



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-322066-25

<b>Development</b>	Retention and completion of renovation works to agricultural building along with retention of upgrade works to internal access road.
<b>Location</b>	Derrigimlagh, Ballyconneely, Clifden, Co. Galway
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Galway County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2461787
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Martin Gorham.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Martin Gorham.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	Tommy Kearns.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	7 May 2025.

**Inspector**

Stephen Rhys Thomas

## Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	5
2.0 Proposed Development .....	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	5
3.1. Decision .....	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies .....	7
3.4. Third Party Observations .....	7
4.0 Planning History .....	7
5.0 Policy Context .....	7
5.2. Development Plan .....	8
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations .....	9
6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening .....	10
7.0 The Appeal .....	11
7.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	11
7.2. Planning Authority Response .....	12
7.3. Observations .....	12
7.4. Further Responses .....	12
8.0 Assessment .....	13
9.0 Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening .....	17
10.0 Water Framework Directive (WFD) Screening .....	18
11.0 Recommendation .....	19
12.0 Reasons and Considerations .....	19
13.0 Conditions .....	19

14.0	Appendix 1 - Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Pre-Screening .....	22
15.0	Appendix 2 - Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Preliminary Examination .....	24
16.0	Appendix 3 - Water Framework Directive (WFD) Screening Matrix.....	27

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The site is located 3km north of Ballyconneely in west County Galway. The site is situated on the eastern side of the R341 regional road, part of the Wild Atlantic Way. The road at this location is relatively narrow with a single white line down the centre. The area is rural with the coast to the west and open countryside to the east. The site includes rocky outcrops and damp hollows, there are no watercourses evident on the site. The shed is located on a rocky outcrop to the south western corner of the site and accessed from a gravelled trackway. A new dwelling is under construction on the adjoining site to the south.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The development comprises the following:
- Retention of renovation works to an existing agricultural building (32.55 sqm), to include galvanised steel roof and concrete block gable wall. Ridge height of 4.2 metres.
  - The completion of the already started works, to upgrade the internal access road.

All on a site of 0.35 Hectares.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

- 3.1.1. The planning authority refused permission for two reasons, as follows:

1. Based on the information submitted with the planning application where sightlines have not been indicated as being within the control of the applicant or achievable as per the standard set out in Table 15.3 of the county plan, the Planning Authority is not satisfied that the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that they can provide and maintain the required sightlines from the entrance to the site along the public road nor is the extent of internal access road works considered justifiable in respect to the scale of the building to be retained. Therefore, to grant the development as

proposed would be contrary to DM Standard 28 and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction of road users or otherwise and thus would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Based on the information submitted and on site observations it is considered that the external finishes of the building comprising of exposed blockwork and the excessively intrusive internal access provision would have an adverse impact of this rural setting in a Class 3 Special landscape which is Highly Sensitive to Change and be injurious to the rock outcrop/watercourses present therein, would result in a built form/layout and unit that would not fit appropriately or integrate effectively into this rural setting, and would contravene materially Policy Objectives LCM 3 and AD1 & DM Standard 13 & 46 of the Galway County Development Plan. Accordingly, to grant the proposed development would interfere with the character of the landscape, would detract from the visual amenity of the area, would militate against the preservation of the rural environment, would contravene materially development objectives and a development management standard contained in Galway County Development Plan and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

- Internal access road and sightline concerns, development provides for a branch off to a dwelling for which no planning status has been verified.
- Proposals for the existing building will conflict with development policies for this sensitive coastal location.
- Effluent Disposal: submission of details of lands available to spread waste generated from the shed in the form of a nutrients management plan and associated mapping.
- Flood risk assessment is not required.
- EIA screening determination is not required.
- AA Screening determination - Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment is not required.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Roads Department GCC - No Report, matter discussed 11<sup>th</sup> February 2025

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

**TII** - that the planning authority has regard to the provisions of official policy for development proposals as follows: proposals impacting national roads, to the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities and relevant TII Publications and proposals impacting the existing light rail network, to TII's "Code of engineering practice for works on, near, or adjacent the Luas light rail system".

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. A single observation, issues include sightlines, visual amenity and architectural heritage.

