



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-322536-25

Development	Refurbishment and extension of the public house and accommodation with all associated works and connections to ancillary services, partial demolition of the existing building.
Location	Main Street, Oughterard, Co. Galway
Planning Authority	Galway County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460723
Applicant(s)	Platinum Edge Investments Ltd
Type of Application	Planning Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission with conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Jacqui and Mark Duncan Pat McGrath
Observer(s)	Mark Duncan
Date of Site Inspection	25 th July 2025
Inspector	Sarah O'Mahony

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Further Information	5
3.2. Decision	7
3.3. Planning Authority Reports	8
3.4. Prescribed Bodies	8
3.5. Third Party Observations	9
4.0 Planning History.....	10
5.0 Policy Context.....	11
5.1. Development Plan.....	11
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	12
5.3. Built Heritage	12
5.4. Section 28 Guidelines: Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines.....	13
5.5. EIA Screening	13
6.0 The Appeal	13
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	13
6.2. Applicant Response	15
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	17
6.4. Observations.....	17
6.5. Further Responses	17
7.0 Assessment.....	19
7.1. Introduction	19

7.2.	End Use	19
7.3.	Scale, Height and Massing	20
7.4.	Overshadowing	22
7.5.	Car parking	25
7.6.	Other Matters	27
8.0	AA Screening.....	30
8.1.	Screening.....	30
8.2.	Conclusion	31
9.0	WFD Screening	31
9.1.	Screening.....	31
9.2.	Conclusion	32
10.0	Recommendation	32
11.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	32
12.0	Conditions	32
Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination		41
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening		

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.049ha site is situated in the centre of Oughterard, immediately southwest of the junction between the N59 and Camp Street. It comprises a terraced three storey building situated on the south side of the N59/main street.
- 1.2. The three storey building comprises a public house on the ground floor with accommodation above however it has the appearance of being vacant with a number of years. Photographs submitted with the application indicate the interior is in poor condition with render removed from walls and ceilings.
- 1.3. The site is an elongated rectangular shape which extends to the rear at the southeast with access from a shared laneway at the rear referred to as Porter Lane. The building extends deep into the site with a single storey and two storey projection to the rear. The rear boundary to the laneway comprises temporary heras type fencing while party boundaries comprise tall stone rubble walls.
- 1.4. Adjoining and neighbouring properties are in commercial use on the ground floor while upper floor uses are unknown. They comprise similar two and three storey structures with multiple different forms of extensions to the rear.
- 1.5. The site is situated within Oughterard Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) and the adjacent building to the east comprises a protected structure (RPS 665).

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for development which comprises the following:
 - Refurbishment and extension of ground floor pub with alterations to existing shopfront.
 - Demolish 280.1m² of existing rear ground and first floor extension.
 - Construct new three storey extension to the rear providing 299m² additional floor space. The revised structure would have a total floorspace of 702.1m².
 - Remove roof of existing three storey building and replace with new roof including 2no. new dormer windows on the front elevation.

- Provision of 19no. bedrooms on the first and second floors for short-term letting as well as kitchen/dining/recreational hall on the ground floor.
- Connection to public water and wastewater services.
- Provision of bicycle parking and bin store with pedestrian access from the shared laneway at the rear.

2.2. No additional documentation such as a Planning Statement, Design Report or Infrastructure Report etc was submitted with the application.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Further Information

3.1.1. 6no. points of further information were sought from the applicant as follows:

1. Clarification regarding tenure of the 19 no. bedrooms as well as justification for same having regard to the site's zoning.
2. Liaison with the Transportation Department regarding parking implications associated with the proposed end use for the bedrooms as well as a Construction Management Plan.
3. An Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment demonstrating justification for the proposed demolition.
4. Daylight and Shadow Projection Study addressing concerns regarding height and scale of the development. If the study demonstrates impacts on the amenities of adjoining properties, the applicant was requested to consider truncating the scale of the extension.
5. A Structural Report relating to the proposed demolition works to enable an assessment of impacts to adjoining properties from a structural integrity perspective.
6. Written correspondence from Uisce Éireann confirming that both the wastewater and water mains serving the site can meet the additional demand.

3.1.2. The response included the following:

- The 19no. bedrooms are proposed for short-term letting, specifically as guest house accommodation with a communal kitchen, dining and recreational area, laundry services and bicycle parking. The response outlines how this land use is acceptable on the town centre zoned lands and associated zoning matrix.
- A calculation of car parking requirements is set out for both the existing and proposed developments which demonstrates a requirement for an additional 2no. spaces only. The response states that the layout and location of the site means it is not possible to provide parking on site however the applicant is willing to pay a financial contribution in lieu of this shortfall. It states that the applicant foresees future guests and patrons utilising public and on-street car parking as per the current arrangements for the existing building. A Construction Management Plan is provided together with a letter of consent from an adjoining landowner permitting construction stage car parking and a compound within their property.
- An Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment makes recommendations and outlines mitigation such as requiring streetside rainwater goods to be cast iron, that a construction method is agreed where the existing front and side walls of the original three storey building at the front of the site are retained. Demolition works should be phased to allow periodic inspections and checks for hidden significant elements and a demolition strategy should be prepared and approved by an accredited surveyor to ensure the adjoining protected structure is not affected. It also outlined that the building likely dates from the second half of the 19th century but has been significantly altered with the likely only original features now comprising the front and side masonry walls. It rated the building as having low significance. Lastly, it considers the proposed works will have a positive impact on the ACA and adjoining protected structure by bringing the building back into use and ensuring appropriate materials are used such as a hardwood shopfront and sliding sash windows in lieu of the current PVC windows.
- A letter prepared by Paul Feeney Consulting Engineers outlining an opinion in response to item no. 3 that the roof, walls, intermediate floors, and foundations of the rear extension to be demolished are relatively modern in construction but are structurally weak and unable to bear the loads required for the proposed design and purpose. Moreover, this section of the building holds no significant architectural or

archaeological value and that demolition is the most practical and cost-effective solution.

