



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-322492-25

Development	Retention of hard stand area and all associated site works.
Location	Balrobuck Beg, Corrandulla, Co. Galway.
Planning Authority	Galway County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460988.
Applicant(s)	M Burke.
Type of Application	Permission for Retention.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Retention.
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Breda Reilly.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	22 nd July 2025.
Inspector	C. Daly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site of 0.796ha., in a rural area, consists of a commercial yard for the storage and manufacture of concrete products including a large shed. The site is of irregular shape and is accessed via a driveway from a local road, the L6173, and is c.800m east of the N84 national road. The site is located adjacent to a detached rural dwelling which is to the south; and to the north, east and west the site is surrounded by agricultural fields.
- 1.2. There are two dwellings located on the opposite side of the road to the south as well as other rural dwellings in the vicinity to the north-east and south. The site is c.2.2km north-west of the small settlement of Corrandulla.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:
 - Retention of additional hard stand area of 1,861sqm to north-west side of adjacent dwelling with revised site boundaries for an existing concrete manufacturing works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Galway County Council initially decided to request further information in relation to clarification of the type and nature of the works and reason for its location, anticipated traffic levels, the effects on adjacent amenities, details in relation to type of deliveries, arrangements for storage and collection of waste, updated site layout plans to clarify the planning status of the existing development, land registry details, sightline details, timeline for the removal of the storage tanks along the site entrance and details in relation to the existing septic tank on the site.

Following F.I., the P.A. decided to grant retention permission subject to 5 no. conditions.

Notable conditions include:

- Condition no. 2 limits the development permitted to that described in the public notices.
- Condition no. 4 requires the landscaping to be in accordance with the submitted landscape plan.
- Condition no. 5 requires no goods, raw materials or waste products to be placed or stored adjacent to the access road serving the development.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The initial Planner's Report noted the substantial increase in site area by reference to the permitted development under reg. ref. 99/4562. The report noted a submission in relation to issues with the existing development and in relation to ownership with land registry details required. It noted the indication of an existing septic tank on the site with no system indicated on the site layout plan with F.I. required. It also noted a lack of drainage detail and sightline demonstration given the intensification of use. It noted a need for landscaping given the location closer to the public road. It noted the absence of landscaping and the storage tanks along the access road and poorly finished vehicular entrance adversely impact the visual amenity of the area with further information required. It also noted a lack of detail in relation to compliance with the permitted development.

The second Planner's Report following F.I. noted no intensification of development or change in employee numbers or hours of operation. It noted that the existing development is for the manufacture of septic tanks. The site layout plan detailed the location of the wheelwash facility and dust suppression system and surface water drainage systems were noted to be included. It noted a detailed landscaping plan including photomontages. The report noted that the landscape plan would provide substantial screening once mature and would soften the visual impact. Land ownership issues were noted to be addressed. No intensification of use was noted in relation to the vehicular entrance. It noted that the storage tanks have been relocated to the hard standing area and this was considered to reduce the visual impact. The report noted confirmation of no septic tank on the site. The F.I. response was considered satisfactory and a grant of permission was recommended subject to 5 no. conditions.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Tuam Council Office: No report received.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- An Taisce: No report received.
- Failte Ireland: No report received.
- Irish Aviation Authority: No report received.
- The Heritage Council: No report received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One no. third party observation was received which can be summarised as follows:

- Issues in relation to land ownership and site boundaries.
- Issues alleged in relation to development which requires permission.
- Issues in relation to incomplete application form.
- Issues in relation to surface water run-off and impact on groundwater.
- Issues in relation to the on-site septic tank.
- Issues in relation to planning fees.
- Issues in relation to intensification of development and hours of working affecting neighbours.
- Issues in relation to absence of the required wheel wash.
- Issues in relation to increase in traffic and use of the route through the village.

4.0 Planning History

Subject Site

99/4562: Permission granted by the P.A. for retention and completion of store and yard for manufacture of concrete products.

Notable conditions:

Condition no. 1 states the permission relates only to the manufacture of septic tanks and that any further intensification would require a new application.

Condition no. 2 requires the installation of a wheel wash at the site entrance.

Condition no. 3 states that lorries shall avoid use of the road through the village.

Condition no. 4 requires a dust suppression system to be installed.

Condition no. 6 requires a detailed landscaping plan.

