



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL07.249421

Development	Extension of 495 sq. m, modifications, changes of roof finish to existing house.
Location	Ballyquirke, Moycullen, Co. Galway
Planning Authority	Galway County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	17/624
Applicant(s)	Faye Bohan & Philip O'Neill
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Faye Bohan & Philip O'Neill
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	16 th January 2018
Inspector	Rónán O'Connor

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	3
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	4
3.4. Third Party Observations	4
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy Context.....	5
5.1. Development Plan.....	5
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	6
5.3. Grounds of Appeal	6
5.4. Planning Authority Response	7
5.5. Observations	8
5.6. Further Responses.....	8
6.0 Assessment	8
7.0 Recommendation.....	17
8.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located approximately 1.5km south-east of the village of Maigh Cuilinn and is accessed via a small road off the N59. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.836 ha. On site is a split level dwellinghouse which has a stated floor area of 207 m².
- 1.2. Beyond the dwelling house on site, the site slopes steeply towards the south and south-east. The southern boundary is approximately 20m from the banks of the Loughkip River (River Kip) which feeds into Ballyquirke Lough, approximately 270m from the eastern boundary of the site.
- 1.3. To the west are residential dwellings accessed off the N59.
- 1.4. The route of the proposed Maigh Cuilinn By Pass corridor passes to the south and east of the appeal site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Extension of 495 sq. m, modifications, changes of roof finish to existing house.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Refuse permission for 3 reasons as follows:

1. Elevated site and sensitive lakeside rural location, considered that modifications and extension to house are excessive in terms of height, scale and overcomplicated in terms of design, visually obtrusive.
2. Adjacent to Lough Corrib SAC, no proposal to upgrade the waste water system – unacceptable risk to receiving waters, impact on the SAC.
3. Located within an indicative fluvial flood risk area. Proposed development has potential to be at risk of flooding in the future.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the planning officer reflects the decision of the planning authority.

Points of note are as follows:

- Site is elevated in a sensitive location overlooking Ballyquirke Lough.
- Part of the site located in an area at risk of flooding.
- Application site is located adjacent to Lough Corrib SAC. Applicant has not submitted an assessment carried out in accordance with article 6 of the Habitats Directive.
- No proposal to upgrade effluent treatment submitted.
- Proposed house design is very suburban in character and does not comply with the GCC Rural Housing Design Guidelines.
- Proposed extension is overcomplicated in terms of design and excessive in terms of height and scale.
- Refusal was recommended having regard to the design, proximity of the site to SAC and absence of proposal to upgrade waste water system, and location within a fluvial flood zone and absence of a flood risk assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. None.

4.0 Planning History

4.1.1. None.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The relevant plan is the Galway County Development Plan 2015 – 2021. The site lies within the East Connemara Mountains Landscape Character area where the Landscape Sensitivity is Class 3 (where Class 1 is the least sensitive and Class 5 the most sensitive) and the Landscape Value Rating is High.
- 5.1.2. The appeal site lies within an area identified as a Rural Area under Strong Urban Pressure (GTPS).
- 5.1.3. The route of the proposed Maigh Cuilinn By Pass corridor passes to the south and east of the appeal site.
- 5.1.4. The following policies and objectives are relevant:
- Objective DS 6 – Natura 2000 Network and Habitats Directive Assessment / Objective DS 10 – Impacts of Developments on Protected Sites
 - Policies NHB1/2/4– Seeks to protect natural heritage and water resources/Objective NHB1 – Protected Habitats and Species /Objective NHB 3 – Water Resources/NHB 12 – Soil/Ground Water Protection
 - Objective RHO 6 – Replacement Dwelling – Encourages refurbishment of existing habitable houses/Objective RHO 9 – Design Guidelines - have regard to GCC's *Design Guidelines for the Single Rural House* /Objective RHO 12 – Waste Water Treatment Associated with Development in Un-Serviced Areas
 - Policy FL 4 – Principles of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines/Objective FL 1 – Flood Risk Management and Assessment/Objective FL 3- Protection of Waterbodies and Watercourses/Objective FL 4 – Flood Risk Assessment for Planning Applications and CFRAMS
 - Objective WS 2- EU Policies and Directives
 - Policy GH 1 – Conserve, protect and enhance the special character of the County including landscape.
 - Policy LCM1 – Preservation of Landscape Character/Objective LCM1/2

5.1.5. **Maigh Cuillinn Local Area Plan (LAP)**

The site lies within the boundaries of the Maigh Cuillinn Local Area Plan (LAP). The majority of the site is zoned 'Agriculture' with the south and south-eastern portion zoned 'Open Space'.

