



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-322597-25

<b>Development</b>	Construction of a new clubhouse, storage shed and associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	Murrevagh, Mulranny, Westport, Co Mayo.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Mayo County Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	24/415.
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Mulranny Golf Club.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant Permission.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party vs Grant.
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Ruth E. Lyons and Robert Hogan.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	21 <sup>st</sup> August 2025.
<b>Inspector</b>	C. Daly.

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The subject site of 0.52ha, which slopes downhill from the south-west towards the north-east, consists of grassland adjacent to a surface car park with a modest prefabricated single storey flat roof building to the south-east adjacent to the Mulranny Links Golf Course, a 9-hole golf course. The adjacent access road also serves the Murrivaugh beach to the east. There is an ESB poll in close proximity to the proposed vehicular entrance close adjoining the public road.
- 1.2. There are low stone boundary walls along part of the north-west and north-east site boundaries towards the corner where these meet and otherwise there are no boundaries with the adjoining grassland, car park and access laneway to the north-east. There is an adjacent detached bungalow dwelling to the north-west of the site.
- 1.3. The adjoining grassland to the south-west and south-east slopes uphill towards the fairways of the golf course. The site is accessed via a single lane road which has a number of detached dwellings which are accessed from it. There are also a number of dwellings to the north and north-east of the site on a more elevated level which overlook the golf course from a distance. The site is c.480m south-east of Mulranny village which is significantly elevated relative to the subject site.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:
  - Construction a new single storey mainly flat roof with part mono pitch roof element clubhouse and mono pitch storage shed and associated site works including vehicular access ways and parking area and three no. practice putting greens.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

Mayo County Council initially decided to request further information in relation to an assessment under Article 6 of the Habitats Directive, land ownership documents including in relation to rights of way, surface finishes for the access road, revised site

layout plan stating finished floor levels, indicating the use of the areas shaded green, the locations of the Irish Water connections and soakpit, plan showing all existing and proposed car parking, proposals for the existing club house building and site entrance elevations.

Following F.I. the P.A. decided to grant permission subject to 7 no. conditions.

Notable conditions include:

- Condition no. 3 requires all service cables to be located underground.
- Condition no. 4 requires the diversion of ESB lines if necessary.
- Condition no. 5 requires the entering into connection agreements with Uisce Éireann for water and wastewater connections.
- Condition no. 7 requires a minimum of 10% of the car parking spaces to be provided with electrical points.

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

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

The initial Planner's Report noted the potential for significant effects on the Clew Bay SAC. It noted no issues in principle with the location and design noting the footprint being akin to that of a dwelling house. It noted no external access changes and new internal access arrangements. It recommended requesting F.I. as noted in Section 3.1 above.

The second Planner's Report noted the submitted AA screening report, that the F.I. items had been adequately responded to and considered the proposal to be reasonable in terms of the vitality and viability of the golf course. It considered all technical considerations to be acceptable and no issues in terms of siting and design. It recommended permission be granted.

#### **3.2.2. Other Technical Reports**

- National Roads Office: No issues raised for national roads.
- Area Engineer Newport: No response received.
- Water Services: No response received.

### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

- Transport Infrastructure Ireland: Requires regard to be had to policy in relation to national roads and proposals impacting the light rail network.
- Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage: The development needs to be screened for Appropriate Assessment and any impacts on the Qualifying Interests of the Clew Bay Complex SAC.
- Department of Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs: No response received.
- An Taisce: No response received.
- Uisce Éireann: No response received.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

Three third party submissions were received which can be summarised as follows:

- Environmental concerns in relation to the Machair landscape.
- Concerns in relation to loss of privacy to adjacent dwelling.
- Concerns in relation to surface water drainage.
- Concerns in relation to access, safety and legal authority in this regard.

## 4.0 Planning History

### Subject Site

None located.

### Sites in the vicinity

**221111:** Permission granted by the P.A. at adjacent site to the north-west to retain the existing conservatory, kitchen extensions and detached shed.

