



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP 322769-25

Development	Construction of house, garage and wastewater treatment system and all associated site works.
Location	Moorfield, Eyrecourt. Ballinasloe. Co Galway.
Planning Authority	Galway Co. Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560320
Applicant(s)	Henry Howard.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	To Refuse Permission.
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Henry Howard.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	July 25 th , 2025.
Inspector	Breda Gannon

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located within the townland of Moorfield, c 5km southwest of Eyrecourt. Co. Galway. It is located on the north side of the regional road (R356) and to the east of its intersection with the R355. The site which is rectangular in shape has a stated area of 0.86 ha and is part of a larger agricultural holding. Its front boundary is formed by a dry stone wall covered in vegetation and the remaining site boundaries are undefined. The ground level at the front of the site is above adjoining road level and continues to rise northwards towards the rear of the site.
- 1.2. The area is rural in character, and the main land use is agriculture. The site lies within an area with a low density of residential development. The pattern of development consists of isolated dwellings and farm holdings.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal is to construct a dwelling house, garage and a wastewater treatment system on the site. The house would be single storey in scale and have a gross floor area of 216.5 m², and a ridge height of 5.17m. It would be finished externally in a combination of nap plaster and natural limestone. The roof covering would consist of fibre cement slates. The house would be set back by a distance of 27m from the public road.
- 2.2. The garage (41.58m²) would be single-storey in scale and would be positioned to the west side of the house. It would be finished externally in a nap plaster finish with a blue/black slate roof covering.
- 2.3. The effluent treatment system would be located at the front of the house. It would provide primary, secondary and tertiary treatment prior to discharge to ground. A water supply would be provided from a private well located within the site.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to refuse permission for the development on the grounds that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and non-compliance with the provisions of DM Standard 28 and Policy Objective NNR 2 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The **Planning Officer's** report of 20/5/25 notes that under the Rural Housing provisions of the development plan, the site is located within a 'Structurally Weak Area' and the applicant is not required to demonstrate a housing need under Policy Objective RH3.

3.2.2. The Site Suitability Assessment indicates that the soil is suitable to treat effluent and a packaged wastewater Treatment system and polishing filter are proposed. A water supply will be provided by a private well and yield tests and chemical and bacteriological/chemical analysis results have been submitted. The well would be located within the boundaries of site.

3.2.3. The proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of siting and design and is in accordance with Policy Objective RH9 of the development plan.

3.2.4. A new entrance is proposed along the R356 and issues regarding road safety have been raised by the Road's Department. The planning authority is not satisfied that the proposed development accords with the provisions of Policy Objective NNR2 of the development plan (Safeguard Regional and Local Road).

3.2.5. The planning authority is satisfied 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.

3.2.6. Other Technical Reports

The **Roads& Transportation Department** in their report of 20/5/25 recommended refusal of the application on the grounds of road safety.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- 3.3.1. **Transport Infrastructure Ireland:** Issued a standard type of response requesting that the planning authority have regard to the provisions of official policy for development proposals impacting national roads, to DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities and relevant TII Publications.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. A submission was received from Mr Thomas Duffy who was refused planning permission for a house on the opposite side of the regional road (ABP 304112-19). Part of the reason for refusal related to housing need and he questions how the current applicant is not required to demonstrate a similar need. It is also stated that the applicant already has a house as evidenced by land registry documentation submitted.

4.0 Planning History

2261332: Planning permission refused on substantially the same site for the construction of a house, domestic garage, treatment unit with percolation area and all associated site works for 3 no. reasons relating to siting/design, sightlines/road safety, water supply.

23/60751: Permission refused for a dwelling house, domestic garage and waste water treatment system with polishing filter on the site the grounds of road safety.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The operative development plan is the **Galway County Council Development Plan 2022-2028**. The site is located in an unzoned rural area outside towns and settlements.