- The above letter also responded to item no. 5 and set out an opinion on the structural integrity of the building. It considered the existing structure to be older than its adjacent two storey counterparts with party walls forming an integral part of the building. In this regard the front and party walls of the three storey part/older part of the building facing the street will remain intact which, it is stated, is crucial for preserving the building's integrity. It concludes that the proposed works are not likely to introduce new permanent loads to these walls but that planning, monitoring and site preparation are crucial to preserve the building's integrity.
- The Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study concluded that minimal overshadowing is likely to occur to some neighbouring premises during short periods only. An assessment of sunlight demonstrated that all amenity spaces and windows to existing buildings met the BRE Guideline recommendations and that a daylight assessment also met the BRE Guideline recommendations for all 18no. points tested. The report states that it did not assess sunlight or daylight impacts for the property immediately east of the site as it does not have windows facing the proposed development.
- A Confirmation of Feasibility letter was submitted from Uisce Éireann noting that connections to the water and wastewater networks are feasible without any requirement for infrastructure upgrades by Uisce Éireann.

3.2. Decision

- 3.2.1. A notification to grant permission was issued by Galway County Council on 30th April 2025 subject to 9no. standard conditions. Condition no. 2 is set out as follows:

'2. The accommodation aspect of the development hereby permitted shall be utilised for tourism purposes only, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.'

Reason: In the interest of clarity.'

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Reports

- There are two case planners reports, one recommending further information and the latter assessing it.
- The Planners report recommendation to grant permission is consistent with the notification of decision which issued.
- Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) issues are screened out and issues were screened out.
- Following receipt of the further information response, the report considered the proposed short term let bedrooms are in compliance with the land use zoning and matrix of uses as set out in the County Development Plan.
- The proposed financial contribution in lieu of the shortfall of 2no. car parking spaces is stated to meet the satisfaction of the Roads and Transportation Unit as well as the Area Engineer. The report later states however that a financial contribution will be attached in respect of the additional floor space proposed but not for the shortfall of spaces, in compliance with the Development Contribution Scheme.

3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

- None

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

- Transport Infrastructure Ireland: Observation submitted requesting the Local Authority to have regard to TII policy and codes of engineering including that for development affecting national roads and for works on, near or adjacent the Luas light rail system.

The application was also referred to the following who did not comment:

- Fáilte Ireland
- Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage
- The Heritage Council

- Uisce Éireann
- An Taisce

3.5. Third Party Observations

3.5.1. 5no. submissions were received from the following third parties:

1. Marc Duncan and Jacqui Duncan, owners of the adjacent Hallorans Restaurant to the east.
2. Pat McGrath, owner of the adjacent Oughterard Bookshop and Café to the west.
3. Karl Nurse
4. Brian Ferguson
5. Norah Heath

3.5.2. The submissions broadly support redevelopment of the vacant building but also raise the following concerns:

- Inaccurate public notices which did not reflect the scale or nature of proposed development. Lack of clarity regarding accommodation end uses. Lack of clarity regarding applicants name and legal interest. No site notice erected on Porter Lane. Incomplete and inaccurate application form. Lack of clarity regarding Part V commitments /requirements.
- Overdevelopment of the site in terms of scale, height and footprint. Out of character with existing developments. No co-ordinated space consideration.
- Impact from height and scale of extension to adjacent solar arrays at adjacent property to the west.
- No need for the development as there is sufficient tourism accommodation available in existing closed facilities.
- No car parking provided or available for construction and operational phases.
- Porter Lane is unsuitable for construction or operational access. It must remain clear for deliveries and rubbish collection as well as public access to the adjacent commercial premises.

- Amenity concerns for residential and commercial properties regarding overshadowing, noise, overlooking, privacy and light pollution.
- Concern regarding surface water management and lack of detail for location of gutters etc.
- Security concern from proximity of backland accommodation to local businesses and dwellings.
- Impact on capacity and availability of water and wastewater resources and associated impacts to Lough Corrib SAC.
- No consultation with surrounding landowners or pre-planning consultation with the Local Authority.
- Structural impact to adjacent buildings from demolition and construction.
- Architectural heritage impact.
- Emergency escape routes should be identified.

3.5.3. One submission did not raise any concerns but only outlined support for the development for the following reasons:

- Addresses visual impact of existing poor condition building.
- Supports tourism, generating jobs and the economy.
- Oughterard has lost the majority of its hotel rooms over the last decade.
- The development could serve as a catalyst for regeneration.

4.0 Planning History

95/292 – Planning permission granted for change of use from restaurant to restaurant and public house.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 (referred to hereafter as the CDP). Volume 2 of the Plan sets out settlement plans for smaller settlements including Oughterard in Section 8.1.

5.1.2. The site is zoned C1 Town Centre which has the following zoning objective as set out in section 4.4:

“To provide for the development and improvement of appropriate town centre uses including retail, commercial, office and civic/community uses and to provide for “Living over the Shop” scheme Residential accommodation, or other ancillary residential accommodation.”

5.1.3. The accompanying description is as follows:

“To develop and consolidate the existing town centre to improve its vibrancy and vitality with the densification of appropriate commercial and residential developments ensuring a mix of commercial, recreation and civic uses.”

5.1.4. The land use zoning matrix set out in Section 4.5 indicates that a bar/restaurant, guesthouse, hotel and hostel are all permissible in principle while short-term holiday accommodation uses are open for consideration on C1 zoned lands.

