



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-322849-25

Development	Construction of 6 houses and all associated site works.
Location	Corskeagh, Frenchpark, Co. Roscommon.
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	24/60251
Applicant(s)	Braddingford Construction Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party Appeal
Appellant(s)	David and Hilary Flanagan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	5 th September 2025

Inspector

Frank O'Donnell

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1. Decision	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	11
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	12
3.4. Third Party Observations	12
4.0 Planning History.....	13
5.0 Policy Context.....	14
5.1. Development Plan.....	14
5.2. Guidelines/ Circulars	17
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	17
5.4. EIA Screening	17
6.0 The Appeal	18
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	18
6.2. Applicant Response	18
6.3. Planning Authority Response	19
6.4. Observations	19
6.5. Further Responses	19
7.0 Assessment.....	19
8.0 AA Screening.....	25
9.0 Water Framework Directive	26
10.0 Recommendation	27

11.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	27
12.0	Conditions	28

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject appeal site is located on the northwest side of the Castlereagh Road (R361 Regional Road), within c. 354 metres to the southwest of the centre of the village at the intersection of the R361 and the N5. The site, which falls gently in a general northern direction, has a stated site area of 0.619 hectares, has a general rectangular shape and forms part of a larger landholding to the rear which, together with the subject appeal site, is shown to extend to c. 1.1 hectares.
- 1.2. The site frontage comprises mature native hedging and trees and there are 2 no. existing field entrances. A medium/ low voltage overhead powerline traverses the southwestern side of the site in a southeast to northwest direction. There is existing public street lighting and an existing public footpath located on the opposite side (southwest) of the Regional Road (R361) which is connected to the centre of Frenchpark further to the northeast. The site is located within the 50 kph speed limit for the village.
- 1.3. There is an existing housing development of 5 no. detached dwellings located c. 27 metres to the southwest on the opposite side (southeast) of the R361 (Corskeagh). There is also a separate existing housing scheme, comprising 20 no. dwelling units and a Childcare Facility, located c. 50 metres to the east of the subject appeal site on the opposite southeast side of the public road (An Choirrsceach).
- 1.4. There is an existing Ringfort (RO015-024---- : Ringfort - rath : CORSKEAGH (Frenchpark By)) the centre of which is located c. 43 metres to the south of the subject appeal site on the opposite side of the public road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, as amended and as approved by the Local Authority, comprises the following:
 - 4 no. single storey detached dwellings, as follows:
 - 2 no. single storey 3 bedroom dwellings – House Type A (96 sqm GFA)
 - 2 no. single storey 2 bedroom dwellings - House Type B (72 sqm GFA)

- The provision of a 2 metre wide footpath along the site frontage and within the development.
- Public Open Space along the site frontage and along the southwestern site boundary.
- Vehicular Access to the rear/ north of the site along the northeastern site boundary.

2.2. The initial proposal, as presented to the Local Authority, was for 6 no. dwelling houses in the form of 2 no. 2 bedroom single storey detached dwellings, 1 no. 3 bedroom single storey detached dwelling, 2 no. 3 bedroom two storey detached dwellings, and 1 no. 4 bedroom two storey detached dwelling.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The Local Authority issued a Request for **Further Information** on 29th July 2024 on 8 no. main points, as follows:

1. *The Planning Authority has serious concerns in relation to the design and layout of the proposed development which it is considered (despite some progress in terms of design development on proposals refused under Planning Register Reference PD/24/60042), both by reason of building/street design and layout constitutes a suburban type multi-unit residential development contrary to the provisions of Roscommon County Development Plan Policy Objective Tulsk DO 1 which discourages further suburban type multi-unit residential development during the plan period. Furthermore it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of the overall design, layout and development strategy proposed, would result in a form of development which would not, as currently proposed, meet the required standard of urban placemaking for its proposed context. Please therefore submit proposals for a significantly revised design and layout focusing on significant revisions to both the layout of the scheme and the design of individual house typologies. In this regard, please submit a proposal for a significantly reduced number of dwellings, designed in a manner reflective of*

the provisions of Section 3 ‘Alternatives to Rural One-off Housing’ and the conceptual village development depicted in Figure 3.3, noting the use of casual groupings of a small numbers of dwellings, shared space and structures of low massing reflective of the human scale.

