



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321988-25

Development	Construction of a house, garage, wastewater treatment system and all associated site works.
Location	Deerpark West, Murrisk, Westport, Co. Mayo.
Planning Authority	Mayo County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460746
Applicant(s)	Tom & Selina gill
Type of Application	Planning permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Tom & Selina Gill
Date of Site Inspection	16 th May 2025
Inspector	Sarah O'Mahony

Table of Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1. Decision	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History	8
5.0 Policy Context	10
5.1. Development Plan	10
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	12
5.3. Built Heritage	12
5.4. EIA Screening	12
6.0 The Appeal	13
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	13
6.2. Planning Authority Response	15
7.0 Assessment	15
7.4. Landscape Impacts	15
7.5. Visual Impact	18
7.6. Access	19
7.7. Wastewater	19
7.8. Biodiversity	21
8.0 AA Screening	23
9.0 WFD Screening	23

10.0	Recommendation	24
11.0	Appendix 1 – EIA SCREENING.....	27
12.0	Appendix 2 – AA SCREENING.....	31
13.0	Appendix 3 – WFD SCREENING	37

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.48ha site is situated along the southern coast of Clew Bay in County Mayo, 5km southwest of Westport and 2km east of Murrisk. It comprises a clearing in an area of woodland which is separated from the coastline by the R335 to the north.
- 1.2. Access is provided from an unbound agricultural style laneway off the R335 which serves an existing dwelling and farmland to the south and east of the site. Access to this subject site and the surrounding woodland is from an offshoot off the lane.
- 1.3. The site itself is an irregular shape comprised of two roughly oval shaped parcels set in a linear west and east fashion and situated to the north and south of the laneway respectively. The western parcel comprises improved grassland while the eastern parcel comprises cleared woodland. The red line site boundary illustrated on the application drawings indicates that the existing vehicular entrance is included within the site but otherwise the site is set back from the R335 with a woodland buffer of 10-40m depth situated between the site and the road.
- 1.4. Landform in the area slopes dramatically with the summit of Croagh Patrick situated 4km southwest of the site. The general landform in the immediate area of the site and adjacent land comprises steeply sloping ground which rises to the south and falls to the north adjacent the coast. Ground levels within the woodland clearing where the dwelling is proposed vary from 15mOD to 25mOD while levels at the roadside fall to 4.2mOD.
- 1.5. The mature woodland comprises native mixed species including oak, holly, birch, ferns, honeysuckle and ivy etc. There is a timber pole frame erected in the clearing outlining the location, footprint and height of the proposed dwelling. The clearing is finished with a deep layer of wood chippings and undergrowth such as bracken and brambles giving the impression that trees were removed and mulched on the site. The woodland is however regenerating in this area with multiple seedlings and saplings of oak and holly present. The clearing extends to include the proposed new vehicular access from the adjacent laneway.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for development which comprises the following:

- Construction of a detached two-storey, flat roof 250.66m² dwelling finished with timber cladding and a green wildflower/sedum roof. This will include cutting into the existing slope by depths up to 6m in places to create two terraces to accommodate the split-level dwelling.
- Construction of a detached single storey, flat roof 39.99m² garage finished externally to match the dwelling and situated to the rear of the dwelling,
- Installation of an on-site tertiary wastewater treatment system,
- Landscaping including planting new woodland on the western parcel of land, utilising saplings currently growing on the eastern area and
- All associated site works.

2.2. The following additional documentation was submitted with the application:

- Personal information to demonstrate the Applicant's local need to reside in the rural area including a birth certificate, school records and membership of local organisations etc.
- Correspondence from a local newspaper confirming that the Applicants published an advertisement from 2015-2021 seeking to purchase a site in the area.
- Appropriate Assessment Screening Report and an addendum report which formed part of a further information request related to a previous planning application.
- Land registry details outlining property in the area in family ownership.
- Confirmation of the Applicants ownership of the site.
- Site Characterisation Form.
- Woodland and Biodiversity Plan comprising a planting plan for the proposed new woodland area. This report also outlines some additional ecological mitigation measures and recommendations including carrying out a pre-construction badger survey and installing mammal proof fencing.
- Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.
- Design Statement.
- Visual Impact Statement

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- Mayo County Council issued a notification to refuse permission on 06th February 2025 for two reasons as follows:
 1. *The development at this location would contravene “Objective RHO 4” of the Mayo County Development Plan which must ensure that development “Does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area, Cannot be considered at an alternative location, Meets high standards in siting and design, Satisfies all other criteria with regard to, inter alia, servicing, public safety, and environmental considerations Demonstrates enhancement to local landscape character and ecological connectivity”. The proposed development would therefore set an undesirable precedent for similar type developments in scenic coastal areas, would interfere with the character of the landscape at this location, which it is necessary to preserve, and would, both by itself, and the precedent it would set, be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.*
 2. *The applicants have failed to satisfy Mayo County Council that the development meets the criteria outlined in Objective RHO 4 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028, most especially with regard to the possibility of locating the development at a less visually sensitive location. The proposed development would therefore interfere with the character of the landscape at this location, which it is necessary to preserve, and be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The Planners report recommendation to refuse permission is consistent with the notification of decision which issued.
- Appropriate Assessment (AA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) issues are both screened out.

