



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322488-25

Development	Construction of a special educational needs base to the existing school, upgrade of the existing wastewater treatment system and all associated works.
Location	Castlebin South, New Inn, Ballinasloe, Co. Galway, H53 K188
Planning Authority	Galway County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460874
Applicant(s)	Michael Kelly, Chairperson of the Board of Management
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission (15 no. conditions)
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Michael Kelly
Inspector	Conor McGrath

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0 Planning History	7
5.0 Policy Context	7
5.1. Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028	7
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	10
6.0 EIA Screening	10
7.0 Grounds of Appeal	11
7.1. Planning Authority Response	11
8.0 Assessment	13
9.0 AA Screening	15
10.0 Water Framework Directive	16
11.0 Recommendation	17
12.0 Condition	17
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	
Appendix 2 – AA Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal relates to works at Scoil Bhrí National School, New Inn, Co. Galway. This small settlement is located approx. 7.5km north of Loughrea and approx. 10km west of Ballinasloe. The main route through the settlement is the R348 running between Athenry and Ballinasloe.
- 1.2. Scoil Bhrí is located centrally within the settlement with frontage onto the western side of the R348, with a stated area of 1.056ha. A wide footpath bounds the site to the front. There is no parking provision within the school curtilage. There is a vehicular access lane along the southern boundary of the school site, which provides a secondary access to a leisure centre, GAA grounds and car park to the west. A stream flows west along the southern side of this access.
- 1.3. South of the school site is a triangular landscaped area and playground, and a surface car park accessed from the R348. The main access to the GAA grounds is further from the southwest. To the southeast of the site is St. Killian's College secondary school.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the following elements:
 - (1) Construction of a two-classroom special educational needs extension to the existing school (GFA 572.00-sq.m.). The new block will be aligned with the southern site boundary.

The application drawings indicate that temporary prefabricated classrooms to the front and to the rear of the main school buildings will be removed on foot of the proposed development.
 - (2) Decommissioning of the existing septic tank and soakaway serving the existing school and provision of an upgraded wastewater treatment system including soil polishing filter.
 - (3) Upgrade and changes to the road traffic layout and traffic management system to include the provision of a car drop off area, set down area and a bus drop off

area. The changes include a new one-way system along the access road on the southern boundary of the school site and within the surface car park to the south.

Drawings describe provision of footpaths and cyclepath along the R348, and also indicate provision for school parking to the west and northwest of the school curtilage adjoining the GAA grounds.

(4) All associated services.

Supporting documentation submitted at application stage included inter alia:

- A site-specific flood risk assessment.
- AA Screening Report.
- Construction and Environmental Management Plan.
- Site Characterisation Report.
- Site Investigation Report.
- Drainage Design Report
- Stage 1 & Stage II Road Safety Audit.
- Confirmation of GWS water supply.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

In considering the application the planning authority sought further information in relation to a number of matters including:

1. Revisions to include considerations of the publications “Safe Routes to School Design Guide July 2021” and the “Rapid Build SRTS Front of School Improvement Advice Note July 2023”.
2. Compliance with DMURS with regard to
 - (i) junction radii and pedestrian routes.
 - (ii) internal pedestrian and cycle permeability links, and additional traffic calming measures.

- (iii) conflicts between bus movements and car set down areas.
- 3. (i) Submission of a surface water management engineering report and SuDS assessment in accordance with DM Standard 67, taking into account the proximity to the existing watercourse.
- (ii) Ground investigations to ensure the suitability of the sw infiltration area and any associated infrastructure proposed including information associated with proposed interceptor specifications and design capacities of same.

The planning authority subsequently decided to grant permission subject to 15 no. conditions including:

- 9. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer / applicants shall lodge a Roads and Transportation Bond with the planning authority of a cash deposit to the sum of €85,000 with the planning authority, or other cash amount or form of security, as may be acceptable to the planning authority, to secure the reinstatement of the public road and road markings which may be damaged by the transport of materials to the site, to secure the provision of existing drains, pedestrian crossings and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the relevant planning authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory reinstatement of the public road, R-348.

Reason: In the interests of traffic safety and proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Technical Reports

Planning Reports (05/09/2024): An area within part of the site of the proposed development is identified as being within a fluvial flood risk area. The conclusions of the submitted SSFRA are noted.