- 2. In the context of the revisions required as per item no. 1 above please submit a detailed statement of compliance with the ‘Key Indicators of Quality Design and Placemaking’ set out in ‘Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements – Guidelines for Planning Authorities’ (DHLGH; 2024) for the scheme as revised.*
- 3. It is noted that the current proposals have failed to address the concerns raised in the previous application (Planning Reg. Ref. PD/2460042) relating to Roscommon’s Smart Travel Initiative, and active travel infrastructural provision. The Planning Authority has serious concerns therefore in relation to the proposed development in the absence of this infrastructural connectivity. You are now required to demonstrate how pedestrian connectivity can be achieved and demonstrate compliance with the provisions of Section 4.4 of Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) and Policy Objectives ITC 7.25, ICT 7.28 and ICT 7.30 of Volume 1 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028.*
- 4. In this regard, the applicant/agent is required to engage with Roscommon County Councils Roads Department, prior to the preparation of a formal response to this notice, in order that full details of required footpaths works, impacts on the public road and/or third party lands (including accommodation works) can be determined.*
- 5. The site layout received does not provide the requisite clarity in relation to maximum achievable sight distance at the proposed entrance. In this regard please submit a revised site layout plan (scale 1:500) which demonstrates the satisfactory achievement of the requisite unobstructed visibility sightlines, shown in both directions from the site entrance in accordance with the provisions of Section 12.24 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 – Volume 1 and in the manner set out in Figure 12.4 of said*

document. The drawing should indicate all proposals for the lowering and/or removal of banks or vegetation and should be measured from a point 3 metres back from the carriageway edge at the centre of the access point to a point to the near edge of the carriageway in each direction. The revised site layout plan submitted should clearly indicate the existing road edge, and the full extent of vegetation required to either be removed or maintained/lowered in order to achieve/maintain the unobstructed visibility sightlines illustrated. In the event that works are required on lands outside the identified planning unit and outside the control of the applicant, evidence of written consent from the relevant landowner will be required. Please indicate on this revised site layout what the proposals are for the replacement of any existing roadside boundary following its removal.

- 6. Submit a Tier 1 construction and demolition waste resource management plan (RWMP) prepared in accordance with the EPA (2021), Best Practice Guidelines for the preparation of resource & waste management plans for construction and demolition projects and the provisions of the Waste Management Act 1996 as amended. The RWMP should include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness.*
- 7. It is noted that the proposed development site is partly within the zone of archaeological potential established around Recorded Monuments RO015-024 (Ringfort – rath) which is subject to statutory protection in the Record of Monuments and Places, established under Section 12 of the National Monuments (Amendment) Act 1994. As per the requirements set out in a consultation response from the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage a suitably qualified archaeologist is required to be engaged to undertake pre-development testing on site. A report of the archaeological assessment and testing should be submitted as a response to this further information request. This will enable the Planning Authority and the Department to formulate an informed archaeological recommendation before a planning decision is taken.*
- 8. The surface water design details received depict an attenuation tank, however no Nature-based Solutions are included on the surface water layout drawing*

and no details of the surface water design were submitted. Nature based solutions for surface water management should be incorporated into the design of the proposed development in line with Nature-based Solutions to the Management of Rainwater and Surface Water Runoff in Urban Areas Water Sensitive Urban Design Best Practice Interim Guidance Document as published by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage. Please submit proposals for updated surface water management arrangements to incorporate SUDs in accordance with the foregoing.