5.1.5. The following policy objectives are particularly noted:

- OSGT 1 – Sustainable Town Centre: Promote the development of Oughterard, as an intensive, high quality, well landscaped, human-scaled and accessible environment, with an appropriate mix of uses, including residential, commercial, service, tourism, enterprise, public and community uses as appropriate, that provide a range of retail services, facilities and amenities to the local community and visitors. The town centre and associated main street shall remain the primary focus for retail and service activity within these plan areas.
- OSGT 6 – Tourism Development:

- a) Promote and facilitate the further development of Oughterard as a key tourist destination for the benefit of the town and its surrounding areas.
- b) To support and facilitate in co-operation with relevant bodies and landowners, the provision of tourism amenity routes around the town.
- c) Encourage and assist the development of the sustainable tourism potential within Oughterard in a manner that respects, builds on, protects and enhances the cultural, built, architectural, archaeological and heritage significance of the town including natural heritage and biodiversity, and its local amenities in particular with the local fishing tourism market which is unique for Oughterard.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The site is situated 140m southeast of Lough Corrib Special Area of Conservation and 880m southwest of Lough Corrib Special Protection Area. Oughterard National School proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA) is situated 530m west of the site while Lough Corrib pNHA is situated 830m northeast of the site.

5.3. Built Heritage

- 5.3.1. The site is situated within Oughterard Architectural Conservation Area. Appendix 7 of the CDP outlines a brief appraisal and statement of significance for each ACA and therein it states that Oughterard retains buildings of architectural significance such as administrative and religious structures and that the towns special significance lies in its:

“development in response to the early presence of a landlord’s house, Claremount, on the west of the river, and the efforts during the early 19th century to open up Connemara, by the development of the road to Clifden, the bridge spanning the river, and the presence of the army barracks. The street pattern and architectural variety of buildings, both designed and vernacular, creates a streetscape which reflects its history.”

- 5.3.2. The adjacent building to the east of the site is a designated protected structure, RPS 665 applies. The Galway County Council Record of Protected Structures is provided

in appendix 6 to the CPD and it states the following regarding the protected structure in question:

“Terraced 3 bay 2 storey mid Victorian house with steeped roof rendered facade. Simple shopfront with pilasters and brackets in 1930's style. Street frontage.

Regional Rating - On account of the general proportions and roof pitch probably one of the earlier buildings in the town. It is also an important element of the streetscape.”

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

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

5.5. EIA Screening

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

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. 2no. third party appeals were received from Pat McGrath and Jacqui and Mark Duncan. The following matters were raised in the appeals:

- The extension is out of scale with surrounding developments. It has an inappropriate bulk and mass.
- Overlooking and overshadowing impacts to neighbouring properties.
- Overshadowing impact on solar array in adjoining commercial premises to the west. The Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study submitted with the further information response did not refer to the solar panels. An opinion was submitted with the appeal from the manufacturer/supplier of the solar microgeneration system which considers the development will have a significant impact on output requiring further financial investment to optimise electricity generation during the morning peak to serve the café.
- The Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study submitted with the further information response states there are no windows facing the development on the adjacent building to the east however there are 3no. windows and 1no. half glass fire door. The study and Planning Authority's assessments are flawed. These windows and the garden of the adjoining property to the east will be negatively impacted from an unreasonable loss of light during the winter months. This would set a negative precedent.
- Lack of car parking and non-compliance with car parking standards will put pressure on existing limited and on-demand public parking, leading to congestion, illegal and overflow parking potentially impeding emergency access. The existing situation has been mis-stated as the existing 9no. bedrooms were for private use and not public/tourism use. The bar floorspace has also been miscalculated as it does not include the beer garden. No supporting information was submitted from the Transportation Department or Area Engineer to evidence the alleged liaison which promotes mistrust and a lack of transparency with the Planning Authority. The lack of car parking would set a precedent.
- The layout fails to provide adequate private open space for future occupants of the site. 'General guidelines' require a minimum of 10m² open space for each bed space in a hostel and therefore 190m² is required in this case which is not proposed. Similarly, Apartment Guidelines require 4m² of private open space for studio units. The proposed units have internal amenity only and are therefore poorly located

resulting in substandard living conditions which is contrary to national policy and would set an undesirable precedent.

- Lack of clarity regarding proposed end-use for the bedrooms. The Case Planners assessment does not adequately clarify the use and the condition no. 2 which limits the use for tourism purposes is too loose. The applicant's further information response refers to terms such as guest house accommodation and tourism and visitor accommodation all of which have been used or temporary accommodation for refugee applicants and similar uses.
- The applicant failed to inspect the interior of the adjacent building to the east to inform demolition plans. No permission is given for demolition of any party walls including external/garden walls. This has not been considered by the applicant or Local Authority.
- Request made to refuse permission due to a lack of car parking, lack of open space and 'negative impact this development will have on the local area'.

6.2. Applicant Response

- A calculation is provided for the existing and proposed uses which again concludes that 2no. additional spaces are required. The response names 2no. Galway County Council employees stated to represent the Roads Department and Area Office who confirmed satisfaction with the proposed approach of applying a financial contribution in lieu of the shortfall of 2no. spaces and to apply the same approach of utilising public spaces as has historically occurred on the site. A letter of consent was also submitted with the further information response outlining consent to utilise adjacent property to the south of Porter Lane for construction stage parking.
- The response outlines a list of site contextual information justifying the car parking proposal including the village centre location of the site, availability of public transport routes and availability of public car parks in walking distance to the site. It also highlights the established development pattern with multiple hospitality and commercial premises operating without dedicated car parks as well as national policy directions to reduce car dependency and create compact settlements. It concludes this matter by stating that the provision of car parking would compromise development viability as well as negatively impacting the streetscape of the ACA.

