



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321023-24

Development	Construction of a veterinary clinic, entrance and associated site works.
Location	Carrowbaun, Westport, Co. Mayo.
Planning Authority	Mayo County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	24320
Applicant(s)	Tom Fabby.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission.
Type of Appeal	Third Party.
Appellant(s)	Patricia Fadden.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	13 March 2025.
Inspector	Stephen Rhys Thomas.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	3
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	4
3.4. Third Party Observations	4
4.0 Planning History	4
5.0 Policy Context	5
5.1. Development Plan	5
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	6
6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening	6
7.0 The Appeal	7
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
7.2. Applicant Response	8
7.3. Planning Authority Response	8
7.4. Observations	8
8.0 Assessment	9
9.0 Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening	15
10.0 Recommendation	16
11.0 Reasons and Considerations	16
12.0 EIA Pre-Screening	17
13.0 EIA Preliminary Examination	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. This appeal relates to a site of 0.29 hectares located at the junction of the N59 and a minor country road approximately 2km to the south of Westport town centre, Co Mayo. The appeal site is triangular in shape, the western point of the site is adjacent to the N59 Leenaun Road and the southern boundary aligns the L1815.
- 1.2. The site is part of a larger agricultural field and the area in question is flat and more or less level with the L1815 road. The flat portion of the field is combination of grassland and a large quantity of rushes. The roadside boundary is defined by a mix of low stone walls, hedging and post and wire fencing with overhead ESB power lines crossing the site towards the southwestern corner. A petrol filling and service station is located on the opposite side of the L1815 minor road to the south of the site and there are a number of dwellings nearby. The L1815, a narrow road, links the N59 to the west and onwards to the L5869 to the east, serving a small number of houses along its southern side.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The applicant proposes to construct a single storey veterinary surgery (253sqm floor area) comprising a shop, consultation rooms, toilets, office, kitchen, store, operating theatre, recovery room, and waiting room.
- 2.2. 17 car parking spaces, a driveway, landscaped area and single vehicular entrance.
- 2.3. All on a site of 0.29 Hectares.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The planning authority issued a notification to grant permission subject to seven conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports

Report 1

- Lands are outside the Westport LAP lands. Considered to be a large animal practice and an essential need in this area.
- EIA preliminary, not required. AA not required.
- Building design appropriate when considered in terms of the character of the area.
- Vehicular entrance acceptable, no traffic hazard issues. Site falls outside the southern bypass corridor for Westport.

Recommendation to grant permission.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer Westport – no objections.

3.2.3. Conditions

- All seven conditions are standard or technical in nature.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. Two observations, issues include, traffic, flooding, zoning, safety and noise.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Site

PA ref 21545 and ABP-311112-21 – Permission refused for a veterinary clinic and entrance. September 2022, two reasons summarised as follows:

1. Agricultural/High Amenity zoning of the Westport and Environs Plan 2010-2016, the commercial development would not be a permissible use and thus contravene the land use zoning.

2. Located on a minor road and close to a junction on to the N59, the development fails to meet the sight line requirements of the development plan, a traffic hazard would result.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028

The Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the operative plan for the area.

Policy EDO 54

To facilitate rural enterprises, and resource development (such as agriculture, agri-food sector, agri-tourism, commercial fishing, aquaculture, rural tourism, forestry, bio- energy, the extractive industry, recreation, cultural heritage, marine enterprise sector, research and analysis) and renewable energy resources (such as wind/ solar/ocean energy) that are dependent on their locality in rural locations, where it can be demonstrated that the development will not have significant adverse effects on the environment, including the integrity of the Natura 2000 network, residential amenity or visual amenity. Where proposals demonstrate measures to promote environmental enhancement through improved ecological connectivity, such as measures in the Pollinator Plan, additional native species planting or blue and green infrastructure measures, these will be favourably considered.

Table 6.5 Road Projects in Mayo – N5/N59 Southern bypass of Westport

MTP 24 To avoid the creation of additional direct access points from new development adjoining national roads or the generation of additional traffic from existing direct accesses to national roads to which speed limits greater than 60 km/h apply.