Objective LU 7 'Agriculture' seeks to protect the rural character of the area from inappropriate development and provide for agriculture and appropriate non-urban uses. Objective LU 6 'Open Spaces/Recreation & Amenity' seeks to promote the sustainable management, use and/or development of OS zoned lands.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

5.2.1. None.

5.3. **Grounds of Appeal**

5.3.1. The Grounds of Appeal, as submitted on behalf of the First Party Appellants, are as follows:

General

- Proposal is in compliance with Objection RHO 6 as the application seeks to modify and extend an existing habitable dwelling house.
- A new wastewater treatment system is proposed.
- Existing dwelling is located in a mature setting and approximately 300m north-west of Ballyquirke Lake – it is not a lakeside location.

Reason for Refusal 1: Design

- Dwelling is substantially screened and is not visible from any public road
- Proposed design adheres to Objective RHO 9.
- Numerous other dormer style and hipped roof dwellings in the vicinity of the subject site, and there are several dwellings of split level design owing to the topography of the area.

- Evident from the photomontages that the extension will have very little impact on the surrounding landscape – existing natural screening and use of local natural stone/materials will help assimilate the dwelling with its surroundings
- Meets the County's ratio of floor area to land area.
- Rooms are in the roof so the house does not appear as a two-storey dwelling.

Reason for Refusal 2: Ecology

- Applicant now proposes to provide a new wastewater treatment system.
- Details submitted as unsolicited additional information/Attached to Appendix 3 of Appeal Submission.
- Proposed upgrade of the wastewater treatment system is in accordance with EPA requirements, will protect groundwater, is in accordance with policy.
- Does not pose a risk to Lough Corrib Special Area of Conservation.

Reason for Refusal 3: Flood Risk

- Application relates to the extension of a house that has never flooded.
- Documentation submitted as part of application 16/1097, for an adventure centre adjacent to the north-west boundary of the site, indicates that this appeal site is outside of any pluvial or fluvial flood risk area.
- The appeal site is also at a greater height relative to both watercourses (Ballyquirke Lake and Kip River)
- Documentation submitted with 16/1097 indicates that the high water level of the lake is 6.9m OD – the finished floor level of the dwelling is approx. 17.3m OD – the access road to the dwelling is between 10.5m OD and 12.5m OD. – road or site hasn't flooded in living memory
- Above documentation indicates that the extreme flood level in the river Kip adjacent to the development may be 12m OD.
- Therefore potential flooding risks are negligible.

5.4. Planning Authority Response

5.4.1. None.

5.5. Observations

5.5.1. None.

5.6. Further Responses

5.6.1. None.

6.0 Assessment

6.1. The following assessment covers the points made in the appeal submissions and also encapsulates my *de novo* consideration of the application. The main planning issues in the assessment of the proposed development are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Visual Amenity/Impact on Landscape
- Site suitability for wastewater treatment
- Other Issues
- Appropriate Assessment

6.2. Principle of Development

6.2.1. Section 3.5.5 of the County Development Plan considers extensions to existing houses and states that extensions will be generally encouraged generally with the design and layout required to have regard to the amenity of adjoining properties.

6.2.2. The site lies with the boundaries of the Maigh Cuillinn Local Area Plan (LAP) and the majority of the site is zoned 'Agriculture' with the south and south-eastern portion zoned 'Open Space'. Objective LU 7 'Agriculture' seeks to protect the rural character of the area from inappropriate development and provide for agriculture and appropriate non-urban uses. Objective LU 6 'Open Spaces/Recreation & Amenity' seeks to promote the sustainable management, use and/or development of OS zoned lands.

6.2.3. Having regard to the existing dwelling on the site and the general provision in favour of extensions, an extension to the existing dwelling is therefore acceptable in

principle, having regard to the detailed considerations below. No development is proposed on the portion of the site that is zoned 'Open Space'.

