



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-319221-24

Development	Use field as an airstrip
Location	Carrowntryla , Dunmore , Co. Galway
Planning Authority	Galway County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2360592
Applicant(s)	John Reddington
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Fergus Hession
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	7 th of August 2024
Inspector	Darragh Ryan

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on regional road R328 in the townland of Carrowntryla, Dunmore, Co. Galway. The site is located on flat land to the rear of two existing detached houses in the open countryside. The site has a stated area of 1.24ha.
- 1.2. The site is accessed via an agricultural passage which runs to the southeast of the houses to the front of the site. The lands at this location are currently used as an air strip with an existing grassed runway on site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal is for the continued use of field as an airstrip. The proposed development relates to formerly approved planning application number 17/1784 which received a temporary permission for 5 years for use of the field as an air strip. The air strip is 500m in length.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Galway County council issued a decision to grant permission subject to 5 conditions. The conditions of note include the following:

C3 - The airstrip hereby permitted shall not be used for commercial purposes or any other purpose other than private and incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house.

C4 - The use of the subject lands as an airstrip shall cease on or before the expiration of five years from the date of this order.

C5 - Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority, the airstrip shall only be utilised by the Applicant's aircraft (serial number 2843673).

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

There are two planning reports on file. The first report sought 9 points of further information. The second report addressed the following:

- Principle of development acceptable
- The planning authority satisfied that there will be minimal archaeological impact from the proposed development.
- The Planning Authority acknowledges that the proposed flight path does not overlay or interact with any of the residential units located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development and considers this statement and associated document satisfactory with regard to Applicant's landing and taking over manoeuvres.
- All take-off and landing manoeuvres will be carried out within daylight hours and no artificial landing lights are required. This is reinforced in the description of the proposed works included in the provided Archaeological Impact Assessment and Environmental Noise Survey Report.
- The proposed airstrip will be only used by the licenced private aircraft as specified and as per the provided certification of registration of aircraft and by no other aircraft.
- The noise generated by the proposed development is regulated to an acceptable level -noise assessment as submitted considered acceptable
- The proposed project will not have any potential impact on the identified Natura 2000 sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- The Applicant has clarified in the cover letter that the lands adjoining the application site to south are owned by the Applicant's brother and used for agricultural purposes as part of the ACRES Scheme that includes certain actions to help climate control, such as maintaining drainage ditches. From the submitted information it appears that those lands are not part of the proposed development and are not used for such.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- None

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- An Taisce

There is a preliminary need to justify the site rationale and the location need for a private airstrip.

A major issue that has arisen in other cases around the country is that once a private airstrip is established or permitted, the intensity of development and associated activity can increase on an incremental basis.

- Department of Housing Local Government and Heritage

It is noted that the proposed development site (PDS) is located at Recorded Monument GA017-048---- (Ringfort – rath). This monument is subject to statutory protection in the Record of Monuments and Places (RMP), established under Section 12 of the National Monuments (Amendment) Act 1994. Given the scale, extent and location of the PDS, it is possible that the Recorded Monument and previously unrecorded archaeological remains may be disturbed by the proposed development.

The National Monuments Service of the Department advises that an updated Archaeological Impact Assessment, to include a programme of Archaeological Geophysical Survey in the first instance and Archaeological Test Excavation where deemed appropriate, be requested as Further Information.

- Irish Aviation Authority – 19th of January 2024

With reference to the above proposed development, a notification of which was forwarded to the Irish Aviation Authority by the applicant, the Authority confirms that consultation has taken place with the applicant in relation to the development.

The Aerodromes Division advises that it notes the Schedule of further information required relating to the application and has no observations with regard to this private development.

3.4. Third Party Observations

There is one third party observation on file, the issues raised in the observation are raised in more detail in the appeal.

- Site Notices misleading
- The applicant has flown over the applicants house and agricultural sheds
- Archaeological Impact Assessment as submitted is outdated. Site lies in an area abundant with Archaeological features
- The lands which is used for airstrip is prone to flooding
- No provision for access or egress to the application site from the public road
- The grass airstrip was extended without the benefit of planning permission. Mature trees were removed to facilitate this extension.