5.0 Policy Context

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

Volume 1

Chapter 4 – Rural Development

CD 1 Rural Enterprises

Consider and support the establishment of small scale rural orientated enterprises in unserviced rural areas outside of town or village settings which can be accommodated in existing farm buildings or can be established on a brownfield site, subject to satisfying the following criteria:

- (a) Compatibility and general suitability to an unserviced rural area (primary consideration will be given to agriculture, renewable and marine resources, forestry, tourism, recreation or food production related enterprise activities and services);*
- (b) Scale of development (assimilate appropriately into a rural setting);*
- (c) Nature of development (raw materials sourced locally);*
- (d) Consideration of social and environmental impacts (enterprise must not have a significant adverse impact on the environment or rural amenity);*
- (e) The enterprise must not constitute a road safety hazard or have a major adverse impact on the road network, road capacity and traffic levels;*
- (f) Residential amenity (enterprise must not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity).*

Chapter 8 – Tourism and Landscape

Section 8.13.2 Landscape Sensitivity

Class 1 – Low: Unlikely to be adversely affected by change.

LCM 1 Preservation of Landscape Character

Preserve and enhance the character of the landscape where, and to the extent that, in the opinion of the Planning Authority, the proper planning and sustainable development of the area requires it, including the preservation and enhancement, where possible of views and prospects and the amenities of places and features of natural beauty or interest.

Chapter 15 – Development Management Standards

DM Standard 17: Rural Enterprise

The Council will consider rural enterprises, and resource development (such as agriculture, agri-food sector, agri-tourism, commercial fishing, aquaculture, marine tourism, forestry, bio-energy, the extractive industry, recreation, cultural heritage, marine enterprise sector, research and analysis) and renewable energy resources (such as wind/ocean energy) in rural and coastal areas within the County subject to considerations of proper planning and sustainable development and shall include the following:

- A) Existing Buildings...
- B) Agriculturally Related Industry...
- C) Farm-Related Business...

Section 15.4 Economic Enterprise and Retail

Industrial Development

There shall be a presumption that only industrial processes of appropriate size and whose nature will not cause nuisance or injury to the predominant residential environment of towns and villages, shall be permitted. Industrial development shall be subject to the proper planning and development of the area, specifically the following requirements:

- *Hours of Operation - The hours of industrial operation will be controlled where they are likely to result in harm to environmental amenities including residential amenity;*

- *Noise Levels - Noise levels shall not exceed 55 dB (a) Leq when measured at the boundary of the site;*
- *Waste Management/Storage - Provision shall be made on site in a screened compound for short-term waste and segregation storage pending collection and disposal. There must be adequate provision for storage of segregated waste (bio-waste/dry recyclables/residual waste) pending collection;*
- *Advertising Signs - Advertising signs shall be confined to the name of the establishment being painted on or affixed to the façade of the building and illuminated, if required, from an external light source so as not to cause glare to road users or intrusion to adjacent property owners;*
- *Density - Site coverage shall not normally exceed 75% nor shall plot ratio exceed 1:2;*
- *Landscaping - A comprehensive professionally prepared planting scheme for the site shall be necessary.*

The Planning Authority shall also consult relevant Local Area Plans where appropriate that may relate to industrial/commercial/enterprise and retail sites including the site coverage, plot area ratio and public open space requirements.

DM Standard 28: Sight Distances Required for Access onto National, Regional, Local and Private Roads

Table 15.3: Sight Distances required for Access onto National, Regional and Local Roads

Section 15.7.2 Landscape Sensitivity

DM Standard 46: Compliance with Landscape Sensitivity Designations

Table 15.6: Landscape Sensitivity Designations

Class 1 – Low Sensitivity All developments which are of appropriate scale and design and are consistent with settlement policies.

DM Standard 47: Field Patterns, Stone Walls, Trees and Hedgerows

Field patterns and associated stone walls, trees and hedgerows are an important part of the visual and environmental quality of rural areas and their removal and replacement with block walls and fencing leads to urban features in a rural

environment. It can also have an effect on wildlife and lead to the removal of valuable hedgerows upon which wildlife depends. New developments will accordingly be subject to the following requirements in this regard:

- a) Existing Features Retain and incorporate existing field patterns and associated stone walls, trees and hedgerows into new development layouts wherever feasible.*
- b) Intervention In general, only the minimum interference with existing field patterns, stone walls, trees and hedges shall be permitted.*
- c) Planting The Council will also encourage the planting of native trees and hedgerows along all boundaries.*
- d) Hedgerows Include consideration of native hedgerow with post and rail fencing along roadside frontages where existing hedgerow is being removed. Employ the appropriate management methods for the maintenance of roadside habitats to minimise damage (in particular to hedges) and observe the hedge cutting closed season.*