## 4.0 Planning History

### 4.1. Site

PA reference: 2461787 – Permission refused for: 1) modification to ruinous agricultural building; 2) construction of partially ruinous gable wall; 3) construction of galvanised steel roof; 4) upgrade works to internal access road.

PA reference: 2361146 – Permission refused the development as outlined in planning application reference 2461787.

### 4.2. Adjacent Site:

PA reference: 19741 – Permission for renovation and extensions of existing stone cottage.

## 5.0 Policy Context

- 5.1.1. The relevant policy background is outlined as follows:

## 5.2. Development Plan

### **Galway County Development Plan 2022 -2028.**

5.2.1. The subject site is located in a rural area defined in the development plan as Landscape Sensitivity 3 - Special, in a Coastal Landscape. Relevant policies, objectives and development management standards of the plan include:

- Policy Objective LCM 3 Landscape Sensitivity Ratings Consideration of landscape sensitivity ratings shall be an important factor in determining development uses in areas of the County. In areas of high landscape sensitivity, the design and the choice of location of proposed development in the landscape will also be critical considerations.
- Policy Objective AD 1 Sustainable Agriculture Practices To facilitate the development of sustainable agricultural practices and facilities within the county, subject to complying with best practice guidance, normal planning and environmental criteria and the development management standards in Chapter 15 Development Management Standards.
- DM Standard 13: Agricultural Buildings - In dealing with planning applications for such buildings the Planning Authority will have regard to: a) Design and Layout The quality of design and layout of the farm complex. Where possible new buildings, shall be located within or adjoining the existing farmyard complex. Buildings shall be of minimum scale and use of muted coloured materials shall be encouraged. b) Residential Amenity The proximity of any existing dwelling house. c) Public Road Access The safe access to public roads. d) Rural Landscape The assimilation of the buildings into the rural landscape by means of appropriate siting, external colouring, screening and shelter belting.
- DM Standard 28: Sight Distances Required for Access onto National, Regional, Local and Private Roads.
- DM Standard 46: Compliance with Landscape Sensitivity Designations Subject to the provisions of the plan but in particular the settlement policies of Chapters 2, 3 & 4 and the consequent restriction on development in rural areas, the control of permissible development shall be in accordance with the



policies as they relate to the four sensitivity classes of landscape in Section 8.13.2 of this plan. It will deem the following types of development generally to be acceptable in the various areas of sensitivity as follows:

Class 3 – Special Restricted to essential residential needs of local households, family farm business and locally resourced enterprises (subject to site suitability and appropriate scale and design) including those with substantiated cases for such a specific location and which are in compliance with settlement policies.

Table 15.6: Landscape Sensitivity Designations

5.2.2. Other relevant sections of the plan include:

- PVSR 1 – Protected Views and Scenic Routes Preserve the protected views and scenic routes as detailed in Maps 8.3 and 8.4 from development that in the view of the Planning Authority would negatively impact on said protected views and scenic routes. This shall be balanced against the need to develop key infrastructure to meet the strategic aims of the plan
- Policy Objectives Rural Development
- RD 1 Rural Enterprise Potential
- RD 3 Assimilation of Buildings
- Policy Objectives Agriculture Development
- Policy Objective Commercial Developments in Rural Area
- CD 1 Rural Enterprises

### 5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1. The location and distance from the nearest European site:

Slyne Head Peninsula SAC, 10 metres to the west.

5.3.2. The Proposed Natural Heritage Areas: Slyne Head Peninsula is located is located 10 metres to the west.

## 6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening

6.1.1. The appeal concerns the development of the retention of renovation works to a shed (32.55 sqm) and complete internal access road, Part 2, Class 1. Agriculture, Silviculture and Aquaculture, Class 1(a) of Part 2 (rural restructuring / hedgerow removal); and Class 10(dd) of Part 2 relating to private roads in the form of driveways of the of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) all refer. I have considered all of these Classes at appendix 1 and 2 of my report and no thresholds have been met. The renovation works in the open countryside will not have an adverse impact in environmental terms on surrounding land uses. It is noted that the site is not designated for the protection of the landscape or of natural or cultural heritage, but is located in a landscape with a high sensitivity to change and along a protected scenic route. The proposed development is not likely to have a significant effect on any European Site as discussed in section 9.0 of my report below and there is no direct meaningful hydrological connection present such as would give rise to significant impact on nearby water courses. The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances that differ from that arising in the area. It would not give rise to a risk of major accidents or risks to human health.