4.0 Planning History

Planning Reference 10/1003 – John Reddington – Permission to use part of an existing field as an airstrip for private use. (An Board Pleanala 07.238257). Decision granted

Planning Reference 17/1784 - John Reddington - Permission to use part of the existing agricultural field as an airstrip for the applicant's private use Decision: granted.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Galway County Development Plan 2022 – 2028

- Chapter 4 – Rural Living and Development
- Chapter 6: Transport and Movement

Policy objectives for air transport. Policy Objective AT2 Local Airstrips states the following:

- a) Galway County Council shall liaise with the Irish Aviation Authority with regard to the effects of any development proposals in the vicinity of local air strips.
- b) Support that the Cleggan and Inishbofin airstrips be brought into use to support economic development.
- c) Bringing these airstrips into use would need to be subject to detailed studies and formal approval of any proposals by Galway County Council. Any proposal would need to demonstrate: a contribution towards the proper planning and sustainable development of the county; compliance with all environmental legislation and policy objectives contained within the Plan and higher level planning documents, including the National Planning Framework and the Northern and Western Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy; and that no effect on the integrity of any European Site would occur.

- Chapter 7 – Infrastructure, Utilities & Environmental Protection

NP3 Noise Impact Assessments To require an assessment of impact of the development on noise levels, having regard to the provisions of the Environmental Protection Agency Acts 1992 and 2003 and the EPA Noise Regulations 1994 when assessing planning application.

NP 4 Noise Pollution and Regulation Restrict development proposals causing noise pollution in excess of best practice standards and regulate and control activities likely to give rise to excessive noise, other than those activities which are regulated by the EPA.

NP 5 Noise Mitigation Measures Require activities likely to give rise to excessive noise to install noise mitigation measures and monitors. The provision of a noise audit may be required where appropriate.

- Chapter 10 – Natural Heritage, Biodiversity and Green/Blue Infrastructure
- Chapter 15 - Development Management Standards

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

1.4km South of Lough Corrib SAC

5.3. EIA Screening

See completed Form 2 on file. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, or an EIA determination therefore is not required

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. Procedural

- The planning reference numbers referred to in the site and public notices refer to different application sites and should not have been used in either site notice or public notices as this is misleading. Site notice does not comply with the Planning and Development regulations as the site notice is not legible from the public road and is not displayed in a conspicuous position. Site notice does not mention the proposed development is in the curtilage of a ringfort.
- The application fails to comply with the Planning and Development regulations 2001, Part 4, Section 22. (2) (b)
- The application fails to comply with with Part 4 Section 23 (1) (a) of the Planning and Development Regulations in that all features in the vicinity of the proposed development in particular properties affected by the proposed development are not detailed on the mapping supplied.
- The drawings submitted with the application describe the proposed development as an airport which is in conflict with site notice and public notice.

- The Site layout plan submitted by further information cannot be relied upon as it details a field boundary at the end of the airstrip (southwestern end). The further information omitted a concrete base constructed on the airstrip with no permission in place. The incorrect mapping also occurred with respect to the details supplied with regard to the flight path. The details supplied are not compliant with Article 23.

6.1.2. Environmental Impact Assessment

- The applicant should have been required to submit an EIAR under Schedule 7, Article 103 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001. The proposal is sub-threshold development. The negative impact on amenity of applicants property should necessitate an EIAR.

6.1.3. Appropriate Assessment

- The development requires the submission of an NIS as there is a chance of a swallow holes on site which are connected to a Sinking River which has connections to the Lough Corrib Special Area of Conservation. There is a complete absence of information that would allow the Planning Authority as competent authority to comply with their obligations under the Habitats Directive.