**2560160:** Permission granted by the P.A. at site c.250m to the north-east for construction of a two storey extension.

## 5.0 Policy Context

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

#### Volume 1

#### Chapter 5 – Tourism and Recreation

TRP 23 *To support and promote sustainable tourism, accessible to all throughout County Mayo, and to work in partnership with tourism organisations and adjoining local authorities, where necessary, in securing the development of tourism enterprises and infrastructure, subject to suitable locations, where it can be demonstrated that the development will not have significant adverse effects on the environment, including the integrity of the Natura 200 network, residential amenity or visual amenity.*

TRP 24 *To encourage the clustering of tourism products and services within identified hubs, to facilitate the sharing of infrastructure and services where possible, to increase linkages within and reduce leakage from the local economy.*

#### Chapter 10 – Natural Environment

Per Map 10.2 the site is located along a designated scenic route.

NEP 14 *To protect, enhance and contribute to the physical, visual and scenic character of County Mayo and to preserve its unique landscape character.*

NEO 25 *To consider applications for development, along Mayo's' Scenic routes, that can demonstrate a clear need to locate in the area concerned, whilst ensuring that it:*

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

*Rural housing applications along Scenic Routes must comply with the requirements set out in Objective RHO 3 (Chapter 3).*

NEO 29 *Require a Landscape/Visual Impact Assessment to accompany significant proposals, located within or adjacent to sensitive landscapes, where appropriate.*

## Volume 2

### Section 7.12.1 Car Parking

Table 7: Golf Course/Pitch and Putt: 3 spaces/hole plus space/employee/shift 1

## 5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

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

- Within the Clew Bay Complex Proposed Natural Heritage Area (PNHA) (site code 001482).
- c.70m north-east of Clew Bay Complex Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (site code 001482).
- c.0.68km south of Owenduff/Nephrin Complex SAC and PNHA (site code 000534).
- c.0.68km south of Owenduff/Nephrin Complex Special Protection Area (SPA) (site code 004098).
- c.1.5km to the east of Corraun Plateau SAC and PNHA (site code 000485).
- c.3.6km south-east of Lough Gall Bog SAC and PNHA (site code 000522).

## 6.0 **The Appeal**

### 6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The grounds of the third party appeal by Ruth E Lyons and Robert Hogan can be summarised as follows:

- Due to height and close proximity to the neighbouring dwelling, the proposal would be overbearing and an overshadowing presence.
- The proposal would negatively impact on the privacy of the adjacent dwelling with views into its sitting room and garden.
- The new road outside the gate of the adjacent house would present a safety risk for young children.

- Questions why the building needs to be located so close to the adjacent house, why there are windows and glass door facing the adjacent house and why the access road cannot come from the existing car park.
- Questions the provision of a right of way from the adjacent vehicular entrance.
- The development does not meet the objectives of policies TRP 23 and NEO 25 of the Development Plan.
- There is a lack of clarity in relation to the proposal, particularly in relation to section drawings and adjacent levels.
- The building should be located as close as possible to the existing building within the golf course site.
- Questions why there is no Landscape/Visual Impact Assessment as required under NEO 29.
- The AA Screening Report is incorrect in relation to the site being a separate habitat to the protected site as it hosts the same flora as the machair including rare fungi and wild flowers
- The AA Screening Report is incorrect in relation to Otter which traverse this terrain travelling from the small stream the bounds the adjacent residence.
- Questions in relation to the regulations in relation to the applicant's area of ownership in the vicinity and any wayleaves and in relation to the use of commonage by the golf club.
- Questions in relation to the way access arrangements are shown on the site layout plan with a lack of definitive detail.
- Concerns in relation to landscaping in the vicinity of the site boundary.
- Questions in relation to how the site will be enclosed if at all.
- Questions in relation to what will happen to the existing buildings.
- Questions in relation to the planning status of the original car park and in relation to the car parking plan with a parking plan required.
- Questions in relation to the validity of the drawings with no north point marked.