3.1.2. The Local Authority issued a Request for **Clarification of Further Information** on 31st January 2025 on 2 no. main points, as follows:

1. *The reduction in the number of dwelling units proposed from 6 to 4 is recognised as representing an attempt to address aspects of item no. 1 of the further information request. However, the associated revised layout continues to be presented in a linear form and fails to reflect the specific requirement for a redesign in a manner reflective of the provisions of Section 3 ‘Alternatives to Rural One-Off Housing’ and the conceptual village design depicted in Figure 3.3 of Volume I of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028. Item no. 1 of the further information request has not therefore been satisfactorily addressed. Please submit a substantially revised site layout plan in accordance with the requirements set out in item no. 1 of that request.*
2. *In relation to Item No. 4 the requested necessary engagement with the Roads Department of Roscommon County Council has not taken place. Given that the proposed scheme indicates works that engage with the public road network, including works on the opposite side of the road from the site itself, it is considered essential that the engagement with the RCC Roads Department take place in advance of a formal decision being made on this application. Accordingly, you are again requested and advised to engage with Roscommon County Council’s Roads Department, and further to detailed agreement with that Department on proposals for all necessary offsite works to facilitate the proposed development, submit details of all such works, including full details of required footpaths works, and identification of impacts on the public road and/or third party lands (including accommodation works).*

Where works are proposed on lands not within the ownership/control of the applicant, submit evidence of written consent from all relevant landowner, agreeing to the undertaking of such works.

3.1.3. The Local Authority issued a Notification of Decision to GRANT permission on 28th May 2025 subject to 23 no. conditions.

3.1.4. Condition no. 2 reads as follows:

2. This permission is for the construction of 4 no. dwelling houses only, involving the construction of all ancillary on site/off site enabling and completion works to facilitate same, inclusive of access to the site and connection to existing public services and sewers only.

Reason: In the interests of clarity.

3.1.5. Condition no. 8 reads as follows:

8. Prior to commencement of development the applicant/developer shall liaise with the Roads Section of Roscommon County Council and the Boyle Municipal District Co-Ordinator to ensure all works relating to site access/exit, footpaths, public lighting, pedestrian and parking areas, road/pedestrian markings etc. will be undertaken to the satisfaction of Roscommon County Council. Furthermore the applicant/developer shall ensure continual engagement with the aforementioned Council Authorities during construction works to ensure an acceptable schedule of all site completion works including but not limited to roads, footpaths/pedestrian area, parking areas, road/pedestrian markings, public amenity areas and public lighting provision. A programme for engagement with the aforementioned parties shall be submitted for the written agreement of the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of proper planning, orderly development and in the interests of public safety.

3.1.6. Condition no. 22 relates to a Special Development Contribution of €15,000 towards the provision of 'a signalised/controlled pedestrian crossing on the public road/footpath of the R-361 regional road that serves this site. The precise siting of

said controlled pedestrian crossing shall be determined by Roscommon County Council.'

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The **Local Authority Planner** considered the Applicants submitted a sufficient response to the issues raised as highlighted in the Request for Clarification for Further Information and therefore deemed it appropriate to recommend a Grant of permission in this instance. The Local Authority Planner further considered it necessary that the proposed roadside works be completed prior to the commencement of any works on site and that a condition to this effect be attached.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- The **Boyle Municipal District Office** note the Applicants proposals show an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing on the R361 (Regional Road) and recommend that Roscommon County Council construct a controlled pedestrian crossing at or near the location proposed under the subject application, reg. ref. no. 24-60251. The Boyle MD recommend that the developer be charged a Special Contribution of €15,000.
- The **Environment Department** raise no objection to the proposed development and recommend that, should permission be granted, 3 no. conditions be attached in relation to noise, a resource waste management plan (rwmp) and the storage/ segregation of all demolition/ excavation/ construction waste on site prior to disposal to a licensed or permitted facility in accordance with the provisions of the Waste Management Act 1996 as amended only.
- The **Housing Department** raise no objection to the proposed development and recommend the Applicant be requested to engage with the housing department in relation to Part V obligations and that agreement be reached before the Applicant submits a commencement notice. The Housing Department dispute the proposed costs referenced by the Applicant state that

a Part V agreement must be in agreement prior to the commencement. Finally, the Housing Department recommend/ state that the Applicant is required to ensure Part V obligations will be met at all potential phases of the project.

