



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-321563-24

Development	Construction of a house and all associated site works.
Location	Cregnanagh, Kilmaine, Co. Mayo.
Planning Authority	Mayo County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460555.
Applicant(s)	Mary Jane Craddock.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission.
Type of Appeal	Third Party.
Appellant(s)	Peter Bayne.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	8 th May 2025.
Inspector	C. Daly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site, of 0.372 ha, in the rural townland of Cregnanagh consists of a rectangular site towards the end of a single lane roadway (L56632). There is a mobile home and driveway access beside, and to the west of the site. Otherwise the site consists of grassland and it is bounded by trees and hedgerows to the rear, by stone walls on one side and to the front, by adjacent fields to the east and south and by a two storey detached dwelling further to the west. There is a line of four dwellings on the opposite side of the road in the vicinity of the site. There are also two further dwellings on the northern side along the laneway to the east close to the N64 and there is a large farm building also.
- 1.2. Shrulue village is c.3.1km to the south, Kilmaine village is c.3.8km to the north, Headford is c.8.5km to the south and Ballinrobe is c.11.5km to the north-west.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:
- Single storey dormer type dwelling with perpendicular gable projection to the rear, rear pitched roof shed and wastewater treatment system.

At F.I. stage, a revised site layout plan was submitted confirming that the existing mobile home is located outside the site boundary.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Further information was initially requested in relation to a revised site layout showing the mobile home on the site and details of the current arrangements on site for disposal of foul effluent. Following a further information request, Mayo County Council granted permission subject to 7 no. conditions. Notable conditions include:

- Condition no. 2: the entrance wall and pillars not to exceed 1.5m.
- Condition no. 3: requirement for wastewater treatment system to meet EPA Code of Practice.

- Condition no. 4: the garage/shed to be only used for domestic purposes.
- Condition no. 7: development contribution condition.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's Report noted the previous refusal of permission by the Board due to flood risk and wastewater treatment issues. It noted that the applicant had not been previously granted permission for a similar development. The site was noted to be located in a 'remaining rural area' for rural housing development with no issues noted. Flood risk was considered satisfactory. The further information request from the first planner's report related to a revised site layout plan showing the location of the mobile home on the site and details of the current arrangements on the site for wastewater disposal. The subsequent report noted the mobile home to be located outside the site boundary and considered it a matter for enforcement. It recommended a grant of permission.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Environment (Flood Risk) Section: Further information required in relation to *"The CFRAM mapping for this area indicates that a significant area of the site would be impacted by both the 1% and 0.1% AEP Pluvial Flood events"* and an SSFRA is required. I note that the Environment section report of 25/10/24 noted that the SSFRA was satisfactory.
- Area Engineer Ballinrobe: No objection subject to conditions.
- Area Engineer Claremorris – Swinford: No objection subject to conditions.
- MCC National Roads Office: No objection.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- TII: Requests the P.A. to have regard to the provisions of official policy relating to proposals impacting national roads and proposals impact the existing light rail network.
- Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage: No response on file.
- Uisce Éireann: No response on file.

- DAU (Natural Heritage): No response on file.
- An Taisce: No response on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One third party observation was received which can be summarised as follows:

- The site has flooded in the past.
- A similar development was previously refused permission.
- There is a history of speculative development by the applicant.
- Traffic hazard given the proximity to the national road network.
- Public health risk from the wastewater generation.

4.0 Planning History

Subject Site

2460445: Withdrawn application for bungalow dwelling house with effluent treatment. System.

22/862: Permission granted by the P.A. and refused on appeal (ABP-316153-23) for construction of a serviced dwelling with an effluent treatment system and a garage/shed.

Two reasons for refusal related to: (1) Flood risk on the site and the vicinity and the site is not suitable for septic tank effluent disposal given the pluvial flood risk; and (2) the Board is not satisfied that wastewater generated by the proposal could be satisfactorily accommodated on site and that no information in relation to how a well could be accommodated given there is no public piped water supply available.

21/1357: Withdrawn application for a dwelling, garage and effluent treatment unit.

Adjacent Site

22/433: Permission granted by the P.A. at site c.200m to east for a dwelling house, garage and wastewater treatment system.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 (the CDP)

Chapter 3 Housing

RHP 4

To ensure that future housing in rural areas have regard to the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2005 (DOEHLG) or any amended or superseding guidelines.

RHP 5

To ensure that rural housing applications employ site specific design solutions to provide for proposals that integrate into and reflect and enhance local landscape character, in terms of siting, design, materials, finishes and landscaping.

