



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-308269-20.

---

<b>Development</b>	Permission to change house plans from previously permitted 2 no. detached dwellings to 4 no. 2 bedroom terraced houses on sites formerly numbered 35 and 38.
<b>Location</b>	Killora, Craughwell, Co. Galway.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Galway County Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	20/916.
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	JBROC Ltd.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	JBROC Ltd.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	10/02/2021.
<b>Inspector</b>	A. Considine.

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located within the village of Craughwell, which is located approximately 22km to the southeast of Galway City. Craughwell is within easy access to Galway City, Ennis and Limerick City via regular rail service and access to M6 motorway. The site is located to the southwest of the village, 115m west of the train station 360m southwest of the village centre. The site forms part of the “Gleanntán na hAbhlann” housing estate, which lies to the south of the Craughwell River.
- 1.2. The site the subject of this appeal, has a stated area of 2.836ha, which includes the wider estate area. The actual area of the proposed development site, which is occupied by sites formerly numbered 35 and 38 amounts to approximately 800m<sup>2</sup> (0.08ha). The site is located away from the overall estate, on a small corner and stand-alone plot to the east of the access road from a small cul-de-sac road. This cul-de-sac currently provides access to 4 detached houses, 3 of which comprise part of the wider estate under construction and a single storey house immediately adjacent to the current proposed site.
- 1.3. Foundation pads and associated services for two detached units have been constructed on the site and there is a small area of public open space located just to the north of the proposed development site. The site is accessed via a cul-de-sac off the R-347 regional road. The existing estate is served by a shared propriety treatment plant. The existing treatment plant is to be upgraded as part of a previous planning permission.
- 1.4. The Board will note that this appears to be a repeat application, ABP ref. ABP-303892-19 refers (PA ref 18/1760).

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought, as per the public notices, for a change of house plans from the currently permitted 2 No. detached dwelling houses on Sites formerly numbered 35 & 38 to 4 no. 2 Bedroom terraced dwelling houses and to connect to the permitted sewage treatment plant and associated services in the townland of Killora. This development previously received permission under Planning Reference No's

07/1922, 12/875, 17/1253, 18/240 and 19/1038. Gross floor space of proposed works: 380 sqm (4 Terrace Houses), all at Killora, Craughwell, Co Galway.

2.2. The Board will note that the sites have previously been identified as nos. 27 & 28.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

The Planning Authority decided to refuse planning permission for the proposed development for the following stated reasons:

1. Having regard to the additional housing units proposed and layout presented, the planning authority consider that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, obstruction of road users or otherwise, owing to the additional turning movements the development would generate at a point where sightlines are restricted and would lead to a conflict between road users, that is, vehicular traffic, pedestrians and cyclists.
2. It is considered that the proposed development, by reason of the monotype design proposed with limited visual relief, in conjunction with the confined site configuration, the deficient quantum, quality of private open space provision for the proposed dwellings, the lack of dedicated public open space within reasonable proximity to the development and absence of refuse storage and collection provision, would constitute a substandard quality of residential design and layout and would be overdevelopment at this location, would be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of prospective occupants. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. Based on the information submitted with the application details, the planning authority is not satisfied that the wastewater arising from the development can be satisfactorily disposed of therefore, if permitted as proposed the development would be prejudicial to public health and conservation objectives cannot be ruled out. Therefore if permitted as proposed development has the potential to pose an unacceptable risk to water quality and adversely affect the qualifying interests and conservation objectives of protected European

sites for flora and fauna and would materially contravene Objective NHB1 and DS6 of the Galway County Development Plan 2015-2021 and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. Planning Authority Reports

### 3.1.1. **Planning Reports**

The Planning report considered the proposed development in the context of the details submitted with the application, internal technical reports, planning history and the County Development Plan policies and objectives. The report includes an Appropriate Assessment Screening, concluding that insufficient information has been provided with the application in relation to wastewater disposal in order to screen out the likely significant effects directly/indirectly/cumulatively on European Sites. The report also includes a Flood Risk Assessment section, noting that the site is not located within an identified flood risk area.