- Questions in relation to building materials.
- Questions in relation to tree shown on the plans with no trees on the golf course.
- Questions in relation to lack of specificity in relation to external materials.
- Questions is there a lighting plan.
- Questions in relation to the hours of operation and the use of the function room and in relation to hospitality.

## 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 the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Residential and Visual Amenity
- Access and Parking
- Other Matters

### 7.2. **Residential and Visual Amenity**

- 7.2.1. I note the concerns of the appellants in relation to impacts on the residential amenity of the adjacent dwelling to the north-west. Having reviewed the submitted drawings, including the site layout plan submitted at F.I. stage, I note that the proposed building would be c.15.3m at its closest point from the boundary with this dwelling which I consider to be a significant setback in the rural context and I note the dwelling is setback by a similar distance from this party boundary. However, I note the difference of 2.39m in finished floor levels between the proposed clubhouse and the dwelling.
- 7.2.2. I consider that the north-west elevation of the club house could be said to partially appear similar to be above a ground floor level when viewed from the adjacent dwelling. In this regard, should permission be granted I consider that the one window and set of doors which would be located along the north-west elevation



close to the north-west corner should be in opaque glass to prevent undue overlooking of the adjacent garden in the vicinity given the rural location. These windows and doors would serve corridors within the building such that I have no concerns in relation to internal impacts.

- 7.2.3. In relation to the position of the dwelling and its scale, noting the separation distance and difference in site levels, I do not consider that any undue overshadowing of neighbouring residential development would occur. Similarly, in relation to position and scale, and noting the difference in ground levels, the north-west and north-east elevations would substantially not directly face the adjacent residential property. I do not consider that it would result in overbearing impacts on same notwithstanding that it could appear as similar in scale to a two storey building when viewed from the adjacent dwelling.
- 7.2.4. I note the lack of specified external finishes, should permission be granted I recommend a condition be attached to require prior agreement in this regard with the P.A. to ensure no unusual out of place external finishes are used. I note issues have been raised regarding the use of the clubhouse for other purposes not associated with the clubhouse. However, if this was to take place I do not consider that it would result in undue negative impacts on residential amenity as there would be no significant intensification of use.
- 7.2.5. In relation to the landscape and the proposed height ranging from 4.33m to c.3.26m and scale, while this could read as partly as greater than a standard single storey height from the north-west, I note the landscape rises in height in all other directions and notwithstanding the absence of significant landscaping measures, which I consider would be inappropriate in such an open grassland area, I note the footprint would be similar to that of a four /five bed dwelling, and I do not consider that this would be visually obtrusive or out of scale for the area.
- 7.2.6. I consider the location close to the north-west boundary, would ensure that the building sits well within the landscape and would not be out of character in the coastal rural landscape. I do not consider that a Landscape/Visual Impact Assessment is required to make the necessary assessment in this regard. For the above reasons, and in relation to technical matters addressed below, I consider that

the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy NEO 25 of the CDP and would not significantly impact on the designated scenic route to the north.

- 7.2.7. I note the position of the driveway access to the clubhouse in close proximity to the boundary of the adjacent dwelling and the modest difference in ground levels along this edge. Noting that this would only serve three car parking spaces with the club house car park, I do not consider that this would significantly impact on the residential amenities of the adjacent dwelling.
- 7.2.8. I note no lighting plan has been proposed and I note the nature of golf is that it is played during daylight hours. However, there would be a function room and potential for clubhouse use following play. In this context, I consider that a standard condition in relation to lighting measures (such as cowlings of lights) to be agreed with the P.A. would be sufficient to ensure that lighting can be appropriately mitigated for the location relative to the residences in the vicinity and the coastal landscape.
- 7.2.9. In relation to the landscaping for the site, including provision for three putting greens, I consider that this would integrate with the rolling grass landscape in the vicinity and would not be out of character with the site and its surroundings. I note that the internal roadway surfaces would be unsealed and finished in crushed stone and gravel. Part of the internal roadway/path network would lead from the clubhouse to the south-east to the existing car park. Should permission be granted, I recommend that this connection be required by condition to ensure its delivery.
- 7.2.10. I note the proposed internal road from the entrance along the north-eastern site boundary. Noting this would be adjacent to the existing road serving the existing car park, I do not consider this to be necessary and I recommend that should permission be granted that it be omitted by condition. I note the width of the access from the site entrance to the clubhouse appears excessive and should permission be granted I recommend this be reduced to a maximum width of 3m to avoid excessive intrusion on the landscape. I consider that this would be appropriate for the site and I do not consider there would be a significant impact on the landscape in the vicinity.

