



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-317095-23

<b>Development</b>	Retain house as 2 no. dwelling units, and retain and complete modifications to dwelling units, including amendments to internal layouts, entrance halls and replacement of substandard roof.
<b>Location</b>	Castle Street/Castle Avenue, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Roscommon County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	22603
<b>Applicant</b>	Patrick and Brian Connolly
<b>Type of Application</b>	Retention Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant Retention Permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party v Conditions
<b>Appellant</b>	Patrick and Brian Connolly
<b>Observer</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	6 <sup>th</sup> March 2024

**Inspector**

Ian Campbell

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal property, which based on the development description contained in the public notices and the drawings submitted with the planning application/appeal, has been subdivided to form 2 no. dwellings, referred to as No. 68A (stated floor area c. 57 sqm) and No. 68B (stated floor area c. 53 sqm).
- 1.2. The appeal property, a single storey structure, is situated c. 200 metres north of the centre of Roscommon, at the junction between Castle Avenue (also referred to as Castle Lane) and Castle Street and has frontage to both streets. The subject site has a stated site area of 0.0355 Ha. (i.e. c. 355 sqm).
- 1.3. The part of the appeal property facing Castle Street is clad in stone. The rear/western part of the appeal property comprises painted render. A vehicular access is located from Castle Avenue. 2 no. separate areas of private amenity space are indicated along the northern boundary of the site.
- 1.4. The adjoining area is predominantly residential in nature and is characterised by detached two storey dwellings. A footpath bounds the appeal site to the south (on Castle Avenue) and to the east (on Castle Street).

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development as described in the public notices submitted with the planning application comprises;

- Retention Permission:
  - of (the use of) a dwelling as 2 no. dwellings.
  - modifications<sup>1</sup> to the dwelling units, including amendments to the internal layout, entrance hall, and the replacement of a substandard roof.

Two sets of drawings were submitted to the PA. *Drawing No. 21000-21* (Original Plan, Elevations and Sections) and *Drawing No. 21000-22* (Existing Plans, Elevations and Sections).

---

<sup>1</sup> The development description contained in the public notices refers to this element of the proposed development as 'retain and complete'. The proposed development therefore comprises retention permission and permission, with the latter comprising those elements of the proposed development which are to be completed.

2.2. The planning application was accompanied by a cover letter which notes the following;

- The applicants purchased the property (2 no. dwellings) in 2017. The property was in a poor state of repair. Alteration were carried out to the property which the applicants assumed where exempt development. The applicants are now seeking to retain and complete these works.
- The original dwelling facing Castle Street had an extension constructed in 1983 and this extension was used as a separate dwelling since then.
- Planning history on the site confirms that the property has been used as 2 no. dwellings (reference is made to the development description of 3 no. planning applications describing the property as '2 no. dwellings units').
- 3 no. car parking spaces are proposed to serve the development.
- Private open space is provided to the front and rear.

2.3. The applicant/appellant has submitted **revised plans to the Board** for consideration which include;

House A<sup>2</sup>:

- Provision of door on east elevation (in lieu of window).
- Increase in private amenity space from 45 sqm to 48 sqm.
- Provision of pedestrian gate along southern elevation.
- Provision of 1.8 metre high hedge along Castle Street and northern site boundary.

House B

- Omission of window on eastern elevation (serving Bedroom 1).
- Provision of new window on northern elevation (serving Bedroom 1).
- Provision of planter bed along south elevation.
- Omission of car parking space.
- Increase in private amenity space from 35 sqm to 49 sqm.

---

<sup>2</sup> Drawing No. 21000-20 submitted to the Board refers to House A and House B as 'Apartment A' and 'Apartment B'. This issue is addressed at paragraph 7.2.2. (below).

- Provision of pedestrian gate along western elevation.
- Provision of 1.8 metre high hedge along northern and part of western site boundary.
- Reduction in depth of area indicated to facilitate car parking (as result of increase in area of private amenity space).

The drawing submitted to the Board indicating the above revisions is annotated on *Drawing No.21000-22* as 'Existing Plans, Elevations and Section, however based on my site inspection I note that these revisions have not been made.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Request for Further Information**

Prior to the decision of the Planning Authority to grant retention permission for the proposed development, the Planning Authority requested Further Information.