6.1.4. Archaeological Impact/ Unauthorised Development

- An unauthorised concrete base has been erected within the recorded Monument. The exemptions under Article 9 (1) (a) (vi) and (vii) of the Planning and Development Regulation 2001 disappplies.. The planning authority cannot consider any Planning Application on these lands until this is regularised.
- The applicant has removed the east west ditch running through the site approximately 500m from the applicants house- this is contrary to condition 2 of Grant of Permission by the Board.
- The applicant has extended airstrip without grant of permission
- The applicant has raised grounds levels in excess of that stipulated under condition no 5 of the decision to grant permission

6.1.5. Flight Path

- The applicant has persistently flown the plane directly over the appellants house and agricultural sheds when landing and taking off not in compliance with the flight path provided with the application. This has had a significant negative effect on the appellants enjoyment of their home.

6.1.6. Omitted Information

- No flood study or hydrological assessment has been submitted with the application
- No calculations have been provided for the decent profile of the aircraft in relation to adjoining properties for assessment.
- No details have been submitted regarding take and climb for assessment
- No calculations provided vertical take off point
- Noise monitoring survey omits the aircraft noise in the assessment. There are no noise level contours in the assessment or noise monitoring proposals.

6.2. Applicant Response

- The existing ditch on site was removed in 2017 in consultation with the Department of Agriculture to improve lands for drainage, it had nothing to do with making the air strip longer. The ditch was removed in 2018 and the Planning Authority granted permission without the ditch. The ditch has since been replaced in another location - with a letter from the department indicating same.
- The airstrip was extended by mistake previously but this area is prone to flooding and could not be relied upon for taking off and landing. The airstrip is 500m long with only 60% of that required for take off and landing. The airstrip has not been extended. The airstrip lies outside of the flood zone.
- The Irish Aviation Authority have no issues on grounds of safety.
- That concrete base has been in situ approx. 1970 and has not been used in 45 years. There is no risk to archaeological heritage as a result of the

proposal with the requirement to discard of grass clippings away from the air strip irrelevant as the applicant has invested in a mulcher for cutting the grass.

- The applicant has not previously flown the plane over the appellants house, the pictures provided are misleading – All issues and complaints were reviewed by the Irish Aviation Authority and there has been no issue with regard to same.
- No ground levels have been raised within the airstrip.
- Noise monitoring survey did take account of aircraft noise and certification was issued.
- A number of letters of support for the proposed development have been submitted from neighbouring properties indicating no issue with the development proposal.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- None

6.4. Observations

- None

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the appeal, and having inspected the site and having regard to the relevant national and local policy guidance, I consider the main issues in relation to this appeal are as follows:

- Residential Amenity
- Archaeological Impact
- Other Issues
- Appropriate Assessment

7.1.1. Residential Amenity

The appellant contends that the owing to the flight path, levels of noise and actions of the appellant the development has serious negative impact on the amenity of the applicants dwelling. The appellant has supplied photographs of the appellant flying over his house which causes distress and also flying over his agricultural sheds which causes upset to animals. Its stated the noise levels indicated within the noise survey are not accurate. Its further stated the applicant has carried out some unauthorised works and extended the air strip which has caused nuisance to the appellant.

7.1.2. The airstrip which has been in situ in 2009 sits to the rear of two detached dwelling houses. An airstrip was granted to the appellant as part of a 2010 and 2018 planning application, on each occasion for a period of 5 years. Access to the strip is via a private access road situated to the north west of a detached dwelling fronting onto the R328. The airstrip is located on relatively flat land and is 500m in length. The appellant states that only 60% of this length is required for take off and landing. The airstrip in question is represented by tightly cut grass on agricultural land, there is no physical structures attached to the development, except a concrete base that has been in situ since 1970, now disused. The airstrip lies outside of the flood zone as indicated in flood zone mapping for the area. In order to address residential amenity, I will examine each aspect of same under distinct headings for the purpose of clarity.

7.1.3. Flight Path – The appellant has raised concerns regarding the accuracy of the flight path analysis submitted by the applicant, claiming that the applicant's aircraft occasionally flies directly over the appellant's house and agricultural sheds. In response, the applicant outlines that the flight path for both take-off and landing has been designed to avoid flying over the appellant's house. It is emphasised that, as the Pilot in Command, the applicant bears the responsibility to operate the aircraft safely and in accordance with aviation regulations. Additionally, consultation with the Irish Aviation Authority (IAA) has confirmed that no concerns have been raised regarding the airstrip's proposed use. The applicant clarifies that the airstrip is intended solely for private use, accommodating a small aircraft used 8 to 10 times annually when flying back from London for personal visits. To substantiate this, the applicant has provided a log of flight plans, which reflects the stated frequency of use and flight plans.