Volume 2 Development Management Standards – section 7.0 Roads and Parking

Paragraph 7.8 - Access and Proximity to Road Junctions, Interchanges and Roundabouts. Where and access to / from a new development onto the road network is in close proximity to a road junction, the new access shall meet the minimum standards as set out in Table 5.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. The location and distance from the nearest European sites:

- The Clew Bay Complex SAC, 2.26 km to the west
- The Brackloon Woods SAC 3.5 km to the south
- The Mweelrea/Sheeffry/Erriff Complex SAC, is located 8 km to the south

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening

6.1.1. The appeal concerns the development of a veterinary clinic (gfa 253sqm), entrance and associated site works.(a commercial unit),

6.1.2. Class 10(b)(iv) of Part 2, Infrastructure projects, Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. (In this paragraph, “business district” means a district within a city or town in which the predominant land use is retail or commercial use.). At 0.29 hectares the site is less than 2 hectares, 10 hectares or 20 hectares. Class 1(a) of Part 2 (rural restructuring / hedgerow removal); the development will entail minor field boundary removal and replacement, any re-contouring is well below 5 hectares and no farming related activities whatsoever. Class 10(dd) of Part 2 relating to private roads in the form of driveways. Development driveway and parking amounts to less than 200 metres, far less than the threshold of 2,000 metres. I have considered all of these Classes at appendix 1 and 2 of my report and no thresholds have been met. The introduction of a single storey commercial building in the open countryside will not have an adverse impact in environmental terms on surrounding land uses. It is noted that the site is not designated for the protection of the landscape or of natural or cultural heritage and the proposed development is not likely to have a significant effect on any European Site as discussed in section 9.0 of my report below and there is no direct meaningful hydrological connection present such as would give rise to significant impact on nearby water courses. The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances that differ from that arising in the area. It would not give rise to a risk of major accidents or risks to human health.

6.1.3. Having regard to: -

- The nature and scale of the proposed development, which is significantly under the mandatory threshold in respect of Class 10 - Infrastructure Projects of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), Class 1(a) of Part 2 (rural restructuring / hedgerow removal); and Class 10(dd) of Part 2 relating to private roads in the form of driveways.
- The location of the site in an area of open countryside, not subject to any particular designation for protection of views or vistas,
- The existing pattern of development in the vicinity,
- The guidance set out in the “Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Guidance for Consent Authorities regarding Sub-threshold Development”, issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (2003).

6.1.4. I have concluded that, by reason of the nature and scale of the single storey commercial unit development and the rural location of the subject site, the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and that on preliminary examination an environmental impact assessment report for the proposed development was not necessary in this case, for further detail and analysis note that appendices 1 and 2 of my report refer.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. A third party appeal on behalf of local residents was received on the 9th October 2024, summarised as follows:

- Safety – vulnerable road users will be put at risk, there is no footpath or cycleway in the area.
- The L1815 is a dirt track with houses opening up on it, the laneway is not able to accommodate the increase in traffic.
- Conflicting entrance points, not shown on plans.

- Flooding is a problem along the minor road and the N59, the storm drain frequently overflows.
- Along with recently approved housing schemes in the area, the volume of traffic will change the character of the area and lead to noise and traffic pollution. The noise and nuisance from a large animal practice will make matters worse.
- How can a veterinary practice be permitted on an agricultural area, what distance should a commercial enterprise entrance be from the N59?

7.2. Applicant Response

The applicant prepared a response to the grounds of appeal by reiterating the content of the application and noting the assessment of the planning authority, relevant points include:

- Use of new units for veterinary purposes in industrial zoned lands may not be acceptable.
- The proposed development provides space for a footpath and the entrance point has been accepted as safe.
- The roadway condition is disputed and flood occurrences are not recorded as such.
- There will be no heavy goods vehicles accessing the site.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

None.

7.4. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. The main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal, and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise. The planning authority issued a notification to grant permission and I note that a similar proposal was previously refused by the planning authority and the Board on appeal. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report/s of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Roads and Traffic
- Flooding
- Other Matters
- Conditions

8.2. Principle of Development

- 8.2.1. The appellant questions whether this agricultural land is the correct location for a veterinary surgery, when there are better locations in Westport, such as commercial premises on zoned land. The applicant points out that the use of new units for veterinary purposes on industrial zoned lands may not be acceptable and that this is the optimum location for the type of development proposed.
- 8.2.2. The appeal site is located outside the development boundary of the Westport Local Area Plan 2024-2030. In this instance the proposal to construct a veterinary surgery is located on agricultural lands and falls to be assessed in terms of the proper planning and the sustainable development of the area and not confined by any particular zoning objectives. I note that the same proposal was refused permission by the Board because of a land use zoning conflict and traffic issues, ABP-311112-21 refers. The site is no longer within the development boundary of the LAP and so a zoning conflict does not arise in this instance.
- 8.2.3. The appellant has pointed to other more suitable sites in Westport for the development proposed, but the applicant is concerned about the potential for zoning