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

In relation to designated sites, the subject site is located:

- c.1.5km east of Lough Corrib Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Proposed Natural Heritage Area (PNHA) (site code 000297).
- c.1.5km east of Lough Corrib Special Protection Area (SPA) (site code 004042).
- c.3.8km south-east of Turloughcor PNHA (site code 001788).
- c.4.5km south of Turlough Monaghan PNHA (site code 001322).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the third party appeal on behalf of Breda Reilly can be summarised as follows:

- The applicant does not own all of the lands shown on the site layout plan with part of the site owned by a neighbour and the planning application should be deemed unauthorised with no consent from the land owner supplied.

- Issues in relation to development on the site without planning permission.
- The application form is unclear in relation to what areas are covered.
- Issues in relation to cumulative surface water run-off and negative impact on the groundwater in the area.
- Hydrological and ecological surveys are necessary.
- There is no permission for an existing septic tank or wastewater treatment system.
- There are areas of the development omitted from the retention application such that the fee is insufficient.
- Issues in relation to absence of company details on the application form.
- Issues in relation to the increased scale of development without planning permission.
- Issues in relation to hours of operation and impact on neighbours.
- Issues in relation to the absence of a wheel wash as required by condition 2.
- Issues in relation to increased vehicular movements to and from the site, sightlines and routing of traffic through the village contrary to condition 3.
- Issues in relation to the absence of a dust suppression system required by condition 4.
- Issues in relation to surface water exiting the site due to absence of soakpits required by condition 5 and a management plan is required.
- Issues in relation to the absence of a landscaping scheme as required by condition 6.
- Issues in relation to the storage silos and containers on the site which have a negative impact on the visual amenity and environment of the area and devaluation of property in the vicinity.
- Issues in relation to failure to indicate the scale of development.
- Issues in relation to the water supply to the site and water treatment on the site.

- Issues in relation to the removal of a natural stone wall boundary, mature trees and hedges on adjacent property.
- Issues in relation to historic development of the site including the cattle shed.
- The activities on site are located close to the Lough Corrib NHA and all activities should be intensively monitored and the ecological impact needs to be investigated by a qualified ecologist.
- Maps and land registry documents attached.

6.2. Applicant Response

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

- The hard stand is for the temporary storage of the septic tanks which were previously stored along the entrance driveway.
- There is no wastewater drainage involved in the proposal or in the associated manufacturing facility.
- All surface water will be collected and only clean uncontaminated water will be discharged to the onsite soakaway system.
- A landscaping plan has been prepared and submitted to screen the hard stand area and the manufacturing works from the public road.
- A wheel washing facility with provision for high pressure cleaning is provided along the entrance driveway.
- The submitted noise survey demonstrates minimal impact on the environment.
- Information in relation to dust suppression provided shows a well maintained and operated facility.
- There are two staff members on site and deliveries of the septic tanks off site consist of one to two loads per day and there is one truck and one van delivery per week.
- Any incidental waste is stored in special containers and collected by an authorised waste collection operator bi-weekly.
- There are no containers on the hard stand area.

- Traffic impact is minimal and comes directly from the N84 via the L2116 and the L6173 which route avoids the village.
- The site entrance complies with the parent permission.
- The letters from adjoining neighbours have demonstrated no local nuisance generated by the facility.
- In relation to site ownership, details were submitted as part of the F.I. response including from the applicant's solicitor.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development
- Impact on Local Amenity
- Ecology
- Drainage
- Water and Wastewater
- Other Matters

7.2. Principle of Development

- 7.2.1. I note the permitted use of the site is for manufacture of concrete products in the large shed and yard. I note that while the red line encompasses the existing permitted development area and the area for retention, the scope of the application is for the area for retention adjacent to the existing yard as identified on the site layout plans.
- 7.2.2. The site is located in a rural area adjacent to a dwelling and there are two dwellings located on the opposite side of the road, one of which is partially thatched (RPS no. 3947, NIAH no. 30405624) opposite the adjacent dwelling, as well as other dwellings

in the vicinity to the north-east and south. I note CDP policy, CD 1 (Rural Enterprises) and DM Standard 17 (Rural Enterprise) in relation to rural orientated enterprises does not include manufacturing or industry such that these policies do not specifically support the proposed development.