The Planning Report concludes that the proposed development is not acceptable by reason of overdevelopment, substandard design and residential amenity, inadequate details provided in relation to the satisfactory disposal of wastewater and traffic safety issues. The planning history of the site, including the Boards previous refusal for a similar development on the site, is also considered. The report concludes that proposed development is not acceptable, and the Planning Officer recommends that permission be refused for the proposed development, for 3 reasons.

This Planning Report formed the basis of the Planning Authority's decision to refuse planning permission.

### 3.1.2. **Other Technical Reports**

**Roads & Transportation Department:** The Department recommends refusal of planning permission for the following reason:

The proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the additional traffic turning movements the development would generate at a point where sightlines are restricted and would lead to conflict between road users, that is, vehicular traffic, pedestrians and cyclists.

### 3.1.3. Prescribed Bodies

**HSA:** The HSA brings to the attention of the Planning Authority the presence of a notified establishment as required under the SEVESO Directive (2012/18/EU). The establishment is identified as Circle K Galway Terminal which is located in Galway Harbour Enterprise Park, New Docks, Galway. The Authority does not advise against granting planning permission in the context of Major Accident Hazards.

### 3.1.4. Third Party Submissions

None

## 4.0 Planning History

The following is the relevant planning history pertaining to the subject site:

**ABP ref: ABP-303892-19 (PA ref 18/1760):** Permission refused for change of house plan from the previously permitted 2 no. detached dwelling houses on Site Nos. 27 & 28 to 4 no. terraced dwelling houses. Refused for the following reasons:

1. Having regard to the outer suburban location of the site, it is considered that the proposed density of the scheme is excessive in the context of adjoining development, would result in an inadequate amount of private open space to serve the proposed development, and would give rise to substandard residential amenity for future occupiers and would constitute overdevelopment. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the additional traffic turning movements the development would generate at a point where sightlines are restricted and would lead to conflict between road users, that is, vehicular traffic, pedestrians and cyclists.
3. Having regard to its location at the edge of the village, it is considered that the design approach fails to address the site context and the site location on the edge of the village and the proposed terrace of four

dwellings would be out of character at this location, and be contrary to Section 3.4.5 Edge of Centre Sites Within Small Towns/Villages of the Galway County Development Plan 2015-2021 to create a soft transition between the urban and rural area. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

**ABP ref: ABP-304893-19 (PA ref 19/625):** Permission granted on appeal for the change of house plans from previously permitted two number detached dwelling houses on site numbers 27 and 28 to two number larger detached dwelling houses by increasing each house by one metre in width.

**PA ref: 18/240:** Permission granted to JRBOC Ltd. to retain and complete alterations to the internal layout of the estate, increase the number of units and the capacity of the effluent treatment plant.

**PA ref: 17/1253:** Permission granted to JRBOC Ltd. to construct 31 dwellings previously granted under 07/1922 and 12/875.

**PA ref: 07/1922:** Permission granted to construct 31 dwellings and associated site works.

## 5.0 Policy and Context

### 5.1. National Planning Framework – Project Ireland 2040, DoHP&LG 2018

- 5.1.1. The National Planning Framework – Project Ireland 2040 is a high-level strategic plan for shaping the future growth and development of Ireland to 2040. A key objective of the Framework is to ensure balanced regional growth, the promotion of compact development and the prevention of urban sprawl. It is a target of the NPF that 40% of all new housing is to be delivered within the existing built-up areas of cities, towns and villages on infill and/or brownfield sites with the remaining houses to be delivered at the edge of settlements and in rural areas.
- 5.1.2. The NPF includes a Chapter, No. 6 entitled ‘People, Homes and Communities’. It sets out that place is intrinsic to achieving good quality of life. A number of key policy objectives are noted as follows:

- National Policy Objective 33 seeks to “prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location”.
- National Policy Objective 35 seeks “to increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including restrictions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights”.

5.1.3. National Planning Objective 13 provides that “in urban areas, planning and related standards, including, in particular, height and car parking will be based on performance criteria that seek to achieve well-designed high-quality outcomes in order to achieve targeted growth. These standards will be subject to a range of tolerance that enables alternative solutions to be proposed to achieve stated outcomes, provided public safety is not compromised and the environment is suitably protected”.