contraventions. The appeal before the Board is not to assess other sites in and around Westport and their suitability or otherwise for the subject proposal. I keep my assessment to the appeal on hand, its merits and suitability for the site in question. In that context, I note that there is no particular zoning objective that applies to the appeal site and no particular policy or objective that concerns veterinary surgeries. However, Policy EDO 54 seeks to facilitate rural enterprises, that are dependent on their locality in rural locations, where it can be demonstrated that the development will not have significant adverse effects on the environment, including the integrity of the Natura 2000 network, residential amenity or visual amenity. I am satisfied that a veterinary surgery that aims to provide a small and large animal practice, should be classed as a rural enterprise.

- 8.2.4. The landscape in the vicinity has no particular designation that requires protection and the site lies just beyond the N59 Scenic Route as illustrated by Map 10.2 Scenic Routes and Views. The proposed building will not be significantly larger than most one off rural houses in the wider area and its form, design, material choices have all taken account of the guidance provided by the Mayo Rural Housing Design Guidelines. I am satisfied that there is no development plan policy or objective that would instantly cause the proposal to be rejected on grounds of principle. The development is for a veterinary surgery, a use that would seem to be a good fit for the treatment of animals in this rural area, there is no reason to refuse permission based on the principle of development at this location.

8.3. Roads and Traffic

- 8.3.1. The appellant has raised a number of roads and traffic related concerns regarding the development. It is the lack of footpaths in the area, the narrow configuration of the L1815, conflicting entrance points and proximity to the N59 that are all a cause for concern. The increase in the volume of traffic is also highlighted as a factor that will exacerbate the inappropriate location for the development. The applicant disagrees and notes that the planning authority approved the development and that no heavy goods vehicles will access the site.
- 8.3.2. The appeal site is located along the L1815, a short road that links the N59 to the west and a country road (L5869) to the east. The L1815 is a short narrow road that serves a small number of residences and the forecourt to a petrol filling and service

station. The L1815 is narrow, has a mostly straight alignment and adequately surfaced, with drainage on both sides. There are no footpaths along the L1815 and no public lighting, this is not unexpected for a very minor rural laneway. The posted speed limit is 60kph for this local road and 80kph for the N59. I note that permission was previously refused for a similar development because of its location too close to a junction with the N59, and that the development failed to meet the sight line requirements of the development plan, and this would result a traffic hazard, ABP-311112-21 refers. With reference to the previous and current applications, I have compared both layout drawings and the proposed vehicular entrance is more or less in the same position, the far eastern end of the site, 115 metres from the junction with the N59. However, on this occasion both the planning authority and the local Area Engineer raise no objections to the proposed vehicle entrance location and that adequate sight lines can be achieved. From my observations of the site and its surrounds, I note a small number of driveways further to the east along the lane, I see no potential for traffic conflicts along the laneway here given the existing traffic volumes.

- 8.3.3. In terms of pedestrian and cyclist safety along the L1815, I note that no facilities are currently in place, it is a country lane. Other new development in the immediate environs has provided a footpath, across from the petrol filling station for example. The applicant have indicated in their response to the grounds of appeal that a sufficient space along the site frontage has been left clear to allow future road improvements and a footpath. This would improve matters for all road users. In my view it would be appropriate to require the applicant to provide the space for adequate pedestrian facilities to the front of the site at this crossroads area becomes urbanised, an appropriately worded condition can address this matter.
- 8.3.4. In terms of any increase in terms of traffic noise and pollution, I note the rural character of the area, where traffic noise and pollution associated with the N59 is not especially noticeable. I note that the pattern of housing development in the vicinity, is spread out, far removed from the road and sheltered by mature vegetation. I do not anticipate that the proposed development will generate such volumes of traffic that would lead to a perceptible increase in traffic noise and pollution.
- 8.3.5. With regard to traffic volumes, the applicant has pointed out that the residential development cited by the appellant is located 600 metres to the north in Westport

and has no bearing on the appeal site. The pattern of traffic visiting the site will entail car and trailer, larger animals tend to be treated off site. I observed that the petrol filling and service station to the south of the site is moderately well used and the addition of a veterinary surgery will not differ in terms of pattern or type of traffic. In any case the proposed vehicular access/egress point is appropriately designed to allow adequate sight distance visibility. I note that after construction is complete it is unlikely that heavy goods vehicles will be regular visitors to the site. The matter of how traffic will behave at the junction of the N59 has not been assessed by the applicant and it would be useful to know if an increase in traffic volume would lead to conflicts when taken together with the filling station, the junction and the N59 as it crests northwards.