- 7.1.4. Having reviewed the documentation provided, including flight logs and plans submitted to aviation authorities, I find that the applicant has demonstrated a consistent and planned approach to aircraft operations, rather than sporadic activity. The evidence supports the claim that the proposed flight path is an accurate representation of the on-site activities, acknowledging that deviations may occasionally occur due to weather conditions or other operational factors.
- 7.1.5. The frequency of aircraft use, limited to 8 to 10 instances annually and restricted to takeoff and landing during daylight hours, is considered low enough not to cause significant disruption to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Furthermore, letters of support from other nearby residents suggest that the development proposal is not widely perceived as a nuisance.
- 7.1.6. Given these considerations, I conclude that the applicant has provided sufficient information to demonstrate compliance with relevant aviation guidelines. The development proposal is therefore unlikely to negatively impact residential amenity in terms of aircraft proximity and flight path, and I find no substantive grounds for refusal on this basis
- 7.1.7. Noise Survey – The appellant has raised concerns regarding the comprehensiveness of the noise survey submitted by the applicant, stating that it lacks essential details such as noise contours and specific noise data from the aircraft. The applicant has provided an Environmental Noise Survey report prepared by Aeon Environmental, which includes an assessment of noise levels at two monitoring locations near the airstrip. These locations represent the closest sensitive receptors, comprising residential dwellings immediately north of the airstrip boundary, approximately 100 meters further north, 135 meters to the east, and 400 meters southwest.
- 7.1.8. The noise monitoring was conducted between October 13th and 17th, 2023, and found that daytime ambient noise levels ranged from 33 to 39 dB LAeq at location UL1 (southwest of the site) and from 42 to 45 dB LAeq at location AL2 (northeastern site boundary). The chosen monitoring locations are considered appropriate for determining potential noise impacts on nearby residential receptors.
- 7.1.9. There is no specific noise standards set out within the Galway County Development Plan for air strips, there is also no statutory Irish guidance for maximum

environmental noise levels at sensitive receptors for aircraft or private airstrips. The proposed development's noise impacts will result primarily from short-duration noise during takeoff and landing. Unlike commercial airports, general aviation airfields and private airstrips lack established noise criteria in both Ireland and the UK. There are several relevant best-practice guidelines referenced to assess the noise emissions, including:

- Professional Practice Guidance on Planning & Noise (ProPG) 2017: This document suggests that noise levels in external amenity areas should ideally not exceed 50-55 dB LAeq,16hr.
- International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) under Annex 16, Volume I. This document sets out maximum permissible noise limits for specific aircraft.
- Fingal County Development Plan Policy on Aircraft Noise (2023-2029): While the site is within Galway County Council's jurisdiction, guidance on aircraft noise levels in Ireland can be derived from Fingal County Council's policies. The plan outlines Noise Zones, with Zone D being the lowest potential exposure, allowing for daytime noise levels between 50 and 54 dB LAeq,16hr, considered acceptable for noise-sensitive development.
- UK Aviation Policy Framework (2013): The UK framework recognizes 57 dB LAeq,16hr as the onset of community annoyance. However, more recent research indicates that annoyance occurs at lower levels, starting at 54 dB LAeq,16hr, with 51 dB LAeq,16hr considered the lowest-observed adverse-effect level (LOAEL).

7.1.10. The aircraft to be used, a Piper Aircraft PA-28-181 with a Lycoming O-360-A4M engine, is classified as a single-engine light propeller aircraft. It has a certified take off noise level of 77.7 dB(A), significantly below the maximum permissible limit of 85.3 dB(A) set by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) under Annex 16, Volume I. This compliance ensures that noise emissions from the aircraft are kept within internationally recognised acceptable levels.