The submitted details have confirmed that the existing wastewater system is no longer operating effectively and a new upgraded wastewater system in accordance with the EPA Code of Practice would be installed on site. Having reviewed the submitted SCF the Planning Authority are satisfied that the proposed upgraded

system would be in accordance with the EPA Code of Practice and would result in a significant improvement in terms of wastewater treatment on site.

The proposal includes new drop off arrangements and parking/set down areas in order to improve the access/traffic safety at the school site. The new extension requires 8 parking spaces. 4 set down spaces and a bus drop off area are located along the southern site boundary and 25 spaces are located further east with 20 additional spaces located along the western boundary. FI recommended in relation to the road and access design and layout.

The proposed extension assimilates into the existing building and is considered acceptable at this village location.

The report screened the development out for EIA and AA.

Following receipt of FI, the Planning Report dated 08/04/2025 recommended that permission be granted.

3.3. Other Technical Reports

Roads and Transportation Dept.

(04/09/25): Recommended that revised design and layouts details be sought, along with revised surface water drainage and infiltration design details.

(08/04/25): Conditions recommended including implementation of the findings of the Road Safety Audit and undertaking of a stage 3 audit. Recommended condition no. 8 required a bond of 85,000 euros in respect of reinstatement of public roads damaged during the proposed development.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

TII: Requests that regard is had to the provisions of official policy for development proposals impacting national roads, to the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities and relevant TII Publications

The application was also circulated to IFI, however, no submission was received therefrom.

3.5. Third Party Observations

None received by the planning authority.

4.0 Planning History

PA ref. 03/71- Permission granted to extend the existing school and demolish an existing outbuilding.

Adjacent:

21/1856 – Permission granted to construct an astro turf pitch, Multipurpose pitch, basket ball court, ballwall, walkway and associated lighting, redevelopment of existing pitch, and all associated works. This relates to lands to the west and north of the school site and was subject to a number of previous applications including 18/1450. The development was screened out for EIA and AA.

23/60419 – Permission granted for the change of use of a shop to a before & after school childcare facility & all associated site works, on a site c.50m to the north.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028

New Inn is identified as a Level 7(a) Rural Settlement: Rural villages and the wider rural region. Rural encompasses villages and the wider open countryside. There may not be good public transport or regional connections and maybe highly car dependent. The open countryside provides for rural economies and rural communities, based on agriculture, forestry, tourism and rural enterprise.

Chapter 11 Community Development and Social Infrastructure

Section 11.9 notes that educational and school facilities are critical to achieving the full socio-economic potential of the County and have a crucial role in the development of a skilled workforce that can meet the demands of a modern economy. The Development Plan seeks to prioritise the alignment of targeted and

planned population and employment growth with educational investment, including the provision of new schools on well-located sites within or close to existing built-up areas that meet the diverse needs of local populations. The continued provision and enhancement of facilities and amenities for children and young people, is a priority and will continue to be for the foreseeable future.

EDU 1 Educational Facilities

Facilitate the provision of primary, second-level, third-level, vocational, outreach, research, adult and further educational facilities, lifelong learning facilities and digital capacity for distance learning to meet the needs of the County. Multiuse facilities which can accommodate both educational and childcare facilities are also encouraged.

Chapter 15 - Development Management Standards

The following parking requirements will be applied for different types of development

b) School Parking

All applications for new schools and where possible extensions to schools will be required to prioritise access safety and will indicate safe access and egress to the school for pupils, parents and students. A Road Safety Audit which should cover the public-private interface will be required in some cases. Drop off facilities will be required in accordance with Department of Education & Skills Guidelines. Off road parking for teachers and bus/car collection will be indicated in all cases as well as secure bicycle parking facilities.

d) Car Parking Standards

In accordance with Table 15.5, 1 no. car parking space per class room is required for primary schools. (It should be noted that a flexible approach to these standards may be applied where such a case is substantiated, there is no traffic safety issue, and it is clearly demonstrated to the Planning Authority in the interest of proper planning and development, that the standard should be adjusted to facilitate the site specific context)

f) Bicycle Parking Standards

Provision must be made for bicycle parking spaces in accordance with the standards outlined within The National Cycle Manual, in particular Section 5.5.7 which deals with the allocation of cycle parking for developments and shall include the following:

Schools: 10% of pupil registration numbers, minimum 10 places.