6.3. Design and Visual Amenity

- 6.3.1. The first reason for refusal related to the height and scale of the development, as well as the detailed design.
- 6.3.2. I note the site lies within an area with a Landscape Sensitivity Class 3 (where 1 is the least sensitive and 5 is the most sensitive) and as such it is considered a relatively sensitive landscape. The character of the landscape within which the appeal site lies is one of a rural lakeside character with the landscape rising in elevation as one moves west from the lake, affording extensive views over the lake from the appeal site. I do note that the area to the south and east of the site is an identified corridor for the Maigh Cuilinn By-Pass. At present however the area immediately to the east of the appeal site is relatively undeveloped.
- 6.3.3. It is the planning authority's view that the modifications and extension to the house are excessive in terms of height, scale and overcomplicated in terms of design., having regard to the elevated site and sensitive lakeside rural location.
- 6.3.4. It is the appellant's view that the site benefits from substantial screening and is not visible from any public road. The appellant cites other examples of dormer style and hipped roof dwellings in the vicinity. Photomontages are submitted with the appeal submission. It is further stated that the materials proposed will further reduce any visual impact.
- 6.3.5. My observations on site were that the site is not visible from the N59, although it is possible to view the existing dwelling from the small local access road, albeit it is somewhat shielded by the topography of the site as well as the planting on the site. The existing house is split level with front elevation appearing as a single storey dwelling, and the rear elevation appearing as part-single storey part-two storey.
- 6.3.6. The proposal is to modify the existing building and to construct an extension to the southern gable end of the dwelling, which faces towards the access road. The existing floor area of the dwelling is 207 m². The proposed floor area, including the new extensions, is 495.6 m², more than double the size of the existing dwelling. There is considerable uplift in scale therefore and the proposal results in a larger

dwelling, closer to the southern boundary of the site, with a resultant increase in the visibility of the dwelling.

- 6.3.7. In terms of the detailed design, I note the planning authority has concerns with the level of complexity in the design and considers that the proposal is not in compliance with Galway County Council's 'Design Guidelines for the Single Rural House'. I note the content of said design guidelines. Simplicity of form is seen as a key attribute of appropriate design, and the use of suburban type features, such as larger dormers and overcomplicated forms, is discouraged. In this instance I concur with the view of the planning authority in that the proposal is over complex in its design and utilises suburban features, such as larger dormers, and as such is contrary to the above guidelines.
- 6.3.8. In conclusion, the combination of the excessive scale of the development and the resultant increase in visibility of the dwelling, together with the use of inappropriate design features, results in an adverse impact on visual amenity and an adverse impact on this sensitive landscape, contrary to the policies of the Development Plan.

6.4. Site Suitability for Wastewater Treatment

- 6.4.1. It is proposed to upgrade the replace the existing septic tank with a Packaged wastewater treatment system and polishing filter. The appellants have stated that a Site Characterisation Report was submitted as unsolicited further information at application stage although I note that no reference is made to this in the assessment of the planning application and there is no record of such unsolicited further information in the planning authority documents on file. However this report is included with the appeal submission and I have had regard to same in my assessment.
- 6.4.2. The GSI Groundwater maps show that the site is located within an area with an Aquifer Category of 'Poor' (P) with an vulnerability classification of 'Extreme' (E), representing a GWPR response of R2¹ under the EPA Code of Practice. According to the response matrix, on-site treatment systems are acceptable in such areas subject to normal good practice.
- 6.4.3. The trial hole was excavated to a depth of 1.9m and bedrock is stated as being encountered at this depth. The trail hole reported the presence of sandy clay / loamy soils with stones. On site, I noted broken rock and the presence of a hardpan layer in

the trial hole. The trial hole was dry. The adjoining percolation test holes contained water to within 250mm of ground surface. Weather conditions at the time of my site visit were changeable with intermittent hail showers. Ground conditions underfoot were wet and ponding was evident throughout the site.

