



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-319486-24

Development	Demolition of existing derelict dwelling and construction of 16 no. houses and associated site works.
Location	The Walk, Clooneybeirne, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	23/60152
Applicant	Tommy Mullaney
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant	Tommy Mullaney
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	3 rd October 2024
Inspector	Ian Campbell

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.78 ha. and is located on the southern side of The Walk (L-1807), in the townland of Clooneybeirne, c.1km north-east of the centre of Roscommon Town, Co. Roscommon.
- 1.2. The appeal site previously accommodated 2 no. bungalows however the westernmost bungalow on the site was recently demolished and the site now accommodates a single bungalow (stated floor area 56 sqm), the curtilage associated with this property, and the vacant plot of land associated with the demolished property.
- 1.3. Detached dwellings are located to the immediate east and west of the appeal site. Lands to the south of the appeal site appear to be in agricultural use.
- 1.4. The front of the appeal site is bound by a low rise wall with 2 no. gated entrances, in addition to the vehicular entrance which served the demolished dwelling. Overhead powerlines traverse the appeal site. Topographical levels on the appeal site fall from north to south, with a level difference of c. 3 metres across the appeal site.
- 1.5. The adjoining area is residential in character with detached dwellings in ribbon formation along both sides of the road. Douglas Drive, a recently constructed housing estate is located to the east of the appeal site.
- 1.6. A public foul sewer pipe traverses the centre of the appeal site from east to west.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises;
 - Demolition of 1 no. detached bungalow.
 - Construction of 16 no. residential units (14 no semi-detached units and 2 no. detached units) –
 - 10. no. 3 bedroom houses.
 - 6 no. 4 bedroom houses.

Material finishes to the houses are indicated as stone and nap plaster for the external walls and slate for the roof. The 2 no. houses fronting The Walk are dual aspect.

- Vehicular access off The Walk.
- 2 no. areas of public open space (comprising 1,328 sqm/17% of site).
- Site development works.
- SuDS measures (proposed as part of the appeal submission).

2.2. The planning application was accompanied by the following reports;

- Planning and Design Report.
- Traffic Report.
- Engineering Submission (addressing drainage/services).
- Engineering Submission (inc. photographic survey of house on site).
- Outdoor Lighting Report.

2.3. The following reports were submitted with the appeal;

- Engineering Report (inc. SuDS measures).
- Preliminary Bat Report.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Request for Further Information

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

3.1.1. Further Information was requested on the 24th of November 2023 as follows:

- Item 1 –reduce number of units to achieve lower density compatible with pattern of development in area.
- Item 2 –incorporate greater mix of house types, variation in design, and demonstrate that 10% of units are universally designed.
- Item 3 –include a centrally located area of open space which is overlooked and functional and not segregated by an access road, and which represents a minimum of 15% of the site area.

- Item 4 – submit revised landscape plan, to include details of roadside boundaries; a more durable boundary treatment between units; details of proposed landscaping; details of hard finishes; and clear delineation of boundary division between the front building line of units.
- Item 5 – as per Section 12.6 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, submit a design statement, including the proposal’s design concept; compliance with Development Plan and Ministerial Guidelines and the integration of green infrastructure.
- Item 6 – demonstrate how the proposal accords with the Council’s Smarter Travel Initiative, the principles of Smarter Travel as set out in Section 12.24 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, and any proposals for sustainable forms of travel.
- Item 7 – the Traffic Report submitted referred to perpendicular car parking but this is not reflected on the site layout plan, address same, and submit a revised layout achieving the ‘Homezone’ concept.
- Item 8 – clarify whether fire tenders and refuse vehicles encroach onto areas of open space, as appears to be indicated on the Swept Path Analysis.
- Item 9 – provide visitor car parking and EV car parking, as per Section’s 12.1 and 12.3 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 respectively.
- Item 10 – submit details of nature based surface water management for the site. The proposal to discharge clean water to the public foul sewer is not considered to be a sustainable option.
- Item 11 – submit evidence of the revised Confirmation of Feasibility from Uisce Éireann, reflecting the proposal to discharge surface water into the foul network.
- Item 12 – submit Tier 2 Construction and Demolition Waste Resource Management Plan to meet the requirements of the EPA (2021) ‘Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects’, and the provision of the Waste Management Act, 1996, as amended. Includes note that construction and demolition waste associated with PA. Ref. 16/375 has not been removed from the site.

- Item 13 – submit bat survey to support the claim that there are no bats in the building.
- Item 14 – clarify how it is proposed to carry out the development, including details of phasing.
- Item 15 – submit revised proposals for compliance with Part V in light of Items 1 and 2 above, including details of house design meeting the requirements of Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (2007).

3.1.2. Further Information submitted on 16th of February 2024.

- Item 1 – the proposal complies with national and local policy. Since the FI request the Draft Roscommon Town Plan 2024 – 2030 has been published and the site is now zoned ‘Tier 1 – New Residential’. Also, the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) seeks to implement compact development in a more intensive manner through the re-use of brownfield and infill sites. The density proposed accords with these guidelines.
- Item 2 – the scheme comprises 16 no. units and it is not feasible or economically viable to introduce a greater mix than the 4 no. house types proposed. Housing schemes of 100 units would typically have no more than 6 no. house types.
- Item 3 – the applicant intimates that arterial routes and streets have been conflated by the Planning Authority; states that the open space provided serves for both passive and active uses; that it meets the prescribed areas; and that each house also has private gardens in excess of minimum requirements.
- Item 4 – the roadside boundary will comprise a 1.8 metre high block wall, capped and rendered, as indicated on the drawings submitted; hit-and-miss fencing was used in the adjoining Part 8 development and this was deemed acceptable. The construction of a wall between all houses would be cost prohibitive and there is no policy requiring same; details of hard surfaces and planting specification can be agreed; and a hedge will be used to delineate property boundary division between the front building line of units.
- Item 5 – a Planning and Design Report was submitted with the application. The design/layout of the proposal results from the foul sewer which crosses the site.