- The **Roads Section** raise no objection to the proposed development subject to further information in relation to details of sightlines as per Development Plan requirements and details of proposed footpaths works/ potential agreement with the Local Authority to extend the footpath back towards Frenchpark on the west side of the road. Further general comments are provided in relation to surface water run-off from the site onto the public road, the relocation of all existing roadside signs and services and the reinstatement of the public road to the satisfaction of the Local Authority in the event of any damage.
- The Roads Section separately state that there has been no engagement with the Roads Department and that perhaps the Area Engineer has been in contact with the developers agent.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- **Uisce Eireann** raise no objection to the proposed development subject to 4 no. standard conditions.
- The **Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage** recommend that pre-development archaeological testing be carried out on site, that a Report in relation to same be submitted as Further Information.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. 1 no. Third Party Submission was received from the following:

- David & Hilary Flanagan

3.4.2. The main issues raised in the submission can be summarised, as follows:

- No objection in principle to the construction of houses in Frenchpark.
- The Observers have not been consulted by the Applicant.

- The proposed cut/ fill balance is unclear. Notwithstanding the submission of a Construction Waste Management Plan, it is unclear as to how excavated waste is proposed to be handled, stored and disposed of.
- The Application does not provide any information as to why the selected site represents the optimum site for residential development in Frenchpark.
- The proposed management of watercourses on the lands is unclear. Will existing watercourses be integrated into the proposed new drainage system. Clarify is sought in relation to this issue.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Planning History on the Subject Appeal Site

- **2460042:** Permission for the proposed construction of a residential development of 9 no. dwelling houses consisting of 6 no. three bedroom detached storey & a half type dwelling houses, 3 no. four bedroom detached storey & a half type dwelling houses, boundary fences/walls, entrance, internal access road, green open space, proposed connections to the existing foul sewer & watermain network. Permission was REFUSED on 26th March 2024 for the following 2 no. reasons:
 1. *Notwithstanding the acceptability of appropriate residential development on the area of the subject site, which is within the Frenchpark Village Plan boundary, as identified in Volume II of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 to 2028, the proposed development by reason of its layout and design constitutes a suburban type multi-unit residential development as referenced in Section 3.19 of Volume II of the said Plan. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the provisions of Policy Objective Frenchpark DO 1 of Volume II of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 which discourages further suburban type multiunit residential development in Frenchpark. The proposed development would accordingly be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

2. *The proposed development by reason of insufficient active travel connectivity to Frenchpark village centre and in addition by reason of its design and layout which is not considered a sufficiently responsive built form in the context of the established pattern and form of development in the immediate vicinity would not meet the required standard of placemaking, would not provide a high quality residential environment and would impact unduly on the residential amenity of future residents, if permitted. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the provisions of Section 4.4 of “Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements – Guidelines for Planning Authorities” (DHLGH; 2024). The proposed development would accordingly be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- ***Roscommon County Development Plan, 2022 to 2028 (Volume 1)***

- 5.1.1. Chapter 2 of the Development Plan relates to Core Strategy and Settlement Policy. As per Table 2.3 and Map 2.2 ‘Settlement Hierarchy’ identify Frenchpark as a Serviced Settlement which are settlements that are serviced by public sewerage and have a capacity to facilitate a degree of residential development.
- 5.1.2. The following Core Strategy Policy Objective is provided in Section 2.7 of the Plan (Settlement Strategy):
- ***CS 2.16: Ensure that the serviced settlements throughout the county maintain existing population levels and services, and to ensure that future growth is balanced and sustainable and is relative and appropriate to their scale, size and character.***
- 5.1.3. Appendix 4 ‘Wastewater Treatment Capacity’ states there is ‘Adequate Capacity’ for anticipated growth over the Plan period. Frenchpark is stated to have a population of 454 persons and the wastewater treatment plant is stated to have a design PE capacity of 1,000 persons.

5.1.4. Chapter 3 relates to People, Places and Housing and includes the following policies:

- **PPH 3.7:** *Support the development of quality residential schemes with a range of housing options having regard to the standards, principles and any specific planning policy requirements (SPPRs) set out in the ‘Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines for Planning Authorities’ (2009) and Circular NRUP 02/2021 Residential Densities in Towns and Village.*

Alternatives to Rural One-Off Housing

‘...This Plan recognises the importance of striking a balance between facilitating residential development in the open countryside and reinvigorating towns and villages. This will provide a platform for the development of sustainable rural communities, whereby an increase in population in towns and villages would create greater demand for services and establish a catchment population for local businesses.