Chapter 4: Rural Living and Development contains the rural housing policies for the county. The following are relevant:

Policy Objective RC 2.

To manage the development of rural housing in the open countryside by requiring applicants to demonstrate compliance with the Rural Housing Policy Objectives contained in Section 4.6.3

Section 4.6.3 of the Plan identifies different rural area types and sets out specific policy objectives for rural housing in the open countryside. The site is located in Rural Housing Zone 3: 'Structurally Weak Area' (Map 4.1). The following policy objectives are relevant.

Policy Objective RH 3:

It is the policy of the Planning Authority to facilitate the development of individual houses in the open countryside in 'Structurally Weak Areas' subject to compliance with normal planning and environmental criteria and the Development Management Standards outlined in Chapter 15 and other applicable standards with the exception of those lands contained in Landscape Classifications 2,3, and 4 where policy objective RH 4 applies.

Chapter 8: Tourism and Landscape contains the policies on landscape protection.

The site is located within the Central Galway Complex Landscape (Map 8.1 Landscape Character Areas), with a Class 1 'Low' sensitivity rating (Map 8.2) and 'Unlikely to be adversely affected by change'.

Chapter 6: Transport and Movement.

Policy Objective NNR 2: To safeguard the carrying capacity and safety of the County's regional and local road network.

Chapter 15: Development Management Standards contains standards for rural housing, including the following:

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

5.2. **National Planning Framework First Revision (First Revision April 2025)**

National Policy Objective 28

Ensure, in providing for the development of rural housing, that a distinction is made between areas under urban influence, i.e. within the commuting catchment of cities, larger towns and centres of employment, and elsewhere:

- In rural areas under urban influence, facilitate the provision of rural housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area and siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and settlements.
- In rural areas elsewhere, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The site is not located within or adjacent to any European site. There are a number of designated sites in the wider area. The closest are the following:

- Ardgraique Bog SAC (Site code 002356), located c 2.37km to the west.
- River Shannon Callows SAC (Site code 000216), located c 4.5 km to the east and south.
- Middle Shannon Callows SPA (Site code 004096), located c 4.5km to the east and south.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The development is of a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, but below threshold. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendix 1 of this report). Having regard to the location and characteristic of the proposed development and the types and characteristic 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 environment impact screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- The proposed vehicular entrance/exit has been designed in accordance with the requirements of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- The R356 is not listed as one of the 'Restricted Roads/Class II Control Roads (Regional Road)' as detailed in DM Standard 27 of the development plan. As such the principle of the proposed entrance/exit to serve the proposed dwellinghouse can be considered in this case.
- The relevant geometric standards/requirements for new vehicular entrance/exit points is set out in DM Standard 28 of the development plan. It places an onus on the applicant to adequately demonstrate '*visibility so that drivers emerging from the access can enjoy good visibility of oncoming vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians*'.
- The design speed has been identified following an independent survey by ORS. It confirmed that '*The speeds experienced over the course of the survey fall under 70kph, therefore a visibility splay of 120m would be considered appropriate in accordance with Table 5.5 of the current Geometric Design of Junctions DN-GEO-0360*'.

- To achieve the 120m sightline requirement, it is proposed to setback the road edge to the east and west. Given that the applicant benefits from extensive road frontage, the line of the proposed road setback is located entirely within applicant's property and is within his control. The proposed entrance therefore meets all relevant road safety requirements.
- The proposed entrance design has been subject to an independent Road Safety Audit which was prepared by ORS. In response to the recommendations made, the layout was updated and this was submitted as part of the planning application.
- The Council's concerns regarding the width of the existing road are not understood. The width serves to control traffic speed and the proposed setback will not widen the existing carriageway, it will provide for enhanced visibility along the stretch of road for the benefit of all road users.
- The reason for refusal refers to the submission from the TII. Having regard to its content, its relevance to the Council's recommendation to refuse permission is not understood. As the access is proposed on a non-controlled regional road, the provisions of the DoECLG guidelines do not apply. As such the reference to the TII submission as part of the decision to refuse has no basis.
- The proposed sightlines are entirely satisfactory and meet the requirements of the development plan. They are entirely in accordance with the requirements of DM Standard 28.
- In terms of horizontal alignment, the site layout demonstrates that the sightlines of 120m can be achieved to the east and west of the proposed entrance/exit. In terms of vertical alignment, the site sections demonstrate that the sightlines are available with no requirement to any alteration of the vertical alignment of the existing road. The concerns regarding the location of the proposed entrance on the 'inside radius' of a curve along the road are obviated by the proposed road setback to the east and west.
- The reason for refusal refers to the significant scale and extents of roadside boundary intervention and set back. DM Standard 28 specifically allows for

