



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321914-25

Development	Construction of two houses and all associated site works.
Location	Erris Street, Crossmolina, Co. Mayo
Planning Authority	Mayo County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460484
Applicant(s)	Eileen Rowland
Type of Application	Planning permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission subject to conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Cian Garrett and Others
Date of Site Inspection	15 th May 2025
Inspector	Sarah O'Mahony

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.086ha site is situated at the west of Crossmolina in Co. Mayo, accessed from the N59/Erris Street at the north of the site. The Deel River is situated 250m southeast while Lough Conn is situated 1.5km southeast of the site.
- 1.2. The site comprises the curtilage of a semi-detached two-storey dwelling. The dwelling forms part of a row of pairs of early to mid-20th century two-storey dwellings with large rear back and side gardens. The dwelling on the property is currently being refurbished and extended with construction work ongoing during the site inspection. This dwelling is however situated outside of the site boundary.
- 1.3. There are some outbuildings situated on the site, all of which are in poor condition. One is situated alongside the western boundary, close to the rear elevation of the dwelling and subdivided into two separate rooms and is largely obscured with ivy. It is utilised for domestic storage. There is another shed situated at the rear of the site, also alongside the western boundary which has animal stalls and appears to be an agricultural structure.
- 1.4. Boundaries comprise masonry walls to the front and sides with mature trees and hedgerows on the adjoining property to the east spilling into the site. The rear boundary comprises an earth and sod ditch with some mature hedgerow and trees. Most of the front boundary alongside the N59 was removed during the site inspection effectively forming a wider vehicular access.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for development which comprises the following:
 - Subdivision of existing residential site,
 - Demolition of domestic shed,
 - Construction of 02no. 100m² 3 bed semi-detached two-story dwellings houses situated to the rear of the existing dwelling with new boundaries to divide the site,
 - Connections to public sewer/surface water & public water main. Including all other ancillary site work/services

2.2. Following a further information request, the proposal was revised to comprise 1no. 160m² detached dwelling and omitting the proposed demolition of the domestic shed. The shared access and open space area to the rear of the existing dwelling and front of the proposed dwellings was also revised accordingly with a reduction from 6no. to 4no. new car parking spaces.

2.3. The following documents were received with the application:

- Flood Risk Assessment
- Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan
- Copy of an Uisce Éireann pre-connection enquiry.
- Car-parking Compliance Document
- Traffic Management Plan
- Part V exemption application

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Further information

3.1.1. The Local Authority requested further information regarding minor matters such as boundary details and landscaping, however it also included an 'advice note' as follows:

- *The limited separation distance between the proposed units and the site boundary. The proposed units are being constructed excessively close to the existing site boundaries and appear too large for the site area. The proposal fails to indicate retention of existing mature trees which contribute to the character of this area.*
- *The proposed house designs are out of character with the existing dwelling units along the streetscape. Revised plans and elevations shall be submitted.*
- *Having regard to the linear configuration of the site one dwelling unit only should be considered on site.*

- 3.1.2. The further information response revised the proposal to provide 1no. 160m² 4-bed dwelling only with a larger 145m² private open space to the rear. It also sought to retain an existing shed in the southwest of the site within the private open space of the proposed dwelling. The area between the existing and proposed dwelling would still retain a shared semi-public layout with 2no. car parking spaces situated adjacent each dwelling and with a small shared landscaped area.
- 3.1.3. The dwelling design was revised from an urban character with tiled external overhang porches and four over four barred windows, to a simpler arrangement with a round headed door and one over one vertical emphasis windows.

3.2. **Decision**

- 3.3. A notification to grant retention permission was issued by Mayo County Council on 07th January 2025 subject to 7no. conditions including no. 2 as follows:

"2. Car parking spaces 3 and 4 shall be removed and this area shall be landscaped. A revised site layout plan shall be submitted to Mayo County Council for written agreement prior to the commencement of development on site.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and sustainable development."

3.4. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.4.1. Planning Reports

Three planners reports are on the file. One requesting further information, one deeming the response as significant and requiring readvertisement of the statutory notices, and the third assessed the further information response.