- The report considered previous reasons for refusal should be assessed in order to determine if the subject application addresses those reasons. It concluded that the development could not overcome some of those reasons as it would impact on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area. It noted how the development meets a high standard in terms of siting and design but that the development could be considered at an alternative location and would not enhance the local landscape character.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Municipal District Engineer: No objection subject to standard conditions.
- Road Design Office: Refusal recommended due to non-compliance with policy MTP 28 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028. A note is also included however that where the principle of development is accepted for economic or social reasons then 2no. conditions are provided in the event of a grant of permission.
- Environment Section: Further information sought regarding the type of treatment proposed, longitudinal cross sections and additional data such as the location of existing wells, the proposed surface water soakway and high-water marks etc.
- Municipal Architect: The Case Planners report does not reference a report but sets out a single comment stating the department was favourable towards approval.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. The application was referred to the following bodies however no response was received.

- Uisce Éireann
- Development Applications Unit, Department of Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs.
- An Taisce

3.4. Third Party Observations

One submission was received from Simon Kavanagh-Joyce which raised the following matters:

- Planning history of refusals and unauthorised dwellings on landholding.
- There are existing dwellings for sale as well as new build units due to come on the market which would be more appropriate than a unit on this site in an area under strong urban influence. It states that the requirement for childcare or elderly care was not accepted as a demonstration for local need.
- Any new structure comprises an unnecessary and obtrusive feature on the landscape, interfering with the character of that landscape which it is necessary to preserve.
- Additional traffic generation to the strategically important R335 should be avoided. The applicants own engineer states sightlines cannot be achieved. A new development would interfere with the carrying capacity and traffic safety at this location and would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard.

4.0 Planning History

- 23/345: Planning permission refused for construction of a new permanent family dwelling house, detached garage, wastewater treatment system, and all associated site works and landscaping. Permission was refused for the following reasons:
 1. The development of this location would contravene “Objective RHO 4” of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022 -2028 in relation to ensuring that development will not adversely impact on the character of a landscape in terms of location design and visual prominence; the dwelling house at this location would result in an obtrusive feature in the landscape and therefore would interfere with the character of the landscape which it is necessary to preserve and if permitted would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development off the area.
 2. The proposed development is located in an area identified as being under strong urban influence for development as set out in the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028, policy objective RHO 1, whereby the council may only permit permanent housing needs in these such areas where the applicants have established such a housing need. In this regard, the applicant has not established a permanent housing need at this location in accordance

with Policy Objective RHO 1 points 1-6. It is considered that the proposed development, if granted, would constitute haphazard development in a rural area, would militate against the preservation of the rural environment, would lead to demands for the uneconomic provision of public services and communal facilities, would contribute to the erosion of the visual and environmental amenity of the area, and therefore would interfere with the character of the landscape at this location which it is necessary to preserve. Therefore, the proposed development would materially contravene the rural housing policies and objectives of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

3. The proposed development is contrary to Policy MTP 28 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 to avoid the creation of any additional access points from new development or the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses to Strategically Important Regional Roads such as the R335, unless it can be demonstrated that the development is required for economic or social reasons and cannot be accessed from a non-Strategically Important Regional Road.
- 24/60032: Planning permission refused for construction of a new permanent family dwelling house, detached garage, wastewater treatment system, and all associated site works and landscaping. Permission was refused for the following reasons:
 1. The development at this location would contravene “Objective RHO 4” of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 in relation to ensuring that development will not adversely impact on the character of a landscape in terms of location, design and visual prominence; the dwelling house at this location would result in an obtrusive feature in the landscape and therefore would interfere with the character of the landscape which it is necessary to preserve and, if permitted, would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
 2. The proposed development is contrary to Policy MTP 28 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022- 2028 to avoid the creation of any additional access

points from new development or the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses to Strategically Important Regional Roads such as the R335, unless it can be demonstrated that the development is required for economic or social reasons and cannot be accessed from a non-Strategically Important Regional Road. Therefore, the proposed development has not demonstrated that it would not interfere with the carrying capacity or traffic safety of the Strategically Important Regional Road and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction of road users or otherwise.

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). The R335 regional road north of the site is a designated scenic route with scenic views as per Map 10.2 of the CDP. It is also a Strategically Important Regional Road with a speed limit of 80 km/ph as per Table 6.6.
- 5.1.2. Map 10.1 of the CDP identifies landscape policy units throughout the county. It outlines how the landscape in which the site is situated is classed as 'Policy Area 3' which refers to uplands, moors, heaths or bogs which is different to Policy Area 2 Lowland Coastal Zone which is situated directly north of the R335. This distinction reflects the dramatic change in landform between the steep slope which begins its ascent at the north of the site and the adjacent flat lowlands and islands across Clew Bay.
- 5.1.3. The following policies and objectives are of particular note:
- RHO 4: Housing applications, within Mayo's Coastal Areas and Lakeshores and within areas along scenic routes with designated scenic views, will be considered where the applicants can demonstrate a long-standing social link to the area concerned, whilst ensuring that it:
 - Does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area

- Cannot be considered at an alternative location
- Meets high standards in siting and design
- Satisfies all other criteria with regard to, inter alia, servicing, public safety, and environmental considerations
- Demonstrates enhancement to local landscape character and ecological connectivity

Note: An occupancy clause will be attached to any grant of planning permission.

• NEO 26: consider applications for development, within Mayo's Coastal Areas and Lakeshores and within areas along scenic routes with designated scenic views, that can demonstrate a long-standing social link to the area concerned, whilst ensuring that it:

- Does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area.
- Cannot be considered at an alternative location.
- Meets high standards in siting and design.
- Contributes to and enhances local landscape character.
- Satisfies all other criteria, with regard to, inter alia, servicing, public safety and environmental considerations.

Rural housing applications along Coastal Areas and Lakeshores must comply with the requirements set out in Objective RHO 4 (Chapter 3).