6.1.2. Having regard to: -

- The nature and scale of the proposed development, which is significantly under the mandatory threshold in respect of Class 1, Class 1(a) of Part 2 (rural restructuring / hedgerow removal); and Class 10(dd) of Part 2 relating to private roads in the form of driveways, of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended),
- The existing pattern of development in the vicinity,
- The guidance set out in the “Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Guidance for Consent Authorities regarding Sub-threshold Development”, issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (2003).

6.1.3. I have concluded that, by reason of the nature and scale of the existing shed renovation development and the rural location of the subject site, the proposed

development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and that on preliminary examination an environmental impact assessment report for the proposed development was not necessary in this case, for further detail and analysis note that appendices 1 and 2 of my report refer.

## **7.0 The Appeal**

### **7.1. Grounds of Appeal**

7.1.1. The grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- The existing entrance way provides access to an existing house and agricultural sheds, it has been improved to facilitate these existing structures. Sight lines of 120 metres are achievable to the north and 57 metres to the south. However, the requirements of DM Standard 28 are only required for new entrances (ABP case 318259) and sightlines should be considered with reference to acceptable standards (ABP case 318819)
- Exempted development regarding agricultural structures is referenced and the Board is asked to note same. The works to the shed now to be retained, are with reference to a shed that was in place before the construction of the adjacent house. The adjacent house is shown as originally comprising four stone walls and without a roof.
- The existing shed is finished in stone and the exposed eastern gable will be completed in a similar manner. The roof will comprise galvanised steel. The shed is small in scale, been in situ since the before the famine and is similar to many other agricultural structures in the wider area. Whilst the shed is located in a sensitive coastal landscape, its design is inherently vernacular in scale and proportions. The visual impact of the shed is minimal, and when combined with the house under construction to the south, it is even less so.  
  
In terms of DM standard 13, the shed is vernacular in design, the shed was in siu before the house, the entrance is pre-existing and the shed assimilates well with the landscape.

7.1.2. The appeal is accompanied by a drawing that illustrates the proposed finishes.

## **7.2. Planning Authority Response**

None.

## **7.3. Observations**

7.3.1. A single observation that supports the decision of the planning authority to refuse permission, is summarised as follows:

- The timing of renovation works are disputed. The ruin was last lived in in 1954.
- The incremental nature of the renovation works in this sensitive landscape are criticised, and at odds with other more sensitive works in the wider area.
- The residential amenity of the existing cottage is impacted, because of the higher floor levels and agricultural wastes likely to result from the use of the shed.
- There are no plans for surface or foul water produced by the cowshed and this will impact on adjacent cottage.

## **7.4. Further Responses**

None.

## 8.0 Assessment

8.1. The main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal, and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise. The issues can be dealt with under the following headings:

- Traffic
- Visual Amenity
- Conditions

### 8.2. Traffic

- 8.2.1. The first reason for refusal that has issued from the planning authority relates to potential for a traffic hazard to relate from the development. Specifically, it is the inability to maintain adequate sight lines that is a primary concern. This would be contrary to DM Standard 28 and result in a traffic hazard or obstruction of road users. The applicant makes the point that a new entrance is not proposed and it is only the improvement of the existing trackway that is proposed. The applicant has secured consent from the landowner to the north but not the south, but makes the point that the entrance and laneway were pre-existing. In that context, other recent appeals are cited to support the proposed development.
- 8.2.2. I note that DM Standard 28 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 applies to new entrances. The applicant has established that the entrance and trackway have existed at this location for some time and the proposed improvements to the farm track are to facilitate the farm building. I note that the application red line boundary and the drawings all relate to the improvement of the track in the vicinity of the farm building and not the existing house located a distance to the east. In any case, from my observations the entrance gateway and track are already in place and have been for some time. The planning authority are of the view that the extent of the internal access road works cannot be considered justifiable. From my observations of the site conditions, there is a mixture of outcropping rock and damp hollows. The existing trackway is already in place and I see no reason why a new gravel surface is in any way excessive. I am of the view that the planning authority's concerns in this regard are overly cautious and not based on any discernible policy

or objective in the development plan. I am satisfied that the improvement of the trackway is reasonable and not a reason to refuse permission.