‘substantial works’ to be proposed in order to meet sightline requirements.

The extent of the required setback is entirely within the ownership and control of the applicant. The implementation of the required sightlines can be controlled by way of condition should the Board be minded to grant permission in this case (Section 34(4)(a)(i) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended)

- Given the merits of the proposed sightline and setback design together with the nature and extent of the proposed development consisting of a single rural house, the proposed development would not endanger the carrying capacity and safety of the regional road in this location. As such, the proposed development would not contravene the provisions of Policy Objective NNR 2 of the development plan.
- Having regard to the Road Safety Audit, the Speed Survey, the proposed sightline and setback and the nature and extent of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in a traffic hazard at this location. On this basis it is considered that the reason for refusal of the application can be dismissed.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

No response was submitted by the planning authority.

7.3. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Introduction

- 8.1.1. Having examined all 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 national and local policies and guidance, I consider the substantive issues to be considered in this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of the Development
- Traffic Safety
- Other matters.
- Appropriate Assessment.

8.2. Principle of the Development

- 8.2.1. The site is located within a 'Structurally Weak Area' where it is the policy of the planning authority to facilitate the development of individual houses in the countryside, except in areas with a Landscape Classification of 2, 3 and 4. The site is located within Landscape Classification Class1 'Low' and is therefore exempt from the requirement to substantiate a housing need under the provisions of Policy Objective RH 4). It also accords with national policy which facilitates rural housing outside areas under urban influence subject to good planning practice.
- 8.2.2. I would, therefore, accept that the proposal to build a house in this location is acceptable in principle subject to normal planning and environmental criteria and the Development Management Standards outlined in Chapter 15 of the development plan. These are considered in more detail below.

8.3. Traffic safety

- 8.3.1. The original application (Reg Ref 22/61332) proposed the vehicular access marginally west of that currently proposed. The current location of the access mirrors that of the previous application (Reg Ref 23/60751).
- 8.3.2. The R356 onto which the proposed dwelling will exit has a posted speed limit of 80 kph. As noted by the applicant, the regional road is not listed as a restricted route under DM Standard 26 where specific restrictions apply to new residential development. However, the development is subject to the provisions of DM Standard 28 and a sight distance requirement of 160m is required in each direction, which is not achievable.
- 8.3.3. The documentation submitted in support of the application indicates that sightlines of 120m can be attained in both directions from the proposed sight access and on lands within the ownership and control of the applicant. The applicant contends that this is appropriate to achieve safe access based on the Speed Survey conducted by

ORS over a six-day period (August 7th to 13th 2024). It found that the 85th percentile speed over the period of was under 70kph. It is further stated that under the requirements of Table 5.5 of TII's Geometric Design of Junctions DN-GEO-03060 visibility splays of 120m would be considered appropriate.