DM Standard 52: Schools

Applications for educational provision shall comply with the requirements of technical guidance documents published by the Department of Education and Skills (see www.education.ie) and the Local Authority including 'Provision of Schools and the Planning System: A code of Practice for Planning Authorities (DES, DEHLG, 2008). In the design of education facilities consideration should be given to provision of multi-campus and multi-use element with a flexible approach demonstrated to allow for different users at different times of the day and throughout the calendar year. This list is not exhaustive and the Council may consider other requirements contained in the chapter on a case by case basis with planning applications should the need arise.

Existing Educational Sites

Lands adjacent to existing schools should where possible be protected for possible future educational use to allow for expansion of these schools, if required, subject to site suitability and agreement of the various stakeholders.

GCTPS 10 Park and Stride, To actively support the development of existing appropriate locations/set down areas to accommodate Park and Stride initiatives at appropriate locations, especially within walking distance to schools

NNR 5, School Travel Plans Increase the safety of children at schools by assessing safe routes to schools for school children and by the installation of traffic management measures. Require School Travel Plans to be submitted with applications by schools or colleges in accordance with actions as set out under Smarter Travel, A Sustainable Transport Future 2009 –2020.

5.2. National Guidance

5.2.1. Development Management Guidelines

Section 7.13 deals with conditions to attach to residential development but is of some relevance here:

Conditions requiring security for completion:

It is essential that permissions for residential development are subject to a condition under which an acceptable security is provided by way of bond, cash deposit or otherwise so as to secure its satisfactory completion.

The amount of the security, and the terms on which it is required to be given, should enable the planning authority, without cost to themselves, to complete the necessary services (including roads, footpaths, water mains, sewers, lighting and open space) to a satisfactory standard in the event of default by the developer.

The condition should require that the lodgment of the security should be coupled with an agreement that would empower the planning authority to realise the amount of the security at an appropriate time and apply it to meet the cost of completing the specified works.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- Radford River Bog NHA – c.1.6km west of the site.
- Lough Rea SPA (Site Code: 004134) – c. 12 km to southwest
- Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code: 000297) – c. 10 km to northwest
- Lough Rea SAC (Site Code: 000304) – c. 13 km to southwest
- Monivea Bog SAC (Site Code: 002352) – c. 13 km to northwest
- Glenloughaun Esker SAC (Site Code: 002213) – c. 14 km to east

The Radford River flows generally west and connects to the Rahasane Turlough SAC and SPA Approx 19m from the site.

6.0 EIA Screening

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, nature, scale 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.

7.0 Grounds of Appeal

Michael Kelly, Chairperson of the Board of Management Scoil Bhrid, makes the following points in this first party appeal:

- The Dept. of Education have instructed that this appeal be lodged in respect of condition no. 9 of the PA decision.
- Pre-planning meetings took place which identified requirements in respect of the proposed development. As no requirement for a cash deposit / bond was identified, this was not accounted for in the budgets provided.
- Notwithstanding that Condition no. 3 requires that full details of design works to the roadway be agreed, the sum of €85,000 is over-inflated.
- An inspection of the R348 noted existing damage to footpaths, faded markings, damage to grass verges and potholes (photos attached).
- While the applicants are willing to undertake traffic management improvement works around the school, there is a concern that the subject bond would be used to remedy existing damage, which is the responsibility of the Co. Co.
- Any damage to the roadway caused during construction would be remedied by the contractor without a requirement for such a sizable deposit.

7.1. Planning Authority Response

No response to the first party appeal was received from the planning authority.

7.2. Further Responses

7.2.1. S.131 Request and PA Response

The planning authority was requested under s.132 of the act to provide clarification in respect of the basis of the amount of the bond specified. Specifically the planning authority was requested to:

- Confirm the extent of works intended to be covered by the subject bond.
- Clarify the scope of development or works covered by the phrase “*to secure the provision of existing drains, pedestrian crossings and other services required in connection with the development*” and the purpose of the bond in this regard, i.e. whether the bond is to secure their reinstatement in the event of damage or to secure the satisfactory provision of development in accordance with the decision to grant permission.
- Set out the calculation which forms the basis for the cited bond amount and its apportionment between the different elements referenced in the condition.
- Whether the agreement referenced in the condition refers only to works related to the satisfactory reinstatement of the R438.