- 7.2.3. I consider the proposed development to be an urban type manufacturing or industrial type development ancillary to the permitted manufacturing development on the site. I further note that policy in relation to industrial development as outlined in Section 15.4 of the CDP effectively refers to this type of development being located within urban areas, i.e. towns and villages.
- 7.2.4. While I note the concrete area for retention would be ancillary to the permitted development, I consider its area of 1,861sqm, to be significant and equivalent to the size of a small agricultural field based on the field pattern in the area. Relative to the ground area of the permitted development to the rear (c.4,347sqm excluding the driveway), I note this constitutes an increase of c.42%. I consider this to be a sizeable increase in the area of the site albeit noting that it is for storage purposes.
- 7.2.5. I note this has resulted in the loss of a significant area of agricultural grassland which is the predominant land use in this rural area. While I note the absence of supportive CDP policy provision for the location of such an industrial type manufacturing activity in such a rural area, I note that the proposal is for the expansion of an existing permitted industrial use on the site, specifically for ancillary storage. Based on this consideration, I consider the principle of development to be acceptable notwithstanding the CDP policy provisions referred to above.

7.3. Impact on Local Amenity

- 7.3.1. I note the appeal has raised issues in relation to impacts on residential amenity in the vicinity including in relation to visual impact, noise and hours of operation. In relation to visual impact, while I note that a concrete ground area would be limited in visibility terms due to its lack of height, I consider that when put to use for ancillary uses associated with the site manufacturing, for example for the storage of septic tanks, materials or finished product, the industrial nature of the site area is visible from adjacent sites and from the public road to a significant extent. I note this in the context of the low landscape sensitivity. I also note that the area for retention has resulted in the relocation of storage silos and containers on the site away from the

vehicular entrance way where they would previously have been more visible from the public road.

- 7.3.2. I note the landscaping scheme for the site submitted at F.I. stage, including screen planting along the south-west boundary, rows of native hedgerow along the driveway and screen planting along the north-west and north-east boundaries of the existing manufacturing site. I note that the Landscape Proposals document, including the visualisations, prepared by Cormac Langan Landscape Architect refers to fast growing native planting including Alder, Common Birch, Mountain Ash and Larch and also Common Oak and Scots Pine.
- 7.3.3. Having visited the site and observed the storage of various materials on the slab area for retention, while noting the visibility of this from the public road due to the height off the ground, I consider that together with the proposed screening and additional screening along the south-east boundary with the adjacent house, that the current impact of the proposal can be mitigated to a sufficient extent over time. I also note that this would have a similar impact in relation to screening the existing development which would be an improvement on the current situation for the permitted development where a landscaping scheme was required but not provided. I consider this would also address the appellant's concerns in relation to the removal of a natural stone wall boundary, mature trees and hedges.
- 7.3.4. I note condition no. 4 of the previous permission required the implementation of a landscaping scheme and this was never carried out over a 25 year period. In this regard, should permission be granted, I recommend a condition to require a bond to ensure the proposed landscaping scheme is carried out. In this context, while I note a lack of policy support for this type of use in such a rural area, I consider that, overall, the visual impact of the development is capable of being adequately screened while noting the current intrusion of urban features in a rural setting.
- 7.3.5. Overall, I consider that this approach would be sufficient to preserve and enhance the character of the rural landscape, relative to the current situation, in line with Policy LCM 1 of the Development Plan. In this regard, I consider the visual impact of the development, over an area of significant extent and noting the low landscape sensitivity, when combined with the existing development, to be acceptable in the rural setting.