- 8.3.6. Volume 2 of the County Development Plan sets out Access Visibility Requirements, Section 7.6 refers. For a local road with a speed limit of 60kph, access visibility requirements extend to 90 metres. The layout drawings illustrate that this is achievable for the development site. Though the site is located on a narrow local road, it does not have a poor horizontal and vertical alignment or an 80kph Speed Limit Sign, thus table 4 Access Visibility Requirements is not applicable in this instance. I am satisfied that the development can be served by a safe vehicle access and egress point as the appropriate sight visibility requirements are met along the L1815.
- 8.3.7. The development plan also states that where an access to / from a new development onto the road network is in close proximity to a road junction, the new access shall meet the minimum standards as set out in Table 5 - Access and Proximity to Road Junctions, Interchanges and Roundabouts. Table 5 is split into rural and urban criteria, and different forms of development, individual house, housing development and other development. The appellant has queried what the minimum distance a development should be from the N59 and table 5 helps with this question. If the area is defined as rural, then the separation distance between a new entrance for the development proposed should be a minimum of 200m from a National Road Junction. However, if the area is defined as urban, then the separation distance would reduce to 115m and the development achieves this standard. I note that the planning authority raised no issues with regard to the entrance location and proximity to the N59, however, it is a matter that demands attention. The appeal site is located

outside the development boundary of Westport, that is to say the LAP boundary. The area comprises a mixture of urban and rural characteristics, but I consider this to be a rural area from a planning perspective and for the purposes of Table 5 set out in Volume 2 Development Management Standards of the statutory plan. That being so, I observe that the proposed vehicular entrance is well inside the 200m minimum distance requirement set out by table 5 and I note that the Development Management Standards state that a new access shall meet the minimum standards. In this instance the proposed vehicular entrance is too close to the N59 junction and permission should be refused on this basis as it was before, ABP-311112-21 refers. Table 5 also sets out the distance for an individual dwelling and 90 metres is the minimum separation distance from the national road, however, the proposed development cannot be considered under this class of development because the pattern and intensity of traffic to and from the surgery would be logically greater than an individual house.

- 8.3.8. Given all of the foregoing, I am not satisfied that the proposed development either meets the standards set out in Table 5 or has suitably demonstrated that the proposed development will not pose a traffic hazard in the context of traffic volumes and the junction with the N59. Even though the planning authority issued a notification to grant permission and did not raise issues with the proximity of the N59 junction, I cannot ignore the standards and guidance set out by table 5 and section 7.0, Volume 2: Development Management Standards of the development plan. For these reasons permission should be refused, as the proposed development could pose a traffic hazard.

8.4. Flooding

- 8.4.1. The appellant has concerns that flooding is a problem along the minor road and the N59, where the storm drain frequently overflows. The applicant notes that intermittent flooding does occur at the western end of the laneway, but will not be affected by the development proposed. In addition, the area is not recorded as a flooded site and does not appear on any flood mapping. I note the contents of the Area Engineer's report with respect to the site frontage and the surface water drainage requirements set out in that report. I am satisfied that a suitably worded condition will ensure that roadside drainage is not affected and that the contribution of the proposed development to existing intermittent flooding is limited. In this

respect I note the slightly enlarged site area (0.29 Hectares as opposed to the previous application site of 0.27 Hectares) and the drainage methods that are to be deployed on the site and outfall to the existing public drainage system. I am satisfied that flood risk is not an issue for this site and adjacent sites and the preparation of a flood risk assessment in this instance would be unwarranted and unnecessary.

8.5. Other Matters

- 8.5.1. Noise – the appellant has raised an issue about noise and general nuisance from a large animal practice. I have already addressed traffic noise in previous sections of my report and it is not clear if the appellant is also concerned about the noise that may be generated by the proposed veterinary surgery. However, I note that the proposed development is intended to treat small animals (sheep and domestic pets) at the premises and that larger animals will be treated off site. I anticipate that any noise that would emanate from the proposed development will be limited and subject to the controls imposed by the Environment Section of the local authority that deal with noise complaints. In any case, the separation distance from the proposed development to nearby residential property is greater than 50 metres with roads and hedging in between. I am satisfied that the proposed development will not generate unreasonable amounts of noise and that any impacts from noise nuisance will not adversely affect residential properties because of the separation distances involved.