In response, the planning authority made the following comments:

- The Roads Section have provided projected costs on the matter to facilitate c.106m of new roadside footpath and cyclepath, and 2 no. pedestrian crossings with associated ancillary works, including drainage and lighting along the R348 – western verge extents.
- The purpose of the bond is to secure the satisfactory provision of roadside development and / or reinstatement works, owing to the scale of works proposed outside the red line planning boundary and the uncertainty of construction, delivery or reinstatement of the R348 public road margin works.
- At date of decision, the cost estimate was based on a pro-rata basis.
- On reconsideration, it is recommended the applicant secure the value attached as a form of insurance bond from an insurance company as an insured time conditioned bond, as security to the planning authority if the need to apply such security, or part thereof, to conduct development and reinstatement of such public margin works.

The response includes a schedule of costs totalling €207,436.55 (incl. vat) for works comprising:

1.	Two pedestrian crossings, including junction tightening improvement works, new kerb build-out.	€101,844.00
2.	1.8m wide footpath and 1.5m wide cyclepath on R348, including connection with existing permeability link to amenity area, playground and car park.	€80,584.68
3.	Existing R348 drain channel and provision of new storm connection and tin-in to active travel storm works.	€6,150.00
	Total	€188,578.68
	Total plus 10% contingency	€207,436.55

7.2.2. First Party Response

The PA response was circulated to the first party, however, no response or comment thereon was received within the relevant period.

8.0 Assessment

This report relates to a first party appeal against condition no. 9 of the planning authority decision to grant permission in this case, which relates to the payment of security in respect of certain works.

I have reviewed proposed development and all documentation submitted at application and appeal stages. I note that the application relates to an extension to an existing national school and that detailed documentation was submitted to the planning authority at application and further information stages, particularly to deal with traffic management and drainage. The planning authority were satisfied with the submissions received at further information stage. I note that no observations were received by the planning authority in relation to the subject application and that no third-party appeals or observations on the appeal have been received by the Commission.

In this regard, and having considered the nature of the condition under appeal, I am satisfied that the determination by the Board of the application as if it had been made to it in the first instance is not warranted, and I propose to consider the appeal under 139(1) of the 2000 Act as amended.

Condition no. 9 under appeal, requires a bond in the amount of €85,000 to:

- secure the reinstatement of the public road and road markings which may be damaged by the transport of materials to the site,
- secure the provision of existing drains, pedestrian crossings and other services required in connection with the development,
- coupled with an agreement empowering the relevant planning authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory reinstatement of the public road, R-348.

The specific wording of the condition lacks clarity in respect of the specific purpose of the bond and scope of works covered thereby. The agreement referenced in the third clause above, refers only to reinstatement of the public road. There was no detail in internal technical reports describing the intent of the condition or the calculation of the bond amount.

I note further that the third-party appeal addresses the bond in the context of reinstatement of damage to the R348 only and does not consider the provision of drains, footpaths, pedestrian crossings or other services.

The S.132 response of the planning authority has provided clarity in respect of the scope of works and calculation of the amount of security. It is clarified that the bond is based on costs in respect of the construction footpaths, cyclepaths, pedestrian crossings, drainage and lighting along the R348.

A schedule of costs for works proposed along the R348 is provided (€188,578.68 plus 10% contingency). I note that these costings do not include any reinstatement costs as referenced in the condition. The pro-rata application of these costs to the proposed development appears to be based on the approximate¹ marginal increase

¹ The proposed new floor area would constitute an increase of 46.3% over the existing floor area of 663m².

in floor area proposed in this case, i.e. (€188,578.68 x 45%). No response or commentary on the clarification of costs provided by the planning authority has been received from the first party.

In principle, having regard to the submission of the planning authority and to the nature of the proposed works within the public realm, I consider it reasonable that security for their satisfactory completion is sought in this case. The first party appeal does not appear to object to the principle of a bond, rather to the form of such bond as a cash deposit.