- Item 6 – Section 12.4 refers to Work Place Travel Plans and is therefore not applicable. Any reduction in density would be at the expense of compact growth. The site is an infill site and there are no links to other schemes. Dedicated cycle lands etc. are not necessary. No details of other Smarter Travel Initiatives can be found.
- Item 7 – the Traffic Report is correct, car parking is perpendicular to the internal access road.
- Item 8 – the Swept Path analysis does not indicate encroachment of wheels into open space. Wheels are 0.5 metres off the kerb line during maneuvers. The body of the vehicle over sails the kerb however this is allowed.
- Item 9 – visitor car parking is not required given the size of the driveways. Street parking can be accommodated at safe locations within the scheme. The Compact Settlement Guidelines states that a maximum of 2 no. spaces in peripheral locations should be provided, and that the maximum standard do not include visitor car parking. No visitor car parking was provided under the recent adjoining Part 8 development (PA. Ref. 21/697 refers). All houses have EV charging ducting on the gables.
- Item 10/Item 11 – revised Pre-Connection Enquiry form submitted taking account of discharge of stormwater to combined foul sewer. Uisce Éireann have issued a Confirmation of Feasibility. Stormwater will be attenuated prior to discharge.
- Item 12 – Tier 2 Waste Management Plan submitted.
- Item 13 – the claim that no bats were present in the house was based on a visual inspection. A condition can be attached to any grant of permission requiring a bat survey during the appropriate period.
- Item 14 – the applicant intends to construct the development in two phases.
- Item 15 – no changes are proposed.

3.2. Decision

The Planning Authority issued a Notification of Decision to **REFUSE** permission on the 14th of March 2024 for 4 no. reasons, summarised as follows.

1. The proposed development is not responsive to the character/existing pattern of development in the area, and would be contrary to key land use zoning objectives pertaining to this 'Existing Residential' land use, to "provide for infill residential development at a density and design appropriate to the area and needs of the community", set out in the Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2014-2020.
2. The proposed development by reason of its design and layout is not conducive to a safe pedestrian prioritised environment, makes insufficient provision for suitably designed and usable open spaces and does not satisfy urban street design standards set out in 'Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) or the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets 2013) (as amended).
3. The surface water management proposals, which makes provision for attenuation of surface water to a combined foul and surface water sewer, with insufficient nature based sustainable urban drainage systems usage, would be inconsistent with the provisions of Roscommon County Development Plan Policy Objective ITC 7.43 (which requires that all new development provides separate foul and surface water drainage systems and to incorporate sustainable urban drainage systems where appropriate) and in addition the provisions of Policy Objective ITC 7.50 and Development Management Standard 12.13.
4. The proposed development fails to satisfy Section 12.6 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 in respect of open space provision; the standards set out in Table 12.1 in relation to car parking; and the minimum standards set out in Section 12.5 and Policy Objective PPH 3.6 in respect of the proportion of units required to be of Universal Design. The proposed development is considered to be injurious to the residential amenity of future residents and to give rise to a traffic hazard.

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Reports

The initial report of the Planning Officer generally reflects the issues raised in the request for Further Information, the report also notes the following –

- The proposal represents overdevelopment of the site, and fails to reflect the predominate pattern and character of lower density development in the area.
- The uniform design approach fails to provide character and individuality.
- The communal open space is segregated by the main arterial route, and its suitability for active recreation is compromised by a raised mound and trail path which is of limited extent, and there is a lack of connectivity to any other path network.

The second report of the Planning Officer notes the following –

- The proposal is not inconsistent with the Compact Settlement Guidelines by reason of density metrics alone. The Planning Authority is obligated to consider the proposal in the context of all applicable policy and guidelines, including Section 28 Guidelines and the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 and the Roscommon Town LAP 2014 – 2020, which remains a material consideration at this time given the early stage of the forthcoming LAP. It is also necessary to respect the setting of the site, and as per Section 12.6 of the CDP *‘the Planning Authority may use its discretion in varying these maximum density standards to take account of the character and context of respective settlements’*.
- The applicant has not demonstrated that 10% of the units are universally designed.
- No amendments have been made to the scheme. The proposal deviates significantly from the predominant established pattern of development in the area and to permit same would be contrary to the zoning objective of the Roscommon Town LAP 2014 – 2020 to ‘provide for infill residential development at a density and design appropriate to the area and needs of the community’.
- The layout of the proposal is substandard with reference to the open space which is separated by an internal access route, impeded on by

vehicle turning heads, and is not of a sufficient layout or configuration to provide adequate amenity space for future occupants.

- Proposals for car parking along the footpaths of the internal access road is not conducive to a safe pedestrian prioritised environment.
- No proposals have been submitted for nature based surface water management.
- The proposal to discharge clean water to public infrastructure is not sustainable and is contrary to the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, which supports nature based surface water solutions.
- Uisce Éireann have reported that works over/in close proximity to the existing foul sewer pipe is not permitted. The layout of the proposal is designed to consider the pipe however no confirmation from Uisce Éireann has been submitted stating this is sufficient to protect the pipe and that adequate separation distances have been provided.
- The CMP submitted by the applicant does not meet the requirements set out in Appendix C of the EPA Best Practice Guidelines (2021).
- The proposal to carry out a bat survey post consent is not appropriate, the issue therefore remains unresolved.
- No time frame for the phasing of the proposal has been provided, or details as to when open space and other infrastructure such as roads will be provided and completed.
- The proposal is deficient for the following reasons (report notes that majority of these reasons in and of themselves do not warrant a refusal of permission);
 - o Design of units.
 - o Boundary treatment between units.
 - o Inadequacy of CDWRMP.
 - o Lack of nature based surface water management solutions.
 - o Lack of compliance with car parking standards of CDP (DM Standard 12.1).