### **7.3. Access and Parking**

- 7.3.1. In relation to access, I note a new access is proposed adjacent to the existing residential access. This would be located at the end of the single lane roadway to the site where it meets the commonage and the golf course lands. Having travelled

along this laneway, where I note speeds are slow and where traffic is required to slow to a crawl in the vicinity of the entrance given that it is the end of the roadway and a turn into the existing entrance is required, I note that sightlines for the access would be an improvement on the existing and would be adequate for this type of development. Accordingly, I am satisfied that no undue safety concerns would arise.

- 7.3.2. I note the parking standards, per Table 7 of Volume 7 of the CDP, requires 30 spaces (3 spaces for each of the 9 holes and 3 for staff). While the site layout plan does not show demarcated parking spaces, I note that it shows that three cars can park to the rear of the building and that the existing long established adjacent car park serving the golf course has ample space to cater for such requirement such that I consider that no car parking plan is required. I also note that on the day of my site visit, an August afternoon in good weather, that no more than 12 spaces were occupied. I note the appellant has also questioned why the existing car park cannot be used.
- 7.3.3. The plans also include provision for an internal walkway/access from the rear of the clubhouse to the proposed shed adjacent to the car park and I note this would provide a short route from the existing car park to the clubhouse. Overall, I am satisfied that the car parking required under CDP policy can be catered for by the existing car park and that the additional car parking spaces to be provided on the site would have a negligible impact on residential amenity in the vicinity and I consider this to be acceptable. In relation to the proposed on-site spaces, the CDP requires that 10% of these have electrical connection points which can be conditioned should permission be granted.

#### **7.4. Other Matters**

- 7.4.1. In relation to drainage matters, I note the proposed soakaway to the east of the clubhouse and noting the site characteristics, I consider that a standard SUDS related condition should be required if permission is to be granted. This would ensure drainage arrangements are catered for on-site in line with the standards of the P.A. I note the proposed development would be connected to the public water and foul sewer network. I note that Mulranny Wastewater Treatment Plant has

available capacity and I am satisfied there is no significant risk to public or environmental health in this regard.

- 7.4.2. In relation to construction measures, while noting the modest scale of development, given the potential for emissions within an environmentally sensitive location, I recommend standard a construction management related condition and standard construction hours should permission be granted.
- 7.4.3. I note the appellants have raised issues in relation to title to the property, rights of way and the commonage. I note the information presented at F.I. stage in this regard and that the Commission is not an arbiter of title and the extent to which it is required to interrogate these issues is limited. I note the first party submission to the P.A. at F.I. stage and that the appellants have presented no definitive information to suggest that the applicant is not the legal owner of the subject site, and the Commission are entitled to rely on the information presented by the applicant on this without further interrogation of the matter as per section 5.13 the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (June 2007). I further note that Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act further provides that if the applicant lacks title or owner's consent to do works permitted by a planning permission, the permission does not give rise to an entitlement to carry out the development.
- 7.4.4. I note the appellants have raised issues in relation to the planning status of the adjacent car park and the adjacent temporary building. I note both of these are long established uses at the golf course. While not shown within the blue line area, I note that from the application documentation that it is clear that the applicant has control over the existing clubhouse structures. I also note that the applicant has suggested that the existing clubhouse will continue in use until a new facility is completed and that the golf club is willing to discuss the future of these buildings with the Council. I consider this to be a reasonable approach and I also note that enforcement matters are not matters for the Commission. In the interests of orderly development, I would recommend that these structure be required to be removed by condition, in line with Section 34(4)(1)(a) of the 2000 Act, on completion of the clubhouse.
- 7.4.5. Issues have been raised in relation to the building materials and insofar as they relate to their aesthetic value this can be dealt with by condition as recommended

above. I also note that the new building would be required to adhere to the current standards of the building regulations such that I note no significant concerns in this regard.