##### **3.1.1. Further Information was requested on the 11<sup>th</sup> of January 2023 as follows:**

###### Item 1:

- (a) Submit documentary evidence to substantiate claims of the existence of 2 no. dwellings on the subject site.
- (b) Submit a revised site layout indicating;
  - (i) Delineation of boundaries for each dwelling unit.
  - (ii) Vehicular access, and legal agreements should a single access be proposed to serve both dwelling units.
  - (iii) Car parking within the curtilage of each dwelling unit in accordance with Development Plan standards.
  - (iv) Private amenity space to serve each dwelling unit, and the means by which each area can be accessed from the respective dwelling unit.
- (c) Submit a swept path analysis for the car parking area.

3.1.2. **Further information submitted on 20<sup>th</sup> of March 2023:**

Item 1:

(a)

The applicants purchased the property in 2016. The properties were named Apartment A (Castle Avenue) and Apartment B (Castle Avenue) and the BER reports for the properties refer to them as such. Both properties also have separate MPRN numbers and correspondence from ESB also refer to two separate houses/apartments. No documentary evidence can be provided for the period prior to 2016 as the applicants did not own the property. The development description in 3 no. planning applications on the site refer to the property on the site as comprising 2 no. dwellings.

(b)

(i) The delineation of the units is indicated on *Drawing No. 21000-20A*.

(ii) A single vehicular access is proposed to serve both properties. The applicants/owners of the properties are brothers and each has a 50% share in both houses. There is no requirement for a legal agreement in respect of the car parking and maintenance is the responsibility of both parties.

(iii) 2 no. car parking spaces are proposed, as was the case when the property was purchased. The properties are rented and previous tenants did not own a car. The site is centrally located and as such 2 no. spaces should be considered acceptable.

(iv) 45 sqm and 35 sqm of private amenity space is provided to Apartment A and B respectively, accessible through separate gates.

(c)

Cars will reverse into the car parking space from Castle Avenue. *Drawing No. 21000-20A* indicated swept path. This is an acceptable proposal given that Castle Avenue is a c. 160 metre long cul-de-sac.

### 3.2. Decision

The Planning Authority issued a Notification of Decision to **GRANT** retention permission on the 14<sup>th</sup> of April 2023 subject to 3 no. conditions. The following conditions are of note;

#### C1:

*The development shall be retained and completed in accordance with the plans and documents submitted on 8th November 2022 and as amended by details submitted on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2023, except where the conditions of this permission specify otherwise. In this regard, this permission permits the retention and completion of the development as one dwelling unit only. For the avoidance of doubt, this permission does not authorise the retention of the subject structure as 2 no. dwelling units.*

*Reason: In the interests of orderly development, clarity and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

#### C2:

*Within two months of the date of the final grant of planning permission or prior to the resumption of any work on site relating to this permission (whichever is the sooner), revised plans and particulars shall be submitted for the written agreement of the Planning Authority to show all internal and external modifications necessary to return the subject structure (in its entirety) to a single dwelling unit. The development shall thereafter be retained and completed in accordance with the agreed details.*

*Reason: In the interest of orderly development.*

### 3.3. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.3.1. Planning Reports

3.3.2. The first report of the Planning Officer generally reflects the issues raised in the request for Further Information. The report also notes that, the principle of 2 no. houses on the site has not been established and would constitute overdevelopment;

private amenity space and accessibility is substandard; and that the works completed have improved the appearance of the property,

Request for Further Information recommended.

3.3.3 The second report of the Planning Officer notes that the applicants have been unable to demonstrate that permission was granted for 2 no. dwellings at the subject property; that the reference in a development description of a planning application does not demonstrate that the property was used as 2 no. dwellings, and that correspondence in relation to BER certificates and the ESB similarly does not demonstrate the planning status of the property. The report notes that the proposal constitutes overdevelopment, specifically with reference to the provision of private amenity space and accessibility of same and car parking provision.

The report of the Planning Officer recommends a GRANT of retention permission consistent with the Notification of Decision which issued.

3.3.4 Other technical reports

None received.

### 3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

None received.

### 3.5. **Third Party Observations**

None received.

## 4.0 **Planning History**

Appeal Site<sup>3</sup>:

**PA. Ref. 05/1517** – Permission REFUSED for demolition of 2 no. dwellings and construction of 2no. dwellings. Refusal reasons concern overdevelopment and layout/open space, and parking/access arrangements.

---

<sup>3</sup> Excluding applications which were invalid or withdrawn.



## **5.0 Policy Context**

### **5.1. Ministerial Guidelines**

- 5.1.1. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024, (DoHLGH) – SPPR2 addresses the minimum private open space standards for houses.

### **5.2. Development Plan**

- 5.2.1. The Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the relevant development plan. The appeal site is not subject to a specific land-use zoning in the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028.