## 5.2. **Sustainable Residential Development in Urban areas, Guidelines (DoEHLG, 2009):**

5.2.1. These statutory guidelines update and revise the 1999 Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Residential. The objective is to produce high quality – and crucially – sustainable developments:

- quality homes and neighbourhoods,
- places where people actually want to live, to work and to raise families, and
- places that work – and will continue to work - and not just for us, but for our children and for our children’s children.

5.2.2. The guidelines promote the principle of higher densities in urban areas as indicated in the preceding guidelines and it remains Government policy to promote sustainable patterns of urban settlement, particularly higher residential densities in locations which are, or will be, served by public transport under the *Transport 21* programme.

5.2.3. Chapter 6 of the guidelines deals with Small Towns and Villages and notes that in some cases, concerns have been raised about the impact of rapid development and expansion on the character of smaller towns and villages. The Guidelines specifically

advise that development in smaller towns and villages must be plan led, and while higher densities are appropriate in certain locations, proposals for lower densities of development may be considered acceptable at locations on serviced land within the environs of the town or village in order to offer people, who would otherwise seek to develop a house in an unserviced rural area, the option to develop in a small town or village where services are available and within walking and cycling distance.

5.2.4. Chapter 6 also provides guidance in terms of Density Standards and in this regard, sections 6.12 and 6.13 of the Guidelines deal with Edge of small town / village and state as follows:

**6.12** In order to offer an effective alternative to the provision of single houses in surrounding unserviced rural areas, it is appropriate in controlled circumstances to consider proposals for developments with densities of less than 15 - 20 dwellings per hectare along or inside the edge of smaller towns and villages, as long as such lower density development does not represent more than about 20% of the total new planned housing stock of the small town or village in question. This is to ensure that planned new development in small towns and villages offer a range of housing types, avoiding the trend towards predominantly low-density commuter-driven developments around many small towns and villages within the commuter belts of the principal cities and other Gateway locations. Such lower density development also needs to ensure the definition of a strong urban edge that defines a clear distinction between urban and the open countryside.

**6.13** The quality of new development will also be determined by many other factors additional to the achievement of an appropriate density of development. However, adherence to the guidance outlined above, coupled with effective local planning can offer a positive path forward in managing the process of development of Ireland's distinctive and attractive smaller towns and villages.

### 5.3. Galway County Development Plan 2015-2021

#### 5.3.1. Section 3.4.3 Infill/Sub-Division of Individual Sites

The existing built fabric of large towns often contain residential areas where additional dwellings can be accommodated without compromising the existing residential amenity or residential character of the area. The provision of additional dwellings within inner suburban areas of towns can be provided either by infill or by sub-division. Infill residential development may range from small gap infill, unused or derelict land and backland areas, up to larger residual sites or sites assembled from a multiplicity of ownership. Sub-division of individual sites can be achieved where large houses on relatively extensive sites can accommodate new residential development without a dramatic alteration in the character of the area or a negative impact on existing residential amenities. Subdivision shall be considered subject to safeguards regarding residential amenity, internal space standards, private and public open space, car parking and maintenance of the public character of the area.

#### 5.3.2. Section 3.4.5 Edge of Centre Sites Within Small Towns/Villages

The emphasis is on achieving successful transition from central areas to areas at the edge of the smaller towns and villages. Development of such sites tends to be predominantly residential in character and given the transitional nature of such sites, the density range will be assessed depending on the characteristics of the small town/village, and the subject site, on a case by case basis. There will also be an encouragement of appropriate housing types with a high standard of design. This form of development needs to ensure the definition of a strong urban edge and design that creates a clear distinction between the urban area and the open countryside while discouraging ribbon development on the approaches to towns and villages.

#### 5.3.3. DM Standard 1: Qualitative Assessment-Design Quality, Guidelines and Statements (Urban and Rural Areas)

- a) Design Quality
- b) Design Guidelines sets out that - On brownfield, infill sites or all other sites, a minimum of 10% public open space will be required.

#### 5.3.4. DM Standard 22: Parking Standards

### c) Parking in Residential Areas

In general, residential layouts should not be dominated by car parking along access roads. New residential development should take account of the following criteria:

- Car parking for detached and semi-detached housing should be within the curtilage of the individual house site.