The identified costs relate to works outside the school grounds. Those costs have not been disputed by the first party. I consider that in the absence of any contradictory information, the basis for the bond amount specified in condition no. 9 appears to be reasonable. I also consider that the pro rata application of the security to the new floor area is an appropriate approach.

The S.132 response of the planning authority further advises that a bond in the form of an insurance company bond in respect of the identified costs is now recommended, rather than a cash deposit. I consider that this form of security would adequately address the concerns of the planning authority in respect of securing the satisfactory completion of development, while also addressing the stated first party concerns regarding the provision of a cash deposit. In this regard, while I note that the wording of condition no. 9 already provided for “other such form of security, as may be acceptable to the planning authority” which would include such an insurance company bond, I recommend that an amended condition be attached providing for such form of security in this case.

9.0 AA Screening

Screening Determination

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 the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on Rahasane Turlough SPA or SAC in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is

therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required. This determination is based on:

- Scientific information provided in the screening report.
- The nature and scale of the development on an existing school site within a settlement and the demonstrated suitability of the site to satisfactorily treat wastewater.
- Distance from and indirect nature of connections to the European sites.
- The absence of potential ex-situ impacts on wintering birds.

Possible impacts identified would not be significant in terms of site-specific conservation objectives for these sites and would not undermine the maintenance of favorable conservation condition or delay or undermine the achievement of restoring favorable conservation status for those qualifying interest features of unfavorable conservation status.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

The proposed development comprises an extension to an existing primary school at new Inn, Co. Galway. The subject site is located adjacent to Crossmacrin Stream (29C59) and underlying groundwater body is the GWDTE-Rahasane Turlough (SAC000322). No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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 regard to

- the nature and relatively small scale of the proposed development,
- the demonstrated suitability of the site for the on-site treatment and disposal of effluent and the improvement in wastewater treatment facilities on site, and
- the measures outlined in the application documentation for the management of surface waters at construction and operational stages;

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

Having regard to the nature of the condition the subject of the appeal, the Commission is satisfied that the determination by the Commission of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and, based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended to:

(a) AMEND condition number 9

REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Having regard to the nature of the proposed development and the works required to facilitate safe access to the site for all travel modes, it is considered that the lodgement of an insurance bond to secure the satisfactory completion of development is a reasonable requirement, and further that the amount of such bond is not regarded as being excessive or disproportionate to the nature and scale of development proposed to be carried out.

12.0 Condition

Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a bond of an insurance company, or other security as may be acceptable to the planning authority, to secure the provision and satisfactory completion, and maintenance until taken in charge by the local authority of roads, pedestrian

crossings, footpaths and cyclepaths, lighting, drains, and other services required in connection with the development, and to secure the reinstatement of public roads which may be damaged by the transport of materials to the site, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion or maintenance of any part of the development. The security to be lodged shall be as follows -

- (a) an approved insurance company bond in the sum of €85,000 (eighty five thousand euro), or
- (b) such other security as may be accepted in writing by the planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion of the development.

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.

Conor McGrath
ADP

31/07/25

Appendix 1 Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322488-25
Proposed Development Summary	Extension to national school, wastewater treatment plant and associated works.
Development Address	NewvInn, Ballinasloe, Co. Galway
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8	

<p>of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p> <p>Class 10. Infrastructure projects (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2ha in the case of a business district, 10ha in other parts of a built-up area and 20ha elsewhere.</p> <p>13. Changes, extensions, development and testing (a) Any change or extension of development which would:- (i) result in the development being of a class listed in Part 1 or paragraphs 1 to 12 of Part 2 of this Schedule, and (ii) result in an increase in size greater than – - 25 per cent, or - an amount equal to 50 per cent of the appropriate threshold, whichever is the greater.</p>

