



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP 302356 - 18

Development	Demolition of single storey link building between hotel and abbey and construction of replacement building with accessible entrance, a canopy and weather protecting entrance lobby at lower ground level to Oak Cellar bar and, associated landscaping and site works.
Location	Glenloe Abbey, Kentfield, Galway. (Protected Structures.)
Planning Authority	Galway County Council
P. A. Reg. Ref.	18/722
Applicant	Baswal Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission.
Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant	Prior Park, (Ireland) Assets, Ltd.
Date of Site Inspection	22 nd October, 2018.
Inspector	Jane Dennehy

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. Development Plan.....	7
6.0 The Appeal	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
6.2. Applicant Response	12
7.0 Assessment.....	15
8.0 Recommendation.....	19
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is that of the Glenlo Abbey Hotel, formerly known as Glenloe Abbey is a hotel and golf complex is located to the north west of Galway city with access from the N59. The total stated area of the hotel complex and golf course is 7.15 hectares. Lough Corrib is approximately three hundred and fifty metres to the north.
- 1.2. There is an original, two storey five bay demesne dwelling with a canted bay, cut limestone steps and a half basement. There is also a church which was constructed in the late eighteenth century adjacent to the house within the demesne and it is at present in use as a restaurant. A former rectangular shaped walled garden on which three granite stone walls survive is laid out in a lawn at present to the south east side
- 1.3. There is a three-storey extension (bedroom block) perpendicular to the rear of the original house, a three-storey building known as the Pavilion building to the east and, approximately one hundred metres to the north there is a golf club building.
- 1.4. The hotel complex has undergone refurbishment and upgrading including the new spa, sunken garden, extensions to the hotel and golf club buildings and carparks along with a new internal road to the south.
- 1.5. An on-site septic tank and wastewater tank were replaced in 2016 by a wastewater pumping system connected to a rising main and discharge to the public wastewater treatment system at Dangan Heights. There are two underground pump stations and valve chambers and kiosks.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The application lodged with the planning authority indicates proposals for:
 - (a) demolition of the existing single storey link building including an accessible entrance in the location between the abbey and the main building
 - (b) construction of a new single storey link building between the abbey and the main building.

(c) a canopy and weather protection entrance lobby at lower ground level leading to the “Oak Cellar” bar, and all associated landscaping and site development works.

The total stated floor area of the structure to be demolished is 37.7 square metres and that of the proposed new build is 118.7 square metres.

The application is accompanied by a design statement, infrastructure design specifications and details, a statement by the applicant’s licensed archaeologist, and ecological and appropriate assessment screening report.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.2. By order dated, 27th July, 2018, the planning authority decided to grant permission subject to conditions of a standard nature which include removal of exempt development entitlements, (Condition No 7), a requirement for a compliance submission regarding lighting to include direction and intensity of illumination, (Condition No 8) an archaeological monitoring condition, (Condition No 9.) and, requirements for compliance submissions for final finishes and specification details for historic fabric, monitoring by an architect with conservations expertise and suitably qualified project management and suet supervisory personnel.

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Reports

The planning officer indicated satisfaction with the proposed development.

3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

The conservation officer indicated satisfaction with the proposed development and included a recommendation for attachment of a condition for monitoring and management by a specialist with expertise in historic building conservation and for a compliance submission for specifications on historic fabric and proposed external finishes in her report.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. The Glenlo Abbey Hotel and golf complex has been subject of an extensive planning history. This current application is for changes to a prior grant of permission and permission for retention, following appeal under **P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93 (PL 07 248915)**, details of which follow:

- a single storey extension to the golf clubhouse,
- demolition of a stair core and part of a link between the existing bedroom block and the Pavilion building and construction for a three-storey extension with seventeen bedrooms and ancillary accommodation and external terraces and glazed doors,
- new external fire escape stairs and a first floor extension to the Pavilion building,
- a single storey spa facility within the walled garden linked to the hotel,
- a canopy and weather protecting lobby at lower ground level for the Oak Cellar bar,
- Realignment of a south corner of the walled garden to provide for a new internal road to the golf club,
- removal of the carpark from the north of the hotel and establishment of a formal garden in this area, relocation of screened refuse and service yard, Extension and realignment of three car park areas to the south, west and north west, landscaping and site works. The total stated floor area is 1,855.5 square metres.
- Permission for retention of two underground pump stations, valve chamber and service kiosks and landscaping and site works. The stated floor area of the development for retention permission is sixty-two square metres.