7.1.11. As the planning permission for the airstrip has expired, direct measurement of noise levels during airstrip operations was not possible. Nevertheless, the baseline noise survey indicates that the existing daytime ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the airstrip range between 33 and 45 dB LAeq. Given the minimal aircraft movements

anticipated per year, the expected noise levels at the closest sensitive receptors are projected to remain below the LOAEL threshold of 51 dB LAeq,16hr (UK Aviation Policy Framework (2013).) Consequently, no significant adverse noise impacts are anticipated from airstrip operations.

7.1.12. In this regard, I consider the noise survey as submitted to be comprehensive to provide for an accurate representation of potential noise nuisance. The noise levels associated with the proposed aircraft operations fall within acceptable limits, and the anticipated noise disturbance is expected to remain below the threshold for observed adverse effects. Therefore, noise considerations do not present a substantive issue that would warrant a reason for refusal in this case.

7.1.13. In conclusion, taking into account the limited nature of the proposed development, the restriction of operations to daylight hours only, and the evidence provided regarding the flight path and noise levels, the potential impact on residential amenity is not considered significant. The applicant has submitted sufficient documentation, including flight logs and detailed flight plans, demonstrating that the flight path is an accurate representation of current on-site activities. While minor deviations may occur due to weather conditions, the frequency and scope of aircraft movements remain minimal, thereby ensuring that disturbance to nearby residences is not substantial.

Furthermore, the applicant has submitted a Noise Impact Assessment carried out in accordance with Section 7.9.2 and Policy Objective NP3 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022 to 2028. The submitted noise survey indicates that expected noise levels will remain below established thresholds for adverse effects, with projected noise emissions from the aircraft falling within acceptable limits. The satisfaction with the demonstrated flight path and adherence to responsible aviation practices further supports the assessment that the development will not lead to significant negative impacts on residential amenity. Therefore, the proposal complies with relevant guidelines on noise management, and the potential effects on nearby properties do not substantiate grounds for refusal in this instance.

7.2. Archaeological Impact -

The applicant has submitted an Archaeological Impact Assessment, prepared by Sherlock Archaeology, in response to further information request. The purpose of

this assessment was to evaluate the potential impact of the proposed development on Recorded Monument GA 017-048, in accordance with Policy Objective ARC 4 and Policy Objective ARC 5 of the Galway County Development Plan. These policies seeks to protect archaeological sites, monuments, their settings, and visual amenities. It requires that planning applications within areas of archaeological potential or near Recorded Monuments incorporate appropriate archaeological mitigation measures.

7.2.1. The assessment identified several archaeological sites within 500 meters of the proposed development:

- A ringfort (SMR No. GA017-048), located approximately 21 meters from the existing grass airstrip.
- An enclosure (SMR No. GA017-049), located around 180 meters from the airstrip in the townland of Carrowntryla.
- A ringfort and associated children's burial ground (SMR Nos. GA017-050---- and GA017-050001), approximately 317 meters from the airstrip.
- The nearest archaeological site, the ringfort GA017-048, is described in the Archaeological Inventory of Ireland as a poorly preserved circular rath situated on a rise in open grassland, with a diameter of approximately 33 meters. The monument is partially obscured by modern features such as a silage pit and a mound of rubble, with a field wall intersecting it at certain points. On the day of the site inspection there was no silage pit or any other feature obscuring the ringfort, it was represented as a small grass mound outside of the airstrip.

7.2.2. The Archaeological Impact Assessment concludes that the proposed development will not directly affect the ringfort or any other archaeological site, as no construction or excavation is involved. The use of the airstrip, limited to around 10 times per year, does not threaten the integrity of the archaeological sites. While the maintenance of the airstrip involves cutting grass, there will be no disposal of clippings within the ringfort. This is recommended to be controlled by way of condition. I agree with the findings of the Archaeological Impact Assessment in this regard, as there is no construction or excavation involved with the proposed use, there is no real likelihood of a direct affect on the ringfort.

- 7.2.3. I consider that the visual impact of the development on the nearby ringfort as negligible. Since the proposal is for the continued use of an existing grass runway for private aviation, the visual character of the site remains unchanged. The existing landscape and visual context will not be altered by the development.