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

Inspector: Conor McGrath **Date:** 31/07/25

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a special educational needs base to the existing school, upgrade of the existing wastewater treatment system and all associated works, including road improvement works.
Development Address	Castlebin South, New Inn, Ballinasloe, Co. Galway, H53 K188
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. The development will provide new classroom space of 572-sq.m., an increase of approx. 46% on the existing school building area. A new upgraded wastewater treatment plant will be installed and new surface water management arrangements. The works will also involve the removal of existing temporary structures from the site.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed The site comprises an existing school site within a settlement. The site is not located within or adjacent to any designated conservation site. The nearest site is Radford River Bog NHA – c.1.6km west and upstream of the site. A stream to the south of the site flows in a westerly direction west. There are no protected structures or features of identified archaeological / cultural interest in the vicinity of the site.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary,	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects. Development works have potential to give rise to temporary noise and dust emissions. There is also potential for release of sediment from the site to

intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	adjoining watercourses during construction. Given the temporary nature of the works, and their nature, scale and separation from sensitive receptors significant effects on the environment are not considered likely
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	<p>EIA is not required.</p> <p>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.</p>

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____
DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____
 (only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 2

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects				
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics				
Brief description of project		Construction of a two-classroom, special educational needs extension to the existing school and removal of existing temporary prefabricated classrooms from the school site. Decommissioning of the existing septic tank and soakaway and provision of an upgraded wastewater treatment system including soil polishing filter. Upgrade and changes to the road traffic layout and traffic management system. On-site disposal of surface water.		
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms		The site comprises an existing national school including prefabricated classroom accommodation, within an existing settlement. There is a stream to the south of the main school site between it and the surface car park area. This watercourse eventually discharges to Rahasane Turlough SPA, SAC approx. 19km downstream.		
Screening report		Yes, submitted with application. Galway Co. Co. screened out the need for AA.		
Natura Impact Statement		No, screened out		
Relevant submissions		None		
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development	Ecological connections	Consider further in screening

Rahasane Turlough SAC (00322)	Rahasane Turlough SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service 16 Dec 2020	19km to west	Indirect connection via Radford River / Crossmacrin stream. SAC is upstream	Yes
Rahasane Turlough SPA (004089)	Rahasane Turlough SPA National Parks & Wildlife Service 16 Dec 2020	19km to west	Indirect connection via Radford River / Crossmacrin stream	Yes
Lough Corrib SPA (004042)	Lough Corrib SPA National Parks & Wildlife Service	c.9.5km	None	No
Lough Corrib SAC (000297)	Lough Corrib SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service	c. 10km northwest	None	No
Lough Rea SPA (004134)	Lough Rea SPA National Parks & Wildlife Service	c. 12.5km southwest	None	No
Lough Rea SAC (000304)	Lough Rea SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service	c. 13km southwest	None	No
Monivea Bog SAC (002352)	Monivea Bog SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service	c. 13km northwest	None	No
Glenloughaun Esker SAC (002213)	Glenloughaun Esker SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service	c. 14km to east	None	No

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

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 1: Rahasane Turlough SAC (code 000322) 16 Dec 2020 QI: Turloughs Objective: To maintain the favourable	Direct: None Indirect: Construction: Site clearance and construction. Localised dust, noise and vibration emissions from construction, potential sw run-off with silt or contaminants. Operation:	The nature, scale and temporary nature of construction effects, and the demonstrated suitability of the site to treat wastewater satisfactorily, combined with distance from receiving features make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate

conservation condition of Turloughs	Activity and presence of new structures. Discharge of wastewater to ground. Surface water infiltration.	impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SAC for the QI listed. Conservation objectives would not be undermined.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): N	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? Other plans and projects are examined in the Screening Report. No other effects of magnitude that could add to other plans and projects.	
	Impacts	Effects
Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
Site 2: Rahasane Turlough SPA (code 004089) 16 Dec 2020 QI's: Whooper Swan: To restore favourable conservation condition Golden Plover : To restore favourable conservation condition Black-tailed Godwit: To maintain favourable conservation condition Greenland White-fronted Goose: To restore favourable conservation condition Wigeon: To maintain favourable conservation condition Wetland and Waterbirds: To maintain favourable conservation condition	Direct: None Indirect: Construction: Site clearance and construction. Localised dust, noise and vibration emissions from construction, potential sw run-off with silt or contaminants. Operation: Activity and presence of new structures. Discharge of wastewater to ground. Surface water infiltration.	Site is part of an existing school campus and generally beyond the foraging distance of over-wintering Whooper Swan or White-fronted Geese from night roosts. Given separation, no ex-situ effects on wintering water birds from disturbance during construction or operation of the proposed development are likely. There will be no loss or material reduction in suitable ex-situ roosting or foraging areas. The development will not constitute a barrier to movement. Low risk of surface water borne pollutants reaching the wetland habitats of the SPA. No significant changes in ecological functions due to any minor construction related emissions are predicted. The site has been demonstrated to