- 7.3.6. In relation to noise, I note the two submissions on the file at F.I. stage from two residents located on the opposite side of the road to the south in the vicinity stating that there are no disturbances from noise or dust from the manufacturing on the site. I also note the appeal raised issues in relation to noise and the impact on residential amenity. I note the submitted Noise and Dust Assessment Report prepared by Corribview Safety Services. The noise survey found average noise levels between 49.73 dB to 54.55 dB and it noted that *“these levels approach the Irish daytime limit of 55 dB LAeq for industrial noise at sensitive receptors, as per EPA Guidelines”*.
- 7.3.7. In relation to peak noise levels, the report notes that *“the maximum noise level recorded was 93.8dB during Set 4”*. This peak noise event lasted for 5 seconds and remains within regulatory requirements and it notes that *“during this time, a tractor was observed passing by, which contributed to the temporary increase in noise levels”*. I note all measurements were taken during working hours between 09:40 and 16:27. This is when higher noise limits apply and the report noted that operations during night-time hours are usually required to be below 45 decibels.
- 7.3.8. The report did not recommend any noise mitigation measures based on the results. Noting this, should permission be granted I recommend that a standard noise condition be applied to the development to ensure average noise levels are below 55dB during daytime and below 45dB at night per the EPA guidelines. I also recommend a standard hours of operation condition to ensure no working outside of standard working hours given the proximity of adjacent residences.
- 7.3.9. In relation to dust, I note the submitted report refers to a one-day survey conducted at the site with monitoring equipment positioned around the site boundary. The report noted that the facility is operating within the Irish and EU permissible air quality limits. It notes that *“this indicates compliance with regulatory requirements, reflecting effective baseline control of particulate emissions”*. While the report did not recommend mitigation measures, it did recommend operational improvements and community engagement. Accordingly, I do not consider there to be a requirement for conditions in relation to specific dust suppression measures beyond the use of the wheel washing system originally provided for in the previous permission.

- 7.3.10. Based on the above I consider that, subject to conditions, impacts on local amenities and residential amenities in the vicinity are acceptable and in this context, I am satisfied that there would be no significant devaluation of property in the vicinity.

7.4. Ecology

- 7.4.1. I note the appellant considers there to be a requirement for ecological surveys. I note the extent of the concrete area and that it replaces a grass agricultural field. Such agricultural fields do not constitute land in its natural state and I note historical aerial mapping do not suggest the site contained features of ecological significance. I do not consider such a change of use in this area of land gives rise to significant ecological concerns. Accordingly, I do not consider there to be a requirement for ecological surveys and I am satisfied that there are no significant ecological issues arising from the development.

7.5. Drainage

- 7.5.1. The appellant has raised the need for hydrological surveys. In relation to the impact on water bodies in the vicinity, please refer to the Water Framework Directive section of this report which notes no significant impacts. In relation to surface water drainage and impact, I note the provisions on the site including a collection channel under the entrance gate and the soakaways at the south-west end of the area to be retained and I consider that a standard condition in relation to this matter to ensure no contaminated surface water drains off the site or into groundwater can be provided should permission be granted. Accordingly, I am satisfied that there is no requirement for hydrological surveys given the capacity to ensure no water-based impacts on or off the site.

7.6. Water and Wastewater

- 7.6.1. In terms of water supply, I note that the development is served by a group water scheme. In relation to wastewater treatment, I note that it was clarified at F.I. stage that there is no septic tank on the site and no wastewater treatment has been included in the development. I also note the response of the applicant in relation to waste disposal arrangements with a twice weekly collection service availed of and that staff numbers have not increased beyond the level (two) associated with the permitted development. Accordingly, I am satisfied that no significant issues arise in this regard, including in relation to ecological or environmental impact.

7.7. Other Matters

- 7.7.1. In relation to the site entrance and traffic and road safety related issues, I note the permitted status of the existing vehicular entrance. I note the information provided at F.I. stage in relation to the limited vehicular movements associated with the site and the route by which the site is accessed avoiding the village to the north as required by the previous permission condition. While I note that the hard standing area provides increased capacity for on-site storage, I do not consider that it provides for an intensification of production/manufacturing on the site.
- 7.7.2. Accordingly, I do not consider that significant increases in vehicular movements to and from the site would arise. I also note that there is no report from a Council Engineer expressing concern in relation to the vehicular movements and the vehicular entrance. I observed adequate sightlines at the existing vehicular entrance. In this context, I am satisfied that no significant issues arise in relation to the vehicular entrance and traffic issues.
- 7.7.3. I note the appellant has raised issues suggesting that the applicant does not own the full site area and that no letter of consent has been supplied in relation to same. Based on the legal folio documents supplied with the appeal, which I consider to be unclear, and the documents submitted by the applicant at F.I. stage, including a letter from the applicant's solicitor confirming site ownership, I consider that there is sufficient basis for the Commission to consider and determine the appeal and noting that per the provisions of Section 34(13) of the 2000 Act as amended, a grant of permission does not confer automatic legal authority to carry out a development.
- 7.7.4. I note the appeal raises issues in relation to developments that the appellant suggests require permission. While noting the nature of the application as one for retention, I note that matters relating to enforcement are under the jurisdiction of the P.A..
- 7.7.5. The appeal raises issues in relation to the way the application form is filled out including in relation to the absence of a company name and in relation to floor areas. I note the company name and associated details are only required where the applicant is a company. However, in this case the applicant is a person as stated in answer to question no. 5 on the application form. In this context, the Planning and

Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) do not require a company name. In relation to floor areas, this only applies to buildings and not to outdoor areas and I note the measures of the area for retention are shown on the plans. I consider the information available on file to be sufficient for this assessment.