- 6.4.4. Under Part C.2.3 of the EPA Code of Practice: Waste Water Treatment and Disposal Systems serving Single Houses (p.e. <10) (CoP), there is a requirement that the standard 'T' test be carried out on all sites irrespective of a P Test. I note that based on the Trial Hole examination, the applicant states that a T value of 20 is likely. While such a T value would indicate the soil is suitable for standard percolation, subsequently no 'T' Test (or modified 'T' Test) was carried out so this result was not verified on site. Where a T value of less than 3 and greater than 50 is encountered, the ground would not be suitable for a standard percolation but may be suitable for use as a soil polishing filter.
- 6.4.5. In the case of CLAY or SILT/CLAY subsoil a modified 'T' test should be carried out. In these clay or silt/clay soils, high T Values are expected. As noted, the information on file does not include T tests or modified T tests. These are required under the Code of Practice, even where a P test is also to be carried out and in order to inform the suitability or not of the site for an on-site effluent treatment. The Code of Practice notes that if a T-test is in excess of 90 then, irrespective of the P-test result, the site is unsuitable for discharge of treated effluent to ground as it will ultimately result in ponding due to the impervious nature of the underlying subsoil (or bedrock).
- 6.4.6. In addition to a 'T' test or modified 'T' test, a P test can be carried out at ground level where there are limiting factors including high water table or shallow bedrock or where the T result is outside of an acceptable range (> 75 and < 90 for a secondary treatment unit). The information on file and observed during my inspection of the trial hole does not indicate either a high-water table or shallow bedrock at the location of the trial hole such as would prevent the carrying out of a 'T' Test.
- 6.4.7. The 'P' Test revealed a 'P' value of 18.97. While this indicates that the site may be suitable for a secondary treatment system with a polishing filter at ground surface or overground, I am not satisfied that the site characterisation assessment is complete, having regard to the absence of any 'T' test or modified 'T' test, contrary to the guidance set out under the Code of Practice, under C.2.3 Percolation testing which

requires a 'T' test to be carried out on all sites, where depth to bedrock or water tables permits, irrespective of any 'P' Test.

- 6.4.8. I note the recommendation set out in Section 5 of the Site Characterisation form, which sets out a proposal for a treatment system and polishing filter with the proposed percolation pipes stated to be a minimum of 1.5m above rock and a proposal to remove the iron pan at the location of the polishing filter and replace it with a suitable soil with a 'T' value of between 5 and 15.
- 6.4.9. No design details are presented, including the location of the polishing filter system and reference to whether or not the treated effluent will travel by gravity or be pumped to a raised percolation area. Under Section 6 of the Site Characterisation form, a 'Tricel Novo Irls' or similar secondary treatment system is proposed which it is stated has a capacity for a population equivalent of 8 with acceptable performance standards noted. In the absence of design details (including drawings and cross section showing the location of the proposed package treatment system, polishing filter and the direction of the pipework) I am not satisfied that it has been demonstrated that the site can accommodate the effluent treatment proposal in its entirety.
- 6.4.10. Overall, I am not satisfied that the Site Characterisation test followed the EPA Code of Practice for Code of Practice: Waste Water Treatment and Disposal Systems serving Single Houses (p.e. <10) (CoP). Neither am I satisfied that the design details which have been presented with the application or appeal including the location of the proposed packaged treatment system and soil polishing filter and details of same are such as would satisfy the Board beyond reasonable scientific doubt that the effluent which would be generated from the development can be safely disposed of on-site. This is particularly so having regard to the sloped nature of the site. In the absence of such detail, my recommendation to the Board is to refuse planning permission on the grounds of effluent treatment.

6.5. **Flood Risk**

- 6.5.1. A reason for refusal was that the subject site lies partly within an Indicative Fluvial Flood Risk Area and that no commensurate flood risk assessment has been submitted with the application.