An account of some other relevant recent planning applications is provided below:

P. A. Reg. Ref.18/772/ PL 302390: This is a concurrent application and appeal comprising proposals for alterations to the previously permitted development under P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93 / PL 07 248915 consisting of:

Alterations of the previously approved ground floor extension to include an additional bedroom and omit a kitchen store/pantry.

Alterations of the previously approved first floor and second floors of the previously permitted three storey extension to include two new bedrooms and omission of a stair core.

Construction of a two-storey extension to provide for bedrooms and fire escape over the permitted single storey extension.

Conversion of a permitted laundry room to a bedroom at first floor level,

Omission of a pair of glazed double doors and terrace gardens at ground floor level bedrooms.

Omission of a first-floor extension at the Pavilion building.

P. A. Reg. Ref. 18/791: Permission was granted (on 3rd August, 2018) for minor alterations to the spa building permitted under P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93 to include a 670 square metres increase in floor area to accommodate reconfiguration to the layout and plant and, alterations to link an eternal sunk garden accommodate a fire escape and plant room, minor alterations to elevations and roof and landscaping works.

P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93: The current application is a proposal for revisions to a recent grant of permission.

Permission was granted for a practice putting green and driving range bays and flood lighting under P. A. Reg. Ref. 15/1599, Elevational changes to the Pavilion Building and a first-floor function, (GFA. 37 square metres) under P. A. Reg. Ref. 14/220, a spa with a hydrotherapy pool, treatment room exercise area and covered link to hotel under P. A. Reg. Refs 04/3217 and 05/736 according to details available on file.

There are prior grants of permission, dating from the 1990s which comprise:

P. A. Reg. Ref. 97/267: Permission for retention of a train used as a restaurant in the grounds

P. A. Reg.Ref.97/2358: Permission for thirty residential units and private effluent treatment and disposal facilities to include percolation areas, holding sewage treatment plant and holding tank and,

P. A. Reg Ref. Ref. 95/1257: Permission for a golf driving range and clay pigeon trap house.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The operative development plan is the Galway County Development Plan, 2015-2021 according to which the site does not come within any areas subject to zoning objectives.

The Abbey and original Country House are included on the record of protected structures. (RPS Ref. Nos 3441 and 3592 refer.) Policy Objectives AH 1 – AH 4 provide for protection of architectural heritage and standards for works relating to protected structures.

Glenlo Abbey is a recorded monument. (RMP GA082-047.)

Objective FPV1 preserves focal points and views indicated on MAP FPV1 and discourages development negatively impact on them subject to balance between key infrastructure to meet strategic aims, zoning and serviced amenities. There is a protected focal point and view across the site towards Lough Corrib from the N 59 to the west

There are several policy objectives of a strategic nature relating support for and encouragement of Galway as a tourism destination and to tourism infrastructure and facilities. Objectives EDST 1, EDT 5, EDT6, EDT10 and EDT 14 refer

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- A third-party appeal was received from Prior Park Ireland Assets Lit on its own behalf on 17th August 2018 according to which the proposed development does not contribute to sustainable development and has no regard for the

protected structures or proposed inclusions on the National Monuments Register and is not sympathetic to national heritage protection.

6.2. According to the appeal:

- Permission should be refused due to the way decisions on planning applications are made and in which 'stringent benchmarks' for thorough examination of all applications and provision of adequate reasoning for decisions are established having regard to High Court and Supreme Court Judgements. The planner's assessment fails to demonstrate that such standards were followed. No reference is made to the grant of permission under P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93 in the conditions attached or to Condition No 1 of the Order attached to the Bord Pleanala decision, following determination of the appeal. There are significant omissions in the planning history in the planning officer's report and that this inadequacy affects the Appropriate Assessment and there are inaccuracies in numbering of conditions. Permission should be refused because of inconsistencies between the numbering on the application form and the description of the proposed development. Extracts from Costello, J in O'Keefe v An Bord Pleanala [1993] and references are made to Charleton, J. Brian McMahon and An Bord Pleanala and Galway County Council, Sean Forde and Jane Joyce (Notice Parties) with regard to obligation to conduct thorough examination of planning history and validation.
- There is no reference to the parent permission in the development descriptions. (P. A. Reg. Ref. 54094 and P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93 refer.) The application is for demolition of a link which was included in the parent grant of permission under P. A. Reg. Ref. 54094 in 1987 and the canopy proposed involved changes from that granted under P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93. The decision-making process has on these applications and the appeal in the case of the latter were not taken into account. The current important application involves to protected structures and the new building proposed is much larger than the existing link.
- The conservation officer should have undertaken a site visit and carried out a detailed analysis, with possible investigative works being required by a further

information request to allow for exposure of the structure and geophysical investigations which would have required a License and more detailed analysis