- 5.2.2. The provisions of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 relevant to this assessment are as follows;

- Volume 1: Table 12.1 (Car Parking Standards)

- 5.2.3. Under the Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024-2030, which at the time of writing this report is at material amendments stage, the appeal site is zoned 'Existing Residential'.

### **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

The appeal site is not located within or close to any European Site.

### **5.4. EIA Screening**

(See Form 1 and Form 2 attached to this report) Having regard to the limited nature and scale of development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity of the site, as well as the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended, 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

This is a first-party appeal against **Condition No. 1 and Condition No. 2** of the Planning Authority's Notification of Decision to Grant retention permission.

The grounds for appeal can be summarised as follows;

#### Re. existence of 2 no. units on site -

- The applicants purchased the property as 2 no. dwellings (Apartment A, Castle Avenue and Apartment B, Castle Avenue) in 2016.
- Each property was on a separate folio (attached to appeal submission). The properties were transferred under two separate Deeds of Transfer and stamp duty was paid on each property.
- Non-Principle Private Residence Tax has been paid on each property to Roscommon County Council (NPPR payment details attached to appeal submission). These payments demonstrate that 2 no. properties existed on the site prior to 2009.
- BER reports exist for both properties, Apartment A and Apartment B (BER Certificate attached to the appeal submission). These BER Certificates are dated 20<sup>th</sup> July 2016, prior to the purchase of the properties by the applicants.
- Separate MPRN numbers existing for each property (details attached to appeal submission).
- Separate Eircodes exist for each property (details attached to appeal submission).
- The applicants are informed that the original dwelling facing Castle Street had an extension constructed in 1983 and this extension was used as a separate dwelling since then.
- Planning applications under PA. Ref's. 04/1622, 05/1517 and 21/146 refer to there being 2 no. dwellings on the site.

Re. private open space -

- *Drawing No. 21000-20B* amends the proposal to address the concerns raised by the Planning Authority. Amendments include;
  - an increase in private open space serving Apartment A from 45 sqm to 48 sqm.
  - an increase in private open space serving Apartment B from 35 sqm to 49 sqm.
  - provision of 1.8 metre high hedging around Apartment A and Apartment B to improve privacy.
  - provision of planter bed to living room of Apartment B.
  - provision of new door to Apartment A, facilitating more convenient access, and access to private amenity space.
  - omission of east facing window serving Bedroom 1 in Apartment B and relocation of this window to the north elevation to protect the privacy of the private amenity space serving Apartment A.
- Neither the Roscommon County Development Plan nor the former Roscommon Town Local Area Plan set out quantitative standards for private open space.
- In relation to private open space, the Residential Density Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoELG, 1999) provides that "a slightly reduced standard may be acceptable where 1-and 2-bedroom houses are proposed but in no instance should a figure of less than 48m<sup>2</sup> per dwelling be acceptable." The proposed development complies with these guidelines.
- The proposed dwelling units could also be considered as "own door apartments" and would greatly exceed the private open space requirements set out in the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (DoHLG&H), December 2020.
- An Bord Pleanála recently permitted a development in the vicinity (ABP. Ref. 307818-20) for a townhouse development with an absence of private open space.

#### Re. car parking –

- Based on car parking requirements in the Roscommon County Development Plan the proposed development is one space below the requirement (i.e. 3 no. spaces), however Section 12.24 allows for reduction in the standard of car parking in town centres. The location of the site also lends itself to public transport usage.
- If considered as apartment units, the Design Standards for New Apartments, 2020 (see Section 4.21) allow for a reduction in car parking. Noting the density and location of the site a reduction should be considered.
- The Planning Authority recently granted a development which had a requirement for 5 no. car parking spaces but which was provided for with 4 no. spaces (PA. Ref. 22/579 refers).

#### **6.2. Planning Authority Response**

None received.

#### **6.3. Observations**

None received.

### **7.0 Assessment**

7.1. I consider the main issues in relation to this appeal are as follows:

- Scope of Appeal
- Condition No. 1 (subject of appeal)
- Condition No. 2 (subject of appeal)
- Appropriate Assessment

#### **7.2. Scope of Appeal**

7.2.1. Revised Plans - The applicants/appellants have submitted revised plans to the Board for consideration (see paragraph 2.3 for details of changes). In my opinion the changes

are minor in nature, do not adversely affect the amenity of the area or neighbouring property and would not be prejudicial to third parties. On this basis I recommend to the Board that it considers the proposal as revised in the appeal submission dated 11<sup>th</sup> May 2023.