- An updated Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study response was submitted which assessed the visible sky component of 2no. of the appellants submitted windows of concerns in the adjoining property to the east. It omitted an assessment of a third window as it serves circulation space and also a fire door with a window insert as it is situated under a large canopy 'and therefore it is not expected to be required for daylight purposes'. The updated assessment outlined the existing substandard VSC at both windows and identified that one would still retain 80% of the existing VSC and therefore passed the BRE test however the latter failed. It goes on to note that the room served by that window is also served by skylights and considers these provide the main source of daylight to the room and therefore the development would result in a minor adverse impact.
- With regard to the solar array, the response states that there was no planning history available to indicate its proposed erection on the adjacent site at the time of carrying out the study but that the landowner of that property was aware of the proposed development and chose to proceed with their installation. The updated study concluded no overshadowing is likely to occur to the southern array as a result of the proposed development however full overshadowing will occur to the northern array during the morning hours of the winter months. The report does not categorise this impact. It also submits that additional environmental considerations also have an impact such as the large trees situated to the south of the panels which have not been considered by the appellant and their technical report.
- Concerns regarding the provision of private open space are based on long-term residential use which are not applicable in the context of the proposed guesthouse/hostel.
- The proposed use is strictly for tourism and visitor accommodation as set out in the further information response and restricted by condition no. 2. The response states that the appellant's speculation regarding refugee accommodation is unfounded and unsupported by the permission granted.
- The proposed development has been designed to avoid impacts and reliance to party walls. All construction will be independent of shared structures and no elements including foundations and structural walls will encroach on neighbouring property. Appropriate protection will be implemented during construction to ensure

the structural integrity of adjoining buildings is maintained. The design approach protects adjoining property, access, privacy and amenity.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- None

6.4. Observations

- 6.4.1. One observation is made by Marc Duncan, which is stated to comprise a supplementary submission to their earlier appeal. It raises one matter only that the public statutory notices were deficient in their description of the scale and nature of the proposed development.

6.5. Further Responses

- 6.5.1. Both appellants submitted a further response raising the following matters:
- Incorrect to state there is public car parking available. The original bar did not have a guesthouse and therefore the calculation of parking spaces is incorrect.
 - Alleged discussions with members of Galway County Council's Transport Department are irrelevant as no evidence is provided to substantiate same.
 - National policy to reduce car dependency is welcome however Oughterard's rural character is reliant on tourists travelling by car.
 - Concerns raised regarding the end use and that an appropriate rate of car parking is provided.
 - Lack of consultation with adjoining property owners.
 - The proposed three storey extension will have a significant impact on solar energy production at Christmas holiday and winter times. The applicant's references to trees at the south are irrelevant as the trees are deciduous with no leaves during the impacted months. The applicant's submission stating that the adjoining landowner to the west was aware of the proposed development and therefore could have amended the solar design is incorrect.

- The principle of the development is welcome but not the scale of the proposed extension which should be reduced to two stories with a flat roof and car parking should be provided.
- The applicant's response states information regarding the location of windows in the adjacent property to the east was not available however the windows are in place over 50 years. Existing windows should not be excluded from assessment based on the use of the rooms they serve as future internal changes may occur to floor layouts. The appellant does not accept the conclusions made in the revised Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study as it is alleged there is a lack of supporting evidence.
- With regard to the need for open space, the third party appellant suggests that any development of this nature should provide private open space for use by its guests.
- Lack of certainty over the number of bedspaces proposed and the applicant's response has not adequately addressed the question of proposed use. Condition no. 2 is insufficient to regulate the use which may be utilised for temporary accommodation for refugee applicants and similar uses.
- The statutory public notices did not specify the number of bedrooms proposed and therefore the application should be invalidated.
- The further information response regarding structural stability and demolition proposals does not explicitly state that all party walls will be retained. The appellant to the east is concerned that party walls will be removed causing implications for their property. Specific references made to a flat roof and 2no. lean-to roofs which are reliant on and tied into the party wall. Additional concerns that new foundations will impact the party wall. Suggestions to address these concerns at a later date post-planning do not address the appellant's concerns given the applicant's ignorance of windows on the adjoining property. No permission is given to demolish party walls.
- Request made again to refuse permission based on lack of car parking, lack of open space, negative impact on the area and structural and overshadowing/daylight impacts.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

- 7.1.1. The site is situated on town centre zoned lands which permit bar/restaurant, guesthouse, hotel and hostel uses. I note that short term holiday accommodation is stated to be open for consideration on such lands and in the context of this being classified separately on the zoning matrix to guesthouse, hotel and hostel uses I consider it refers to holiday home type accommodation and does not comprise any of the former three types of tourist accommodation. The application refers to the proposed accommodation as a hostel on the application drawings and as a guesthouse in the further information response, both of which comply with the zoning objective. I therefore consider the principle of development to be acceptable.
- 7.1.2. Therefore, having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report/s of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows
- End use
 - Scale, height and massing
 - Overshadowing
 - Car parking
 - Other matters

7.2. End Use

- 7.2.1. As part of the further information request the Planning Authority sought clarification as to the type of accommodation proposed. The applicant's response is an intention to operate the rooms as 'short-term let accommodation, specifically as guest house accommodation'. This is expanded in the applicant's response to the appeal where they state that speculation as to other accommodation such as to house refugees is unfounded.

- 7.2.2. The application seeks permission for tourism accommodation only and with no evidence submitted to the contrary or any permission seeking any other type of accommodation, I accept that this is the proposed use and should be conditioned accordingly. Any subsequent proposal to change the use should be assessed on its own merits in accordance with the relevant legislation at that time.
- 7.2.3. The third-party appellant considers condition no. 2 is insufficient to regulate and limit the use of the accommodation to prevent refugee accommodation. Condition no. 2 is set out above and limits the use '*for tourism purposes only*'. I propose an alternative as follows:

The accommodation aspect of the development hereby permitted shall be utilised for tourism purposes only for the purpose of providing short-term overnight paying guest accommodation.