- Failure to support claim that bats are not roosting in house to be demolished.
- Failure to demonstrate that development meets requirements of Universal Design, as set out in Chapter 3 of CDP.
- Outstanding issues in relation to how Part V will be complied with.
- No conformation from Uisce Éireann as to whether their infrastructure will be affected by proposal.
- Inadequate phasing details.
- Proposal for perpendicular car parking close to road junctions is contrary to 'Homezone' design, and potentially creates dangerous traffic movements.

Other Technical Reports.

3.3.2. Environment Department – initial report notes that construction and demolition waste from the site associated with PA. Ref. 16/375 has not been removed from the site, and recommends that Tier 2 Construction and Demolition Waste Resource Management Plan is submitted and that a nature based solution for surface water management is incorporated into the proposal. Second report notes that no proposals for nature based solution for surface water management have been provided and that the CMP submitted as Further Information does not meet the requirements set out in Appendix C of the EPA (2021) Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Recourse and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects.

Housing Section – initial report notes that housing should meet requirements of Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (2007); that the housing proposed as Part V should meet the requirements of Universal Design, set out in chapter 3 of the CDP; and notes that the costings for the units are high. Second report similarly notes that housing should meet requirements of Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (2007).

Roads Section – report notes the requirement for a financial contribution to provide a raised table for traffic calming and pedestrian priority on lands outside the red line boundary of the site, and standard conditions.

Area Engineer – report notes that traffic calming is to be installed along the The Walk in the coming weeks, that the proposed entrance will conflict with the proposed traffic calming measures, and recommends that a Special Contribution of €30,000 is sought towards the construction of a raised platform across the L1806/The Walk, in addition to standard conditions.

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

Uisce Éireann – submission recommends Further Information and notes that it is Uisce Éireann's policy to minimise storm water inputs to combined sewers; that developers are required to dispose of stormwater to outlets other than Uisce Éireann networks; and that the applicant is required to submit a follow up Pre-Connection Enquiry to determine the feasibility of connection to the public waste water infrastructure taking account of the intended discharge of storm water to an existing combined sewer.

3.5. **Third Party Observations**

The report of the Planning Officer summarises issues raised in observation submitted in respect of the planning application as follows;

- Density.
- Impact on residential amenity.
- Impact of proposal on character of area.

4.0 **Planning History**

Appeal Site (recent/valid planning applications)

PA. Ref. 16/375 – Permission GRANTED to demolish existing dwelling and extensions, erect 2 no. dwellings garages and associated site works.

PA. Ref. 16/375 was granted an extension of duration under PA. Ref. 21/3013 for a period of 5 no. years.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

5.1.1. National Planning Framework 'Project Ireland 2040'¹

Relevant Policy Objectives include:

- **National Policy Objective 7:** Deliver at least 40% of all new homes nationally, within the built-up footprint of existing settlements and ensure compact and sequential patterns of growth.
- **National Policy Objective 12:** Ensure the creation of attractive, liveable, well designed, high quality urban places that are home to diverse and integrated communities that enjoy a high quality of life and well-being..
- **National Policy Objective 22:** In urban areas, planning and related standards, including in particular building 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..
- **National Policy Objective 43:** 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 45:** Increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration, increased building height and more compact forms of development.

5.2 Ministerial Guidelines

¹ Revised NPF April 2025.

5.2.1 Having regard to the nature of the proposed development and to the location of the appeal site, I consider the following Guidelines to be pertinent to the assessment of the proposal.

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).
- Regulation of Commercial Institutional Investment in Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2021).
- Appropriate Assessment of Plans and Projects in Ireland, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2010).
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities - Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities (2007).

5.2.2. Other Relevant Guidance.

- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2019).

5.3. Development Plan

5.3.1. The Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the relevant County Development Plan. The appeal site is not subject to a specific land-use zoning in the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 (land-use zonings for Roscommon Town are provided under the Roscommon Town LAP 2024 – 2030 - see 5.3.3. below).

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

Volume 1:

Chapter 3 (People Places and Housing)

Policy Objective PPH 3.3 - Require the provision of an appropriate mix of house types and sizes in residential developments throughout the county, in order to meet the needs of the population and support the creation of balanced and inclusive communities.

Policy Objective PPH 3.6 - *Require new residential developments in excess of 10 residential units to include a minimum of 10% universally designed units, in accordance with the requirements of 'Building for Everyone: A Universal Design' published by the Centre for Excellence in Universal Design.*

Chapter 4 (Towns and Villages)

Policy Objective TV 4.9 - *Encourage the redevelopment of centrally located vacant and/or underutilised areas within towns and villages.*

Chapter 7 (Infrastructure, Transport and Communications)

Policy Objective ICT 7.43 - *Require all new development to provide a separate foul and surface water drainage system and to incorporate sustainable urban drainage systems where appropriate in new development and the public realm.*

Policy Objective ICT 7.44 - *Prohibit the discharge of additional surface water to combined (foul and surface water) sewers in order to maximise the capacity of existing collection systems for foul water.*

Policy Objective ICT 7.50 - *Require the provision of separate foul and surface water drainage systems.*

Chapter 12 (Development Management Standards)

Section 12.13 Storm Water Disposal - *Disposal of storm waters to the foul sewer system shall be strictly prohibited. Where available and of adequate capacity, storm water should be directed to the existing surface water drainage system.*

Table 12.1 (Car Parking Standards)

5.3.3. The Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024 – 2030 is the relevant LAP for Roscommon Town, under which the appeal site is zoned 'New Residential'. Multi-unit residential use class is stated as being 'permitted in principle' under the 'New Residential' land use zoning. The following objectives in the Roscommon Town LAP are relevant;

Chapter 4 (Population, Housing and Compact Growth)