- The prior applications, including the parent application (for the hotel development on agricultural zoned lands) shows a site outline on the location maps indicating the entire Glenlo Abbey lands of 48 to 54 hectares as the planning unit. The current application shows substantially different site boundaries reducing the planning unit to 7.15 hectares. This is a material change and a separate planning application is required for the change in the boundaries. It is questionable as to whether works can be implemented, if permitted without first obtaining permission for the change in boundaries. Article 22 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 as amended, (PDR) refers.
- The larger site shown for the prior applications include a Special Area of Conservation and Proposed Natural Heritage Area. A site area cannot be selected to avoid restrictions as imposed and this is an important consideration for Appropriate Assessment. The appropriate assessment, as submitted in the application can therefore not be considered. Planning authorities may give permission for houses but if the site outline is different, the applicant is required to apply for permission for retention and for the change of boundaries. The application cites a new site of 7.15 hectares redefining the planning unit. The creation of the new site is “development” defined in PDR and an application would be required to subdivide the property. The creation of a new planning unit constitutes material change and permission cannot be granted due to contravention of planning law. There is prior grant of permission for change of boundaries and there is an onus on An Bord Pleanála to give direction on the matter and indicate whether a separate planning application is required.
- There are three concurrent undetermined applications involving massive impact on the protected structure. Conditions, 2,3,4,7,8 and 10 of the prior grant of permission under P.A. Reg. Ref. 17/93 (following appeal) require compliance submissions which should be agreed before considering the subsequent applications. The current application is premature in this regard

and the application could create anomalies in deviating from the prior grant of permission. From a legal perspective, the conditions attached to the grant of permission under P. A.17/93 could be regarded as redundant if permission is granted without the compliance submissions on the conditions being agreed. Reference is made to condition No 2 regarding material textures, colours and external finishes, condition No 3 regarding archaeological investigations and supervision and detailed drawings of the walled garden and, Condition 8 regarding implementation and supervision of excavation works.

- The specification details within the Architectural Conservation Reports are too open to interpretation for resolution by compliance with a condition, especially given the proximity to the protected structures. (“natural stone “or natural stone wall finish” is not good enough.) Rubble stone wall is to be demolished. There is a plethora of contradictions in the past applications.
- The application is premature until the conditions of the prior grant of permission under P.A. Reg. Ref. 17/93 which the applicant seeks to change are satisfied. Otherwise there is plethora of anomalies causing inconsistencies. The conditions could be considered redundant by the further grant of permission without prior agreement on the conditions. The application should not have been considered until the conditions were agreed. The Board should not have decided the application unless these conditions have been agreed. The proposed development is therefore premature.
- The planning authority reneged on its serious responsibility for protecting heritage as bound to do so in the Planning and Development Acts, National Monuments Acts and Irish Constitution in the assessment and conditions attached to the grant of permission under P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93. (The planning authority attached no conditions whereas the Board attached a condition for the protected structures. Condition Nos 8, 9 and 10 provides for some archaeological supervision. The archaeologist report on the concurrent application and appeal file, (P.A. Reg. Ref. 18/658/ (302290) mentions trial holes dug but there are not photographs or dimensions. There is no record of notification, as required for four weeks’ notice prior to commence of site operations as required under Condition No 8 (a) of the grant of permission under P. A. Reg. Ref.17/93. Lack of notification as required, in advance of

trial hole digging renders the works unauthorised development and permission should then be refused for the current application. In this regard the applicant should provide proof of compliance with this requirement with copies of the licenses. It is questionable as to why no trial hole was located in the area of the subject application between the two structures. A geophysical survey would have been helpful. An archaeologist or conservation architect is required to indicate alternative if older foundations are found.