7.3. **Scale, Height and Massing**

- 7.3.1. Both appellants consider the scale of the three storey extension to the rear is inappropriate, represents a large bulky mass and is out of character with surrounding developments.
- 7.3.2. The existing extension to the rear comprises a two-storey pitched and hipped roof portion situated along the eastern boundary of the site with a flat roof single storey portion adjacent the western boundary and further south providing a total of 280.1m² of floorspace. The existing ridge height ranges from a high point of 23.6m on the older building at the street to 21.7m at the two-storey extension to the rear and 16.8m on the single storey flat roof.
- 7.3.3. It is proposed to construct a revised extension with three floors across three connected blocks which will encompass most of the site with a site coverage rate of 0.51 and a plot ratio of 1:1.41. The extension will maintain a minor setback and separation from the existing boundary walls to the rear of the older building. 702.1m² of floorspace will be provided which includes the split-level bin and bike storage building at the southern end of the site facing onto Porter Lane.
- 7.3.4. The older building at the streetscape will retain the same profile of pitched roof with a ridge level of 23.63m. The first block immediately to the rear will comprise a hipped roof tying into and matching the ridge level to the front. The middle wing will

comprise a lower flat roof with a finished level of 22.6m and situated along the east of the site. A private courtyard will be provided to the west enclosed by the three blocks and the western boundary. The third block at the south will comprise a hipped roof with a ridge level of 24.8m.

- 7.3.5. In this regard, the third block will be visible from the streetscape, protruding above the streetscape by 1-1.2m despite the internal finished floor level being consistent throughout the entire building. The existing streetscape has a varied mix of terraced structures with a mix of single and three storey buildings all with different profile pitched roofs. The height of the existing building means the third block is not likely to be visible directly in front of the pub however its side profile would be much more visible from the northeast at the junction of the Clifden Road and Camp Street above the roof of the adjacent protected structure.
- 7.3.6. Matters regarding amenity as a result of the scale of the development are discussed later. However, when assessing the sole matter of scale, height and massing of the proposed works, I consider the first and second blocks (those situated closer to the original building) to be acceptable in scale and do not consider them to be out of character with existing surrounding development.
- 7.3.7. The rear of the streetscape when currently viewed from Porter Lane comprises a wide range of extensions and alterations which provide a range of reference points for architecture and heights etc. Flat, pitched and hipped roof extensions are present, some of which are taller than the current rear extension on the site while others comprise a single storey with much larger floorspaces encompassing most of their respective plot as far as Porter Lane. In this context, and together with an emphasis on national planning policy to create more dense and compact settlements, I consider the principle of constructing a three-storey extension is acceptable in this location. While the extension would comprise the tallest building facing Porter Lane, I do not consider it would be out of character or create a visual impact. In my opinion the works would create an urban edge and potentially act as a catalyst to regenerate Porter Lane, creating efficiencies in land use and maximising the context of the site which has combination of town centre lands with good quality vehicular access to the rear.

- 7.3.8. I do however have concerns regarding the design of the southernmost third block. I consider its visibility above the streetscape to the north would not be visually pleasing within the Architectural Conservation Area and would represent a disjointed pattern of development. I recommend a lower roof profile should be provided on the third southernmost block in order to ensure the streetscape is not further interrupted. The drawings do not demonstrate why a taller building is required in this location to accommodate the same internal head height and finished floor levels as the other two blocks. This would also help to reduce the bulk of the building and enable it to assimilate better to the lane.
- 7.3.9. I am also of the opinion that an alternative southern elevation should be submitted and agreed with the planning authority. This extension represents the first significant development addressing Porter Lane and in my opinion the rear elevation as currently proposed represents poor quality architecture which has no sense of place. High quality finishes and revised fenestration should be provided on the rear elevation to reflect the public face of the rear elevation which is situated within an ACA, regardless of its backland location. Lower order materials such as uPVC are not appropriate in this location in my view.
- 7.3.10. I therefore recommend that in the event of a grant of planning permission, a condition is attached requiring the southern block to be redesigned. It should include a lower roof level no higher than the ridge level of the original building on the street, and a revised southern elevation with high quality materials and finishes and a more contemporary approach to fenestration creating a strong urban edge and sense of place which reflects the character of the ACA.

7.4. Overshadowing

- 7.4.1. This section of the report makes references to the 'BRE Guidelines'. The non-statutory BRE Guidelines titled 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice' advise on site layout planning to achieve good sun lighting and daylighting, both within buildings and in the open spaces between them. It contains guidance on site layout to provide good natural lighting within a new development; safeguarding of daylight and sunlight within existing buildings nearby; and the protection of daylighting of adjoining land for future development. The

appendices contain methods to quantify access to sunlight and daylight within a layout however it also states that *‘Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly since natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design’* and that the calculation methods are *‘entirely flexible’*.

Impact to Solar Array to West

- 7.4.2. The applicant and appellant both submitted an analysis, prepared by their respective experts, of the extent of overshadowing which would occur to the solar arrays to the west. It is clear from this evidence that the proposed extension would have a negligible to minor impact on the array to the south due to its location further south and west of the southern elevation of the third block.
- 7.4.3. The layout and location of the northern array however is such that it is likely to be further impacted by the extension. The appellants assessment suggests that after optimisers are fitted there would still be a loss of 17-30% electricity generation from this array during the morning period in the winter months. The applicant’s report similarly suggests that the proposed development would result in additional full overshadowing during the morning period of the winter months as well as some partial overshadowing during the morning period of summer months.
- 7.4.4. The applicant submits that it is those winter mornings when the premises would experience the highest demand for electricity due to its operation as a café (and bookshop) however I note the solar systems provider’s report refers to night time storage heating as consuming more energy. That report estimates a total annual loss of approximately 1148kWh/year which, when compared to the provided estimates of energy generated already on the site, equates to a loss of approximately 13% when optimisers are fitted or 19% without optimisers.
- 7.4.5. I consider the impact of the total loss of electricity generation potential is classified as minor to moderate negative due to a number of factors as follows:
- the lack of any meaningful impact to the southern array,
 - the likely loss of generation to the northern array and likely total loss of generation,
 - the limited time period when that generation loss would occur and

- the likely lower rate of generation loss as a result of the recommendation to lower the roof profile of the third/southern block which would result in less overshadowing.