8.6. Conditions

- 8.6.1. The planning authority attached seven conditions to the notification to grant permission. Most conditions are standard and technical in nature, including a development contribution condition. In the preceding sections I have identified where specific conditions may be required in addition to those sought by the planning authority, but a grouping and explanation of conditions follows:
- 8.6.2. Roadside boundary – I note that condition three requires measures to ensure roadside flooding does not occur. In addition, I recommend that details are submitted to provide a footpath area across the site frontage and that boundary details be agreed with the planning authority.
- 8.6.3. Landscaping Plan – the applicant refers to the potential to increase biodiversity of the site, specifically at the road frontage. In the absence of a landscaping plan it is difficult to envisage how this might be achieved. A detailed landscape and

implementation plan should be submitted prior to the commencement of development.

- 8.6.4. All other conditions that may be attached are standard and encompass the matters addressed by the planning authority and all construction activities of this scale, further explanation is unnecessary and repetitious.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2. The subject site is located at Carrowbaun, Westport, Co. Mayo. The proposed development comprises a veterinary clinic (gfa 253sqm), entrance and associated site works.
- 9.3. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.4. 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:
- a) The small scale and nature of the development,
 - b) The location, distance and lack of meaningful connections with the nearest European sites at:
 - The Clew Bay Complex SAC, 2.26 km to the west
 - The Brackloon Woods SAC 3.5 km to the south
 - The Mweelrea/Sheeffry/Erriff Complex SAC, is located 8 km to the south
 - c) Taking into account the screening report/determination (section 12 of the Planner's Report) by Mayo County Council.
- 9.5. 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.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend that planning permission should be refused for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The vehicular entrance to proposed development is located less than 200 metres from a junction with the National Secondary Route N59 and this would not comply with the minimum distances set out in Table 5 Access and Proximity to Road Junctions, Interchanges and Roundabouts, section 7.0 Volume 2 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028. It is considered that the additional traffic generated by the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users and this would therefore 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.

Stephen Rhys Thomas
Senior Planning Inspector

26 March 2025

12.0 EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-321023-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a veterinary clinic (gfa 253sqm), entrance and associated site works.		
Development Address	Carrowbaun, Westport, Co. Mayo.		
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	✓
		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	✓	Class 10(b)(iv) of Part 2, Infrastructure projects, Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. (In this paragraph, "business district" means a district within a city or town in which the predominant land use is retail or commercial use.). Class 1(a) of Part 2 (rural restructuring / hedgerow removal); and Class 10 (dd) of Part 2 relating to private roads in the form of driveways.	Proceed to Q3.
No			
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes		.	
No	✓		Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			

Yes	✓	<p>Class 10(b)(iv) of Part 2, Infrastructure projects, Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. (In this paragraph, "business district" means a district within a city or town in which the predominant land use is retail or commercial use.). At 0.29 hectares the site is less than 2 hectares, 10 hectares or 20 hectares.</p> <p>Class 1(a) of Part 2 (rural restructuring / hedgerow removal); the development will entail minor field boundary removal and replacement, any re-contouring is well below 5 hectares and no farming related activities whatsoever.</p> <p>Class 10(dd) of Part 2 relating to private roads in the form of driveways. Development driveway and parking amounts to less than 200 metres, far less than the threshold of 2,000 metres.</p>	Preliminary examination required
------------	---	--	----------------------------------

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	✓	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q4)
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

13.0 EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-321023-24
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a veterinary clinic, entrance and associated site works.
Development Address	Carrowbaun, Westport, Co. Mayo.
<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 (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 development will provide a veterinary surgery amounting to a gfa of 253sqm. The scale of development is similar to other forms of building in the vicinity. 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 are all considered to be minor in scale.</p>
<p>Location of development (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 site is located at a crossroads junction where there are houses and a petrol filling station. There are no environmental sensitivities in the area likely to be affected by the development in terms of land uses. There are no sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance in the area.</p>

Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).		The types of impact are limited and unlikely to result in any significant effects on environmental parameters.
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.	No , EIA is not required.
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 , Schedule 7A Information is not required.
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.	No , EIAR is not required.

Inspector:

Date:

DP/ADP: _____

Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)