A geophysical survey conducted in October 2023, covered both the runway and apron areas, identifying a single feature of interest—a "mass dipolar anomaly" near the northeastern end of the runway. This anomaly may represent archaeological or modern activity, such as burning, or it could be due to buried ferrous materials. Regardless, it poses no immediate concern since no excavation or ground reduction is proposed.

- 7.2.4. The Archaeological Impact Assessment meets the requirements of Policy Objectives ARC 4 and ARC 5 of the Galway County Development Plan. Given that no construction or excavation is planned, and the use of the site will remain limited and non-intrusive, the proposal will not have any physical or visual impact on known archaeological sites. The identified potential archaeological feature does not warrant further excavation, as unnecessary ground disturbance would be inappropriate for this type of development. Consequently, I do not consider that there is a substantive archaeological reason to refuse the planning permission in this instance.

7.3. Other Issues

7.3.1. Incorrect Information/ Procedural

The appellant contends that the application does not adhere to the requirements of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, specifically Part 4, Section 22(2)(b), and Part 4, Section 23(1)(a).

- 7.3.2. Regarding the site notice, I have reviewed its location and found it to be clearly visible and legible from the public road. Based on my examination of the relevant legislative provisions, there is no evidence to suggest that the inclusion of past planning history file numbers would invalidate the application. I am satisfied that the site notice complies with the statutory requirements under the Planning and Development Regulations.
- 7.3.3. In relation to Section 23, the applicant addressed the issue of the labelling anomalies in the original submission as part of the response to the request for further information. The updated drawings clearly label the site area and the airstrip,

providing sufficient detail for a comprehensive assessment of the development. I am satisfied that the drawings meet the requirements set out in Section 23 of the Regulations.

- 7.3.4. Overall, I consider the information provided in the application to be in compliance with all statutory obligations concerning public notification and the provision of clear and accurate drawings. There are no procedural deficiencies that would warrant the invalidation of the application.

7.3.5. Unauthorised Development

The appellant asserts that the removal of a hedgerow located to the south of the site constituted a breach of Condition 2 attached to the original planning permission granted under file 10/1003 (An Bord Pleanála reference 07.238257). Condition 2 specified that the use of the lands as an airstrip, including any associated works or maintenance, was to be confined to the area northeast of the existing east-west ditch located approximately 500m southwest of the applicant's house, with no works permitted southwest of the ditch.

- 7.3.6. The applicant has clarified that the ditch was removed in 2017 by the applicant's brother for land drainage and improvement purposes. A letter from the Department of Agriculture confirms that a hedgerow of equivalent length has since been planted in another part of the applicant's landholding, thereby compensating for the original hedgerow removal.
- 7.3.7. In assessing the matter of unauthorised works, I note that the planning permission granted by An Bord Pleanála was valid for a period of 5 years, and the ditch removal occurred after this period had lapsed. Consequently, the removal did not constitute a breach of planning permission. Additionally, the planning authority has since granted permission (17/184) for a similar development on the site, with the ditch having already been removed at the time of the application.
- 7.3.8. The applicant has also provided clarification regarding the accidental cutting of an extended area resembling the airstrip in the past. This was an error, as the airstrip's required length does not exceed 500m for take-off and landing. Furthermore, the existing concrete base on the site, which dates to the 1970s, has not been used for approximately 45 years.

7.3.9. Based on the information provided, I do not consider there to be an issue of unauthorised works on the site. The applicant has addressed the concerns regarding the hedgerow removal, and there is no proposed intensification of use associated with the current application. The scale and nature of the development can be appropriately managed through suitable planning conditions. Therefore, I am satisfied that the issue of unauthorised development has been adequately addressed and does not warrant a reason for refusal in this instance.

7.3.10. Development Contribution Scheme

The appellant sets out that the Planning Authority was in error in not applying a planning contribution in line with the current Galway County Development Contribution Scheme. Having reviewed the scheme I see no mechanism by which contributions would apply in this instance and therefore do not consider the Planning Authority were in error in this regard. I do not consider Planning contributions should be applied in this instance.

