is more appropriate.

Article 26

(4) Where, on inspection of the land to which the application relates, the planning authority considers that the requirements of articles 17(1)(b), 19 or

20 have not been met, or the information submitted in the planning application is substantially incorrect or substantial information has been omitted, the planning application shall, notwithstanding the fact that an acknowledgement has been sent to an applicant in accordance with sub-article (2), be invalid.

7.18. Visual & Residential Amenity

7.19. Policy under Chapter 11, section 11.6.8 of the plan requires that; *'The design, scale, siting and layout of agricultural buildings should respect, and where possible, enhance the rural environment'*. Furthermore, it is a stated objective under DM OBJ 62 that buildings be sited appropriately in order to minimise obtrusion on the landscape.

7.20. Under Appendix 5 of the plan, the Landscape Character Assessment designates the site as being within the 'Lowland Character Area' which has a 'Very High Landscape Value', with a moderate sensitivity to absorb development. Under DM OBJ 62 it is a requirement that buildings are sited appropriately in order to minimise obtrusion on the landscape, having regard to the Landscape Character Assessment.

7.21. The appellant submits that the subject '4 steel containers', the subject of the application and appeal, are not visible from the public road. This point is also made under the planner's report.

7.22. I concur that the containers do not appear to be visible from the public road due to thick hedgerow growth and the presence of earth berms on site, however, I consider that the steel containers are of industrial type construct and by the appellants own submission are c. 70 metres from the nearest dwelling. Accordingly, as industrial type steel features, It is considered that they represent discordant features in the rural landscape and do not comply with agricultural buildings policy 11.6.8 *Agricultural Buildings & Structures*, in the plan, which requires that the design, scale, siting and layout of agricultural buildings should respect, and where possible, enhance the rural environment and it would also contravene objective DM OBJ 62 of the plan, which requires minimum obtrusion on the landscape.

7.23. Justification

7.24. Under the first and second reasons for refusal the planning authority has referenced the lack of justification for the proposed development. It refers to policy objective DM

OBJ 62, which requires that in the in the case of new farm enterprises, a clear evidence base must be provided, which demonstrates the need for the proposal and requires details of how any buildings proposed form part of a comprehensive business plan for the farm holding, which is supported by Teagasc.

- 7.25. The second reason for refusal links the lack of justification with traffic safety and the lack of demonstrated sight lines at the entrance to the site.
- 7.26. The agent for the appellant submits that this is not 'a new farm enterprise' and that agricultural use/activity has been carried out on the site for years stating that to date there has been ponies, horses and sheep on the land. However, the agent for the appellant also states that the appellant is assessing the viability of pedigree Suffolk rams as part of a business plan for the farm and states that it is a niche market that requires research as to its viability. It is considered that while agricultural use may be established on the lands in question, part of this proposal, which requires research, can certainly be reasonably considered to be a 'new enterprise'.
- 7.27. The agent for the appellant also submits that the purpose of the steel containers is for security of agricultural machinery. There was no evidence of agricultural equipment on site on the date of inspection, however there was a mini-digger positioned beside one of the subject steel containers.
- 7.28. In the case of a new enterprise, a clear evidence base must be provided which demonstrates the need for the proposal and details of how any buildings proposed form part of a comprehensive business plan for the farm holding supported by Teagasc. While the agent for the appellant has stated that the appellant has used guidance from Teagasc, there is no documentation or clear evidence base provided under the documents lodged, to support this statement.
- 7.29. Notwithstanding the issue of 'a new enterprise', objective DM OBJ 62, also contains a number of other policy objectives that require 'all agricultural developments' to comply with. Such requirements include that 'all' planning applications for agricultural development shall be accompanied by comprehensive details of all land holdings and herd numbers, if applicable and all new and existing agricultural development are required to demonstrate that all effluent including yard run-off, is collected and stored within the confines of the development.

- 7.30. There are no details regarding herd numbers/flock numbers on the file regarding the land holding in question. There are no other lands indicated or submitted to form part of the overall farm holding other than the land delineated in red under the application. Additionally, there are no details on file demonstrating how all new and existing agricultural development collects and stores effluent and yard run-off, within the confines of the development.
- 7.31. Therefore, while part of the proposal is considered to comprise 'a new enterprise', it also fails to comply with other important policy objectives stated under Policy Objective DM OBJ 62.
- 7.32. Furthermore, it is noted that on the date of inspection there was a greyhound and 2 No ponies on the site. The appellant has also submitted that ponies, horses and sheep are accommodated on the land. In addition, it is being proposed to provide a new enterprise, that of rearing pedigree Suffolk rams on the site. There can be little doubt that these combined animal husbandry uses and their respective related activities on the relatively restricted farm holding (based on the land holding details provided), comprise an intensified use of the land in question.
- 7.33. Proposed Use
- 7.34. Submissions under the observations to the application and also under the appeal suggest that the use in question may be of a commercial nature and/or for rubbish storage and is not under agriculture use. I consider that combined with the lack of justification above, which is a requirement, there was little evidence of any other agricultural activity taking place on the site. There were no sheep present or evidence of sheep and the only animals on site was 1 No greyhound and 2 No ponies.
- 7.35. The site is locked at the front by large industrial type gates and high fencing. The steel container positioned inside the front boundary hedgerow, the boundary with the servicing road, is situated beside an enclosed yard, which is fenced off, which appears to be providing storage space for various items such as bricks, pipe works and other random items. As discussed earlier, this enclosure and steel container is not demarcated on the documents submitted. The items being held in this enclosure do not appear to be of agricultural nature.