- 8.3.4. Under the provisions of DM Standard 28, where a new entrance is proposed, the planning authority must consider traffic considerations and available sight lines. The sight distance requirements under DM Standard 28 mirror those set out by the TII in DN-GEO-03060. The planning authority has consistently refused permission for the development of this site on the grounds of road safety and there is no material difference between the current and previous proposal to warrant a reversal of this decision. I note that the application of the 85th percentile design speed under DM Standard 28 only applies to narrow Local roads and not to a regional road as contended by the applicant.
- 8.3.5. A Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit (dated March 14th, 2025) was also conducted by ORS on the proposed access arrangements. It highlighted a number of issues including the attainment of the envelop of visibility, the treatment of the set-back area between the metalled edge of the carriageway and the new proposed boundary fence line (which could result in widening of the road and increased speed) and the delineation of the edge of the carriageway.
- 8.3.6. The drawings submitted in support of the application showing the sightlines in both directions are broadly similar to those previously submitted in support of the previous application (2360751). However, they have been amended to include the recommendations of the Road Safety Audit. The revised drawing indicates the replacement of more dense planting with individual trees, the set-back area will be finished in grass to maintain the existing width of the carriageway, the edge of which will be delineated using reflective bollards.
- 8.3.7. While the implementation of these measures would improve visibility in both directions from the proposed site entrance, the achievable sightlines fall short of the standards required in the development plan. The works would also involve significant intervention along the regional road, which has the potential to establish a precedent for similar development in the future and impact on the carrying capacity of the regional road in contravention of Policy Objective NNR 2. While the lands are

currently in the ownership and control of the applicant, there would be no requirement for the applicant to retain the house in his ownership and no guarantee that the site would not be sold in the future. The commitments given by the applicant to maintain the set-back area would not, therefore, be guaranteed in perpetuity. This would generate issues for the maintenance of the visibility spays from the entrance in the future, which would impact on road safety.

- 8.3.8. I accept that the submission from the TII is a standard type response and is not applicable to the proposed development, which is not located on a national road. I do not however accept applicant's argument that the site entrance has been designed in accordance with the provisions of the development plan.
- 8.3.9. The existing road at the front of the site is narrow and suffers from poor vertical and horizontal alignment. The local authority, who is responsible for maintenance of the road and for addressing hazards is clearly dissatisfied with the proposal and accordingly I consider that the decision of the planning authority to refuse permission on the grounds of road safety should be upheld.

8.4. Other Matters

- 8.4.1. The site is located in a Class 1 Landscape with a low sensitivity rating. These are the least sensitive landscapes in the county which are 'unlikely to be adversely affected by change'.
- 8.4.2. I note that a previous application (Reg Ref 2261332) on the site included a reason for refusal relating to siting and design. The proposal was for a two-storey dwelling with a ridge height of 7.9m and a finished floor level which would be notably elevated and c. 4m above the public road. The proposed house was sited towards the rear of the site, necessitating a substantial driveway for access (83m).
- 8.4.3. The current proposal is different in that the house is located closer to the public road (27m). Ground level in the location of the proposed house is c 3m above adjoining road level. The house is single storey in scale with a ridge height of 5.17m and the design, which includes a variety of external finishes and variations in the roof line, reduces the mass and bulk of the development from that originally proposed. The site does not benefit from site screening and there are open views from the south, west and east.