- The Planners report recommendation to grant permission is consistent with the notification of decision which issued.
- Appropriate Assessment (AA) issues are both screened out however no Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening assessment was carried out.
- *'The development has now being reduced to one dwelling unit and two associated car parking spaces. This proposal involves the redevelopment of*

underutilised land in the self sustaining consolidation zone of Crossmolina town. Mayo County Council has no objection with the proposed development.'

3.4.2. Other Technical Reports

- No reports received.

3.5. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Éireann: No response received.

3.6. Third Party Observations

3.6.1. 3 no. submissions were received from the following third parties, some at initial application stage and some at the further information stage:

1. Mary Duffy, Fionan Duffy and Cliona Conlon
2. Cian, John and Deirdre Garrett (x 2 submissions)
3. Gerard and Jennifer Sweeney

3.6.2. The submissions raised the following issues:

- Overlooking
- Overshadowing
- Existing dwelling is being extended but this development is not reflected in the application documents.
- Concern that a precedent of 'garden grabbing' would be set, representing overdevelopment and erosion of green spaces, impacting biodiversity and visual aesthetics.
- Traffic hazard due to intensification.
- Infill and backland development is out of character with the established pattern of development. Query regarding impact to existing dwelling on the property (no. 44) and subsequent plot size. Only the existing dwelling should be permitted.
- Impact to existing trees on adjacent property.

- Questions regarding validity of the application, erection of the site notice and alterations to vehicular entrance already undertaken.
- Queries regarding the accuracy of site surveys and property ownership.
- No surface water management details submitted.
- No site investigations data to inform structural stability and integrity.
- Inaccurate drawings including lack of distances to boundaries and structures to be demolished.
- Proposal to replace existing boundary wall would impact adjacent property.
- Impact to security for adjacent dwellings from new access road.
- Query regarding minimum floor areas and lack of housing schedule.
- Further information request was not adequately addressed.
- Overdevelopment from single dwelling in revised proposal.

4.0 Planning History

No known planning history on the site.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 (referred to hereafter as the CDP). Crossmolina is designated as a Tier III self-sustaining town and a settlement plan is set out in Section 12.11 of the CDP. The settlement plan map for Crossmolina is provided in Volume 3 of the CDP and the site is situated within the Tier 3 self-sustaining consolidation zone. Table 1.2 of the CDP provides a land use zoning objective for these lands as follows:

“To provide for, protect and strengthen the vitality and viability of Tier III Self-Sustaining towns, through consolidating development, and encouraging a mix of uses, including but not restricted to commercial, residential, industry,

enterprise and employment, community, amenity, public realm enhancements, while maximising the use of land.”

- 5.1.2. Within the consolidation zone, the site is also situated within an area identified as ‘town centre – outer core’ and table 12.2 of the CDP outlines the zoning objective as follows:

“To maintain and enhance the vitality, viability and environment of the town centre and provide for appropriate town centre uses.”

- 5.1.3. Section 12.11.8 of the Crossmolina settlement plan states ‘*The delivery of sustainable communities will involve the re-use and regeneration of derelict and vacant buildings within the town centre and the provision of a mix of housing types and densities of high-quality design on infill and brownfield sites, moving out from the centre*’.

- 5.1.4. Objective CSO 4 of the CDP states it is an objective:

“To move towards more compact towns by promoting the development of infill and brownfield/consolidation/regeneration sites and the redevelopment of underutilised land within and close to the existing built-up footprint of existing settlements in preference to edge of centre locations.”

- 5.1.5. Objective SSO 4 states it is an objective:

“To strengthen the core of settlements and encourage the compact growth of settlements by way of the development of infill sites, brownfield lands, under-utilised land / buildings, vacant sites, and derelict sites within the existing built-up footprint of the settlements and develop outwards from the centre in a sequential manner.”

5.2. Section 28 Guidelines: Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines

- 5.2.1. The guidelines, hereafter referred to as the Compact Settlement Guidelines, set out a context to create higher density settlements to underpin sustainable development principles. Specific Planning Policy Requirements (SPPRs) are set out including SPPR 1 which refers to minimum standards for separation distances between residential units and opposing windows in habitable rooms.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. The River Moy Special Area of Conservation is situated 250m southeast of the site while Lough Conn and Lough Cullin proposed Natural Heritage Area is situated 1.5km to the southeast.