- 7.4.6. I also note the presence of an ESB pole and associated wires close to the north-east site boundary with the public road. Should permission be granted I recommend a condition similar to the P.A. requiring this be relocated if required to facilitate the proposed development.
- 7.4.7. In relation to development contributions and the Mayo County Council Development Contribution Scheme 2023, I note that should permission be granted these are exempt for recreational or social purpose and ancillary surface car parking development such that there is no requirement for a development contributions condition in this case.

## **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. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on Clew Bay Complex SAC and Owenduff/Nephin Complex SPA in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.
- 9.2. This determination is based on:

- Nature and scale of the development.
- The separation from the European site and the absence of direct ecological connections thereto.
- The connection to mains services.
- The nature of the habitat on the site and surrounding area.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The subject site is located above the Mulranny groundwater body (IE\_we\_g\_0027) which is noted to consist of poorly productive bedrock and has a status of “good”; and is a short distance from the Clew Bay coastal waterbody (IE\_WE\_340\_0000) which has a “high” status. The proposed development comprises a clubhouse, shed and associated access and site works.

10.2. 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 and 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.

10.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale of works and nature of the development.
- The proposed connections to the water and foul water sewer network.
- That the temporary construction impacts can be mitigated by condition requiring standard construction measures.

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 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be granted.

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028, to the nature and scale of the proposed development 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 residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would be acceptable in terms of design, visual and landscape impact, environmental impact, access and car parking, and in relation to lighting impact. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 8<sup>th</sup> 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. With three months of the completion of the development, the temporary existing clubhouse structures shall be removed from the adjacent site and from the golf course area.

Reason: In the interest of clarity and to protect local amenity.

3. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:
- (a) The proposed internal road along the north-east boundary shall be omitted.
  - (b) The proposed internal road from the vehicular entrance to the clubhouse shall be a maximum width of 3 metres.
  - (c) The road and pathway along the south and south-east boundary shall connect directly to the existing car park.
  - (b) The window and set of doors which would be located along the north-west elevation closest to the north-west corner should be in opaque glass. 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. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the clubhouse shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

5. Public lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The scheme shall include low level and cowled lighting along pedestrian and access routes. Such lighting shall be provided prior to the completion of the development.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and public safety.

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. A minimum of 10% of the proposed car parking spaces shall be provided with electrical connection points, to allow for functional electrical vehicle charging. The remaining car parking spaces shall be fitted with ducting for electric connection points to allow for future fitout of charging points.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable transportation.

8. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development. All existing over ground cables shall be relocated if required as part of the site development works.

Reason: In the interests of visual and amenity.

9. Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement (s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for service connections to the public water supply and wastewater collection network.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.

10. A Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The CEMP shall include but not be limited to construction phase controls for dust, noise and vibration, waste management, protection of soils, groundwaters, and surface waters, site housekeeping, emergency response planning, site environmental policy, and project roles and responsibilities.

Reason: In the interest of environmental protection, residential amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection.

11. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.

Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the [residential] amenities of property in the vicinity.