Policy Objective RN 2 – *Require new residential development to be designed to have regard to ‘Universal Design’ and ‘Age Friendly’ principles.*

Policy Objective RN 3 – *Ensure the delivery of compact residential growth that aligns with the growth ambitions and density ranges for Roscommon Town, in accordance with the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).*

Policy Objective RN 4 – *Ensure all new residential development proposals demonstrate an efficient use of serviced lands in order to maximise the sustainable use of infrastructure services and facilities in the area, in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.*

Policy Objective RN 5 – *Ensure multi-unit new residential proposals deliver an appropriate mix of house type, tenure, density and scale, inclusive of universal design considerations, in order to meet the housing needs of a diverse population, including but not limited to those with specialist or unique accommodation needs.*

Chapter 9 (Climate Action and Flood Risk Management)

Policy Objective RN76 – *Require all new large scale developments to provide ‘Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems’ (SUDS) as part of their development proposals.*

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

- Lough Ree SAC (Site Code: 000440) – c. 3.6 km south-east.
- Lough Ree SPA (Site Code: 004064) – c. 7.2 km east.
- Lough Ree pNHA (Site Code: 000440) – c. 3.6 km south-east.

5.5. EIA Screening

(See Form 1 and Form 2 attached to this report) Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the 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 the decision to refuse permission. The grounds for appeal may be summarised as follows;

Re. Refusal Reason No. 1

- The proposal is located on a zoned, serviced, infill site.
- The Planning Authority disregarded the 'New Residential' zoning of the site in the Draft Roscommon LAP 2024 – 2030.
- Without increasing density the objectives of the NPF will not be achievable.
- The proposal aligns with national policy in terms of qualitative and quantitative standards.
- The OPR made a submission on the Draft Roscommon LAP regarding consistency in the application of density irrespective of whether the lands are zoned 'New Residential' or 'Infill' in the context of the Compact Settlement Guidelines (2024). The report of the Chief Executive noted that the applicable density is 35 dpha, however a footnote allows the Planning Authority discretion on the matter depending on the character of the area.
- The approach of the Planning Authority is inconsistent, on one hand by zoning the site 'New Residential', whilst at the same stating that the proposal is at odds with the character of the area.
- The adjoining Part 8 development has a density of 24 dpha.
- The site has capacity to cater for 16 no. houses.
- The proposal is more sustainable than individual houses on large plots.

- The design of the proposal is responsive to the character of the street with 2 no. dual aspect houses providing a set-back similar the adjacent houses.
- It is unclear how the proposal is not appropriate to the needs of the area. The proposal would provide a mix of house types catering for a mix of house types.

Re. Refusal Reason No. 2

- It is unclear how the scheme does not provide a safe pedestrian environment. The proposal provides fully lit, segregated footpaths connecting to The Walk.
- The layout/location of open space on the site is as a result of the sewer pipe running across the site, topography and the need to address the street.
- 2 no. areas of overlooked open space are proposed amounting to 17% of the site, in excess of CDP requirements.

Re. Refusal Reason No. 3

- The entire network in Roscommon comprises a combined foul sewer.
- The proposed houses are appropriately located in relation to the sewer. Wayleaves are agreed with Uisce Éireann as part of the connection agreement and not during the planning process.
- Uisce Éireann have recently undertaken upgrade works of the foul sewer network in Roscommon which will increase capacity in the network.
- Due to the site's topography and the ownership of lands to the south, an outfall to a drain could not be secured.
- Despite Objective ITC 7.43 of the CDP, as there is no separate surface water system in Roscommon the current proposal represents the only option.
- The adjoining Part 8 development discharges all surface water to the foul sewer network running along Lanesboro Road.

- Uisce Éireann have accepted the proposal to attenuate and discharge to the combined foul sewer.
- Additional nature based SuDS measures² will further reduce this and replenish groundwater.

Re. Refusal Reason No. 4

- The proposal is similar other schemes across the County where car parking is provided in driveways with streets wide enough to provide on-street parking if required.
- Refusal reason no. 4 is unclear, including in relation to whether the Planning Authority consider there to be an overprovision of car parking.
- The requirement for Universal Design typically applies for larger developments and the provision of same is not commercially viable for a small scheme as proposed.

Other Issues –

- A bat report has been submitted with the appeal and notes that should bats be identified on the site/within the house as part of a bat survey completed during the appropriate period, mitigation measures will be employed, including the provision of bat boxes. The report notes that the site has a ‘low-moderate’ value for bats.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

6.3. Observations

None received.

² As part of the appeal submission a revised Engineering report has been submitted which includes SuDS measures, specifically bio-retention tree pits, permeable paving and soakaways.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Refusal Reason 1 (design/density)
- Refusal Reason 2 (pedestrian safety/open space provision)
- Refusal Reason 3 (surface water)
- Refusal Reason 4 (open space, car parking and universal design)
- Issues Arising.
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Refusal Reason 1 (design/density)

7.2.1. The first reason for refusal cited by the Planning Authority concerns the density of the proposal, which the Planning Authority considered was not responsive to the pattern of development in the area, or the character of the area.

7.2.2. The decision of the Planning Authority was based on the zoning objective in the Roscommon Town LAP 2014 – 2020, that being ‘Existing Residential’, however I note that the Roscommon Town LAP 2024 – 2030 was adopted on the 25th of July 2024 and the appeal site is now zoned ‘New Residential’. I have based my assessment on the Roscommon Town LAP 2024 – 2030, and the zoning objective and policy objectives contained therein.