RHP 8

To require that new houses in the rural areas ensure the protection of water quality in the arrangements for on-site wastewater disposal, ensure provision of a safe means of access in relation to road and public safety, avoid flood risk and ensure the conservation of sensitive areas such as natural habitats, ecological connectivity, the enjoyment of protected structures and other aspects of heritage.

RHO 2

In rural areas not classified as in Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence, there is a presumption in favour of facilitating the provision of single housing in the countryside, based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, except in the case of single houses seeking to locate along Mayo's Scenic Routes/ Scenic Routes with Scenic Views or Coastal Areas/Lakeshores (See RHO 3 below).

Category 2 - Remaining Rural Areas: These areas comprise of all other rural areas outside of the identified pressure areas under strong urban influence. It is recognised that sustaining smaller community areas is important and as such, it is considered appropriate to encourage rural housing in accordance with the principles of proper planning and sustainable development. In these areas, the Council recognises the

importance of increasing population and supporting the rural economy, while seeking to consolidate the existing rural town and village network.

Chapter 6 – Movement and Transport

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.

Chapter 7 - Infrastructure

INO 3

To ensure that any new development connects to a public water supply or Group Water Scheme, where available. Connections to wells for individual housing units in unserviced rural areas will only be considered where there is no public water main or Group Water Scheme serving the site and where it can be demonstrated that connection to the proposed well will not have significant adverse effects on water quality or water quantity in the area and can provide a potable water supply in accordance with EU Drinking Water standards.

Volume 2

Chapter 2 – Residential (Rural)

Volume 3

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

Volume 4

Mayo Rural Housing Design Guidelines

5.2. **Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) (2020) for the Northern and Western Regional Assembly Area**

“The NPF confirms that there needs to be a distinction made between areas under urban influence and elsewhere. It confirms that the capacity to provide for single

rural housing should be retained for those that have a demonstrable economic or social need to live in the area, subject to all other proper planning and sustainable development considerations. The management of these pressures is a matter for individual local authorities through the development plan process, having regard to the provisions of Ministerial Guidelines and other material considerations”.

5.3. Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (NPF)

National Policy Objective 19 of the NPF states the following,

“Ensure, in providing for the development of rural housing, that a distinction is made between areas under urban influence, i.e. within the commuter catchment of cities and large towns and centres of employment, and elsewhere:

- In rural areas under urban influence, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area and siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements;

- In rural areas elsewhere, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements”.

5.4. Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2005.

The above guidelines seek to facilitate people from rural areas in the planning system. The Guidelines give examples including farmers (and their sons and daughters) or other persons taking over or running farms and persons who have spent substantial periods of their lives living in rural areas and are building their first homes.

5.5. EPA Code of Practice 2021: “Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)”

This code of practice is relevant in relation to the assessment of the proposed wastewater treatment system.

5.6. Natural Heritage Designations

In relation to designated sites, the subject site is located

- 0.7km north of Shrile Turlough Proposed Natural Heritage Area (PNHA) (site code 000525).
- 0.79km north of Shrile Turlough Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (site code 000525).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. The grounds of the third party appeal by Peter Bayne can be summarised as follows:

- The site and adjacent roadway is at risk of pluvial flooding which the appellant has observed almost annually.
- There is potential for flood waters to be displaced to adjoining sites.
- Soakaways are not an appropriate remedy for pluvial flooding at this location.
- CDP policy provides that areas at risk of flooding should be avoided and the sequential test and justification test should be used.
- The site is unsuitable for the disposal and treatment of wastewater which flooding would exacerbate.
- The access road is narrow in width and substandard and the traffic from the development would endanger public safety.
- The appeal includes an undated photo purported to be of the site showing it flooded, a letter from previous applicants for permission on the site stating they witnessed the site submerged in water in March 2022 and the Inspector's Report under ABP-316153-23 which recommended refusal of permission for a dwelling and shed on the site.

6.1.2. To note there is a letter on file purporting to be from the appellant seeking to withdraw the appeal and a subsequent email and letter from the appellant stating that this letter was from someone impersonating him and that the appeal stands.

6.1.3. A letter was issued by An Bord Pleanála stating that the Board is satisfied that the letter of 30th January 2025 (purporting to withdraw the appeal) was not sent to the

Board by a person who made the appeal and that Section 140 of the Act has therefore not been engaged.