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

3<sup>rd</sup> September 2025

## Appendix 1

### Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	ABP-322597-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of a new clubhouse, storage shed and associated site works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Murrevagh, Mulranny, Westport, Co Mayo.
	<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (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.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>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?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b></p>	<p><b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b></p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	<p><b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b></p> <p>Part 2, Class 12(e) Theme parks occupying an area greater than 5 hectares. Threshold: 5 ha.</p> <p>Clubhouse, shed and landscape works on a site area of 0.52ha.</p>

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

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

## Appendix 2

### Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	ABP-322597-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of a new clubhouse, storage shed and associated site works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Murrevagh, Mulranny, Westport, Co Mayo.
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<b>Characteristics of proposed development</b>  (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	<b>Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed.</b>  Clubhouse and shed building floor area of 250sqm. Connection to public mains for water and public sewer for wastewater.
<b>Location of development</b>  (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).	<b>Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed</b>  The site is c.70m from the Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482) and is in a coastal rural area.
<b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b>  (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	<b>Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.</b>  Temporary construction impacts. Operational discharge to mains services. Modest/limited changes to the ground below and around the building footprints, pathways, roadways and landscaping for practice putting greens.

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)

## Appendix 3

### AA Screening Determination Test for likely significant effects

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects				
<b>Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics</b>				
<b>Brief description of project</b>	Construction of a new clubhouse, storage shed and associated site works.			
<b>Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms</b>	New single storey clubhouse building and shed of 250sqm on a site area of 0.52ha. Additional access roads, parking area and landscaping works.			
<b>Screening report</b>	Y – Appropriate Assessment of Protected Sites Screening Reports prepared by Sitecheck. Author: Siobhan Sheil, MSc (Env Sc); H Dip (Env Management); MMO; PSO. Certified Dept. Ag. FETAC Farm waste storage site assessor.			
<b>Natura Impact Statement</b>	N			
<b>Relevant submissions</b>	Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage: The development needs to be screened for Appropriate Assessment and any impacts on the Qualifying Interests of the Clew Bay Complex SAC.			
<b>Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model</b>				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests <sup>1</sup> Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections <sup>2</sup>	Consider further in screening <sup>3</sup> Y/N
Clew Bay Complex Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (site code 001482)	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]  Coastal lagoons [1150]	c.70m	No direct hydrological connections but proximity to SAC (c.70m away) and associated river/stream connections	Y

	<p>Large shallow inlets and bays [1160]</p> <p>Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]</p> <p>Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220]</p> <p>Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima) [1330]</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p> <p>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophila arenaria (white dunes) [2120]</p> <p>Machairs (* in Ireland) [21A0]</p> <p>Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles [91A0]</p> <p>Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355]</p> <p>Phoca vitulina (Harbour Seal) [1365].</p> <p><a href="#">Conservation Objectives</a>, NPWS, 19<sup>th</sup> July 2011.</p>		<p>potentially used by QI species in close proximity gives rise to potential disturbance impacts. No direct loss of habitat. Potential pollution run-off from construction to groundwater. Consider further below in screening.</p>	
Owenduff/Nephin Complex SAC (site code 000534)	<p>Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains (Littorelletalia uniflorae) [3110]</p> <p>Natural dystrophic lakes and ponds [3160]</p>	c.0.68km	<p>No direct hydrological connection and the SAC is on higher ground.</p> <p>No direct loss of habitat.</p>	<b>N</b>



	<p>Water courses of plain to montane levels with the <i>Ranunculus fluitans</i> and <i>Callitriche-Batrachium</i> vegetation [3260]</p> <p>Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i> [4010]</p> <p>Alpine and Boreal heaths [4060]</p> <p><i>Juniperus communis</i> formations on heaths or calcareous grasslands [5130]</p> <p>Blanket bogs (* if active bog) [7130]</p> <p>Transition mires and quaking bogs [7140]</p> <p><i>Salmo salar</i> (Salmon) [1106]</p> <p><i>Lutra lutra</i> (Otter) [1355]</p> <p><i>Saxifraga hirculus</i> (Marsh Saxifrage) [1528]</p> <p><i>Hamatocaulis vernicosus</i> (Slender Green Feather-moss) [6216]</p> <p><a href="#">Conservation Objectives</a>, NPWS, 24<sup>th</sup> July 2017.</p>			
Owenduff/Nephin Complex Special Protection Area (SPA) (site code 004098)	<p>Merlin (<i>Falco columbarius</i>) [A098]</p> <p>Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>) [A140]</p>	c.0.68km	No direct hydrological connection with the SPA on higher ground and significant distance to SPA such that	<b>N</b>

	<a href="#">Conservation Objectives</a> , NPWS, 25 <sup>th</sup> April 2025		no potential disturbance impacts. Not suitable or optimum habitat for breeding birds, can be ruled out given the small site area relative to the whole golf course area and commonage which would be available to breeding birds if used in this manner.	