#### 5.3.5. Section 2.6.1 Settlement Hierarchy

##### 2.6.6 Other Villages (Population <1,500)

The villages in this tier of the hierarchy include Craughwell. They have strong settlement structures and have the potential to support additional growth, offering an alternative living option for those people who do not wish to reside in the larger key towns and do not meet the housing need requirements for the rural area.

#### 5.4. Craughwell Local Area Plan 2009 - 2015

5.4.1. The LAP complements the implementation of the current Galway City Development Plan 2017-2023. The site is located in an area identified as “Outer Village Area” in the Local Area Plan. The following policies and objectives are considered relevant in relation to the proposed development:

**Policy RD1:** It is a policy of the Council to encourage residential development that adds to the character and is appropriate to the existing character and density of the village.

**Objective RD1.2:** Residential developments must have regard to the village and rural ethos of the surrounding landscape; a respect for design, density, materials used and mass.

**Objective RD1.4:** Houses located at the plan boundary will be at a low density to create a soft transition between the plan area and the surrounding landscape.

5.4.2. Section 5.0 Layout and Built Form

**Objective LB1.2:** Appropriate gateways, entrances and thresholds should be encouraged at the edges of the village and at the entrance to major new developments. The entrances to the village should be designed as gateways

with high quality public spaces, structures and / or landscaping to create a sense of place, arrival and identity.

**Objective LB1.3:** Orientate buildings towards public roads and other public spaces so as to provide a 'face' to development, to create a more vibrant streetscape and to ensure natural surveillance and a safe environment. Buildings on corner sites will be encouraged to 'turn the corner' by fronting onto two streets.

**Objective LB1.12:** Buildings and public spaces should be designed to create quality places that are suited to their context, that have a recognisable identity and that contribute to the creation of a high quality public realm.

**Objective LB1.13:** Developments should provide for a high level of connectivity and permeability, to encourage walking and cycling and to promote linkages between areas, together with an adequate level of legibility, to provide a distinctive distribution of places and spaces that provide adequate orientation and clarity.

## 5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within any designated site. The closest Natura 2000 site is the Rahasane Turlough SAC (site code 000322), and is located approximately 0.5km to the west of the site. The Rahasane Turlough SPA (site code 004089), is located approximately 0.7km to the west.

## 5.6. EIA Screening

Having regard to nature and scale of the development, together with the brownfield nature of the site, 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

6.1.1. This is a first party appeal, submitted by Padraic Hession & Associates Ltd on behalf of the applicant, against the decision of the Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the proposed development. The appeal sets out the context of the wider residential development and addresses the grounds of appeal in the context of the three reasons for refusal as follows:

#### Reason 1:

- The proposal amounts to 2 additional units as permission is in place for 2 houses on the site.
- The units will front onto a very quiet cul-de-sac and it is difficult to see how 2 additional houses would lead to conflict between road users.
- There is adequate space within the site to manoeuvre without having to reverse onto the public road. The proposed planting between houses 36 and 37 can be omitted if required.
- Direct access to the regional road is not proposed as part of this application.

#### Reason 2:

- It is agreed that the design is a simple design and the appellant disagree that any major modifications are required.
- The concern in the planners report in relation to unit number 35. It is submitted that the small area of public open space beside this unit, which is of limited benefit from a public open space point of view, could be used to significantly increase the size of unit 35 if desired.
- Access to public open space is identical to the access to public open space from the two permitted units on the site.
- In terms of refuse bins, it is submitted that this will be dealt with by each individual owner as is the case within the main body of the estate, and as would be done in any terrace.

- The first party submits that a similar block of four terraced units was refused by the PA under PA ref 14/1348 for similar reasons and was subsequently granted on appeal by the Board<sup>1</sup>.
- There is no minimum private open space requirement set out under the provisions of the Galway County Development Plan 2015-2021 or the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas 2009 and its accompanying design manual.
- Reason 3:
  - It is submitted that there is capacity required for the additional 2 units, which is only 4PE. There is no requirement to make any amendments to the treatment plant or polishing filter.

It is respectfully requested that the Board grant permission for the development as proposed.

## 6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

None.