7.2.2. Unit Typology - The applicants/appellants refer to the proposal as apartments and also dwellings in the documentation submitted. In my opinion the proposed development should be considered as two separate dwellings, and not as apartments, noting that each unit is independently accessed, and that with the exception of the area of car parking there are no communal amenities serving the development.

7.2.3. de novo - Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and to the nature of Condition No. 1 and Condition 2, it is considered that a *de novo* assessment would not be warranted in this instance. Therefore, the Board should determine the matters raised in the appeal only, in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended.

### 7.3. **Condition No. 1 (subject of appeal)**

7.3.1. Condition No. 1 requires that the development, which is to be retained, is used as a single dwelling, and not as 2 no. dwelling units, as proposed.

7.3.2. The crux of the appellants' case in relation to Condition No. 1 is that the subject property has been in use as two separate dwellings for a considerable period, and was purchased by the applicants on this basis. I note that the applicants have submitted various documentation in support of this contention (see documents appended to appeal submission). The applicants contend that the proposed development (as amended through the submission to the Board) provides an acceptable quantum of private amenity space, ample car parking, and would provide an acceptable level of amenity to residents.

7.3.3. The Planning Authority note that, irrespective of the use of the dwelling a two separate dwellings no valid permission exists for the use of the property as two separate dwellings. The Planning Authority note that the proposed use of the property as two separate dwellings would result in overdevelopment of the site with reference to

private open space provision (quantum) and its relationship to each respective dwelling, and also in respect of car parking provision, which the Planning Authority consider to be deficient in spite of the central location of the site.

7.3.4. In my view, the pertinent considerations in respect of whether the Board should remove/amend Condition No. 1 are whether the proposed use of the property as two separate dwelling constitutes overdevelopment of the site, whether the proposed development complies with the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, and Draft Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024-2030, and applicable Guidelines, and on the basis of residential amenity considerations. In my opinion, whether the property has been used as two separate dwellings is moot given that no permission exists for same.

7.3.5. Based on the revised proposal submitted to the Board I note that House A is served by 48 sqm of private amenity space and House B is served by 49 sqm of private amenity space. I note that neither the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 nor the Draft Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024-2030 prescribe a quantum of private amenity space for dwelling units. I note that SPPR2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024, (DoHLGH) addresses the minimum private open space standards for houses and provides a minimum standard of 30 sqm for 2 bedroom dwellings. I therefore consider it reasonable to conclude that the provision of private amenity space serving each dwelling is acceptable. I further note that each area of private space is secure with the provision of a gate and boundary walls, and is not overlooked having regard to the changes proposed at appeal stage, specifically through the omission of the window opening which previously served Bedroom 1 in House B and the provision of screen planting around the boundaries of the site. Whilst I note that the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024, (DoHLGH) at page 56 states that a principal area of open space should be directly accessible from a living space, given the size of the site, the nature of the proposed development, that being the subdivision of an existing property and the configuration of same, I consider that the connection between the private amenity space and each house is on balance acceptable in this instance.

7.3.6. Table 12.1 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 sets out minimum car parking standards for dwellings with 1-3 bedroom at 1.5 space per house. The Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (page 193) states that a 'reduction in the standard of car parking provision in town centre areas will also be considered'. The proposed development, comprising 2 no. 2 bedroom houses, has a minimum car parking requirement of 3 no. car spaces, whereas 2 no. car parking spaces are indicated. Noting the location of the appeal site in proximity to the centre of the town, the shortfall in car parking concerned and the provision in the Development Plan which allows for a reduced quantum of car parking I consider the proposed development to be acceptable in this regard.

7.3.7. In summation, I consider that both dwellings are sufficiently provided for in terms of private amenity space and car parking and in my opinion the proposed development would not result in overdevelopment of the site. I therefore recommend that the Planning Authority is directed to amend Condition No. 1, omitting the requirement that the property/structure is used as a single dwelling.

#### **7.4. Condition No. 2 (subject of appeal)**

7.4.1. This appeal is also made in respect of Condition No. 2 which requires that revised plans and particulars be submitted to show internal and external modifications necessary to return the subject structure to a single dwelling unit. As addressed at paragraph 7.3.7 (above) I recommend to the Board that Condition No. 1 is amended to omit the requirement that the property is used as a single dwelling and therefore Condition No. 2, which relates to the implementation of measures necessary to bring about the use of the appeal property as a single dwelling unit, is no longer warranted. I therefore recommend that the Planning Authority is also directed to remove Condition No. 2.