7.2.3. The proposed development, comprising 16 no. dwellings on a site with a stated area of 0.78 ha. has a resultant density of c. 20.5 dpha. Policy Objective RN3 of the Roscommon Town LAP 2024 – 2030 states ‘*ensure the delivery of compact residential growth that aligns with the growth ambitions and density ranges for Roscommon Town, in accordance with the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)*’. The Roscommon Town LAP (page 22) refers to an average yield of c.30 dwellings per hectare on suburban ‘New

Residential' lands. The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) provides guidance in respect of the density of residential development at different locations/scales. Roscommon is identified as a 'Key Town' in the Northern and Western Regional Assembly's Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES). Table 3.5 of the Guidelines provides density ranges for Key Towns and Large Towns (5,000+ population). Given the location of the appeal site and the character of the adjacent area I consider that most applicable criterion under Table 3.5 is 'Key Town / Large Town - Suburban/Urban Extension', the description of which includes 'low density car-orientated residential areas constructed at the edge of the town'. It is a policy and objective of the Guidelines that residential densities in the range 30 dph to 50 dph (net) shall generally be applied at suburban and urban extension locations of Key Towns and Large Towns, and that densities of up to 80 dph (net) shall be open for consideration at 'accessible' suburban / urban extension locations (as defined in Table 3.8). The density of the proposal is below that set out in the Roscommon Town LAP and the Guidelines, i.e. 30 dpha, and 30 dph to 50 dph (net) respectively, however noting the constraints of the site, specifically the presence of a foul sewer pipe which traverses the site and also having regard to the pattern of development in the area, I consider that the proposed development, with a density of c. 20.5 dpha, accords with the Roscommon Town LAP and the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) in respect of density.

- 7.2.4. The Planning Authority raised concerns in relation to the density of the proposal relative to the adjoining area. I am satisfied that the density proposed would not be incongruous with the area. I specifically note the number of units proposed, and the existing housing estate east of the appeal site. Within this context, I consider the scale/density of the proposal appropriate to this location. Additionally, I note Policy Objective RN4 of the Roscommon Town LAP 2024 – 20230 which seeks to ensure that new residential development demonstrates an efficient use of serviced lands so as to maximise the sustainable use of infrastructure services and facilities in the area, and in this regard the density of the proposal, which with the exception of the housing estate to the east, is higher than the prevailing density in the area, is acceptable in my view.

7.3. Refusal Reason 2 (pedestrian safety/open space provision)

- 7.3.1. The Planning Authority consider that the design and layout of the proposal is not conducive to a safe pedestrian prioritised environment and makes insufficient provision for open spaces, with reference to useability.
- 7.3.2. In relation to pedestrian infrastructure, footpaths are proposed along the edge of the two areas of open space and connecting onto The Walk. There is no footpath provision along the southern edge of the two areas of public open space. I consider that this issue could be addressed by condition should the Board be minded to permit the proposed development. I also note the absence of crossing points for pedestrians within the scheme. I consider that this issue could also be addressed by condition, specifically pedestrian crossings at agreed locations facilitating crossings (2 no.) between the two areas of public open space and the southern block of units. A pedestrian crossing could also be provided between/connecting the two areas of open space. In total, 3 no. pedestrian crossing are required. Regarding the type of crossing, I note that Section 4.3.2 of DMURS states that local streets, due to their lightly-trafficked/low-speed nature, generally do not require the provision of controlled crossings, and that the provision of zebra crossings or courtesy crossing should be considered where pedestrian demands are higher such as around focal points. Noting the location of the public open space within the scheme I consider that zebra crossings would be appropriate.
- 7.3.3. I note the concerns of the Planning Authority in respect of the applicant's suggestion to accommodate visitor car parking along the roadside. I have addressed car parking in detail below at paragraph 7.5.3.
- 7.3.4. In respect of public open space, the scheme provides 1,328 sqm of open space across two separate areas, representing 17% of the site. The Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 requires that 10% of the site be open space for brownfield sites. The proposal therefore provides a quantum of public open space significantly in excess of this. The area of open space to the east provides an active area ('kick-about' area) with wild flower areas to the edge. The area of open space to

the west comprises an informal area with a path and mound. I also note that both areas are adequately overlooked.

- 7.3.5. The Planning Authority raise concerns in relation to the location of turning areas within the public open space. I consider that the provision of turning heads where vehicles, including large vehicles such as refuse vehicles, would make reverse maneuvers would pose a significant risk to users of the public open space, in particular children using the public open space. The omission of the 2 no. turning heads from the areas of public open space and provision of turning areas within the road network would require a redesign of the centre of the proposal, with implications for the layout and configuration of the areas of public open space. I also note that the provision of DMURS compliant pedestrian crossing points and footpaths along the edge of the public open space together along with the provision of turning areas within the road network would require additional area. Whilst the provision of footpaths and pedestrian crossings are capable of being addressed by condition, when considered together with changes to the layout of the scheme required to address the turning areas within the public open spaces I do not consider that these changes could be collectively addressed by condition. As such, I agree with the contention of the Planning Authority that the layout and design of the scheme as proposed fails to adequately consider pedestrians and would represent a substandard form of development and a poor urban environment. I recommend that permission is refused on this basis.

7.4. Refusal Reason 3 (surface water)

- 7.4.1. The third reason for refusal cited by the Planning Authority relates to the applicant's proposal to discharge surface/storm water to the existing foul sewer network, and the absence of nature based surface water management/SuDS within the scheme. The Planning Authority contend that the proposed development would be inconsistent with Policy Objectives ITC 7.43 and ITC 7.50, and Development Management Standard 12.13 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, which requires the provision of a separate foul and surface water drainage system and SuDS, and the prohibition of storm water disposal to the foul sewer system.
- 7.4.2. Regarding surface water, the proposal will entail the discharge of surface water from the site/development to the existing foul sewer on the site. The applicant notes in their

appeal submission that there is no dedicated storm water system in Roscommon and that the sewer which traverses the appeal site is a combined sewer. I note that both the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 and the Roscommon Town LAP 2024 – 2030 contain policy objectives which prohibit the discharging of surface water into the public foul sewer. In addition, I note Uisce Éireann's submission to the Planning Authority which states that it is its policy to minimise storm water inputs to combined sewers. Uisce Éireann's submission however required the applicant to submit a follow up Pre-Connection Enquiry to determine the feasibility of connection to the public waste water infrastructure taking account of the intended discharge of storm water to an existing combined sewer³. Uisce Éireann did not submit a subsequent submission to the Planning Authority in respect of the applicant's response to the Further information request however it issued a Confirmation of Feasibility to the applicant (dated 12th February 2024) which stated that a wastewater connection was feasible without upgrade and that there was capacity within the existing foul sewer network to cater for the proposal, which I note included the discharge of surface water to the foul network.