## 6.3. **Observations**

None.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

### 7.1. **Introduction**

- 7.1.1. The Board will note that the subject appeal in essence, amounts to a repeat application. Under ABP-303892-19, the Board considered the merits of the replacement of two detached houses on the subject site with a terrace of 4 units. The scale and design are not too dissimilar in terms of the refused proposal and the proposal currently before the Board.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Board will note that I have had regard to this and ABP ref is 244967. This referenced site lies within the village centre of Craughwell on Ballymore Lane.

- 7.1.2. I accept that the principle of the proposed development, given the planning history of the site, the location of the site within the development boundaries of Craughwell, is wholly acceptable subject to the normal planning and environmental considerations.
- 7.1.3. The Board will note that the submitted site layout plan is indicated at a scale of 1:500. This is, however, incorrect and is actually at a scale of 1:100.
- 7.1.4. I consider that the main issues pertaining to the proposed development can be assessed under the following headings:
1. Compliance with the County Development Plan & Craughwell Local Area Plan
  2. Roads & Traffic Issues
  3. Other Issues
  4. Appropriate Assessment

## **7.2. Compliance with the County Development Plan & Craughwell Local Area Plan**

- 7.2.1. The appeal site lies to the south west of the village centre of Craughwell. The site can be described as being on the edge of the village and in this regard, Section 3.4.5 of the Galway County Development Plan is relevant, in that it deals with Edge of Centre Sites Within Small Towns/Villages. The aim of the plan is to achieve successful transition from central areas to areas on the edge of small towns and villages. It is noted that such sites tend to be predominantly residential in character and the Plan the characteristics of the village will dictate the density range. The Plan also states that development needs to ensure the definition of a strong urban edge and design that creates a clear distinction between the urban area and the open countryside while discouraging ribbon development on the approaches to towns and villages.
- 7.2.2. In terms of the subject site, I note that the corner site sits in a prominent location and that the existing character of the residential area to the north east, and along the cul-de-sac, provides for larger detached houses. The subject site is disconnected from the rest of the wider residential estate by the R347 regional road to the west. The wider estate provides for larger semi-detached and detached houses. In the context of Section 3.4.5 of the CDP, together with the design proposed, I do not consider

that the applicant has adequately addressed the Boards previous concerns. I also note the objectives of the Craughwell Local Area Plan, and in particular Objective RD1.4 which requires that 'houses located at the plan boundary will be at a low density to create a soft transition between the plan area and the surrounding landscape'.

- 7.2.3. The Boards previous decision raised concerns in terms of the restricted nature of the site and the density of the scheme proposed, particularly in the context of the adjoining development. While I acknowledge national policy in terms of increased density, I would not accept that the subject site is either suitable or capable of the density as proposed. In addition, I note that the proposed Section 6.3 (e) of the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, Guidelines states that the scale of new residential schemes in smaller towns and villages should be in proportion to the pattern and grain of existing development.
- 7.2.4. The planning application includes the full area of the wider estate in terms of the proposed development site area, but the actual area affected by the proposed development is in the region of 0.08ha. In this regard, the proposed density of the development equates to 50 units per hectare. As such, I consider the development to represent a significant overdevelopment of this small site in the context of its location at the edge of Craughwell, and would not accord with the requirements of national guidelines as they relate to density.
- 7.2.5. In terms of Section 5.0 of the LAP, Objective LB1.2 requires that the 'entrances to the village should be designed as gateways with high quality public spaces, structures and / or landscaping to create a sense of place, arrival and identity'. Objective LB1.13 requires that developments should provide for a high level of connectivity and permeability, to encourage walking and cycling and to promote linkages between areas, together with an adequate level of legibility, to provide a distinctive distribution of places and spaces that provide adequate orientation and clarity.
- 7.2.6. The design introduces a blank gable onto the regional road while the introduction of terraced houses on this restricted site does not reflect the suburban character of the wider area. Given the lack of dual aspect proposed, together with the boundary treatment, I consider that the introduction of a boundary wall onto the regional road

would be a visually intrusive feature at this location and would not support the objectives of the LAP to create a soft transition between the plan area and surrounding landscape.