		<p>be suitable for the on-site treatment and disposal of wastewater.</p> <p>Conservation objectives related to ensuring adequate supporting habitat outside of the SPA will not be undermined and no likelihood of the development compromising objectives to restore favourable conservation condition or make such restoration more difficult is identified.</p> <p>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p>
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y/N	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
	Other plans and projects are examined in the Screening Report. No other effects of magnitude that could add to other plans and projects.	
Step 4 Likelihood of significant effects on a European site		
<p>I conclude that the proposed development (alone or in combination with other plans and projects) would not result in likely significant effects on a European Site.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions. I consider the provision of the installation of the wastewater treatment plant is a standard requirement for such development and is not a mitigation measure for the purpose of avoiding or preventing impacts to the SAC or SPA.</p>		

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

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 the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give

rise to significant effects on Rahasane Turlough SPA or SAC in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- Scientific information provided in the Screening report.
- The nature and scale of the development on an existing school site within a settlement and the demonstrated suitability of the site to satisfactorily treat wastewater.
- Distance from and indirect nature of connections to the European sites
- The absence of potential ex-situ impacts on wintering birds

Possible impacts identified would not be significant in terms of site-specific conservation objectives for these sites and would not undermine the maintenance of favorable conservation condition or delay or undermine the achievement of restoring favorable conservation status for those qualifying interest features of unfavorable conservation status.

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

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

An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	ABP-322488-25	Townland, address	Castlebin South, New Inn, Ballinasloe, Co. Galway, H53 K188
Description of project	Construction of a special educational needs base to the existing school, upgrade of the existing wastewater treatment system and all associated works.		
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,	The site comprises an existing school site, with a village / settlement. The school is served by an existing septic tank and soakaway, which is to be upgraded as part of the proposed development. A watercourse (Crossmacrin Stream) runs west along the southern boundary of the site. The watercourse is of Moderate Status and is at Risk.		
Proposed surface water details	Surface water is to be collected and disposed of on-site to ground. SUDS measures, including rainwater harvesting and permeable paving will be implemented. The development will provide for an upgrade in on-site treatment facilities.		
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	GWS supply available.		

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues			New WWTP to EPA CoP standards proposed			
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)
Surface - River Waterbody	Along the southern boundary of the site	Crossmacrin Stream (29C59)	Moderate Status RAFORD_020 Sub-catchment 29_5 Rafor SC_010	At Risk RAFORD_020 Sub-catchment 29_5 Rafor SC_010	Nutrients - Agriculture and Domestic wts	Potential sw run-off during construction and operation. Ground water discharge of sw and ww may constitute a pathway to the watercourse
Groundwater	Underlying the site and wider area.	GWDTE-Rahasane Turlough (SAC000322)	Good	At Risk	Chemical – quality diminution for SW, Nutrients – Agriculture and Domestic wts	Locally important aquifer (LG), moderately productive only in local zones, of low vulnerability.

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.							
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	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if ‘screened’ in or ‘uncertain’ proceed to Stage 2.
CONSTRUCTION PHASE							
1.	Surface -	Crossmacrin Stream (29C59)	Existing drainage, providing potential pathway to watercourse.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages	CEMP, Standard construction practice.	No	No Screened out.
2.	Ground	GWDTE-Rahasane Turlough (SAC000322)	Pathway exists Vulnerability is low	Hydrocarbon spillages			
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
3.	Surface -	Crossmacrin Stream (29C59)	Existing drainage. WW and SW discharge to ground, providing	WW and SW discharge to ground impacting on water quality	Adherence to EPA CoP and suitable	No	No Screened out.

			potential pathway to watercourse.		soil / ground		
4.	Ground	GWDTE-Rahasane Turlough (SAC000322)	Pathway exists Vulnerability is low	WW and SW discharge to ground impacting on water quality	conditions, SUDS features. Improved / upgraded wastewater treatment facilities.		
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	NA						