- NEP 1: To support the protection, conservation and enhancement of the natural heritage and biodiversity of County Mayo, including the protection of the integrity of European sites, that form part of the Natura 2000 network, the protection of Natural Heritage Areas, proposed Natural Heritage Areas Ramsar Sites, Nature Reserves and Wild Fowl Sanctuaries (and other designated sites including any future designations).
- NEP 7: To encourage the effective management of native and semi-natural woodlands, groups of trees and individual trees in the discharge of development management functions.
- NEO 4: To protect and enhance biodiversity and ecological connectivity in County Mayo, including woodlands, trees, hedgerows, semi-natural grasslands, rivers,

streams, natural springs, wetlands, stone walls, geological and geo-morphological systems, other landscape features and associated wildlife, where these form part of the ecological network.

- MTP 28: It is a policy of Mayo County Council, in relation to lands adjoining Strategically Important Regional Roads to which to which speed limits greater than 60 km/h apply, to avoid the creation of any additional access points from new development or the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses to Strategically Important Regional Roads, unless it can be demonstrated that the development is required for economic or social reasons and cannot be accessed from a non-Strategically Important Regional Road.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is situated within the Clew Bay Complex proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA). The pNHA includes the public road and a portion of the vehicular entrance to the site and in this regard there is a minor overlap between the site and the pNHA boundary. The site is also situated 8m from the boundary of the Clew Bay Complex Special Area of Conservation which is situated on the northern side of the R335.

5.3. Built Heritage

- 5.3.1. There is a cluster of records from the National Monuments Service 'Sites and Monuments Record' referred to as Annagh-Killadangan archaeological complex which is situated 100m north of the site. The various records refer to mounds, standing stones, stone rows, enclosures and fulacht fia etc.

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

- The appeal considers that documents already submitted with the application demonstrate how the refusal reasons are not appropriate or proportionate and also are inconsistent with similar decisions in the area. The Local Authority has misinterpreted Objective RHO 4 and not reasonably judged the development. All the criteria required by RHO 4 are met.
- The planning history and difficulties encountered to date should not negatively inform this decision.
- Delivery of housing, including rural housing is a key principle of the national planning system. The NPF supports rural housing including NPO 19 and NPO 23. The applicants have demonstrated local need which was acknowledged by the Local Authority.
- The Landscape Appraisal of County Mayo supports the dynamic nature of landscapes and supports a common sense approach.
- Considerable informal pre-planning consultation was undertaken to address previous concerns. No other department recommended a refusal. The roads report was conditional on local need being met which was accepted by the Case Planner and the appeal sets out responses to the Environment Department's recommended further information request; therefore the application satisfies all other environmental considerations required under Objective RHO 4.
- Regarding landscape impacts and compliance with Objective RHO 4, the test should be whether any impact on the landscape would be significant, not whether there is any impact in the first instance. The Local Authority has not stated that any impact would be significant or provided any further clarification. The application documents including the Visual Impact Statement and pole framework erected on the site demonstrate there would be no visual impact given that the development would be entirely obscured from view and the proposed planting would enhance the integrity, character and distinctiveness of the woodland.

- The dwelling would not alter the character of the area as it would be obscured from view. Any extent of its visibility would enhance the character and distinctiveness of the area by adding 'an exemplar design and one single house could not reasonable impact on the integrity of the area'.
- The Local Authority's assessment and conclusions regarding the availability of alternative land and matters regarding the date of purchase of the site are irrelevant and inappropriate. The application demonstrated multiple attempts to source alternative sites and land already in family ownership is not suitable for construction. The appeal sets out details of the applicants unsuccessful ten-year search for alternative sites.
- The Local Authority acknowledged that matters relating to siting and design were acceptable and the dwelling meets high standards. The appeal therefore contends that if this is the case, the dwelling cannot be considered to impinge on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area in any significant way.
- The Local Authority's conclusion that the development would not contribute to the local landscape and ecological corridor is not appropriate and disregards efforts undertaken to prepare supporting documents including a design statement, visual impact statement, woodland and biodiversity plan, contextual sections, erection of a poleframe and preparation of scaled models. These all demonstrate that the development would not impact on the landscape as it would be obscured while the proposed landscaping would enhance the local landscape character.
- The concept of setting a precedent for such development should not be considered as each application should be considered on its own merits, however, if precedent is factored then regard should be given to similar grants of planning permission in the area.
- The appeal includes a response to the further information items recommended by the Environment Department regarding wastewater treatment. This includes clarification that a packaged wastewater treatment system and raised soil polishing filter is proposed. Longitudinal site sections are received as well as additional data including contours, the high water mark and the location of the surface water soakway including design calculations for same.

- Matters raised in the third party appeal are irrelevant and addressed in either the Case Planners report or the appeal.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- No response received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Planning permission is sought to construct a detached dwelling in a rural area southwest of Westport, County Mayo. The applicants have demonstrated compliance with the local need criteria of the Mayo County Development Plan.

7.2. Planning permission was refused due to impacts to the local landscape. The first party appeal suggests the refusal was inappropriate, subjective and did not account for the significant body of work submitted with the application to demonstrate there would not be any significant impact on the landscape, mainly due to the lack of visibility of the dwelling as surrounding woodland screening would be retained and enhanced.