- 7.36. Furthermore, there is a sizable area covered in hard core material at the rear (north) of the site. This area is not demarcated on the documents lodged either and there is no explanation for its use or purpose or for the purpose of the constructed concrete foundation, which is also at this location on the site. It is considered unusual that such a large area of a land holding, relative to the overall landholding (as submitted), would be given over to hardcore surface, in an agricultural context and no justification or explanation for this area is submitted under the application/appeal documentation.
- 7.37. Additionally, the area where the five steel containers and a large skip is located, in the northeast area of the site, also contains a poly tunnel, which appears to be packed with plastic storage bags. This would appear to suggest that there is some form of rubbish storage activity taking place at the site along with the large skip. No explanation for this structure is provided. This enclosure is also separated from the remaining landholding by agricultural gates, which are locked.
- 7.38. Therefore, having regard to all of the above factors, including the lack of detail on the file, it is considered that the stated solely agricultural use of the site overall is in question and it is considered that it has not been explicitly established that there are no other non-agricultural uses in operation on the site. Additionally, there appears to be a waste storage area being accommodated on part of the site.
- 7.39. Traffic Safety
- 7.40. Based on an inspection of the site, it is considered that there appears to be a number of activities ongoing on the site, which include different elements of animal husbandry and in addition there appears to have been land clearance and re-surfacing of land area carried out, without any explanation thereof under documentation submitted, and which is not delineated on the documentation submitted. It also appears that there is some form of waste storage is ongoing in one area of the site (northeast). The response to the appeal also provides for an additional enterprise, that of Suffolk ram rearing. Overall, it is considered that the proposal comprises an intensification of use of the established access/egress point of the site, at a point, on a bend on a road, which is seriously substandard in width and alignment.

- 7.41. It is considered that there is no visibility in either direction when exiting the site. The front boundary along the public road comprises a thick dense hedgerow, which inhibits sight distances towards the east. There is no recessed lay-bye along the front area of the site, which could, without prejudice, facilitate achieving adequate sight distances in this direction. The front boundary of the adjacent property to the west inhibits sight distances towards the west. It is considered that access and egress is currently dangerous. Furthermore, no sight distance triangle has been presented with the application/appeal and no permission from adjoining landowners to achieve such sight distances, if required, is submitted.
- 7.42. From the documents submitted, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed traffic movements at the site can be adequately and safely accommodated at the site entrance, which is on a bend in the road, where sight distances are seriously restricted in both directions. Accordingly, it is considered that additional turning traffic movements at the site would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and therefore it is recommended that permission should be refused on this basis also.
- 7.43. Appropriate Assessment
- 7.44. Having regard to the limited nature of the proposed development and the nature of the receiving environment and the proximity to the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect either individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that retention permission be refused.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The development description on public notices does not conform with or present an accurate description of the existing development within the delineated site boundary. Therefore, substantial information has been omitted and accordingly the proposal contravenes the provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. It is an objective of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 to require all applications for agricultural buildings to comply with objective DM OBJ 62 including the following text *'In the case of new farm enterprises, a clear evidence base must be provided which demonstrates the need for the proposal and details of how any buildings proposed form part of a comprehensive business plan for the farm holding supported by Teagasc'*. Furthermore, said objective requires that *'all planning applications for agricultural development shall be accompanied by comprehensive details of all land holdings and herd numbers'* and *'all new and existing agricultural development are required to demonstrate that all effluent including yard run-off, is collected and stored within the confines of the development'*. Therefore, in the absence of sufficient documentation, the proposed development would contravene the provisions of policy objective DM OBJ 62 of the plan and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. The combined storage of waste material on site, in addition to the large area covered in hard-core materials in addition to the construction of earth berms, and steel containers have not been explained or justified and in the absence of same, the development does not conform with agricultural use, and would therefore materially contravene the provisions of the Meath County Development Plan, Objective RA (Rural Area), which aims to protect and

promote the development of agriculture and therefore would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4. It is considered that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the additional traffic turning movements the development would generate on a county road at a point where sightlines are restricted in an east and west direction
5. The proposed containers on site are of steel industrial type construct, and would if permitted, represent discordant features on the landscape and would negatively impact on the visual and residential amenities of the area and depreciate the value of property in the area, and 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.

Aisling Dineen
Planning Inspector
21st August 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

| | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|---|
| An Bord Pleanála Case Reference | ABP 317728-23 | | |
| Proposed Development Summary | Retention of 4 steel containers on site for the purpose of agricultural machinery and all ancillary items and all associated site development works. | | |
| Development Address | Rush, Dunboyne, Co. Meath. | | |
| 1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings) | | Yes | |
| | | No | No further action required |
| 2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class? | | | |
| Yes | | Class..... | EIA Mandatory EIAR required |
| No | | | Proceed to Q.3 |
| 3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]? | | | |
| | | Threshold | Comment (if relevant) |
| No | | N/A | No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required |
| Yes | | Class/Threshold..... | Proceed to Q.4 |

| 4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted? | | |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| No | | Preliminary Examination required |
| Yes | | Screening Determination required |

Inspector: Aisling Dineen

Date: 30TH August 2024