5.4. EIA Screening

- 5.4.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

One third party appeal is received from Cian Garrett, John Garret and Deirdre Garret. It raises the following matters:

- Planning application was validated on a Saturday raising the question of how this occurred when human input is required during out of office hours.
- The site notice was erected in a different location to that illustrated on the drawings.
- The design is not in keeping with the streetscape. There are no existing dwellings situated to the rear of Erris Street. The further information request highlights this and states that only one dwelling should be considered on the site. There is one dwelling on the site already and therefore the grant of permission has backtracked on the Council's own recommendation.
- 2no. car parking spaces for all units on the site is insufficient, will lead to overflow car parking on Erris Street and create a traffic hazard.

- The existing pillar to no. 45 Erris Street obscures sightlines for traffic exiting the site across a footpath posing a hazard for children and families. Intensification of the entrance constitutes a traffic hazard onto the busy N59.
- The design represents overdevelopment and would overshadow and overlook existing dwellings, impacting privacy and devaluing property.
- There are 80 existing derelict dwellings in Crossmolina and therefore there is no requirement to construct new dwellings. References are made to recent funding granted for a flood relief scheme and *'therefore the idea that new houses need to be built in a back garden is almost laughable given the fact that there are 80 houses that lie derelict and should be built up and redeveloped before new builds commence.'*

6.2. Applicant Response

- No response to the appeal was received.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- No response to the appeal was received.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. The proposed development comprises erection of dwellings on existing residential land, which is zoned for town centre uses including residential use. Further, the overarching consolidation zone land use zoning objective seeks to consolidate the existing town centre lands by maximising the use of land. This proposal comprises a backland infill development which is further supported by compact settlement objectives such as SSO 4 and CSO 4 outlined above.
- 7.1.1. The appeal suggests that existing derelict properties should be refurbished for housing before new buildings are erected. The policies and objectives of the Mayo County Development Plan do not expressly require this to be the case, but simply require existing brownfield land to be promoted. Objectives CSO 4 and SSO 4 clearly support the proposed development and I consider the principle of development to be established and acceptable.

7.2. 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 local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Procedural matters
- Design and layout
- Overlooking
- Overshadowing
- Property devaluation
- Car parking and traffic hazard

7.3. **Procedural Matters**

- 7.3.1. The appeal questions the validity of the planning application when the application was allegedly validated on a Saturday, when the offices of the Local Authority is normally closed. The application was lodged digitally with a date stamp of 03rd August 2024 which was a Saturday. I note a letter from the Local Authority to the applicant acknowledging receipt of the application on Tuesday 06th August 2024 as well as a validation checklist dated 06th August and therefore do not consider there is any concern regarding the validity of the application.
- 7.3.2. The appeal submits that the site notice was erected in the incorrect location as per the drawings received.
- 7.3.3. I note the site location map suggests the notice was erected in the northeast corner of the site, adjacent to the boundary with no. 44 Erris Street which is the dwelling retained on the overall property. The original curtilage of no. 44 is effectively subject to subdivision as part of this application. This site notice location is adjacent to the original vehicular entrance to no. 44 which was centrally located on the front boundary of the site but was widened and altered at the time of the site inspection. The proposed site layout plan illustrates a slightly different location in the northwest of the site, immediately adjacent to the boundary with no. 45 Erris Street.

- 7.3.4. The case planners report includes a photograph of the notice stated to be captured on 23rd August 2024 which portrays the notice in the northwest, adjacent to no. 45.
- 7.3.5. Given the overall scale of the front boundary and the 5m differential between the two locations on the site layout and site location maps, I consider the matter to be immaterial as a member of the public would be able to clearly locate the notice if standing at either location. The notice was erected conspicuously and clearly legible from the public domain in accordance with the requirements of the regulations and I therefore do not consider there are any grounds to consider the application invalid.