- 8.2.3. The applicant's drawings show available sight lines to the north and south, 120 metres and 57 metres respectively, drawings PP.05 .01, 02, 03 and 04 all refer. Given the maritime influence of the site, the area is devoid of upstanding trees or hedging and the field boundaries in the area comprise low stone walls backed by stock proof post and wire fencing. There is very little to interfere with available sight lines. The regional road (R341) is relative straight to the north, but with a dip and slight turn to the south. The adjacent house to the south is currently under construction and has removed their roadside boundary. DM Standard 28 of the development plan states that where a new entrance is proposed, the Planning Authority must consider traffic conditions and available sight lines. There is no Road Department report on the file, though the Planner noted that the matter was discussed internally. In this instance, the house and farm building entrance already exist and the plan is to improve the surface treatment of the internal trackway to facilitate the farm building. A new entrance is not proposed and so DM standard 28 is not applicable and I am satisfied that the improvement of the existing internal track can be permitted without leading to a traffic hazard or obstruction of road users.

### **8.3. Landscape Character Impact**

- 8.3.1. The planning authority refused permission on the basis that the proposal to retain and complete renovation works to an existing shed would be an intrusive feature on the landscape and adversely impact visual amenity. It is the external finishes of the building (exposed blockwork) and intrusive trackway that fail to integrate with the rock outcrop/watercourses present on site, all in this Class 3 Special landscape which is Highly Sensitive to Change. All of these matters would contravene materially Policy Objectives LCM 3 and AD1 & DM Standard 13 & 46 of the Galway County Development Plan. The applicant disputes all of this points and has set out a very detailed and thorough rationale for the renovation of a small agricultural shed and improvements to an existing trackway and how they all fit in the landscape.
- 8.3.2. The retention of renovation works to an existing shed and improvements to an existing trackway are located along the Wild Atlantic Way (R341), a designated scenic route named Maritime Scenic Route in the development plan. The area is

designated in the development plan as a Coastal Landscape with a landscape sensitivity level of 3 (special) or highly sensitive to change. The area is characterised by a lack of mature vegetation, this is a result of the maritime climate and influence of onshore winds. The landscape is therefore a mixture of low quality grazing set amongst rocky outcrops and numerous small inlets and beaches. It is a picturesque area, where traditional home and farm buildings have been constructed of local stone, are small scale and vernacular in design. The shed it is proposed to complete renovations on, is just such a building. In addition, there is the occurrence of more modern dwelling houses spread out across the landscape.

8.3.3. In terms of any adverse impact of the shed and entrance in this coastal landscape highly sensitive to change, I find the facts on the ground do not support this view. The landscape in the area is indeed special, the development plan landscape character assessment states this. In addition, I note that LCM 3 and DM Standard 46 seek to support the landscape sensitivity ratings and provide guidance for the location and use of new development. Also of relevance is that AD 1 and DM Standard 13 provides advice on sustainable agricultural practices and farm building design and layout. These are policies and standards to guide development and the applicant has adequately shown that regard has been had to their content, I am not satisfied that any material contravention of the development plan has occurred. I find that there can be no material contravention of the Development Plan with respect to landscape and agricultural buildings and the Board can consider the appeal before it without turning to section 37(2) of the 2000 Act and instead consider the appeal in the context of objective LCM 3, AD 1 and DM standards 46 and 13 of the statutory plan

8.3.4. The existing shed is positioned atop a rocky outcrop, has a simple gable wall and pitched roof. I note that a house is currently nearing completion immediately to the south and its design concept was to retain the original ruined dwelling on site and sensitively extend. In my view this has been successfully achieved and is a credit to the planning authority and the applicant with respect to building in the countryside. I note the observations made with respect to the shed works, but in this instance the shed was in existence before the renovation works to the new house were started. In any case I do not anticipate any adverse residential amenity impacts. This is a rural area, cattle already graze the lands and the shed will be used to store feedstuffs.