7.3. Having therefore 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:

- Landscape impacts
- Visual Impact
- Access
- Wastewater
- Biodiversity

7.4. Landscape Impacts

7.4.1. The site is accessed from and visible from a designated scenic route with scenic views to Croagh Patrick, the coastline and Westport Bay. Objectives RHO 4 and

NEO 26 are therefore the relevant objectives to consider in terms of establishing the principle of development and they centre on maintaining the high-quality landscape of the scenic area. Both objectives have the same list of criteria which a potential development must meet:

- Does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area
- Cannot be considered at an alternative location
- Meets high standards in siting and design
- Satisfies all other criteria, with regard to, inter alia, servicing, public safety and environmental considerations and lastly,
- 'Demonstrates enhancement to local landscape character and ecological connectivity' (RHO 4) or 'contributes to and enhances local landscape character' (NEO 26).

7.4.2. The appeal demonstrates how no other alternative lands are available to the applicants in the area on which to construct a dwelling and that the subject site is the only opportunity following a ten-year search for a site.

7.4.3. The site is situated on a steeply sloping area of woodland which ranges from 15-25mOD and which has been subject to c.0.2ha of clearing and felling in the location of the proposed dwelling, garage and driveway etc. No other clearings were noted in the surrounding woodland during the site inspection. This clearing is regenerating naturally with many saplings of oak, holly and birch etc noted.

7.4.4. It is proposed to remove these saplings and relocate them to a separate area of the site currently finished with grassland and situated lower down the slope, adjacent to the vehicular entrance. It is then proposed to cut a platform across the clearing with depths of up to 6m to accommodate two terraces in the form of an upper car parking area and a lower wildflower garden with the split-level dwelling situated in the centre. A garage and wastewater treatment system would also be accommodated and a band of trees retained around the verges of the site. Adjacent land outside the ownership of the applicants would form a c.60m woodland buffer between the dwelling and the R335.

- 7.4.5. The appeal and Design Statement contend that the dwelling has been designed to sit within the landscape by utilising both the alignment axis of the Croagh Patrick summit and the 20m contour line as a starting point for the site layout and dwelling design, ensuring that the dwelling would not break the skyline. The irregular typology maximises solar gain and breaks down the massing of the site, while also working with the topography by proposing a split-level structure.
- 7.4.6. The appeal suggests that the proposed high quality dwelling design and woodland planting would enhance the local landscape. It considers that the design, mitigatory woodland planting and additional documentary evidence all demonstrate that there would be no visual impact to the character of the landscape as the dwelling would be obscured.
- 7.4.7. I consider the dwelling design to be attractive and well thought out for a steeply sloped woodland type site. The proposed green roof and external timber cladding are appropriate design responses for a woodland setting and would impart less of an impact compared to the more typical nap rendered bungalows or farmhouses common in the rural area throughout the state. However, in my opinion, the addition of any structure in this highly sensitive landscape would not, in my opinion, enhance the character of the area when its value and economic benefits to the area lie in its natural state.
- 7.4.8. The close proximity of the site to nationally recognised landscape features such as Croagh Patrick and Westport Bay reflects the sensitivity of the landscape and the adjacent scenic road with scenic views as designated in the CDP. In my opinion, any permanent change which proposes interventions such as cutting and filling across an area of native woodland, removing native woodland and providing a new structure in such a high sensitivity area reflects a significant change to the integrity and distinctiveness of the landscape. This is a separate matter to visual impact which is discussed later.
- 7.4.9. Further, in my view any interventions of the extent proposed in such a sensitive landscape, cannot be considered an enhancement, regardless of the quality of design. I do not agree that cutting and filling the slope to create an artificial platform and subsequently inserting a dwelling in the altered scenic landscape could be considered as enhancing the landscape. The appeal considers that the proposed

compensatory woodland is an enhancement however in my opinion it is simply compensatory. It does not reflect a net gain in terms of impacts to the landscape in my opinion and therefore cannot be considered an enhancement.

- 7.4.10. In this regard, I consider the development would impinge on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area and would not enhance the local landscape area. It would therefore not comply with the requirements of Objectives RHO 4 and NEO 26 of the CDP.

7.5. Visual Impact

- 7.5.1. I note documentation received with the application which demonstrates how the dwelling is not likely to be visible from the public arena. Tree cover would be retained on the verges of the woodland within the site thereby providing screening to the dwelling. The flat roof and timber cladding would also help the dwelling to blend into its surroundings and reduce its visibility.
- 7.5.2. I have concerns however regarding the principle of long-term retention, maintenance and management of woodland for the purposes of screening a development, particularly in this high sensitivity landscape. The concern is heightened in this situation where much of the woodland required to provide screening is situated outside of the site and ownership of the applicants. This risk may be acceptable elsewhere in less sensitive landscapes but is not appropriate in my opinion in the context of this site.
- 7.5.3. The proximity of the site to the R335, which is a linear road roughly travelling east to west, means that in the absence of trees the local topography itself would not provide the full extent of screening currently available and the dwelling would be likely be visible across long distances from the R335 scenic route.
- 7.5.4. I consider that the principle of development in this case relies on the two aforementioned objectives RHO 4 and NEO 26, which require that proposed development demonstrates enhancement to local landscape character and does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area. In my opinion, regardless of the lack of any significant visual impact, I consider that the proposed development would result in a significant change to this sensitive

landscape and would not enhance the landscape character. I therefore do not consider that the development complies with objectives RHO 4 and NEO 26.