- A more detailed report than that provided is required to support suggestion for new foundations and a cantilevered approach to mitigate damage to the protected structure than that provided in the submitted report of Simon Kelly. More information should have been required and a lighter structure which is smaller could have been suspended as an alternative. The materials and sizing and massing and especially the zinc and flat roofs are out of context, stand out and detract from the protected structures.
- The existing link was designed by a leading architect and the disingenuous comments in the submission in the application are rejected. The link is discreet was appropriate for its time. A more creative approach is required and there are alternatives for upgrading thermal performance. The proposed demolition is serious as the existing link is part of protected structure. If permission is to be granted, including the proposed timber windows then they should be required though the entire complex to ameliorate mismatches in materials. The facades and large fenestration do not conform with the existing structures.
- The limestone finish or cut stone on the east and west elevations are different and inappropriate and this affects the uniformity of the complex. False stone or forticrete if used instead would be inappropriate and should be excluded and appropriate supervision is required ensuring high standards of craftsmanship.
- The increased size of the link (from 37.7 square metres to 118.7 square metres) is excessive and there is no justification on grounds of access for the disabled in this regard. The proposals also may not comply with Part B or M of the Building Regulations. A ramp could be accommodated and

incorporated in the development. The fixings for the canopy may damage the protected structure.

- There is no recommendation from the Conservation Officer about the necessity to use lime mortar and not cement on the structure which are jointed in cement mortar at present. Repointing throughout with lime-based mortar is required. A condition should be attached for removal of the cement pointing and replacement with lime-based mortar.
- The proposal is unsympathetic to the existing structure from which it detracts regarding size, massing, use of material and design. Modifications to the existing link can be achieved saving it from demolition and the other negative impacts referred to in the appeal submission.
- The etymology of the Kentfield townland is important but not explored and there is no detail about an abbey on the site.
- It is not understood why three applications were lodged within a short space of time and these applications increase the floor area and use of the complex substantially. Parking space will be more than at a premium and does to satisfy the requirements of the development plan. A shortfall was identified in the application under P. A Reg. Ref. 17/93. It is a material contravention when the three applications are considered.
- There were no financial contribution conditions attached to the grant of permission under P. A. Reg Ref.18/93 but this is rectified following appeal in the attachment of condition No 10. The planning authority is ignoring the advice of the Board's inspector in not attaching a financial condition for the current proposal because it is not exempt. It could be argued that the grant of permission for the current proposal supersedes that of 17/93 following appeal.

6.3. Applicant Response

- 6.3.1. A submission was received from McCarthy, Keville, O'Sullivan on behalf of the applicant in response to the appeal on 18th September, 2018 and it includes an account of the background and context and rebuttal of the appeal under subheadings as outlined in brief overleaf.

- Procedural issues and scope of assessment.

No evidence is available in the submission to demonstrate conflict with legal precedents established by the case law referred to in the submission. The contention as to lack of robust assessment on the part of the planning authority is subjective. The 'inconsistencies' referred to have no bearing on the assessment. The application documentation and the assessment by the planning authority accords with statutory requirements of Article 22 and 23 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 as amended. (PDR) The planner's report and it and conservation officer report conclude that the proposed development is acceptable. comprehensive.

- Planning unit – site boundaries.

All elements of the proposed development, and the buildings and the immediate curtilage are within the red line boundary identified in the application drawings and the full extent of the landholding is identified in blue and the application accords with Article 22. (1) (b) (i) of the PDR. There is no obligation to include other areas within the red line boundary. The issues raised in the appeal should be disregarded as irrelevant.

- Premature development –

The contentions as to several live applications for development and as to separate and conflicting and overlapping conditions, lack of adequate consideration in assessment and premature development regarding the discharge of the extant grant of planning permission under P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93 are rejected. The applicant intends to fully comply as required with all conditions. The issues raised in the appeal should be disregarded as irrelevant.

- Appropriate Assessment

There are no deficiencies regarding Appropriate Assessment obligations. The planning officer indicated satisfaction in is regard. The lodged appropriate assessment screening report indicated no potential adverse impact and the contention of the appellant lacks evidence to the contrary.

- Impact on Protected Structures

The appellant in the appeal refers to concerns about a separate planning application and they should be disregarded. (P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93 refers.) However, contentions as to ground works being undertaken contrary to the conditions are rejected in that the required notifications were lodged with the local authority.