- 6.5.2. The appellant has stated within the appeal submission that a Flood Risk Assessment was submitted as unsolicited further information at planning application stage. There is however no record of this with the planning authority documents, nor has this been submitted with the appeal submission.
- 6.5.3. The appellant's submission notes that neither the existing house nor the appeal site has ever flooded. Reference is made to documentation, submitted as part of application 16/1097, for an adventure centre adjacent to the north-west boundary of the site, which indicates that this appeal site is outside of any pluvial or fluvial flood risk area. Figure 4.1 and 4.2 of the appeal submission include Indicative Flood Risk mapping. These figures would appear to indicate that the south and south-eastern portion of the site is within an indicative fluvial flood risk area.
- 6.5.4. It is also stated within the appeal submission that the appeal site is also at a greater height relative to both watercourses (Ballyquirke Lake and Loughkip River), and having regard to these factors, potential flooding risks are negligible.
- 6.5.5. I have had regard to the OPW's Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) Mapping data (www.cfram.ie) which indicates that the site lies within an indicative Fluvial Flood Zone.
- 6.5.6. I also have had regard to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which was undertaken alongside Galway County Council's preparation of the Maigh Cuilinn Local Area Plan 2013-2019. This also indicates that the southern and south-eastern portion of the appeal site is located within Flood Risk Zone A, which has a high probability of flooding.
- 6.5.7. While I note the comments of the appellants within the appeal submission, it is my view that a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment should have been carried out and submitted with the application, given that the appeal site is situated partly within a Fluvial Flood Risk Zone. This is a requirement of Objective FL 4 'Flood Risk Assessment for Planning Applications and CFRAMS' of the County Development Plan. No such assessment has been submitted either at application stage, or at appeal stage, and as such this should form a reason for refusal in this instance.

Appropriate Assessment

6.5.8. Neither an Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening Report nor a Natura Impact Statement (NIS) were submitted with the application or appeal. There are 8 no. Natura 2000 sites within 15km of the appeal site and these are listed below:

Name (site code)	Distance/Direction from Appeal Site
Loch Corrib SAC (000297)	0.01km S
Loch Corrib SPA (004042)	2.5km E
Ross Lake and Woods SPA (001312)	4.6km NW
Gortnandarragh Limestone Pavement SAC (001271)	8.5km N
Inner Galway Bay SPA (004031)	10km SW
Galway Bay Complex SAC (000268)	10km SW
Connemara Bog Complex SAC (002034)	11km W
Connemara Bog Complex SPA (004161)	11km W

6.5.9. With the exception of two sites, Loch Corrib SAC and Loch Corrib SPA, I am satisfied that the remainder can be ‘screened out’ on the basis that significant impacts on these European sites could be ruled out as a result of distance from the appeal site.

6.5.10. The closest designated European Site is Loch Corrib SAC (site code 000297), the boundary of which is located approximately 10m south of the appeal site. Loch Corrib SPA (Site Code 004042) is located approximately 2.5km to the east of the appeal site.

6.5.11. The site slopes towards the south/south east towards the Loughkip River and this feeds directly into Ballyquirke Lough. This section of the river and Ballyquirke Lough are within the boundary of the Loch Corrib SAC.

6.5.12. There is direct source pathways to the two European Sites identified above, due to potential surface water run-off from the appeal site into the River Loughkip, which feeds into Ballyquirke Lough, which has, in turn, a surface water hydrological connection to Lough Corrib, and due to potential groundwater contamination. I note

that the two European Sites share the same aquifer as the proposed development, and this aquifer is identified as having an 'Extreme' vulnerability rating and is of Regional Importance.

6.5.13. In relation to the Loch Corrib SAC, the site is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) selected for the following habitats and/or species listed on Annex I / II of the E.U. Habitats Directive

- [3110] Oligotrophic Waters containing very few minerals
- [3130] Oligotrophic to Mesotrophic Standing Waters
- [3140] Hard Water Lakes
- [3260] Floating River Vegetation
- [6210] Orchid-rich Calcareous Grassland*
- [6410] Molinia Meadows
- [7110] Raised Bog (Active)*
- [7120] Degraded Raised Bog
- [7150] Rhynchosporion Vegetation
- [7210] Cladium Fens*
- [7220] Petrifying Springs*
- [7230] Alkaline Fens
- [8240] Limestone Pavement*
- [91A0] Old Oak Woodlands
- [91D0] Bog Woodland*
- [1029] Freshwater Pearl Mussel (*Margaritifera margaritifera*)
- [1092] White-clawed Crayfish (*Austropotamobius pallipes*)
- [1095] Sea Lamprey (*Petromyzon marinus*)
- [1096] Brook Lamprey (*Lampetra planeri*)
- [1106] Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar*)
- [1303] Lesser Horseshoe Bat (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*)

[1355] Otter (*Lutra lutra*)

[1393] Slender Green Feather-moss (*Drepanocladus vernicosus*)

[1833] Slender Naiad (*Najas flexilis*)

6.5.14. The site synopsis for the Loch Corrib SAC (accessed from the NPWS website) notes that the main threats to the quality of this site are from water polluting activities resulting from intensification of agricultural activities on the eastern side of the lake, uncontrolled discharge of sewage which is causing localised eutrophication of the lake, and housing and boating development, which is causing the loss of native lakeshore vegetation.