7.6. Access

- 7.6.1. I note a report received from the Local Authority's Transport Department recommending that permission is refused in accordance with Policy MTP 28 to avoid the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses to Strategically Important Regional Roads, unless it can be demonstrated that the development is required for economic or social reasons and cannot be accessed from a non-Strategically Important Regional Road. Conditions were also specified in the event an economic or social reason was provided to require use of the access point.
- 7.6.2. I note the Case Planner accepted that the applicants demonstrated a social tie to the area and therefore this reason for refusal was not adopted. I agree with this approach.
- 7.6.3. A Road Safety Audit was submitted with the application which details a list of recommendations including clearing vegetation to achieve sightlines, specifying the new roadside boundary, providing a dwell area in the event of icy weather for vehicles exiting the site and steep laneway and surface water management etc.
- 7.6.4. The feedback form appended to the audit outlines how the recommendations were adopted into the design and include proposals to remove vegetation and dry stone wall to the east of the existing entrance to enhance sightlines and install new timber post and mesh fencing as well as installation of surface water drains discharging to the adjacent field 'or new soakway'. The site layout drawing clarifies that 19m² of vegetation and stone wall would require removal to achieve sightlines. This area is situated within the Clew Bay pNHA and 8m from the Clew Bay Complex SAC and matters regarding biodiversity are addressed later however from a traffic safety perspective I consider the proposals to be acceptable.

7.7. Wastewater

- 7.7.1. The Local Authority's Environment Department sought further information which was not requested due to the refusal of permission. The appeal however provided a response to these items and addresses the items sought.

- 7.7.2. The Site Characterisation Form (SCF) received with the site does not note the proximity of the site to the adjacent Clew Bay Complex SAC but simply states ‘*none*’ in section 2.0 where the question is asked regarding ‘presence of significant sites (archaeological, natural, historical) and later in section 3.1 under the heading of comments it states ‘there are no environmental risks within 250m of the proposed development’. This is an inaccurate statement in my opinion as it does not identify the Clew Bay Complex SAC which is situated 80m downhill from the proposed wastewater treatment system. The boundary of the pNHA encompasses a wider area including much of the R335 and in this regard there is a shorter separation distance of 70m between the pNHA and wastewater treatment area.
- 7.7.3. The SCF did not make any reference to the Annagh-Killadangan archaeological complex situated immediately north of the R335, with the closest SMR record situated 100m north of the site.
- 7.7.4. Section 3.0 of the SCF also has two boxes ticked to describe the slope of the site – both steep and relatively flat are chosen, the R335 is incorrectly described as a local road instead of the strategically important regional road class that it has. Similarly regarding the proposed water source, the SCF suggests a proposed private well, connection to an existing well and connection to a group water scheme.
- 7.7.5. Section 5.3 of the EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems specifically states that *the location of any archaeological or natural heritage sites [special areas of conservation (SACs), special protection areas (SPAs), etc.] within 1 km of the proposed site should be identified* and in this regard I have concerns regarding the accuracy and appropriateness of the proposed wastewater treatment system design. I note however that all separation distances are met and that good percolation is available in the soil on the site. The SCF concludes by stating that:
- “The slope will need to be significantly reduced to allow for the compliant construction of the soil polishing filter. The quality of the soil in-situ is high and therefore the spoil from the construction can be retained and used to level out the proposed location for the soil polishing filter.”*

7.8. Biodiversity

- 7.8.1. As outlined previously, the area where the dwelling is to be situated has already been subject to clearance and felling across an area of approximately 0.2ha. The clearing, including clearance of the proposed driveway, is clearly visible on aerial images in the conclusion section of the Visual Impact Statement received with the application. Google earth imagery demonstrates that the woodland was still intact in April 2020. There is much evidence that the native woodland is regenerating with saplings noted throughout.
- 7.8.2. The majority of the application documents refer to the woodland as comprising primarily birch with some beech, holly and scrub. I noted a good degree of oak however during the site inspection including saplings within the development area, while the Woodland and Biodiversity Plan (WBP) received with the application states that oak and birch each constituted 40% of the woodland. Further, the WBP references a submission from the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage made to one of the previous refusals for permission on the site which outlined concerns about impacts to 'Old Sessile Oak Woods with Ilex and Blechnum' Annex I habitat as well as the potential for badger habitat.
- 7.8.3. The WBP is not an ecological impact assessment but a suggested planting plan for the new woodland area. It did however carry out a badger survey and did not note any setts within the site, but considered there is suitable badger habitat present. The report made the following recommendations additional to the planting plan:
1. The cleared area should also be fenced with mammal proof fencing to prevent any impact from domestic animals such as cats on fauna in the surrounding woodland.
 2. All external lights should be bat friendly low wattage, sensor lights or timed lights.
 3. Care must be taken to ensure no invasive species are introduced to the garden area
 4. A preconstruction badger survey should be undertaken and actions taken to protect badgers if encountered as per TII guidelines.

- 7.8.4. The plan does not make any reference to the location of the site within the Clew Bay Complex pNHA but it does note that the species of oak present is *Quercus Robur* rather than *Quercus Petraea* and therefore there are no links with the Annex 1 habitat. It concludes by stating that it *‘addresses the concerns raised by the Department of Housing, Local Government, and Heritage ensuring no net loss of woodland. The plan includes implementing replacement planting and taking measures to mitigate the impact on local wildlife, including the potential presence of the Eurasian Badger’*.
- 7.8.5. I have concerns regarding impacts to biodiversity and do not agree that ecological connectivity would be achieved in accordance with Objective RHO 4. The permanent removal of established woodland is not appropriate in my view. I consider there are merits to the proposed compensatory habitat but contend that it is compensatory only. Proposals to permanently remove the woodland, which is in the process of regenerating, would lead to fragmentation and habitat loss and would not enhance ecological connectivity. Enacting the recommendations outlined in the WBP report to erect mammal proof fencing would further restrict connectivity in an area identified as having suitable badger habitat.
- 7.8.6. Policy NEP 7 seeks to encourage the effective management of native and semi-natural woodlands in the course of development management functions while Objective NEO 4 seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity and ecological connectivity including woodlands. In my opinion the permanent removal of the woodland as proposed, regardless of the additional woodland planting proposals, would contravene Policy NEP 7 and Objective NEO 4 and permission should be refused accordingly. The Board should be aware that this is a new issue which was not raised in the Local Authority’s reason for refusal.
- 7.8.7. Lastly, the application documents do not specify the proposed construction methodology or any measures to contain surface water during the construction stage. I have concerns in this regard that the significant excavations proposed into the slope to accommodate the dwelling could result in siltation and contaminated surface water flowing down the steep slope and entering the adjacent pNHA and SAC in Westport Bay. Further, the removal of vegetation within the pNHA at the roadside entrance is not referenced anywhere in the application documentation.