8.0 EIA Screening

- 8.1. 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.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located c.1.5km from Lough Corrib SAC and Lough Corrib SPA. The proposed development comprises hard stand area of 1,861sqm.
- 9.2. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of works with no intensification of development otherwise proposed.
 - The distance from the nearest European sites and lack of connections.
 - Taking into account screening report/determination by the PA..
- 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

10.1. The subject site is located c.700m from the Ballinduff Stream_010 river waterbody (IE_WE_30B050100). The proposed development comprises hard stand area of 1,861sqm. 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.

10.2. 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.

10.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The scale of development and absence of intensification of manufacturing development on the site.
- The location-distance from the nearest water bodies and lack of hydrological connections to same.

10.4. 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 Conclusion

I have assessed the principle of development to be acceptable in the context of the proposed expansion of the existing permitted development and I have noted no significant issues in relation to impacts on residential, visual and local amenities.

12.0 Recommendation

I recommend that retention permission be granted.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028, the planning history relating to the site, the location within a rural area, to the nature and scale of the development for retention and its relationship with the surrounding area, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be acceptable and would not seriously injure the local, residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would be acceptable in terms of design, visual impact, noise impact, hours of operation and environmental impact. The development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

14.0 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 the planning authority on the 24th 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 development hereby permitted is only that described in the public notices and does not include or provide for manufacturing activities on the concrete slab area for retention.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

3. The landscaping scheme shown on drawing number 24875_LP001, as submitted to the planning authority as part of the 'Landscape Proposals' report on the 24th day of March, 2025, shall be carried out within 3 months of the date of this permission. Additional screen planting similar to that shown on the south-west boundary of the area to be retained shall be located along the south-east boundary of the area to be retained.

All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Within three months of the final grant of permission the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a bond of an insurance company, a cash deposit, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion of the landscaping scheme required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the planning authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion 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 €20,000, or
- (b) a cash sum of €20,000 to be applied by the planning authority at its absolute discretion if such services are not provided to its satisfaction, or
- (c) such other security as may be accepted in writing by the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity and to ensure the satisfactory completion of the development.

4. During the operational phase of the proposed development the noise level shall not exceed (a) 55 dB(A) rated sound level between the hours of 0700 to 2300, and (b) 45 dB(A) 15min and 60 dB LAfmax, 15min at all other times , (corrected for a tonal or impulsive component) as measured at the nearest dwelling.

Procedures for the purpose of determining compliance with this limit shall be

submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of property in the vicinity of the site.

5. The wheel wash at the vehicular entrance way shall be constructed, maintained and operated so as to remove all loose material from the wheels under the body of vehicles prior to exiting the site and shall incorporate an underbody power washing facility. Details of this shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for its written approval within three months of the final grant of permission.

Reason: In the interests of amenities in the area.

6. The attenuation and disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

7. Site operations shall only be carried out between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

8. No goods, raw materials or waste products shall be placed or stored adjacent to the access road serving the development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

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

Ciarán Daly

Planning Inspector

13th August 2025

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322492-25
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of additional hard stand area of 1,861sqm and revised site boundaries.
Development Address	Balrobuck Beg, Corrandulla, 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.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed	

<p>type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	<p>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>Threshold: Class 10 (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere.</p> <p>Hard stand area of 1,861sqm (0.18ha.) proposed.</p>

<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)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP-322492-25
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of additional hard stand area of 1,861sqm and revised site boundaries
Development Address	Balrobuck Beg, Corrandulla, Co. Galway.
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. Hard stand area of 1,861sqm (0.18ha.) adjacent to an existing yard, combined site area is 0.796ha. Hard standing area represent a c.30% increase in site area most of which is in hard standing/driveway.
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 is in a rural area remote from sensitive designated sites and water bodies. I note no other sensitive ecological or cultural features in the vicinity that would be significantly affected by the proposed development.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects. Potential impacts from surface water run-off on groundwater if not properly controlled. Area is less than 1% of the EIA threshold such that no significant environmental impacts are anticipated.

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)