7.4. Design and Layout

- 7.4.1. The application sought to provide a pair of semi-detached, 100m² 3 bed, two-storey and pitched roof dwellings. The proposed layout placed the dwellings close to the rear of the site with open spaces to the rear. Pedestrian access would be maintained at both sides to allow each dwelling to access their rear open spaces independently. 4no. car parking spaces were proposed to the front of the dwellings and another 2no. to the rear of the existing dwelling, with the remaining space largely comprising a surfaced access road and footpath.
- 7.4.2. The Local Authority requested further information regarding minor matters such as boundary details and car parking layouts however an additional advice note was included which recommended reducing the layout to only 1no. 160m² dwelling and a revised proposal was received accordingly.
- 7.4.3. Having assessed both proposals, I consider the revised layout with one dwelling is more appropriate and would better reflect the character of the area and would also allow an opportunity to subdivide the overall property into two plots. The revised further information layout proposes a shared common space effectively with on-street car parking, however I recommend a condition is attached which subdivides the entire site into two separate properties, with no shared space beyond the access drive. In such a layout, there would be no common grassed/landscaped area however both properties would benefit from larger areas of private open space and in-curtilage car parking while also retaining the existing treeline to the east as currently proposed.

- 7.4.4. The appeals contend that the backland development is out of character with the existing streetscape and represents overdevelopment however I disagree. I consider the layout would not detract from the established character of the area, particularly as I note the Erris Gardens scheme immediately north of the site has a similar arrangement with dwellings situated to the rear of other dwellings in a very similar manner to the proposed development.
- 7.4.5. I also consider that the revised dwelling design put forward at the further information stage is appropriate. There is a large two storey shed situated at the rear of no. 45., adjacent to the party boundary with the subject site. The pitched roof structure demonstrates there is scope for such a large structure to the rear of the existing dwellings without detracting from the character of the streetscape. The proposed dwelling would be set back from the street by approximately 50m and is therefore unlikely, in my opinion, to negatively impact the architectural character of the area.
- 7.4.6. I note references in the appeal to the further information advice note which state that only one dwelling should be considered on the site. The appeal considers the construction of a dwelling would contravene this recommendation due to the presence of the existing dwelling. It is important to note that the existing dwelling does not form part of the site. The red line boundary specifically excludes that dwelling and an area to the rear.
- 7.4.7. Lastly, I consider that the revised proposal to retain the existing shed at the rear of the site is acceptable and a more sustainable approach to retain and reuse existing buildings.

7.5. Overlooking

- 7.5.1. Overlooking is a concern raised due to the backland location of the proposed new dwelling which would have a separation distance of over 30m to the rear elevation of any other dwelling on Erris Street.
- 7.5.2. I note the provisions of SPPR 1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines requires a minimum separation distance of 16m between opposing first floor windows to habitable rooms. The proposed development would greatly exceed this minimum requirement and therefore I am satisfied that any overlooking achievable from the

new dwelling would not negatively impact existing residential amenity to a significantly negative degree.

7.6. Overshadowing

7.6.1. The appeals suggest that the proposed development would overshadow existing adjacent properties.

7.6.2. The new dwelling would be situated to the south of the existing dwellings on Erris Street and therefore there is potential for overshadowing to occur. I consider however that the 30m separation and 8.9m high dwelling design means it is highly unlikely that any overshadowing would occur.

7.6.3. I note section 2.2.4 of the BRE document 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to good practice' states:

"Loss of light to existing windows need not be analysed if the distance of each part of the new development from the existing window is three or more times its height above the centre of the existing window. In these cases the loss of light will be small. Thus, if the new development were 10 m tall, and a typical existing ground floor window would be 1.5 m above the ground, the effect on existing buildings more than $3 \times (10 - 1.5) = 25.5$ m away need not be analysed"

7.6.4. In the current case, the equation would read as follows: $3 \times (8.9 - 1.5) = 22$. The proposed dwelling would be situated more than 22m from the rear elevation of existing dwellings and therefore an in-depth analysis is not required.

7.6.5. Further, I note there is an existing treeline situated along the eastern boundary of the site which comprises a range of tall and mature trees, the majority of which appear to be growing on the neighbouring property. These are taller than the proposed dwelling would be and therefore already cause a much more significant shadow to properties to the east than would occur from the dwelling.

7.6.6. I am satisfied that on the basis of the layout and design of the proposed development that overshadowing is not likely to occur to adjoining property to such a degree as which would significantly and negatively affect the residential amenity of that property.

7.7. Property Devaluation

- 7.7.1. I note the concerns raised in the grounds of appeal in respect of the devaluation of neighbouring property. However, having regard to the assessment and conclusion set out above, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the value of property in the vicinity.