- 7.8.8. I note the WBP and AA Screening reports refer to 'standard construction methodologies' however the slope of the site and proximity of sensitive receptors, together with the extent of proposed cut and fill leads me to the conclusion that the site is not standard and normal construction methods are inadequate to protect the receiving surface water. I consider a Construction Management Plan should be prepared with detailed surface water management measures in order to ensure protection of the adjacent receiving waters.
- 7.8.9. With respect to the proposed roadside works which are situated within the pNHA boundary, I do not consider it likely that the extent of vegetation removal would result in a significant negative impact which would affect the integrity of the pNHA however I consider a CMP should be sought in the event of a grant of planning permission.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I am not satisfied that the proposed development individually, or in combination with other plans or projects would not adversely affect the integrity of the Clew Bay Complex SAC, in view of the site's Conservation Objectives.
- 8.2. I therefore conclude that it is not possible to exclude that the proposed development alone [or in combination with other plans and projects] will give rise to significant effects on Clew Bay Complex SAC in view of the sites conservation objectives. Appropriate Assessment is required.
- 8.3. This determination is based on:
- The lack of information surrounding the proposed construction methodology and surface water protection measures, having regard to the steeply sloping site and the proposed degree of cut and fill required to accommodate the development.
- 8.4. The Board should be aware that this is a new issue.

9.0 WFD Screening

- 9.1. The subject site is located adjacent to Westport Bay transitional water body and overlies the Clifden Castlebar groundwater body.

- 9.2. The proposed development comprises construction of a detached dwelling and ancillary works as outlined previously.
- 9.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.4. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. 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 surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 9.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows
- The domestic nature of the proposed works and potential to prepare a Construction Management Plan prior to the commencement of development to outline surface water management measures during the construction phase.
- 9.6. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

10.0 Recommendation

- 10.1. In undertaking this assessment I have had regard to overarching principles and policy emphasis to facilitate housing in the rural area. However, the sensitivity of the site as characterised by the dramatic change in land form, proximity to the coast and mountains, intervisibility of the site to both Croagh Patrick and Westport Bay and location of the site adjacent a designated scenic route with scenic views means the proposed extent of interventions to the landscape are significant and would alter the character and distinctiveness of the local area. The proposed works also would not enhance the landscape. Further, the proposed permanent loss of woodland would

not enhance ecological connectivity. I therefore recommend that planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. Objectives RHO 4 and NEO 26 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 seek to facilitate development along scenic routes with designated scenic views in circumstances where the development, inter alia, does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area and where it demonstrates enhancement to the local landscape character. Having regard to the extent of works proposed including permanent removal of naturally occurring woodland, cutting and filling a steep slope in a scenic area and construction of a permanent structure in the sensitive landscape, it is considered that the proposed development would significantly impinge on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area and would not enhance the local landscape character. The proposed development would therefore not comply with objectives RHO 4 and NEO 26 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Policy NEP 7 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 seeks to encourage the effective management of native and semi-natural woodlands in the course of development management functions while Objective NEO 4 seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity and ecological connectivity including woodlands. Further, Objective RHO 4 facilitates rural dwellings along scenic routes with designated scenic views only in circumstances where, inter alia, the development demonstrates ecological connectivity. The permanent removal of the woodland as proposed would contravene Policy NEP 7 as well as Objectives NEO 4 and RHO 4 and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. It is considered on the basis of the information received with the application that adequate information has not been provided to determine that adverse effects on site integrity of the Clew Bay Complex Special Area of Conservation can be excluded in view of the conservation objectives of these sites, and that reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects. It is therefore considered that the Board is unable to ascertain that the

proposed development will not adversely affect the integrity of a European Site and it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Sarah O'Mahony
Planning Inspector

04th June 2025

11.0 Appendix 1 – EIA SCREENING

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	321988-25
Proposed Development Summary	Detached dwelling, detached garage, on-site wastewater treatment, revised vehicular access and landscaping including woodland planting.
Development Address	Deerpark West, Murrisk, Westport, 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.	
<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)	Class 10 (b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units

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)

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	321988-25
Proposed Development Summary	Detached dwelling, detached garage, on-site wastewater treatment, revised vehicular access and landscaping including woodland planting.
Development Address	Deerpark West, Murrisk, Westport, 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).	<p>The rural site is unserviced and its size is not exceptional in the context of the prevailing plot size in the area for rural dwellings in the area.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The size and scale of the proposed development is not significantly or exceptionally different to the existing dwellings.</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,	<p>The development is situated in a sensitive coastal area adjacent to a scenic route and scenic views with limited capacity to absorb change. The development is likely to have a significant impact on the landscape, however this is insufficient to warrant an Environmental Impact Assessment.</p>

nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	<p>The site is situated within the Clew Bay Complex proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA). The pNHA includes the public road and a portion of the vehicular entrance to the site and in this regard there is a minor overlap between the site and the pNHA boundary. The site is also situated 8m from the boundary of the Clew Bay Complex Special Area of Conservation which is situated on the northern side of the R335.</p> <p>It is not likely to have any cumulative impacts or significant cumulative impacts with other existing or permitted projects.</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>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.</p>
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:** _____