<sup>1</sup> Summary description / **cross reference to NPWS website** is acceptable at this stage in the report

<sup>2</sup> Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species

<sup>3</sup>if no connections: N

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

#### AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
<b>Site 1: Clew Bay Complex Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (site code 001482)</b>  <u>QI list</u>  Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]  Coastal lagoons [1150]	Direct:  Indirect: Potential negative impacts (temporary) on surface water/water/groundwater quality due to construction related emissions including increased sedimentation and construction related pollution. Potential disturbance of otter and which may use the river/stream c.0.6km to the north-west.	Given separation distances, no potential disturbance/displacement effects. No potential changes to habitat quality/ function and undermining of conservation objectives related to water quality, potential habitat loss/ modification. No likelihood of significant effects given separation from SAC and absence of direct

<p>Large shallow inlets and bays [1160]</p> <p>Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]</p> <p>Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220]</p> <p>Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae) [1330]</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p> <p>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophila arenaria (white dunes) [2120]</p> <p>Machairs (* in Ireland) [21A0]</p> <p>Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles [91A0]</p> <p>Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355]</p> <p>Phoca vitulina (Harbour Seal) [1365].</p>	<p>The AA Screening Report states that the site “is too inland for seal haul out sites” and “<i>it is unlikely that shoreline near the proposed development site has otter activity such as holts feeding areas etc. due to the presence of the golf course. No otter activity (holts spraint tracks etc) was observed on or adjacent to the proposed development site</i>”. It also states that “<i>the nature of the site particularly the fact that there are existing houses surrounding the site would indicate that this is not an optimum location for any of these species</i>”. However, there are no recent surveys included in the report to support this.</p> <p>In relation to flora, the report refers to the site including grass shrubs and small trees. While I observed some shrubs along the site boundary, I did not observe any trees on the site and I do not consider this significant in relation to significant areas of concern which only relate to otter.</p>	<p>pathway, including poorly productive nature of the underlying aquifer.</p> <p>Given the distance from waterbody to the north-west which may be used by otter and the intervening land, including a residence, I consider that significant disturbance impacts and effects from construction can be ruled out.</p>
	<b>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y</b>	
	<b>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?</b>	
	<b>Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*</b>	
	<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Effects</b>
<b>Site 2: Owenduff/Nephin Complex Special Protection Area (SPA) (site code 004098)</b>	No direct hydrological connection with the SPA on higher ground and significant distance to SPA such that no potential disturbance impacts.	No potential disturbance/displacement

<u>QI list</u>	The AA Screening Report screens out the SPA noting a low risk and “ <i>no protected bird habitats associated with the proposed development site</i> ”. The site is not a suitable breeding or foraging site for the QI. Any loss of existing habitat is not likely to have a significant effect on the QI, particularly in the context of the surrounding area.	and no undermining of conservation objectives related to species protection.
Merlin (Falco columbarius) [A098]		
Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) [A140]		
	<b>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y</b>	
	<b>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?</b>	
<b>Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site</b>		
I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on Clew Bay Complex SAC and Owenduff/Nephin Complex SPA. The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project. No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.		

## Screening Determination

### Finding of no likely significant effects

#### Finding of no likely significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on Clew Bay Complex SAC and Owenduff/Nephin Complex SPA in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- Nature and scale of the development.
- The separation from the European site and the absence of direct ecological connections thereto.
- The connection to mains services.
- The nature of the habitat on the site and surrounding area.