- 8.4.4. I note that the planning authority raised no issues regarding the siting, design and visual impact of the proposed development. It considered that it was in compliance with Policy Objective RH9 (Design Guidelines for the Single Rural House) in terms of assimilation into the landscape and landscaping and screening proposals.
- 8.4.5. While I accept that the proposal is an improvement on that originally proposed, it has not been demonstrated that the development is capable of effective assimilation into the landscape. I note that a site contour survey or site sections have not been submitted in support of the application showing how it is proposed to integrate the development into the site. The landscaping proposals, which include front boundary hedging and isolated/groups of native trees, would provide limited screening. The Coimisiún should it be minded to refuse permission for the development on the grounds of visual impact may consider this to be a new issue.
- 8.4.6. Foul effluent for the house would be discharged to an effluent treatment system located downgradient of the proposed house. A Site Suitability Assessment has been submitted with the planning application. It indicates that the site is underlain by a Locally Important (LI) aquifer with a 'high' vulnerability rating. The ground water protection response is R1. The closest well is located on the subject site and c 81m upgradient of the proposed effluent treatment system. There is another private well c 200m from the proposed system. There are no watercourses or drains on the site or within 150m of the effluent treatment system.
- 8.4.7. The trial hole was excavated to a depth of 1.0m and rock and ground water were recorded at this level. The soil type is identified as Silty/clay. No significant preferential flow paths were recorded. The percolation tests indicated a value of 18.22. The target at risk is groundwater. The assessment concluded that the provision of a septic tank system was not a suitable option and recommended the installation of a Secondary Treatment System (Kingspan BioFicient +®) with treated effluent pumped to a raised soil polishing filter (45m²) that will be constructed using 600mm of imported soil placed on top of 1000mm of undisturbed soil over bedrock. The system is designed for a PE of 6. I note that details of how the proposed system would be accommodated on the site are included in the assessment.
- 8.4.8. The Site Suitability Assessment has been carried out in accordance with the EPA's 'Code of Practice: Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems' (2021). The proposed

effluent treatment system is designed in accordance with the Code of Practice and satisfies the distance requirements set out in Table 6. On the basis that the suitability of the site for the proposed treatment system has been established and the minimum separation to boundaries, roads, dwellings, wells and surface water features can be complied with, I consider that foul effluent from the house can be effectively treated and discharged to ground without posing a threat to surface water or ground water quality.

- 8.5. In contrast to the original proposal (Reg Ref 2261332) which relied on a water supply from a well located on lands outside the site boundaries, the current application proposes to source water supply from a well located within the site. The results of yield tests indicated that the drilled well on the site could produce 220 gallons per day, which would be sufficient to cater for the house proposed. I note that the report states that a minimum amount of 220 gallons per day is guaranteed for one year but that further pumping could improve the well. Treatment would be required as iron levels exceeded the limit for drinking water. The water was acceptable with respect to bacteriological parameters.

8.6. Appropriate Assessment

Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive)

I have considered the proposal to construct house, garage and effluent treatment system in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located c 5km southwest of Eyrecourt. Co Galway.

The proposed development comprises the construction of a house, garage and effluent treatment system on the site.

No nature conservation issues were raised in the appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows.

- the scale and nature of the development
- the distance from the nearest European sites
- and lack of connections

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.

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

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. On the basis of the above assessment, I recommend that permission be refused for the development for the reasons and considerations set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1. It is considered that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the additional traffic turning movements that would be generated onto a narrow and substandard section of the adjoining Regional Road R 356, where a speed limit of 80kph applies and where adequate sightlines of 160m in both directions in accordance with DM Standard 28 of the

Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 cannot be achieved. The proposed development, if permitted, would result in significant road boundary intervention along the regional road, which would create an undesirable precedent for similar development and would reduce the carrying capacity of the regional road which would be contrary to Policy Objective NNR 2 of the development plan. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

Breda Gannon
Planning Inspector

29th August, 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP 322769-25
Proposed Development Summary	Dwelling house, garage and wastewater treatment system together with all associated site works.
Development Address	Moorfield. Eyrecourt. Ballinasloe. Co. Galway
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, 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.	
☒ 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.	Class 10(b) of Part 2, Schedule 5(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. (In this paragraph, "business district" means a district within a city or town in which the predominant land use is retail or commercial use)
☐ 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)	1 dwelling on 0.860 hectares

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 ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP 322769-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a house, garage and wastewater treatment system with all associated site works
Development Address	Moorfield, Eyrecourt, Ballinasloe. Co. Galway
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. The development has a modest footprint and comes forward as a standalone project. It does not require demolition works, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed

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 development is situated in a rural area on improved agricultural land which is abundant in the area. The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, centres of population and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects. Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, 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.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
--	--

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)