6.2. Applicant Response

The response to the appeal on behalf of the applicant can be summarised as follows:

- The subject application was granted permission by the Council as, after F.I., it addressed the previous reasons for refusal of An Bord Pleanála.
- The appellant appears to have withdrawn his observation and then changed his mind and it is unclear why this happened.
- The address of the appellant varies across his previous submissions on planning applications 22433, 22862 and 2460555.
- An undated non-descript photo of a field containing water has been exhibited by the appellant since January 2022 and it is not clear when this photo was taken with no more recent photo provided.
- The submitted letter purported to be from previous applicants was investigated by the Council and found to be falsified information corroborated by their engineer.
- A Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment (SSFRA) submitted found no risk of flooding and this was accepted by the Council.
- The applicant has lived on a mobile home on the site for two years and at no point were the mobile homes subject to flooding.
- The trial pits for this and previous applications showed no evidence of flooding and at no point did these trial pits fill with water.
- A letter is appended purporting to be from a local landowner and farmer stating that the lands do not flood.
- The concerns about effluent treatment appear to be heavily linked to the false assumption that the site is subject to regular flooding.
- A Site Suitability Assessment has been undertaken which proves the site can provide the necessary level of effluent treatment in accordance with the EPA Code of Practice.

- The Council's National Roads Office raised no concerns for the national road system.
- The appeal should be dismissed as vexatious, frivolous and without substance.

6.3. Further Responses

Two solicitor's letters on behalf of the applicant were received stating that they received a letter from the Board that the appeal was deemed to have been withdrawn. The solicitor is of the view that the Council decision stands and that the Board has no jurisdiction to proceed further. It is sated that the Board has no further lawful role and that there is no live appeal before it.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Rural Housing Policy
- Flood Risk
- Public Health
- Access

7.2. Rural Housing Policy

7.2.1. I note the subject site location within a rural area designated as a 'remaining rural area' (category 2) for the purposes of housing development. I note RHO 2 is applicable which states that,

"In rural areas not classified as in Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence, there is a presumption in favour of facilitating the provision of single housing in the countryside, based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory

guidelines and plans, except in the case of single houses seeking to locate along Mayo's Scenic Routes/ Scenic Routes with Scenic Views or Coastal Areas/Lakeshores (See RHO 3 below)".

- 7.2.2. I note the site meets the above criteria where a single rural house can be facilitated as it is not within a rural area under strong urban influence or along a scenic route with scenic views and is not a coastal or lakeshore area. There is no requirement to demonstrate rural housing need in this context and I note that the applicant's name does not appear under the Mayo County Council planning search function other than in relation to the subject site and there is no evidence on the file on which to conclude that this constitutes speculative development.
- 7.2.3. In relation to the siting and design criteria of the CDP (Rural Housing Design Guidelines, Volume 4), I note no issues following the updated site layout plan showing the existing mobile home located outside the site boundaries and I note this would be removed on completion of the development and that enforcement issues are matters for the P.A. and not the Board. The house design with traditional forms including pitched roofs would be broken into smaller forms and, in my view, would reflect the scale, form and proportions of traditional vernacular dwellings to a reasonable degree. I consider that the dwelling and shed would integrate with the rural agricultural setting and would assimilate with the landscape.

7.3. Flood Risk

- 7.3.1. I note the submitted 'Assessment of Minor Proposals in Areas of Flood Risk' (SSFRA) document dated July 2024. This notes no flood risk on the site or surroundings. On this basis no stage 2 assessment was deemed to be required. The report notes that as per the request of the Council for the permitted dwelling to the west, the finished floor level is at 42.4m. This FFL is also provided for the shed. I note the submitted SSFRA indicates the PFRA maps suggests areas adjacent to the site may be subject to groundwater flooding and notes sufficient separation of the site from the Turlough associated with flooding. I note the Environment section was satisfied with the SSFRA.
- 7.3.2. Having reviewed the OPW CFRAM maps, I note the subject site is located in Flood Zone C and is not proximate to the higher risk zones of Zones A or B. My site visit on 8th May 2025 was a dry sunny day following a dry period of weather and the

ground on the site and surrounds was firm and the site was predominantly covered in long grass with some uncovered areas of hard ground. The appellant has raised concerns in relation to flood risk and the impact on adjacent sites and the appeal is accompanied by a photograph from the adjoining road. While it is not clear where or when the photo was taken, the appellant's photo does support the previous Inspector's observations of the lands on site where he observed "*the adjacent field to the east had a large quantity of standing water present at its centre. I also noted that a recently excavated hole on the site contains an effluent tank partially submerged under water*".