7.8. Transportation

- 7.8.1. It is proposed to revise the vehicular entrance to provide one shared entrance with a laneway leading to the rear of the site and subsequently to 4no. car parking spaces.
- 7.8.2. The appeal considers the degree of intensification occurring as a result of the proposed development would be inappropriate and would constitute a traffic hazard due to inappropriate sightlines from the position of the adjacent pillar at no. 45. Erris Street, from the high number of pedestrian traffic utilising the footpath to the front of the site and from the high traffic volume utilising the N59 together with a poor vertical alignment of that road.
- 7.8.3. I note no report was received from the Local Authority's transport department or Municipal District.
- 7.8.4. I do not agree that the scale of additional traffic generated by one dwelling would be sufficient to constitute a traffic hazard. Furthermore, I consider there is sufficient opportunity to provide appropriate sightlines at the proposed entrance while the proposals to provide tactile paving and a dished entrance, together with the scale of traffic generated from the proposal, are sufficient in my opinion to protect pedestrian safety.
- 7.8.5. I note condition no. 2 of the notification to grant permission seeks removal of car parking space nos. 3 and 4, situated to the rear of the existing dwelling however the rationale to remove car parking for the existing dwelling is not clear. I recommend this condition is omitted but that the layout in this shared area is revised as I have outlined earlier in order to provide in-curtilage parking for both properties.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the proposed infill residential development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 8.2. The River Moy Special Area of Conservation is situated 250m southeast of the site. The intervening area comprises a mix of agricultural lands and residential properties, together with an access road and a number of native hedgerows.
- 8.3. The proposed development comprises construction of 2no. semi-detached residential units in the rear open space of an existing residential property and connections to existing public services.
- 8.4. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 8.5. 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.
- 8.6. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small scale and domestic nature of the works with a likely short construction phase,
 - The 250m separation distance between the site and the SAC which comprises significant tracts of vegetated ground and dense hedgerows and
 - Taking into account screening report/determination by Mayo County Council.
- 8.7. 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.
- 8.8. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that planning permission is granted, subject to conditions, for the reasons and considerations set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location and character of the site and surrounding area in an urban area together with the provisions of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 including the provisions of the Crossmolina Settlement Plan and Objectives CSO 4 and SSO 4, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the scale and nature of the development is acceptable. The development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenity of the area. The development is, therefore, in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 30th day of October 2024, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed development shall be amended as follows:</p> <p>The car parking area and common public space area situated between the existing and proposed dwellings shall be revised to provide two separate properties both with car parking provided within the curtilage of each property. There shall be no common public open space provided on the site with the exception of the shared access road.</p>

	<p>Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.</p>
3.	<p>The landscaping scheme shown on drawing number P32, as submitted to the planning authority on the 30th day of October, 2024 shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works.</p> <p>In addition to the proposals in the submitted scheme, the following shall be carried out:</p> <p>The open space referred to as 'no. 2 lawn seed area' shall be omitted and incorporated into the private curtilage of the dwellings on the site as per condition no. 2 above.</p> <p>All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p>

	Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.
5.	<p>All vehicular access arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the vehicular entrance including boundary treatments, signage, road surface finishes and surface water details for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.</p>
6.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08:00 to 14:00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.</p>
7.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of</p>

	<p>the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>
--	---

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.

Sarah O'Mahony
Planning Inspector

21st May 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	321914-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 2no. infill dwellings.
Development Address	Erris Street, Crossmolina, 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 Part 1, 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.	State the Class here
<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	

<p>type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p>	<p>Class 10 (b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.</p> <p>Class 10 (b)(iv) 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</p>

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"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	321914-25
Development Address	Erris Street, Crossmolina, 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).

The urban site is serviced and its size is not exceptional in the context of the prevailing plot size in the area.

A short-term construction phase would be required and the development would not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance due to its scale. The development, by virtue of its type and nature, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. Its operation presents no significant risks to human health.

The size and scale of the proposed development is not significantly or exceptionally different to the existing dwellings.

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).

The development is situated in an urban area adjacent to and in close proximity to existing residential and commercial properties which is not exceptional in the context of surrounding development.

It is not likely to have any cumulative impacts or significant cumulative impacts with other existing or permitted projects.

The development is removed from designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan. The River Moy Special Area of Conservation is situated 250m southeast of the site however significant impacts have been ruled out.

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 nature of the proposed development and works constituting development within an existing built up area, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i>
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Inspector: _____ Date: _____