- 8.3.5. The planning authority have referenced the exposed blockwork on the gable end and how this detracts from the landscape qualities of the area. In this regard I note the drawing submitted with the grounds of appeal by the applicant that details the completion of all external walls with stone. This is an entirely acceptable building finish and matches the original structure of the shed. The addition of galvanised roof is a pragmatic approach to this exposed location and a common material used on agricultural buildings of all shapes and sizes. I am satisfied that the finished shed will be a positive addition to the landscape.
- 8.3.6. In terms of the internal track improvements, I have already set out in section 8.2 that I consider the proposed works to be reasonable and commensurate with the scale of the overall landholding. With respect to a watercourse on the site, I observed no obvious signs of such a feature and no evidence is shown on the drawings prepared by the applicant. The applicant has submitted documentation to state that the proposed use of the sheds will be for livestock feed/fodder during the winter months. I see no reason to further consider visual amenity impacts to watercourses as it has been set out in the reason for refusal drafted by the planning authority.
- 8.3.7. In terms of visual impact, the shed is positioned 11 metres from the road edge and reads as being a part of the new dwelling nearing completion to the south. In addition, the applicant has provided historic maps to show the existence of the structures on this site over the years. I am satisfied that the completion of shed renovation works and improvements to an internal track, in no way adversely affect the character of this landscape. The development is not haphazard or disorderly, it is well integrated with the surrounding landscape. This is not surprising given the fact that the shed has stood at this location for a considerable time period. The shed and internal track are inherently agricultural in nature and not an unusual or inappropriate development in this rural setting. Policy Objectives LCM 3 and AD1 as well as DM Standard 13 and 46 have been referred to and complied with. It is my view that the development when completed will positively contribute to the sustainability of this rural area, integrates and preserves the character of the landscape and scenic route, and does not detract from the visual amenity of the area in any meaningful or perceptible way. Finally, I am satisfied that the overall development to retain and renovate a historic agricultural building is consistent with policy objective PVSR 1



that seeks to protect scenic routes from development that would negatively impact same.

#### **8.4. Conditions**

- 8.4.1. In terms of the planning conditions appropriate to this form of development, I recommend the attachment of standard and technical conditions to do with agricultural developments. In addition, Part 4 of the Galway County Council Development Contribution Scheme 2016 provides that Agricultural Development shall be exempt from Development Contributions. As the trackway improvement and completion of renovations to an agricultural shed are to serve agricultural lands I consider that the proposal comes under 'agricultural development' for the purposes of the Development Contribution Scheme. In the event that the Board grant retention and permission for the proposed development a condition requiring the payment of a financial contribution is not required.

#### **9.0 Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening**

- 9.1. I have considered the retention of a shed project in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. It is absolutely clear that the development could not have any conceivable effect on a European site. The applicant prepared an AA Screening report. I am satisfied that there is enough material on the file for the Board to establish the facts and provide a reasoned determination.

- 9.2. The subject site is positioned relative to the following designated sites:

- Slyne Head Peninsula SAC, 10 metres to the west.
- The Proposed Natural Heritage Areas: Slyne Head Peninsula is located is located 10 metres to the west.

The proposed development comprises the renovation of a 32.55 sqm shed and existing internal road improvements. No nature conservation concerns have been raised. No watercourse on site.

- 9.3. 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. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- small scale and nature of the development
- the lack of any meaningful connections with a European site

9.4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

9.5. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive (WFD) Screening

10.1. The subject site is located in a rural location, and is positioned on the Clifden Castlebar Groundwater site code IE\_WE\_G\_0017, and 220 metres upslope from the Coastal Water Body Mannin Bay site code IE\_WE\_260\_0000, Appendix 3 of my report refers.

10.2. The proposed development comprises the retention of refurbishment works to an agricultural shed with a floor area of 32.55 sqm and completion of improvement to an existing driveway. The shed has a pitched roof with black corrugated galvanised finish to roof and concrete block/stone to all shed elevations. The shed is positioned on a rocky outcrop and approached via a gravelled driveway.

10.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.4. I have assessed the retention of refurbishment works to an agricultural shed with a floor area of 32.55 sqm and gravelled driveway improvement project 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.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The limited scale and agricultural nature of the development proposed.