- 7.4.3. The applicant has submitted a revised proposal to the Board and now proposes a number of SuDS measures. Noting the nature of the changes I consider that it is appropriate for the Board to consider same, as the changes proposed are minor in nature and would not be prejudicial to third parties. The revised proposal provides for a nature based approach to the management of surface water on the site, as advocated by the Planning Authority. The introduction of SuDS measures will also reduce the volume of surface water from the site entering the foul sewer network. I am satisfied that the introduction of SuDS measures addresses the requirement for nature based surface water management, as advocated in both the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 and the Roscommon Town LAP 2024 – 2030.
- 7.4.4. In refusing permission for the proposed development on the basis of the proposal to discharge surface water to the foul network the Planning Authority did not state that the proposed development, if granted, would materially contravene stated objectives of the Development Plan, but rather that it would be inconsistent with specific

³ My emphasis.

provisions of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028. As such the Board are not constrained by Section 37 (2) (b) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, should it wish to grant permission for the proposed development. Having regard to the revised proposal submitted to the Board, specifically the introduction of SuDS measures, which reduces the volume of surface water being discharged to the foul network, the availability of capacity within the foul sewer network to cater for the proposal, as noted by Uisce Éireann in the Confirmation of Feasibility issued to the applicant, I do not consider that a refusal of permission would be warranted in this instance on the basis of the reasoning set out in refusal reason 3.

7.5. Refusal Reason 4 (open space, car parking and universal design)

- 7.5.1. The fourth reason for refusal is that the proposed development fails to satisfy specific provisions of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028, specifically, Section 12.6 in respect of open space provision, Table 12.1 in relation to car parking, and the minimum standards set out in Section 12.5 and Policy Objective PPH 3.6 in respect of Universal Design.
- 7.5.2. In relation to open space provision, 12.6 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 sets out a number of criteria, including that open space should be integrated into the overall residential layout; should comprise of 10% of gross site area for brownfield sites; should be of a sufficient size to be functional and usable; and should be subject to natural surveillance. I have considered the proposal under these criteria under Section 7.3.4 (above) in the context of refusal reason no. 2, which also referred to the adequacy of open space, and am satisfied that the proposal is generally acceptable in terms of the provision of public open space, from both a quantitative and qualitative perspective. I have addressed the issue of turning areas within the public open space separately in the context of pedestrian safety.
- 7.5.3. Table 12.1 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 sets out minimum standards for car parking, specifically 1.5 no. spaces for 1-3 bedroom dwellings and 2 no. spaces for 4+ bedroom dwellings. In addition, 1 no. visitor car parking space is required for every 3 no. dwellings. Based on the proposal, a total of 32 no. car parking spaces are required. I note that each of the 16 no. units is served by 2 no. car parking spaces and therefore the proposal provides 32 no. car parking

spaces overall, meeting the requirements of Table 12.1. Visitor car parking is essentially included within in-curtilage car parking within the scheme. I note that the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 does not prohibit such an approach. I also note that, in respect of intermediate and peripheral locations, SPPR3 of the Compact Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) provides a maximum rate of car parking for residential development of 2 no. spaces per dwelling, (where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority), and that the maximum car parking standards include provision for visitor parking. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal accords with the requirements of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the Compact Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) in terms of the provision of car parking.

- 7.5.4. Section 12.5 and Policy Objective PPH 3.6 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 concern Universal Design. Section 12.5 ‘Overarching Principles’ states that *‘the Council encourages that all new development proposals be designed in accordance with the standards outlined in the ‘National Disability Authority - Building for Everyone; A Universal Design Approach 2012’ and Technical Guidance Document M - Access and Use of the Building Regulations 2010 or any subsequent update’*. Policy Objective PPH 3.6 requires new residential developments in excess of 10 residential units include a minimum of 10% universally designed units, in accordance with the requirements of ‘Building for Everyone: A Universal Design’ published by the Centre for Excellence in Universal Design. The applicant states in his appeal submission that such requirements are more typical for larger developments and that the requirement would result in visibility issues arising from the costs associated with constructing the dwellings to these standards. I have reviewed the document referred to, *Building for Everyone: A Universal Design’ published by the Centre for Excellence in Universal Design*, and note that it contains a multiplicity of specific requirements spanning areas from sanitary facilities to building management. The requirements of Policy Objective PPH 3.6 are in my view non-specific noting the wide ranging nature of the document. I note that the proposed development will be required to comply with Building Regulations, including Part M which addresses access, and overlap with *Building for Everyone: A Universal Design’ published by the Centre for Excellence in Universal Design*, and therefore through compliance with Part M of the Building

Regulations, the proposed development will also comply with those overlapping elements contained in *Building for Everyone: A Universal Design* published by the Centre for Excellence in Universal Design. I do not consider that a refusal of permission would be warranted on the basis of the applicant's failure to demonstrate compliance with the guidance document *Building for Everyone: A Universal Design* published by the Centre for Excellence in Universal Design.