12.0 Appendix 2 – AA SCREENING

Standard AA Screening Determination Template

Test for likely significant effects

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	Construct detached dwelling, garage and onsite wastewater treatment system, upgrade existing vehicular entrance and undertake woodland planting.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	<p>The 0.48ha site is situated on steeply sloped land situated adjacent to Clew Bay Complex SAC which has a separation distance of 8-80m from the site in different works areas of the irregular shaped site. A construction period of approximately 12 months is specified.</p> <p>A high-level construction methodology is received however it lacks in detailed methodology or environmental management measures.</p> <p>The existing site contours range from 15mOD to 25mOD within a clearing where the proposed dwelling is to be situated however ground levels drop as low as 4.2mOD at the roadside. It is proposed to lower ground levels across the clearing by up to 6m and create two terraces with the split level dwelling situated in the centre.</p>
Screening report	<p>A screening report was submitted with the application however I have concerns regarding its reliability and accuracy as discussed later.</p> <p>The Planning Authority Case Planners report does not include a screening assessment but notes the applicants report and states : <i>'In accordance with Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, the proposed development, by itself or in combination with other development in the vicinity, would not be likely to have a significant effect on European site(s).</i></p>

	<i>Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening Report Submitted on file.... The findings of which Mayo County Council as the competent authority for AA are in agreement with' (sic)</i>
Natura Impact Statement	No
Relevant submissions	None received which relating to appropriate assessment matters.

The AA Screening report received with the application makes some errors in fact such as stating that there are no oak species associated with the area or that the site is situated 45m from the SAC. It states that all existing vegetation on the site will remain in-situ except for the house footprint and driveway but makes no reference to the garage, wastewater treatment area, lower wildflower area/lawn and vehicular entrance alterations, the latter of which are situated 8m from the SAC boundary. The report does not address how surface water would be managed on the steeply sloping site during the construction phase which includes significant and deep cuts into the slope.

An addendum report was submitted with this subject application which appears to respond to a further information requested dated 04th August 2023 relating to a previous planning application on the site. The request related to concerns regarding impacts to the SAC from surface water runoff at both construction and operational stages. The addendum report simply states the following:

'As detailed in the submitted Appropriate Assessment Screening Report, the subject site is located 45m from the Clew Bay Complex SAC and is therefore not located within or directly adjacent to any Natura 2000 sites. It is also important to clarify that normal construction methods are being proposed. Waste produced will be in a controlled environment whereby a fully EPA compliant tertiary wastewater treatment system is to be installed. The surface water management of the proposed development will also be in a controlled environment, whereby a soakaway system is to be installed in accordance with Part H of the Building Regulations. These measures are considered to be part of the design of the proposed development and are not considered to be mitigation measures. Thereby the potential indirect impacts to this site can also be excluded.'

Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development	Ecological connections²	Consider further in screening³ Y/N
Clew Bay Complex SAC 001482	Coastal habitats	8-80m	Indirect surface water connection from site which is	Y

	<p>including mudflats, sandflats, lagoons, inlets and bays, dunes, salt meadows, stony banks, drift vegetation, machairs, sessile oak woods, otter and harbour seal.</p> <p>Conservation Objectives</p> <p>(link to NPWS website, June 2024)</p>		<p>situated on higher ground levels than the adjacent SAC.</p>	
Oldhead Wood SAC 00532	<p>Dry heaths</p> <p>Sessile oak woods</p> <p>Conservation Objectives, Link to NPWS website, June 2024</p>	11km	Indirect surface water connection via the Atlantic Ocean in Clew Bay.	N
Mweelrea/Sheeffry/Erriff Complex SAC 001932	<p>28no. habitats including coastal and peatlands</p>	7km	No known connectivity.	N

	Whorl snail, freshwater pearl mussel, salmon, otter, petalwort and slender naiad. Conservation Objectives Link to NPWS website, June 2024			
Brackloon Woods SAC 000471	Old sessile oak woods with ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles Conservation Objectives Link to NPWS website, June 2024	3km	No known connectivity.	N

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

[From the AA Screening Report or the Inspector's own assessment if no Screening Report submitted, complete the following table where European sites need further consideration taking the following into account:

- (a) Identify potential direct or indirect impacts (if any) arising from the project alone that could have an effect on the European Site(s) taking into account the size and scale of the proposed development and all relevant stages of the project (See Appendix 9 in Advice note 1A).
- (b) Are there any design or standard practice measures proposed that would reduce the risk of impacts to surface water, wastewater etc. that would be implemented regardless of proximity to a European Site?
- (c) Identify possible significant effects on the European sites in view of the conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other plans and projects)