10.5. Conclusion - 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.

## **11.0 Recommendation**

11.1. Having regard to the above assessment, and based on the following reasons and considerations, it is recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions.

## **12.0 Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the Galway County Development Plan 2022 -2028, and the scale and nature of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity, would not be prejudicial to public health and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and visual amenity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## **13.0 Conditions**

1. 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 An Bord Pleanála on the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March 2025, 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The use of the shed shall be limited to agricultural use only, which may include for activities associated with farming and livestock feed storage purposes. The following shall apply in relation to the shed to be retained:

(a) the shed shall not be sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the overall landholding.

(b) The building shall not be used for human habitation or any commercial purpose other than a purpose incidental to farming/horticulture, whether or not such use might otherwise constitute exempted development.

Reason: To ensure that the use of the building provides for activities appropriate to a rural area.

3. Water supply and drainage arrangements for the site, including the disposal of surface and soiled water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. No surface water from the proposed development, shall discharge onto the public road or adjoining properties. In this regard-

(a) uncontaminated surface water run-off shall be disposed of directly in a sealed system to ground in appropriately sized soakaways

(b) all soiled waters shall be directed to an appropriately sized soiled water storage tank (in accordance with the requirements of the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Waters (Amendment) Regulations 2022, as amended..

(c) all separation distances for potable water supplies as outlined in the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Waters) (Amendment) Regulations 2022, as amended shall be strictly adhered to.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory disposal of waste material, in the interest of amenity, public health and to prevent pollution of waters.

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

---

Stephen Rhys Thomas  
Senior Planning Inspector

26 May 2025

## 14.0 Appendix 1 - Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Pre-Screening

<b>An Bord Pleanála Case Reference</b>	ABP-322066-25		
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Retain renovation works to a shed (32.55 sqm) and complete internal access road improvements. All on a site of 0.35 Hectares.		
<b>Development Address</b>	Derrigimlagh, Ballyconneely, Clifden, Co. Galway		
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b> (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		<b>Yes</b>	✓ proceed to Q2.
		<b>No</b>	
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>	✓	Part 2, Class 1.  May also include  Class 1(a) of Part 2 (rural restructuring / hedgerow removal); and  Class 10 (dd) of Part 2 relating to private roads in the form of driveways.	Proceed to Q3.
<b>No</b>			
<b>3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>			

<b>No</b>	✓	<p>Part 2, Class 1.</p> <p>May also include:</p> <p>Class 1(a) of Part 2 (rural restructuring / hedgerow removal); and</p> <p>Class 10 (dd) of Part 2 relating to private roads which would exceed 2000 metres in length.</p>	Proceed to Q4
-----------	---	---	---------------

**4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?**

<b>Yes</b>	✓	<p>Part 2, Class 1. Agriculture, Silviculture and Aquaculture, and does not equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for this class.</p> <p>Class 1(a) of Part 2 (rural restructuring / hedgerow removal), no re-contouring, site is well below 5 hectares and farming related activities relate to existing.</p> <p>Class 10(dd) of Part 2 relating to private roads which would exceed 2000 metres in length. Development driveway amounts to less than 50 metres, far less than the threshold of 2,000 metres.</p>	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)
------------	---	---	---

**5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?**

<b>No</b>	✓	<b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q4)</b>
<b>Yes</b>		<b>Screening Determination required</b>

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## 15.0 Appendix 2 - Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Preliminary Examination

<b>An Bord Pleanála Case Reference</b>	ABP-322066-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Retain renovation works to a shed (32.55 sqm) and complete internal access road. All on a site of 0.35 Hectares.
<b>Development Address</b>	Derrigimlagh, Ballyconneely, Clifden, Co. Galway
<p><b>The Board carried out a preliminary examination [ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended] of at least the nature, size or location of the proposed development, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</b></p> <p><b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b></p>	
<p><b>Characteristics of proposed development</b> (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>Development comprises renovations to an existing agricultural shed of 32.55 sqm and completion of improvement to an internal roadway, it considered that there are no environmental implications with regard to the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health.</p>