### **7.3. Roads & Traffic Issues**

- 7.3.1. The PAs first reason for refusal relates to the concerns raised by the Roads and Transportation Department of Galway County Council. It is submitted that the proposed development will result in a traffic hazard for existing road users and the development as proposed would endanger public safety.
- 7.3.2. The proposed development provides for 6 car parking spaces to the front of the terrace of houses. The previous proposal for terraced housing, which included 3-bedroom units, had provided for parking to the front of the units as well as to the rear, with a separate parking area with access directly onto the regional road. It was concluded that sightlines at the entrance to the site were restricted due to the alignment of the road. While the current proposed layout provides for an appropriate number of parking spaces to the front of the houses only, I am concerned that inadequate space is available to manoeuvre within the site. I note the submission in the appeal that if deemed necessary, the central planting area proposed can be removed to improve circulation within the car park area to the front of the houses.
- 7.3.3. Having regard to the proximity of the junction to the entrance, together with the narrow nature of the road to the front of the site, I do not consider that the traffic issues which formed part of the previous Board decision have been adequately addressed.
- 7.3.4. While I accept that permission has been granted for 2 houses on the subject site, I consider the increase in density will, by reason of traffic hazard arising due to additional traffic movements, would endanger public safety and would lead to conflict between road users.

## **7.4. Other Issues**

### **7.4.1. Residential Amenity Issues**

In terms of residential amenity issues, I note that the PA considered that the proposed development represented a substandard form of development as it relates to residential amenity. Of note, concern was raised in relation to the provision of private open space, the absence of refuse storage and collection provision, lack of public open space, all of which ultimately results in an overdevelopment of the site. I would concur with these concerns.

While the CDP or the Craughwell LAP do not stipulate minimum open space requirements, it is a requirement that open space be designed for maximum privacy and orientated for maximum sunshine and shelter. While the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas 2009 Guidelines do not dictate a minimum private open space provision, section 7.8 requires that all houses have an area of private open space behind the building line. While I acknowledge that all proposed units have private open space, no breakdown in the areas is provided. The 2009 Guidelines also require that where no front gardens are proposed, a 'defensible space' is created between the public footpath is considered. The Board will note that the parking area for the units takes up the full area to the front of the houses.

In terms of the provision of refuse stores, I note the submission of the appellant that each unit will be responsible for the management and collection of their own waste. While the end of terrace houses have side access to the rear gardens, the two mid-terraced units do not. No provision for bin storage has been provided for.

I consider that the proposed development, if permitted would give rise to substandard residential amenity for future occupants and would constitute overdevelopment of this restricted site.

### **7.4.2. Site Servicing**

The development is proposed to connect to the existing WWTP which serves the wider residential estate and will connect to public mains. I note that the PE of the WWTP was increased under PA ref. 18/240, and there is no objection in this regard.

#### 7.4.3. **Development Contribution**

The subject development is liable to pay development contribution, a condition to this effect, in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme 2016, revised August 21<sup>st</sup> 2019, should be included in any grant of planning permission.

#### 7.4.4. **Appropriate Assessment**

The site is not located within any designated site. The closest Natura 2000 site is the Rahasane Turlough SAC (site code 000322) and is located approximately 0.5km to the west of the site. The Rahasane Turlough SPA (site code 004089), is located approximately 0.7km to the west.

Overall, I consider it is reasonable to conclude on the basis of the information available that the proposal individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of a Natura 2000 site having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and separation distances involved to adjoining Natura 2000 sites. It is also not considered that the development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European Site.

### 8.0 **Recommendation**

I recommend that planning permission be Refused for the proposed development for the following stated reason and subject to the following stated conditions.

### 9.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

1. Having regard to the outer suburban location of the site, it is considered that the proposed density of the scheme is excessive in the context of adjoining development, would result in an inadequate amount of private open space to serve the proposed development, and would give rise to substandard residential amenity for future occupiers and would constitute overdevelopment. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the additional traffic turning movements the development would generate at a point where sightlines are restricted and would lead to conflict between road users, that is, vehicular traffic, pedestrians and cyclists.
  
3. Having regard to its location at the edge of the village, it is considered that the design approach fails to address the site context and the site location on the edge of the village and the proposed terrace of four dwellings would be out of character at this location and be contrary to Section 3.4.5 Edge of Centre Sites Within Small Towns/Villages of the Galway County Development Plan 2015-2021 to create a soft transition between the urban and rural area. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

A. Considine  
Planning Inspector  
11<sup>th</sup> February 2021