The conservation architect report with the application confirms minimal intervention and a design that use existing cuts to mitigate impact on history fabric. There is no assessment or report to demonstrate contravention of the findings of the applicant's conservation architect or the conservation officer's observations and recommendations.

- Quantum of 'live' applications.

There is no statutory bar on the lodgement of more than one application at a time or basis to the objections of the appellant in this regard.

- Carparking Provision.

The proposed link structure is a high-quality circulation space and it does not generate new or additional parking demand. A similar space in use as a lounge would generate eight spaces. There are 204 spaces and three accessible spaces at present. Implementation of the grant of permission under P.A. Reg.Ref.17/93 sees removal of a north facing carpark which is to be replaced with gardens and will result in a total of 229 spaces, representing a shortfall of fifteen spaces. The concurrent, live application omits a previously permitted first floor extension at the Pavilion reducing the shortfall to 6.8 spaces. If there is an additional requirement for the link building the shortfall rises to fifteen as presented in the grant of permission under P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93. There are no current issues with carparking on the site and there is adequate provision for the existing, permitted and proposed developments.

There is adequate on-site provision for carparking to serve existing and additional demand arising from the implementation of extant planning permissions. A potential shortfall identified in the assessment of the

application under P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93 by the planning authority was resolved on grounds of significant guest arrivals by bus.

- Development Contributions

The appellant's contentions are not considered relevant to the appeal in that development contributions are a matter for the planning authority.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. The assessment, having regard to the issues raised in the appeal is set out below under the following sub headings:

Legal, procedural and validity Issues.

Archaeological Heritage

Architectural Heritage.

Size and Intensification of use.

Environmental Impact Assessment Screening

Appropriate Assessment Screening.

7.2. **Legal, procedural and validity Issues.**

7.2.1. Glenloe Abbey has a complex planning history extending back to the 1990s when it was originally developed as a hotel and golf resort. It is agreed that planning applications have been fragmented and somewhat piecemeal with regard to the development and the expansion of the complex over the past twenty plus years. However, it is considered that the contentions that the planning code has been breached by the planning authority and or the applicant in relation to legal precedent, validity, procedural matters and the assessment of the current application, quantum of concurrent undetermined applications and appeals or prior applications are matters for resolution through the legal system. Issues as to lack of evidence of compliance with conditions attached to the grant of permission under P. A. Reg. Refs 54094 and 17/93 are matters to be resolved between the planning authority and the applicant.

7.2.2. With regard to the dispute over the planning unit, the inclusion of the details of the entirety of the landholding, (outlined in blue) on the site location map in conjunction with the area, (outlined in red) which includes the buildings and the immediate curtilage is consistent with the requirements of Article 22 (1) (b) (i) of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001-2018.

7.2.3. In view of the foregoing, it is considered reasonable to proceed with the assessment and determination of the appeal, without prejudice to any possible future legal proceedings.

7.3. **Archaeological Heritage.**

7.3.1. The archaeological significance of Glenlo Abbey, a recorded monument is not disputed by the parties. The contentions as to commencement of site investigative works without a prior license and consent of the National Monuments service is a matter which can be brought to the attention of the planning authority and the National Monuments Service. The site has previously been subject to significant disturbance and earth works whereas in the case of the current application, no significant additional major earth works appear to be necessary.

7.3.2. The written statement by Ms Anne Carey among the application documentation as to her appointment to undertake the works required under Condition No 8 of the grant of permission under P. A. Reg. Ref. 17/93 and her undertaking to monitor excavation works is noted. An appropriate archaeological monitoring condition can be attached should permission be granted for the current proposal.

7.4. **Architectural Heritage.**

7.4.1. It is agreed that alternative options for a lighter structure, smaller structure and suspended structure may be viable. However, there is an insufficient case for rejection of the current proposal on grounds of potential for damage to historic fabric or subsurface material of an archaeological nature.