- 7.3.3. The Council's Environment (Flood Risk) response was noted in the Planner's Report to have no concerns in terms of the ability to safely dispose of wastewater but the first internal report noted that "*The CFRAM mapping for this area indicates that a significant area of the site would be impacted by both the 1% and 0.1% AEP Pluvial Flood events*" and an SSFRA is required. Having reviewed the applicant's submitted SSFRA, the second report from the Environment (Flood Risk) section was satisfied that there is no significant risk of flooding.
- 7.3.4. I note under reg. ref. 22/862, the Planner's Report noted that pluvial flood risk was a risk at the site and adjacent field. I also note the previous Inspector's Report (ABP-316153-23) and Board decision related to flooding. I note the submitted SSFRA did not specifically address the CFRAM mapping issue previously noted by the Council in relation to pluvial flood events on part of the site and there is no detailed discussion of how a dwelling on the site may displace flooding or affect adjacent sites.
- 7.3.5. The Council's Environment (Flood Risk) section was satisfied in relation to flood risk provided that the new dwelling matched the finished floor level of the adjacent dwelling. This gives a FFL of c.700m over the existing ground level of the site. This approach is not consistent with Section 7.7.2 (Ground Levels, Floor Levels and Building Use) of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Volume 3) of the CDP where for example it states,
- *Development at the site must have been justified through this SFRA based on the existing (unmodified) ground levels....* "

- 7.3.6. While a FFL consistent with the adjacent permitted dwelling may be effective, the issue of displacement has not been addressed. Section 7.7 (Flood Mitigation Measures at Design Stage) of the CDP has not been met given the failure to *“demonstrate that appropriate mitigation measures can be put in place and that residual risks can be managed to acceptable levels”*. I consider the mitigation requirements have not been demonstrated in the submitted SSFRA to avoid displacement effects associated with the proposal.
- 7.3.7. On this basis and in the absence of any changed circumstance between the two applications and the two submitted flood risk assessments, I concur with the previous Inspector that there is a risk of flooding on the site and adjoining lands. This would be contrary to RHP 8 where flood risk for rural housing should be avoided. I also note the location of the wastewater treatment system (WWTS) on site and the lack of submitted information in relation to the effect of flood risk / high water table on this system. Accordingly, I recommend that permission be refused in relation to flood risk.

7.4. Public Health

- 7.4.1. The proposal includes an on-site wastewater treatment system and polishing filter to be located in the rear garden area. The Planner's Report noted good ground conditions and noted that the Environment section had no concerns in relation to the ability of the site to safely dispose of wastewater. On my site visit I was unable to locate the trial hole.
- 7.4.2. I note the submitted Site Characterisation Form. This noted a regionally important aquifer and a bedrock type of limestone and calcareous in an area of high vulnerability. The ground water protection response is noted as R2(2). I note that the reported trial hole depth was 1.75m to bedrock, without encountering the water table. Based on this a secondary treatment system and polishing filter was recommended. The subsoil is noted to be light clay. An average T-value of 58.33 is recorded and the sub-surface percolation value 26. Based on this a secondary treatment system and polishing filter was considered appropriate, and this was recommended in the form. This is consistent with Table 6.3 of the EPA Code of Practice and Table 6.4 for percolation values.

7.4.3. In relation to the proposed site layout, based on mains water supply I note no issues in relation to separation distances per Table 6.2 of the code. While the submitted documentation suggests compliance with the EPA Code of Practice, I am not satisfied that it has been demonstrated that an adequate depth of unsaturated sub-soil will be available at the location of the proposed WWTP. While the location of the WWTP appears to lie outside the pluvial flood risk zone, the SCR fails to address the high water table previously observed on the site. I also note that in karstic areas, water tables can fluctuate significantly and relatively quickly. On this basis I do not consider the submitted report to be robust and I recommend that permission be refused on this basis.

7.4.4. I note water supply is proposed from the public network and the P.A. noted no concerns in this regard. I note no pre-connection feasibility letter on file from Uisce Éireann and no confirmation from a local group water scheme. I note the Site Characterisation Report was informed on the basis of connection to the group mains. In the previous case the Inspector noted the failure to confirm that *“the proposed DWWTS is compliant with separation distances set out by, Table 6.2: Minimum separation distances from the entire DWWTS of the Code of Practice”* on the basis of the failure to show the location for a bored well on site given that there was no confirmation of mains water supply connection. However, given that the P.A. reports indicate a water main on the road, I do not consider that this issue is of such weight as to merit refusal.