7.6. Issues Arising

- 7.6.1. Bats – the proposed development includes the demolition of a dwelling on the site. Item no. 13 of the Planning Authority's request for Further Information requested the applicant to submit a bat survey to support the claim in the documentation submitted with the planning application that there are no bats in the building which is to be demolished. The applicant responded stating that the assertion in the planning documentation was based on a visual inspection of the dwelling and that the Planning Authority could attach a condition requiring the carrying out of a bat survey. The Planning Authority stated that this response was not acceptable as the issue could not be addressed post-consent, and that as such the issue remained outstanding. The applicant has submitted a Preliminary Bat Report prepared by an ecologist. The report is desktop based and it is not apparent that the ecologist conducted a site visit. The report notes that the site has a 'low-moderate' value for bats, that the house could potentially be used by bats, noting the existence of ivy on the façade of the house and the presence of holes in the roof tiles. The report proposes that a bat survey will be carried out during an appropriate period for undertaking bat surveys and that should bats be identified on the site/within the house mitigation measures will be employed, including the use of bat boxes. I note that bats are listed on Annex IV(a) of the Habitats Directive and are afforded Strict Protection under Article 12 of the Habitats Directive. I am not satisfied that the impact of the proposed development on bats has been adequately addressed in the application or the appeal. The information submitted by the applicant at both application and appeal stage is not in my view sufficiently robust to allow the Board to draw an informed conclusion as to the potential impact of the proposed development on bats. No bat survey was undertaken, which given the ecologist's comments in relation to the potential use of the house by bats is a significant gap in my opinion. Also, the report undertaken by the ecologist was not

informed by a physical inspection of the site or the house, and appears to have been based on photographs. It may therefore transpire that a derogation is required. I also note that the efficacy of mitigation measures suggested by the ecologist cannot be properly assessed in the context of this application/appeal, being finalised and based on a bat survey undertaken post-consent. I recommend that permission is refused on this basis. I submit to the Board that this is not a new issue as it was raised by the Planning Authority throughout the application, and also by the applicant in their appeal submission.

7.6.2. Development Contribution – the reports of both the Roads Section and the Area Engineer recommend that a financial contribution is sought from the applicant towards traffic calming measures on The Walk, specifically the construction of a raised platform. The report of the Roads Section refers to traffic calming measures being implemented along The Walk imminently. Following my site inspection I note that there is a speed ramp along the front of the appeal site. The Area Engineer notes that the proposed entrance will conflict with the proposed traffic calming measures, presumably the recently installed speed ramp, and recommends that a Special Contribution of €30,000 is sought towards the construction of a raised platform across The Walk. Costings for the raised platform are provided in the report of the Area Engineer. This is an appeal against the decision to refuse permission and the applicant has not referred to, or contested this issue. In my opinion, it is not clear that the costs associated with this infrastructure are not included as part of Roscommon County Council's General Development Scheme⁴ under Roads Infrastructural Works. Given that the provision of traffic calming measures on the public road would come under Roscommon County Council's General Development Scheme, and therefore the application of a Section 48 General Development Contribution, I submit to the Board that should it be minded to grant permission for the proposed development a condition requiring the payment of a Special Development Contribution is not attached.

7.6.3. Quantitative Standards - I note that the proposed units within the scheme generally accord with the quantitative requirements set out Quality Housing for Sustainable

⁴ Roscommon General Development Contribution Scheme 2014, amended 24th February 2024.

Communities - Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities (2007).

- 7.6.4. Unit mix/design of units – the Planning Authority are not satisfied that the unit mix meets with the requirements of Section 3.6 (Dwelling Mix and Tenure) of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, or that the design of the units within the scheme are sufficiently varied. The report of the Planning Officer specifically notes an absence of single storey dwellings and one and two bedroom units. Section 3.6 of the CDP requires that the mix of house types proposed in an area must ensure that the needs of all sectors of society are accommodated. The proposal is for 16 no. dwellings and comprises a mix of 3 and 4 bedroom houses. I note that there is no prescribed unit mix for developments in the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, and that Policy Objective PPH 3.3 requires *‘the provision of an appropriate mix of house types and sizes in residential developments throughout the county, in order to meet the needs of the population and support the creation of balanced and inclusive communities’*. Noting the scale of the proposal and the mix provided I am satisfied that the proposed development generally accords with Section 3.6 and Policy Objective PPH 3.3. of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 2028. I note that Policy Objective RN5 of the Roscommon Town LAP 2024 – 2030 also requires that multi-unit developments provide for mix in house type and tenure and I consider that the proposal also complies with same. Regarding the variation in house design, in response to Item no. 2 of the FI request the applicant noted that it is not feasible or economically viable to introduce a greater mix than the 4 no. house designs. Having regard to the scale of the proposal I am satisfied that the proposal provides an acceptable variation in house design.
- 7.6.5. Impact on pipe – the Pre-Connection Enquiry issued to the applicant from Uisce Éireann noted that works in proximity to the sewer pipe should not affect the integrity of the pipe, and that adequate separation distances should be provided. The report of the Planning Officer noted that in the absence of confirmation from Uisce Éireann on this issue that it remains an outstanding issue. The applicant notes in the appeal submission that the proposed houses are appropriately located in relation to the sewer and that wayleaves are agreed with Uisce Éireann as part of the connection agreement and not during the planning process. Whilst the issue was included in the

Pre-Connection Enquiry issued to the applicant I note that Uisce Éireann's submission to the Planning Authority did not raise proximity to the pipe as an issue, and in this regard I am satisfied that the issue does warrant further consideration. I also note that a way-leave is indicated on the submitted site layout plan (see *Drawing no. 002*).