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
<p>Clew Bay Complex SAC 001482</p> <p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]</p> <p>Coastal lagoons [1150]</p> <p>Large shallow inlets and bays [1160]</p> <p>Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]</p> <p>Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220]</p> <p>Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae) [1330]</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p> <p>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophila arenaria (white dunes) [2120]</p> <p>Machairs (* in Ireland) [21A0]</p> <p>Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles [91A0]</p> <p>Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355]</p>	<p>Direct: None</p> <p>Indirect: Negative impacts on surface water/water quality due to construction related emissions including increased sedimentation.</p>	<p>Disturbance/displacement changes to habitat quality/function due to water quality changes which could undermine conservation objectives related to water quality.</p> <p>Possibility of significant effects cannot be ruled out without further analysis and assessment due to lack of detailed construction methodology and surface water management details.</p> <p>There are conservation objectives seeking to restore the favorable conservation conditions of some of the qualifying interests which may be affected by water quality impacts.</p>

Phoca vitulina (Harbour Seal) [1365]		
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Unknown	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site* Yes due to absence of surface water control measures.	
The information provided in the application regarding the construction methodology and surface water protection measures are vague. Terminology such as ‘normal construction methods’ does not provide a high enough bar to unequivocally rule out surface water discharges from the site which may flow downhill into the nearby SAC.		
Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site		
It is not possible to exclude the possibility that proposed development alone would result significant effects on Clew Bay Complex SAC from effects associated with surface water discharges.		
An appropriate assessment is required on the basis of the possible effects of the project ‘alone’. Further assessment in-combination with other plans and projects is not required at screening stage.		

Significant effects cannot be excluded

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that it is not possible to exclude that the proposed development alone [or in combination with other plans and projects] will give rise to significant effects on Clew Bay Complex SAC in view of the sites conservation objectives. Appropriate Assessment is required.

This determination is based on:

- The lack of information surrounding the proposed construction methodology and surface water protection measures, having regard to the steeply sloping site and the proposed degree of cut and fill.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

13.0 **Appendix 3 – WFD SCREENING**

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality

An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	321988	Townland, address	Deerpark West, Murrisk, Westport, Co. Mayo
Description of project		Construct detached dwelling, garage and onsite wastewater treatment system, upgrade existing vehicular entrance and undertake woodland planting.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		<p>The site is situated in a woodland clearing on an elevated sloping site with good drainage down to the north to the Atlantic Ocean in Westport Bay which is 8m from the closest boundary of the site.</p> <p>There are 4no. water quality monitoring stations located in Westport Bay.</p>	
Proposed surface water details		Green roof and soakways	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Proposed private well/existing private well/group well/borehole (note this proposal is not clear in the application documents and all the above boxes are ticked in the Site Characterisation Form).	

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues			Proposed on-site tertiary treatment system.			
Others?						
Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)
Transitional Waterbody	8m	Westport Bay IE_WE_350_0100	Good	Review	No pressures	Yes – surface water run off.

Groundwater Waterbody		Underlying site	Clifden Castlebar IE_WE_G_0017	Good	Not at risk	No pressures	Yes – well drained soils with some bedrock outcrops.
Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.							
CONSTRUCTION PHASE							
No.	Component	Waterbody receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if ‘screened’ in or ‘uncertain’ proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Transitional	Westport Bay IE_WE_350_0100	Surface water runoff	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages	Standard construction practice CEMP	No	Screened out

2.	Ground	Clifden Castlebar IE_WE_G _0017	Surface water runoff	As above	As above	No	Screened out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
3.	Transition al	Westport Bay IE_WE_35 0_0100	Surface water runoff	Hydrocarbon spillage	Soakways, SUDS features including green roof and permeable paving etc	No	Screened out
4.	Ground	Clifden Castlebar IE_WE_G _0017	Surface water runoff	Spillages	As above	No	Screened out
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	NA						

STAGE 2: ASSESSMENT					
Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives – Template					
Surface Water					
Development/Activity e.g. culvert, bridge, other crossing, diversion, outfall, etc	Objective 1: Surface Water Prevent deterioration of the status of all bodies of surface water	Objective 2: Surface Water Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of surface water with aim of achieving good status	Objective 3: Surface Water Protect and enhance all artificial and heavily modified bodies of water with aim of achieving good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status	Objective 4: Surface Water Progressively reduce pollution from priority substances and cease or phase out emission, discharges and losses of priority substances	Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)

	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 4:	
Construction works	Site specific construction mitigation methods are required and should be specified in a CEMP e.g. silt fences, site-specific design of settlement ponds, etc	Site specific construction mitigation methods are required and should be specified in a CEMP e.g. silt fences, site-specific design of settlement ponds, etc	NA	NA	YES
Stormwater drainage	Adequately designed SUDs features, green roof, permeable paving etc	Adequately designed SUDs features, green roof, permeable paving etc	NA	NA	YES

Development/Activity 3 e.g. Creation of a transport crossing of watercourse.					
Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives – Template					
Groundwater					
Development/Activity e.g. abstraction, outfall, etc.	<p>Objective 1: Groundwater</p> <p>Prevent or limit the input of pollutants into groundwater and to prevent the deterioration of the status of all bodies of groundwater</p>	<p>Objective 2 : Groundwater</p> <p>Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of groundwater, ensure a balance between abstraction and recharge, with the aim of achieving good status*</p>	<p>Objective 3:Groundwater</p> <p>Reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in the concentration of any pollutant resulting from the impact of human activity</p>	<p>Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)</p>	

	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:	
Construction works	Site specific construction mitigation methods are required and should be specified in a CEMP e.g. silt fences, site-specific design of settlement ponds, etc	Site specific construction mitigation methods are required and should be specified in a CEMP e.g. silt fences, site-specific design of settlement ponds, etc	N/A	N/A
Stormwater drainage	Adequately designed SUDs features, green roof,	Adequately designed SUDs features, green	N/A	N/A

	permeable paving etc	roof, permeable paving etc		
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------	--	--