7.5. Access – New Issue

7.5.1. The appeal raises concerns in relation to the safety of the access to and from the site via the N84 public road (100kph speed limit) and the single laneway which serves a number of dwellings and a farm yard. I note there would be a new vehicular entrance with 70m sightlines demonstrated in both directions. The Inspector’s Report for the previous application anticipated traffic conflicts owing to the type of vehicles using the access laneway and the number of houses and the poor condition of the laneway.

7.5.2. While the access to the N84 is an established road junction, I note no confirmation of required sightlines is included with the application documentation. I note national road policy MTP 24 which is *“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". In this context, the provision of an additional dwelling, on a laneway that would serve 9 dwellings and a farm with associated vehicular trip generation where adequate sightlines have not been demonstrated but appear satisfactory, would constitute the creation of an additional turning movements accessing on to the N84 where the speed limit is 100km/h such that I consider this would be contrary to CDP policy relating to a strategic road priority to protect national roads and would likely result in a traffic hazard such that I consider refusal of permission is merited. I note that this is a new issue and the Board may not wish to have regard to it in making its decision, given the substantive reason identified above.

7.6. Other Issues

- 7.6.1. I note that the response of the applicant considers the issues raised in the appeal to be frivolous or without foundation. However, given the issues considered above in Section 7 of this report I do not consider this to be the case and I have, accordingly, assessed the appeal on its merits and I do not recommend the Board dismiss on the appeal on such grounds as requested.
- 7.6.2. In relation to the legal issues raised on behalf of the applicant's solicitors contending that the appeal was withdrawn and that the Board has no jurisdiction, I do not consider the appeal to have been withdrawn. I note the Board letter of 25/03/25 where the case was not considered to be withdrawn.

8.0 EIA Screening

- 8.1. See Form 1 and Form 2 appended to this report. The proposed development is located within a rural area on un-serviced land for wastewater treatment. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and the absence of direct connectivity to any sensitive location, 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.

9.0 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. The subject site is located 0.79km north of Shrute Turlough Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (site code 000525). The proposed development comprises a single storey dwelling, shed and wastewater treatment system. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.2. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The domestic scale and nature of the development.
 - The distance from the nearest European site and lack of connections.
 - Taking into account screening report/determination by the P.A.
- 9.4. I conclude, 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 (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be refused.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the observed high water table on the appeal site and adjoining lands and to the design of the wastewater treatment plan, the Board is not satisfied that the proposed development would not give rise to an increased risk of flooding on the site or of property or the public road in the vicinity, contrary to Policy RHP 8 of the Mayo County Development

Plan 2022-2028 where flood risk should be avoided for rural housing. Furthermore having regard to the observed high water table at this location the Board is not satisfied that the site is suitable for the treatment and disposal of wastewater. The proposed development would, therefore, be prejudicial to public health and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the laneway access to the N84 for the proposed dwelling at a point where the maximum speed limit applies, the provision of an additional dwelling with associated additional vehicular turning movements on to a national road, would be contrary to Policy MTP 24 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 which seeks to avoid the generation of additional traffic from existing direct accesses to national roads where the speed limit is greater than 60km per hour and would constitute the creation of a potential traffic hazard on a national road. The proposed development 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.

Ciarán Daly
Planning Inspector

30th May 2025

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-321563-24
Proposed Development Summary	Single storey dwelling, shed and wastewater treatment system.
Development Address	Cregnanagh, Kilmaine, Co. Mayo.
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1 . EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.	

No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	Part 2, Class 10(b)(i) and (iv). Threshold is 500 dwellings and a site area greater than 20ha. Proposal is for one dwelling and a shed on a site area of 0.372ha.

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2

Form 2 – EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP-321563-24
Proposed Development Summary	Single storey dwelling, shed and wastewater treatment system.
Development Address	Cregnanagh, Kilmaine, Co. Mayo.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
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).	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. New single storey dwelling and shed, total floor area 309sqm. Wastewater treatment system and polishing filter. Connection to mains for water supply.
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).	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed The rural location is removed from streams, rivers and lacks and is not proximate to a sensitive designated site. The site is not proximate to any sites of cultural interest. No significant loss of hedgerow / trees is proposed in the context of the EIA threshold.
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).	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects. There is potential for water based impacts, silt at construction stage and wastewater at operational stage, to leave the site via flooding. There is no connection to any designated sites.

Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector:

Date:

DP/ADP: _____

Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)