- 7.6.6. CDWRMP – the Planning Authority contend that the Construction and Demolition Waste Resource Management Plan submitted by the applicant was not adequate as it did not meet the criteria contained in Appendix C of the EPA (2021) 'Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects'. I note that neither the report from the Environment Section nor the Planner's report elaborates on this issue. In the event that the Board grant permission for the proposed development a condition could be attached requiring the submission of a Construction and Demolition Waste Resource Management Plan for the agreed with the Planning Authority.
- 7.6.7. Phasing – the Planning Authority requested that the applicant confirm details of phasing for the proposal (see Item 14 of the FI request). The applicant confirmed that it is proposed to construct the proposal over 2 no. phases and that the proposal would be constructed by the applicant. The report of the Planning Officer noted that there was no timeframe specified for the proposal and that details were lacking in relation to when the open space and roads would be completed. Given the scale for the proposal and the standard duration of the permission sought (i.e. 5 no. years), I am satisfied that the phasing arrangements proposed by the applicant are acceptable.
- 7.6.8. Boundary treatments between units – the Planning Authority have expressed concerns in relation to the proposal for a timber boundary fence to the rear of the units. The Planning Authority consider this form of boundary to be sub-standard in terms of durability. In response the applicant noted that the adjacent Part 8 development proposed a similar boundary treatment, that there is no policy requirement for a specific boundary to the rear of units, and also noted the cost implications of providing a block wall. I am satisfied that the proposal for a timber fence to the rear of the units is acceptable, would be durable and acceptable from an aesthetic perspective.

- 7.6.9. Part V – the report of the Planning Authority refer to outstanding issues in relation to Part V, principally issues in relation to costings. Should the Board grant permission for the proposed development a condition requiring agreement in writing with the Planning Authority in relation to the provision of housing in accordance with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 would be attached.
- 7.6.10. Institutional Investment - The Section 28 Guidelines, Regulation of Commercial Institutional Investment in Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2021), issued by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Housing, applies to developments comprising 5 or more houses or duplex units. Having regard to the Section 28 Guidelines in respect of 'Commercial Institutional Investment in Housing', I consider that the development, comprising/including 5 or more own-door units and falling within the definition of structure to be used as a dwelling to which these guidelines applies, should include a condition to restrict the first occupation of these units as outlined by the Guidelines. In the event that the Board are minded to grant permission for the proposed development I recommend that 'Condition RCIIH1' as per the wording provided in the Guidelines is used as it enables the developer to carry out any enabling or preparatory site works, unlike condition RCIIH2, and as the effect in respect of the residential component is the same.

7.7. **Screening for Appropriate Assessment**

- 7.7.1. I have considered the proposed development at The Walk, Clooneybeirne, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended. The subject site is located c. 3.6 km north-west of Lough Ree SAC (Site Code 000440) and c. 7.2 km west of Lough Ree SPA (Site Code 004064).
- 7.7.2. The proposed development comprises permission for the demolition of a dwelling and the construction of 16 no. dwellings and associated site works and connects into the exiting foul sewer network.
- 7.7.3. 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 based on the following;

- The distance from nearest European Site(s) and absence of connectivity between the development site and European Sites.
- The nature and scale of the proposed development, and location of the proposed development within an existing developed/urban site.
- The proposal to connect to the existing public sewer at operational phase.

7.7.4. 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

8.1. Having regard to the above it is recommended that permission should be refused for the reasons set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that the layout and design of the proposed development, which includes turning heads within areas of public open space, an absence of dedicated pedestrian crossing points between the areas of public open space, and between the houses and areas of public open space, and inadequate footpath provision, would not be conducive to pedestrian safety and would give rise to an unattractive environment for pedestrians. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the principles of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, 2019, (DMURS), which seeks to place pedestrians at the top of the user hierarchy, and contrary to the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), which provides that new developments create permeable urban environments which optimise movement for sustainable modes, including walking. The proposed development would therefore constitute a substandard form of development which would seriously injure the amenities of the area and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the proposal to demolish the house on the site, which may be used by bats, a species protected under the EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC), in the absence of a bat survey to determine whether the house is used by bats and the potential impact on bats and their habitats, the Board is not satisfied that the proposed development, would not result in the deterioration or destruction of bat roosts or habitats, and consequently the disturbance or destruction of a species which is afforded Strict Protection under the Habitats Directive. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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
Senior Planning Inspector

14th May 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála	ABP-319486-24		
Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for demolition of existing derelict dwelling for the construction of 16 houses and all associated site works.		
Development Address	The Walk, Clooneybeirne, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon		
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)?			
Yes	X	Part 2, Sch. 5, Class 10, (b), (i) Part 2, Sch. 5, Class 10, (b), (iv)	Proceed to Q3.
No			
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			
No	X		Proceed to Q4

4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	X	Class 10, (b), (i) (threshold is 500 dwelling units) – proposal is for 16 no. dwelling units. Class 10, (b), (iv) (threshold is 2 Ha.) – site area is 0.78 ha.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

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

Inspector: Ian Campbell

Date: 14th May 2025

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-319486-24
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for demolition of existing derelict dwelling for the construction of 16 houses and all associated site works.
Development Address	The Walk, Clooneybeirne, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon
<p>The Board carried 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> <p>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>	
<p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>The proposed development comprises the demolition of dwelling and the construction 16 no. houses. The site is located on a brownfield site within an urban area.</p> <p>The proposed development will not give rise to the production of significant waste, emissions or pollutants.</p>

<p>Location of development</p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>The development is located in an urban area on a brownfield site. The site is c. 3.6 km from a European Site. Following screening for Appropriate Assessment, it has been ascertained 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.</p> <p>Given the scale and nature of development there will be no significant environmental effects arising.</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>During the construction phase noise, dust and vibration emissions are likely. However, any impacts would be local and temporary in nature and the implementation of standard construction practice measures would satisfactorily mitigate potential impacts.</p> <p>In the absence of a bat survey it is unclear whether the proposal, which includes the demolition of a house which has been indicated as being potentially</p>

		suitable for use by bats, would adversely affect bats. In the event that the house is used by bats, potential impacts arising as a consequence would be geographically limited to local bat populations and would not be significant.
Conclusion		
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA	Yes or No
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.	Yes
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.	No
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.	No

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____

Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)