7.4.6. When regard is had to this impact together with the town centre location of the site and national planning policy emphasis on efficient land use and compact settlements, I consider the scale of the proposed extension is acceptable.

Impact to Windows to the East

7.4.7. The applicant carried out a revised daylight assessment to address concerns raised by the appellant on impacts to openings on the property to the east. The revised assessment omitted two of these openings serving circulation space and a fire door with a large canopy overhead. This is in accordance with the BRE Guidelines and I agree with this approach.

7.4.8. The remaining two windows were assessed for visible sky component (VSC) and it is noted that neither meet the current recommended BRE guideline values for VSC. The modelling identified that if the development were implemented as proposed, then one window would still retain 81% of VSC as currently experienced and therefore meets the guidelines. The last window would meet 56% of its current VSC which fails to meet the BRE recommendations however the applicant's report highlights how the relevant internal space is lit primarily by rooflights and therefore the overall impact to light levels is classified as a minor adverse impact.

7.4.9. The appellant's submit that they do not accept this conclusion and that allowances should be made for potential future development of the site. I disagree and accept the conclusions drawn in the applicant's report, especially when the impacts overall are minor and not significant.

7.4.10. The appellants also suggest the development would negatively impact a garden. Having inspected the site I did not note any landscaped garden space and note that the adjoining open space is finished with concrete much like the subject site. That space faces south/southeast and therefore experiences high levels of direct sunshine and daylight. The applicant's Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study submitted with the further information response carried out a detailed assessment on the amenity space associated with the property to the west but not the east. It concluded that the results of an assessment of impacts to the eastern amenity comply with the BRE recommendations.

- 7.4.11. I have had regard to the orientation and layout of the proposed development and adjacent amenity space to the east, as well as the shadow and 3D block models produced in the report. In my opinion it is highly likely that the amenity space to the east would retain high levels of sunshine, daylight and amenity and would not be significantly impacted by the proposed development.
- 7.4.12. Further, any adverse impact is, in my opinion, acceptable given the town centre location of the site and benefits and sustainability of creating a compact settlement.

7.5. Car parking

- 7.5.1. No car parking is proposed within the site for the proposed development. The applicant has set out calculations of the rate of car parking required, assessing the existing development against the proposed development and concludes there would be a shortfall of 2no. spaces. The applicant submits that the existing development also has no on-site parking and only utilises public spaces, therefore the same should apply for the proposed development. The applicant suggested a financial contribution for the shortfall.
- 7.5.2. The Planning Authority accepted this stance but did not apply the financial contribution as the Galway County Council Development Contribution Scheme 2016, as extended in 2019, states in Part 3 that such charges will only be applied in areas subject to a Local Area Plan. It specifically states that charges for car parking will not apply in other villages and areas. Oughterard is designated as a small town but does not have a Local Area Plan and therefore the charge does not apply.
- 7.5.3. The appellants make the argument that on-site car parking is required for a range of reasons including pressure on public parking and overflow onto Porter Lane impeding access. Further, it is contended that the calculations are misleading as the previous use and layout did not provide for 9no. short term letting/tourism use bedrooms as submitted and that the proposed bar floorspace does not include the beer garden space. The beer garden comprises 23m² which equates to 2no. parking spaces under the car parking standards outlined in Chapter 15 of the CDP.
- 7.5.4. No evidence has been provided in any of the application documents to demonstrate if the previous use of the upper floors was standard residential or commercial in nature.

- 7.5.5. I have had regard to the list of similar accommodation premises in Oughterard which are provided in the third-party submissions which are stated to be closed. These include the Boat Inn which is situated in the town centre and visible from the site to the northeast. This premises provided overnight accommodation and does not appear to benefit from its own car parking. The Connemara Lake Hotel is an operational hotel situated directly opposite the site and also does not benefit from any on-site parking.
- 7.5.6. I am also of the opinion that if public car parking spaces are occupied by tourists and guests of the proposed development, during the peak daytime demand period of business hours, then those tourists are likely contributing to the local economy of Oughterard by spending time in the town eating and shopping. In this context I do not consider that the principle public spaces being occupied by tourist/guests would impact the area.
- 7.5.7. Having regard to the availability of spaces and concerns regarding congestion and impeding access etc, I also have had consideration to the likely time when spaces would be required by guests which in my opinion is overnight and outside of peak daytime demands. This opinion is based on a consideration that if tourists are arriving to Oughterard in a private car then they are likely to be touring the general Connemara area during daylight hours visiting the wider tourist attractions and spending their evenings in the town. This is also the case for any guests who may be staying in the accommodation in order to attend a function in the pub or nearby restaurants and hotels. The very nature of requiring car parking spaces to serve bed spaces in my opinion leads to demand for spaces during off-peak hours.
- 7.5.8. I visited the town and inspected public car parks on a weekday during the peak holiday season and did not note any shortfall of car parking for the area or existing proliferation of overflow and illegal parking. I also note the Planning Authority's assessment did not raise any concerns with the proposal.
- 7.5.9. Having regard to the scale of the proposal, its town centre location and the nature of any proposed car parking demand associated with the development, I consider there is sufficient public parking available in the town to cater to the demand. I also am of the opinion that it is unlikely that traffic flows and car parking generated from the proposed development is likely to impact the safe operation and accessibility of

Oughterard due to the limited scale of the parking demand generated by the development.

- 7.5.10. Lastly, I note the appellant raises a concern regarding statements of alleged consultation with representatives from Galway County Council's Transportation Department and local Area Office Engineer. The appeal suggests that no evidence is submitted to support the applicant's claim that these offices accepted the proposed car parking regime. I agree that no evidence has been supported, however ultimately the Case Planner's report discusses the topic of car parking and does not raise any further concerns in the matter.