6.5.15. No part of the development would be located within the SAC and there would be no loss or fragmentation of habitat.

6.5.16. In relation to the Loch Corrib SPA, the site is a Special Protection Area (SPA) under the E.U. Birds Directive, of special conservation interest for the following species:

Gadwall (*Anas strepera*) [A051]

Shoveler (*Anas clypeata*) [A056]

Pochard (*Aythya ferina*) [A059]

Tufted Duck (*Aythya fuligula*) [A061]

Common Scoter (*Melanitta nigra*) [A065]

Hen Harrier (*Circus cyaneus*) [A082]

Coot (*Fulica atra*) [A125]

Golden Plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*) [A140]

Black-headed Gull (*Chroicocephalus ridibundus*) [A179]

Common Gull (*Larus canus*) [A182]

Common Tern (*Sterna hirundo*) [A193]

Arctic Tern (*Sterna paradisaea*) [A194]

Greenland White-fronted Goose (*Anser albifrons flavirostris*) [A395]

- 6.5.17. The development would not result in any loss or fragmentation of habitat within the SPA.
- 6.5.18. The proposal has potential for direct impacts on the above European Sites as a result of foul effluent discharge during the ongoing use of the house. I note the concerns raised in my assessment regarding the suitability of the site for the proposed effluent treatment system. Due to the hydrological links identified above (surface water and ground water), I cannot reasonably rule out that there would not be significant effects, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on these European sites on the basis of the scientific information available.
- 6.5.19. On the basis of the information provided with the application and appeal and in the absence of a Natura Impact Statement, the Board cannot be satisfied that the proposed development individually, or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on Loch Corrib SAC (Site Code No. 000297) and Loch Corrib SPA (Site Code No. 004042), in view of the sites' Conservation Objectives. In such circumstances, the Board is precluded from granting approval/permission.

7.0 Recommendation

- 7.1. I recommend permission be refused for the following reasons and considerations.

8.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The site of the proposed development is located in an area where the landscape is designated as Sensitivity Class 3, as set out in the current Development Plan for the area, where emphasis is placed on the importance of designing with the landscape and of siting of development to minimise visual intrusion as set out in the current Galway County Council Rural House Design Guidelines, which Guidelines are considered to be reasonable. Having regard to the topography of the site, the elevated positioning of the proposed development, together with its excessive height and scale, and inappropriate

design, it is considered that the proposed development would form a discordant and obtrusive feature on the landscape at this location, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would fail to be adequately absorbed and integrated into the landscape, would militate against the preservation of the rural environment and would set an undesirable precedent for other such development in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to insufficient information submitted in relation to the proposals for waste water treatment, the Board is not satisfied that the site is suitable for the treatment and disposal of domestic foul effluent in accordance with the "Code of Practice - Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses (p.e. \leq 10)", 2009 and subsequent clarifications issued by the Environmental Protection Agency. The proposed development would, therefore, be prejudicial to public health.
3. The proposed development is in an area which is deemed to be at risk of flooding, by reference to the current Development Plan for the area and the documentation on file. Having regard to the provisions of the Development Plan in relation to development proposals in areas at risk of flooding, it is considered that, in the absence of adequate information relating to the risk of flooding, analysis of such risk, and appropriate mitigating measures to address any risk, the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
4. On the basis of the information provided with the application and appeal, and in the absence of a Natura Impact Statement, the Board cannot be satisfied that the proposed development individually, or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on Loch Corrib SAC (Site Code No. 000297) and Loch Corrib SPA (Site Code No. 004042), in view of the sites' Conservation Objectives. In such circumstances, the Board is precluded from granting approval/permission.

Rónán O'Connor
Planning Inspector

31st January 2018