7.4.2. A significant feature in the relationship between the original demesne building and the chapel, which is in use as a restaurant is the distinct separation between the two as 'stand-alone' structures which is a characteristic feature of the historic demesne. The modest size, scale and proportions and, the relatively low profile, of the existing link building does not unduly adversely affect this relationship while at the same time it facilitates the integration of the current contemporary restaurant use within the

overall hotel complex. The profile of the proposed new link building, in views towards the front is prominent and over dominant and fails to respect the historic relationship between the chapel and the demesne dwelling. The footprint of the proposed new link building which is forward of the front building line of the chapel and demesne dwelling exacerbates the negative impact of the proposed link building within the relationship between and setting of the chapel and original demesne house in profile in views towards the frontage. The height reaches the eaves height of the chapel, the massing is considerable and the solid to void distribution in the front elevation is visually obtrusive by way of the extent and size of the glazing and the height and depth of the cut stone finished façade above the glazing to the parapet. In view of the foregoing, it is considered that the proposed link building would be visually obtrusive and would seriously injure the historic integrity, character and setting of the chapel and the demesne dwelling within the complex, having regard to their inclusion on the record of protected structures.

- 7.4.3. The requirements of the conservation officer regarding external finishes, specifications for historic fabric, monitoring and management of the project in accordance with good conservation practice under the direction of a person with specialist expertise in historic building conservation, as indicated in her report on the application can all be addressed to the satisfaction of the conservation officer by way of compliance with conditions. However, greater specificity in the terminology within the conditions to provide for preparation of a comprehensive method statement for the works, use of appropriate lime-based mortar for repointing and as to exclusion of use of forticrete or inappropriate artificial materials would be warranted and should address the concerns of the appellant in this regard.

7.5. **Size and Intensification of use.**

- 7.5.1. It is agreed with the appellant that the proposed development which has a stated floor area of 118.7 square metres is considerable in relation to the existing link building which has a stated floor area of 37.7 square metres. Contrary to the assertion in the appeal, it is considered that the proposed development represents an intensification of use and cannot be regarded as circulation space that is neutral to this end. The layout shows proposals for considerable seating which can reasonably be included as generating additional parking demand having regard to the carparking standards within the CDP although relaxation of the application of

these standards is open to consideration. There is no objection in principle to consideration of proposals for intensification of use or expansion of development at the complex on their own merits, subject to all qualitative planning standards being deemed satisfactory. A development of the size proposed, if it is unsatisfactory cannot be justified by way of an argument as to ability to satisfy required standards within Part B and M of the Building Regulations. Furthermore, it is not accepted that there are no alternative options to ensure consistency with the minimum standards.

7.6. Environmental Impact Assessment Screening.

7.6.1. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development and its location in a serviced urban area, removed from any sensitive locations or features, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

7.7. Appropriate Assessment Screening.

7.7.1. The application was accompanied by a screening report prepared by McCarthy Keville O'Sullivan which has been consulted for the purposes of the assessment.

7.7.2. The site location is approximately three hundred and fifty metres to the east of the Loch Corrib SAC (Site Code 00297), and Lough Corrib SPA (4042). The Inner Galway Bay SPA (4031) is approximately 4.6 km to the south and the Galway Bay Complex SAC (0286) is circa four kilometres to the south.

7.7.3. There is ditch between the Glenlo Abbey lands which is a direct source pathway link with the Lough Corrib SPA and SAC, but it does not support significant water flows. The Glen Abbey development is connected to the public sewage system to discharge is via a pumping system supported by back up pumps an overflow tank and a reserve power generation. The increase in intensity of development incorporated in the current proposal is insignificant in addition to and in conjunction with existing development and concurrent development proposals at Glenlo Abbey.

7.7.4. It can be concluded, owing to the scale and nature of the proposed development that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise. The proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. In view of the foregoing it is recommended that the planning authority decision to grant permission be overturned and that the appeal should be upheld. Draft Reasons and Considerations follow.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 9.1. The original chapel structure and the demesne dwelling which form part of the historic complex at Glenlo Abbey are included on the record of protected structures. It is considered that the proposed new link building fails to respect the historic relationship between the chapel and the demesne dwelling as two separated distinct structures within the historic demesne and that the profile, due to the footprint forward of the front building line of the chapel, the height which reaches the eaves height of the chapel, the massing and, the distribution of solid to void on the front elevation by way of extent and size of glazing in combination with the extent and depth and height of the stone finish to parapet height above the glazing on the front elevation the proposed development would be excessive in scale and profile, visually intrusive, and would fail to respect the historic relationship, integrity, character and setting of the chapel and demesne dwelling within the complex. As a result, the proposed development would seriously injure the integrity and character of the protected structures and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Jane Dennehy
Senior Planning Inspector
27th November, 2018