7.6. Other Matters

- 7.6.1. Concerns are raised regarding potential demolition of party walls and the structural integrity of the adjoining building to the east. I have reviewed the layout and floor plan drawing nos. 3100, 3101, 3102 and 3003 as well as proposed demolition drawing no. 3002. I note that the proposed development seeks to retain the existing party wall between the site and eastern property. The wall is visible with the same 'top of wall' levels illustrated on both the existing and proposed layouts as well as annotations stating that the wall is to be retained and supplemented where necessary. The proposed new extension is illustrated as an independent construction with a clear separation from the party walls. This proposal is, in my view, best demonstrated on the ground floor drawing no. 3100 where the orange dashed line on the existing layout drawing, which refers to proposed demolition, excludes the party wall. Retention of the party wall to the east is also legible on the demolition drawing and therefore consider it is unambiguous that the existing party walls will be retained on site.
- 7.6.2. I also have had regard to condition no. 4 as set out by the planning authority which requires the preparation of a method statement certified by a suitably qualified structural engineer and implemented in accordance with continual monitoring and surveying of the works. I consider this is an appropriate condition which will protect the integrity of those remaining walls, but recommend a slight alteration to include the words 'construction and demolition method statement' to clarify the extent of works which require that additional attention.

- 7.6.3. The appeals raise a concern regarding overlooking to adjoining properties however I note from the elevation drawings that no windows are proposed above ground floor level on the eastern elevation while windows on the western elevation are proposed to be finished with obscure glazing. I consider this is acceptable from an internal amenity perspective as those windows serve circulation space and the stairwell only. Some minor overlooking to the west may be afforded from 4no. proposed bedrooms where 2no. each have windows facing south and north respectively on the first and second floors. The views from the rooms at the south facing north would be primarily over a roof space of the adjoining property. Some intervisibility may be achieved to a second floor window in the next building further west again however the oblique angle of the views and the 17m separation distance means, in my opinion, that the impact of any overlooking would be minor.
- 7.6.4. I note that a separation distance of 22m is referenced in the CDP for windows above first floor however SPPR 1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines which was published post adoption of the CDP requires a minimum separation distance of 16m between opposing first floor windows to habitable rooms for residential developments. I therefore consider that the separation and degree of overlooking is acceptable and would not significantly impact the amenity of an adjoining premises.
- 7.6.5. Views from bedrooms at the north with south facing windows would also be over the roof and solar arrays of the adjoining premise while also some limited views of their amenity space to the rear. Again, however having regard to the angle of the window I consider it unlikely that any significant impact would occur to the amenity of that open space and would be very similar to the degree of overlooking currently afforded from the existing rear extension.
- 7.6.6. With regard to the provision of private or communal open space on the site, one appeal suggests permission should be refused due to the lack of same 'as required in the Galway County Development Plan'. I have reviewed Chapter 15 of the CDP and did not note any such requirement for the type of guesthouse accommodation proposed. DM standard 45 refers to self-catering developments and requires communal open space however there is no suggestion in the application documents that the proposed development would comprise self-catering which, in my view, constitutes an entire unit rather than own door bedrooms with a shared

kitchen/dining/recreational area as proposed. I therefore consider the lack of open space is acceptable.

- 7.6.7. References are made to a precedent being set such as the lack of car parking and lack of private open space. As outlined above in the first instance I do not consider that any negative impact is likely to occur from the matters suggested which may set an unwelcome precedent. Secondly, every planning application is judged on its own merits against the legislation and guidance in place at the time of making the assessment and therefore I do not consider it likely that a precedent would be set.
- 7.6.8. The appeals and observation suggest that the application should be invalidated as the development description inaccurately described the nature and extent of the proposed development. I note this matter was also raised in submissions to the Local Authority and the matter was considered acceptable. I am satisfied that the description as advertised did not prevent the concerned parties from making representations.
- 7.6.9. The appeals submit that consultation did not occur with adjoining landowners and that permission is not given for access to adjacent property. I note that statutory consultation did occur in accordance with the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) which alerted the parties concerned to the making of the application. Any additional non-statutory consultation is outside the scope of this appeal. I also consider that any matters regarding access to adjoining land is a civil matter and not a planning matter.
- 7.6.10. Lastly, I note from the site inspection that there are mature deciduous trees situated on Porter Lane between it and the greenfield land to the south which is proposed to be utilised as a construction compound. I note a Construction Environmental Management Plan was submitted with the application but did not note any tree protection measures therein and I therefore recommend a condition is attached to include measures to protect the trees and their roots. I also note that the proposed construction hours as set out in that document are 0700 – 1900hrs Monday to Friday inclusive 0800 – 1400hrs on Saturday & no works on Sunday or Public Holidays. The Planning Authority attached condition no. 6 to the notification to grant permission which restricted the hours to 0800 hours and 1800 hours, Monday to Friday and between 0900 hours and 1600 hours on Saturday. Having regard to the proximity of

the site to other dwellings I recommend the hours are altered in accordance with the Planning Authority's recommendations.

8.0 AA Screening

8.1. Screening

- 8.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 8.1.2. The subject site is located 140m southeast of Lough Corrib Special Area of Conservation and 880m southwest of Lough Corrib Special Protection Area.
- 8.1.3. The proposed development seeks to refurbish and extend an existing pub building to include demolition of existing rear extension, construction of 3 storey rear extension providing additional 299m² gross floorspace. The development includes 19no. bedrooms and ancillary kitchen, dining and laundry facilities for tourism accommodation as well as a bin and bike store, alterations to the front façade and connections to public services.
- 8.1.4. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 8.1.5. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 8.1.6. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The infill/backland and urban nature of the proposed works on a serviced town centre site.
 - Existing and proposed connections to the public water, wastewater and surface water networks and confirmation of feasibility letter from Uisce Éireann.
 - Location and distance from nearest Lough Corrib SAC and SPA and the lack of ecological and hydrological connections.
 - Taking into account the screening report/determination by Galway County Council.