#### **7.5. Appropriate Assessment**

7.5.1. Having regard to the nature and limited scale of the proposed development and the lack of a hydrological or other pathway between the site and European sites, it is considered that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and that the proposed

development would not be likely to have a significant effect either individually or in combination with other plans or projects on any European site.

## 8.0 Recommendation

8.1. Having regard to the above and based on the reasons and considerations set out below, it is recommended that the Planning Authority be directed to -

- (i) AMEND Condition No. 1.
- (ii) REMOVE Condition No. 2.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

9.1. Having regard to the nature of the conditions which are the subject of the appeal, the Board is satisfied that the determination by the Board of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and, based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to –

- (a) AMEND Condition 1 as attached to the grant of retention permission as follows;

*The development shall be retained and completed in accordance with the plans and documents submitted on the 8<sup>th</sup> of November 2022, and as amended by details submitted on the 20<sup>th</sup> of March 2023, and the plans submitted to the Board on the 11<sup>th</sup> of May 2023. This grant of retention permission hereby authorises the use of the structure as 2 no. separate dwelling units.*

*Reason: In the interests of orderly development, clarity and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

For the reasons as follows:

- (i) having regard to, the revisions made to the proposed development, received by the Board on the 11<sup>th</sup> of May 2023,
- (ii) to the quantum, arrangement and accessibility of private amenity space provided to House A and House B.



- (iii) SPPR2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024,
- (iv) the provision of car parking to serve House A and House B, the requirements set out in Table 12.1 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, and the provision set out on page 193 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 which allows for a reduction in car parking at locations close to the centre of towns,

the requirement that the subject property is used as single dwelling unit is therefore not warranted.

(b) REMOVE Condition 2 for the reason as follows:

- (i) as the requirement that the subject property is used as single dwelling unit is not warranted for the reasons set out above, the requirement to submit revised plans and particulars showing internal and external modifications necessary to return the subject structure to a single dwelling unit is therefore not warranted.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

---

Ian Campbell  
Planning Inspector

31<sup>st</sup> July 2024

## Appendix 1 - Form 1

### EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

<b>An Bord Pleanála Case Reference</b>	ABP-317095-23			
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Retain house as 2 no. dwelling units, and retain and complete modifications to dwelling units, including amendments to internal layouts, entrance halls and replacement of substandard roof over.			
<b>Development Address</b>	Castle Street/Castel Avenue, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon			
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b> (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		<b>Yes</b>	X	
		<b>No</b>	No further action required	
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?</b>				
<b>Yes</b>			EIA Mandatory EIAR required	
<b>No</b>		X	Proceed to Q.3	
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?</b>				
		<b>Threshold</b>	<b>Comment (if relevant)</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
<b>No</b>				
<b>Yes</b>		Class 10, (b), (i) (threshold is 500 dwelling units)	Significantly below threshold.	Proceed to Q.4

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

Inspector: Ian Campbell

Date: 31<sup>st</sup> July 2024

## Form 2

### EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>An Bord Pleanála Case Reference</b>	ABP-317095-23	
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Retain house as 2 no. dwelling units, and retain and complete modifications to dwelling units, including amendments to internal layouts, entrance halls and replacement of substandard roof over.	
<b>Development Address</b>	Castle Street/Castel Avenue, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon	
<b>The Board carries out a preliminary examination [Ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)] of, at least, the nature, size or location of the proposed development having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</b>		
	<b>Examination</b>	<b>Yes/No/ Uncertain</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Nature of the Development</b></li> <li>• Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</li> <li>• Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed development comprises (retention permission for) the subdivision of a house on a serviced site within an urban area, and alterations to 2 no. existing dwelling units.</p> <p>The proposed development will not give rise to the production of significant waste, emissions or pollutants.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No</li> <li>• No</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Size of the Development</b></li> <li>• Is the size of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</li> <li>• Are there significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing</li> </ul>	<p>The size of the proposed development would not be described as exceptional in the context of the existing environment.</p> <p>There are no significant developments within the vicinity of the site which would result in significant cumulative effects/considerations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No</li> <li>• No</li> </ul>

and/or permitted projects?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Location of the Development</b></li> <li>Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or does it have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location?</li> <li>Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area?</li> </ul>	<p>Having regard to the limited nature and scale of development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity of the site, as well as the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended, 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Conclusion</b></li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</b></li> <li>EIA not required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</del></li> <li><del>Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.</del></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</b></li> <li><del>EIAR required.</del></li> </ul>

Inspector: Ian Campbell

Date: 31<sup>st</sup> July 2024

DP/ADP: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