7.3.11. Environmental Impact Assessment

The appellant sets out that the applicant should have been required to submit an EIAR under Schedule 7, Article 103 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001. I have assessed the requirement for EIAR under Section 5.3 of this report.

A runway is considered a class of development under Part 1 Schedule 5 – “A line for a long-distance railway traffic, or an airport with a basic runway length of 2,100 meters or more”. I do not consider the proposal falls under this class of development as there is no physical runway on site, but a maintained grassed area for take off and landing of the aircraft. In any case the airstrip as proposed is 500m in length.

There is no construction or excavation associated with the development and other environmental impacts have been addressed above, I therefore have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, or an EIA determination therefore is not required

7.4. AA Screening

- 7.5. I have considered the proposal to use part of existing agricultural field as an airstrip in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 7.6. The subject site is located within a rural location 1.4km South of Lough Corrib SAC. The development proposal consists of using part of existing agricultural field as part of an airstrip. There are no development works associated with the development.
- 7.7. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- scale and nature of the development
 - No development works to facilitate the development – the development is agricultural land, cutting of grass does not constitute development works
 - Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections
- 7.8. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

8.0 Recommendation

For the reasons outlined above, I consider that the proposal is in compliance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, and I recommend that permission is granted subject to the following conditions.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be in accordance with the provisions of the Galway County Development Plan 2022 to 2028 namely Policy Objective ARC 4 and ARC 5 with respect to Archaeological Heritage and Section 7.9.2

with respect to control of noise pollution. The proposal would not be detrimental to amenities of neighbouring residential development in terms of noise or visual impact owing to the low intensity use proposed. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on the 1st of June 2023 and as per revised drawings, reports and documents submitted on the 23rd of January 2024, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development, or as otherwise stipulated by conditions hereunder, and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. In default of agreement the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: In the interest of clarity

2. This permission relates solely to the development as advertised under the public notices associated with this application.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

3. The airstrip hereby permitted shall not be used for commercial purposes or any other purpose other than private and incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

4. The use of the subject lands as an airstrip shall cease on or before the expiration of five years from the date of this order.

Reason: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development.

5. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority, the airstrip shall only be utilised by the Applicant's aircraft (serial number 2843673).

Reason: In the interest of controlling the extent and intensity of use of the proposed air strip and limiting the impacts on residential amenities and agricultural activities in the vicinity of the development site.

6. There shall be no depositing of grass clippings or other vegetation within and around a 25m radius of the nearby ringfort (SMR No. GA017-048).

REASON To ensure the continued preservation of places, caves, sites, features or other objects of archaeological interest.

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.

Darragh Ryan
Planning Inspector

22nd of September 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	319221-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Use field as an Airstrip		
Development Address	Carrowntryla , Dunmore , Co. Galway		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			
No	X		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
No	X		
Yes			

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

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	319221-24	
Proposed Development Summary	Use field as an airstrip	
Development Address	Carrowntryla , Dunmore , Co. Galway	
<p>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.</p>		
	Examination	Yes/No/ Uncertain
<p>Nature of the Development</p> <p>Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?</p>	<p>The site is located on a site on agricultural land in a rural area. There is no construction associated with the development, the development is not exceptional in the context of existing environment.</p> <p>No the proposal involves maintaining a grassed area for the taking off and landing of a small aircraft. The applicant has stated a mulcher is used to cut grass therefore there shall be no grass clippings. For clarity a condition has attached with regard to management of grass clippings.</p>	No
<p>Size of the Development</p> <p>Is the size of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Are there significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects?</p>	<p>No the red line boundary of the site remains the same. There is no extension to boundary as a result of proposed development. The site area is 1.24ha.</p> <p>There are no other developments under construction in proximity to the site. All other development are established uses.</p>	No
Location of the	The proposed development is located 1.4km South	No

<p>Development</p> <p>Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or does it have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location?</p> <p>Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area?</p>	<p>of Lough Corrib SAC. There is no construction associated with the development therefore no potential for a pathway to connect into the SAC.</p> <p>There are no other locally sensitive environmental sensitivities in the vicinity of relevance.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Conclusion</p>		
<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>EIA not required.</p>		

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____

Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)