<p><b>Location of development</b></p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>Development comprises renovations to an existing agricultural shed of 32.55 sqm and completion of improvement to an internal roadway, there are no environmental sensitivities in terms of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources and the absorption capacity of the natural environment.</p>
<p><b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b></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>Development comprises renovations to an existing agricultural shed of 32.55 sqm and completion of improvement to an internal roadway, there is not likely to be 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><b>Conclusion</b></p>	
<p><b>Likelihood of Significant Effects</b></p>	<p><b>Conclusion in respect of EIA</b></p> <p><b>Yes or No</b></p>

There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.	<b>No EIA is not required.</b>
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.	<b>No, Schedule 7A Information is not required.</b>
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.	<b>No, an EIAR is not required.</b>

**Inspector:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DP/ADP:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

## 16.0 Appendix 3 - Water Framework Directive (WFD) Screening Matrix

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	ABP-322066-25	Townland, address	Derrigimlagh, Ballyconneely, Clifden, Co. Galway
Description of project		<p>The development comprises the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention of renovation works to an existing agricultural building (32.55 sqm), to include galvanised steel roof and concrete block gable wall. Ridge height of 4.2 metres.</li> <li>The completion of the already started works, to upgrade the internal access road.</li> </ul> <p>All on a site of 0.35 Hectares.</p>	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		<p>The site is located 3km north of Ballyconneely in west County Galway. The site is situated on the eastern side of the R341 regional road, part of the Wild Atlantic Way. The road at this location is relatively narrow with a single white line down the centre. The area is rural with the coast to the west and open countryside to the east. The site includes rocky outcrops and damp hollows,</p>	

	there are no watercourses evident on the site. The shed is located on a rocky outcrop to the south western corner of the site and accessed from a gravelled trackway. A new dwelling is under construction on the adjoining site.					
<b>Proposed surface water details</b>	Surface Water - Discharge to Constructed Soak pit.					
<b>Proposed water supply source &amp; available capacity</b>	None.					
<b>Proposed wastewater treatment system &amp; available capacity, other issues</b>	None. Shed is not for overwintering stock. Agricultural feed storage is proposed.					
<b>Others?</b>	None.					
<b>Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection</b>						
<b>Identified water body</b>	<b>Distance to (m)</b>	<b>Water body name(s) (code)</b>	<b>WFD Status</b>	<b>Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk</b>	<b>Identified pressures on that water body</b>	<b>Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)</b>

Coastal Water Body <sup>1</sup>	Approximately 220 metres at high water.	Mannin Bay IE_WE_260_0000 Coastal Water Body	SW 2016-2021 Ecological Status or Potential - High	WFD Risk: Not at risk	Unknown.	None.
Groundwater Body <sup>2</sup>	0 metres	Clifden Castlebar IE_WE_G_0017	GW 2016-2021 Overall Groundwater Status is Good across all tests listed.	WFD Risk: Not at risk	Unknown.	On site soak pit drainage.
<b>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.</b>						

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.catchments.ie/data/#/waterbody/IE\\_WE\\_260\\_0000?\\_k=by4ak6](https://www.catchments.ie/data/#/waterbody/IE_WE_260_0000?_k=by4ak6)

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.catchments.ie/data/#/waterbody/IE\\_WE\\_G\\_0017?\\_k=cs1zfv](https://www.catchments.ie/data/#/waterbody/IE_WE_G_0017?_k=cs1zfv)

CONSTRUCTION PHASE							
No.	Component	Water body receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	<b>Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.</b>
1.	Surface	IE_WE_260_000	N/A – no watercourse.	N/A.	N/A	No.	Screened out.
2.	Ground	IE_WE_G_0017	Pathway exists.	Spillages if cement based products used in stone wall construction.	Standard construction practices.	No.	Screened out.
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
3.	Surface	IE_WE_260_000	N/A – no watercourse.	None.	None.	No.	Screened out.
4.	Ground	IE_WE_G_0017	New pathway could exist via	On site soak pit drainage,	On site soak pit drainage,	No.	Screened out.

			proposed surface water soak pit.	contaminated roof water.	ensure that only clean surface water run-off from the roof flows to soak pit as required and in accordance with Dept of Agriculture rules.		
<b>DECOMMISSIONING PHASE</b>							
5.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A