8.2. Conclusion

- 8.2.1. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 8.2.2. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 WFD Screening

9.1. Screening

- 9.1.1. The subject site is located 200m southeast of the Owenriff River which flows northeast into Lough Corrib 1km northeast of the site.
- 9.1.2. The proposed development seeks to refurbish and extend an existing pub building to include demolition of existing rear extension, construction of 3 storey rear extension providing additional 299m² gross floorspace. The development includes 19no. bedrooms and ancillary kitchen, dining and laundry facilities for tourism accommodation as well as a bin and bike store, alterations to the front façade and connections to public services.
- 9.1.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.1.4. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 9.1.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The urban and infill nature of the works on a moderate to small scale.

- The location of the site removed from any waterbodies and lack of any hydrological connectivity.
- Existing and proposed connections to the public water, wastewater and surface water networks and confirmation of feasibility letter from Uisce Éireann.

9.2. Conclusion

- 9.2.1. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

10.0 Recommendation

- 10.1.1. I recommend planning permission is granted in accordance with the condition set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 11.1.1. Having regard to the location and character of the site and surrounding area in an urban area together with the provisions of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 including the town centre zoned lands and Policy Objectives OSGT 1 and OSGT 6 which seek to promote mixed use and tourism development in Oughterard town centre, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the scale and nature of the development is acceptable and would not seriously injure residential or visual amenity of the area. The development is, therefore, in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 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 08th day of April 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 accommodation aspect of the development hereby permitted shall be utilised for tourism purposes only for the purpose of providing short-term overnight paying guest accommodation. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
3.	The proposed three storey southernmost block shall be amended as follows: (a)The roof shall be redesigned to be no higher than the ridge level of the pitched roof on the northernmost portion of the building facing Clifden Road. (b)The southern elevation facing Porter Lane shall be revised to provide a higher quality architectural response creating a sense of place which reflects the location of the site within an Architectural Conservation Area. This shall include revised fenestration, materials and finishes. Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.
4.	The signage, pilasters framing/plinths and fenestration details along street/front façade of the proposed development shall accord with the

	Shopfront Design Guide, Galway County Council document 2023, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority. Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.
5.	The mitigation measures as set out in Section 5 of the Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment Report, as received by the Planning Authority on the 8th April 2025, shall be adhered to as part of the proposed development. Reason: In the interest of clarity
6.	(a) Prior to the commencement of development a construction and demolition method statement shall be compiled and certified by a suitably qualified structural engineer and thereafter the development works shall be implemented in accordance with same. (b) Continual monitoring and surveying of the development works shall be conducted and documented by the aforementioned engineer and made available to the Planning Authority on request. REASON: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development.
7.	The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a revised Construction Environmental Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including: (a) Location of the site and materials compound(s) including area(s) identified for the storage of construction refuse; (b) Location of areas for construction site offices and staff facilities; (c) Details of site security fencing and hoardings; (d) Details of on-site car parking facilities for site workers during the course of construction; (e) Details of the timing and routing of construction traffic to and from the construction site and associated directional signage, to include proposals to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads to the site;

	(f) Measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network; (g) Measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network; (h) Alternative arrangements to be put in place for pedestrians and vehicles in the case of the closure of any public road or footpath during the course of site development works; (i) Details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels; (j) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater; (l) Off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste and details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil; (m) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains. (n) A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan shall be available for inspection by the planning authority; (o) Measures to protect the mature deciduous trees situated between Porter Lane and the proposed construction compound. (p) Revised construction hours as follows: Construction on site shall be limited to between 0800 hours and 1800 hours, Monday to Friday and between 0900 hours and 1600 hours on Saturday, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. No work shall take place on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays Reason: In the interest of amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection
8.	The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for

	the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority. Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.
9.	Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement (s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network. Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.
10.	The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme. Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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

Sarah O'Mahony
Planning Inspector

13th August 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	322536-25
Proposed Development Summary	Main Street, Oughterard, Co. Galway
Development Address	Refurbish and extend existing pub building to include demolition of existing rear extension, construction of 3 storey rear extension providing additional 299m ² gross floorspace. The development includes 19no. bedrooms and ancillary kitchen, dining and laundry facilities for tourism accommodation as well as a bin and bike store, alterations to the front façade and connections to public services.
	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)	☒ Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2.
	☐ 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)?	
☐ 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
☒ 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?	
☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	Class 10 (b)(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. The site comprises 0.049ha. Class 14: Works of demolition carried out in order to facilitate a project listed in Part 1 or Part 2 of this Schedule where such works would be likely to have significant effects on the environment, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7.

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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The urban site is serviced and its size is not exceptional in the context of the prevailing plot size in the area. A short-term construction phase would be required and the development would not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance due to its scale. The development, by virtue of its type and nature, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. Its operation presents no significant risks to human health. The size and scale of the proposed development is not significantly or exceptionally different to the existing building.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	The site is situated in a serviced urban area which is designated as an Architectural Conservation Area and there is a protected structure adjacent to the site. An Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment was submitted with the further information response which indicates that no negative impacts are likely to occur to architectural heritage in the area. A minor positive impact would occur from refurbishing the building on site. It is considered that, having regard to the limited nature and scale of the development, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on other significant environmental sensitivities in the area.

	The proposal is not likely to have any cumulative impacts or significant cumulative impacts with other existing or permitted projects
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).	The size of the proposed development is notably below the mandatory thresholds in respect of a Classes 10 and 14 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 as amended. Localised construction impacts will be temporary. The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances beyond what would normally be deemed acceptable. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development and works constituting development within an existing built-up area, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____