The Settlement Hierarchy outlined in Chapter 2, Table 2.3 identifies rural villages as settlements that provide important services and facilities to serve their own population and their rural hinterlands. Some of these villages are served by public mains water and/or waste water supply, whilst others are unserved. There is capacity in these villages to accommodate a modest level of growth, with the growth capacity being dependent on the size of the village. The provision of serviced sites in these settlements will be encouraged in line with the capacity of public water and/or waste water infrastructure available.’

- **PPH 3.20:** *Promote the provision of serviced sites, supported by Irish Water infrastructure, in order to provide opportunity for people to build their own home and live within the existing footprint of villages and Self-Sustaining Growth Towns < 2000 population.*
- **PPH 3.21:** *Encourage the provision of housing within designated Rural Villages, to act as a viable alternative to single housing in the open countryside.*

5.1.5. Chapter 4 relates to Towns and Villages and includes the following policies:

- **TV 4.1:** *Promote and facilitate the sustainable development of a high quality built environment in order to create a distinctive sense of place, with attractive streets, spaces, and neighbourhoods that are accessible and provide safe places for the community to meet and socialise.*
- **TV 4.2:** *Develop sustainable and successful neighbourhoods through the consolidation and redevelopment of built-up areas. Promote new compact mixed-use forms of development in urban settlements and rural villages, served by public transport and green infrastructure.*
- **TV 4.3:** *Enhance and develop the fabric of existing urban and rural settlements in accordance with the principles of good urban design, including the promotion of high quality, well designed, visually attractive main entries into towns and villages.*
- **TV 4.18:** *Promote development at sustainable densities that support compact growth and the consolidation of urban areas (with particular emphasis on Town Cores), and which are also appropriate to the local context and enhance the local environment in which it is located.*

5.1.6. Chapter 7 relates to Infrastructure, Transport and Communications.

5.1.7. Chapter 12 relates to Development Management Standards.

- **Roscommon County Development Plan, 2022 to 2028 (Volume 2)**

5.1.8. Section 3 relates to Village Plans. Section 3.19 specifically relates to Frenchpark and includes the following Development Objectives:

- **Frenchpark DO1:** *To facilitate quality low density residential development at appropriate locations within the village settlement boundary. Further suburban type multi-unit residential developments will be discouraged.*
- **Frenchpark DO2:** *To support the provision of local and community services which can assist in sustaining and developing a resident community.*
- **Frenchpark DO3:** *To encourage opportunities for employment generation through appropriate developments, commensurate with the scale of the*

village, and in accordance with the principles of proper planning and sustainable development.

The subject appeal site is shown on Map 19 to be within the defined boundary of Frenchpark Village Plan.

5.2. Guidelines/ Circulars

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines, 2024
- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, 2019

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1. The site is not located within or adjacent to a Natura 2000 site. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are as follows:

- Cloonshanville Bog SAC (Site Code 000614), c. 1.5 km to the east;
- Bellanagare Bog SAC (Site Code 000592), c. 1.5 km to the south;
- Bellanagare Bog SPA (Site Code 004105), c. 1.8 km to the southwest.

5.4. EIA Screening

5.4.1. 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. The proposed development is the subject of 1 no. Third Party Appeal. The main Grounds of Appeal can be summarised as follows:

- No objection in principle to the construction of houses in Frenchpark.
- Lack of Consultation on behalf of the Applicant/ Developer.
- Site Excavations: There is no information on the cut/ fill balance. It is unclear how it is proposed to handle, store and dispose of excavated waste material.
- Site Selection: There is no justifications as to why the subject site is the optimum site for residential development within the Village.
- Watercourse Management: It is unclear as to how existing on-site watercourses are proposed to be managed or indeed whether they will become part of the proposed new drainage system.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. A First Party Appeal Response was received from the Applicant, the main issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- The Applicant has attached a copy of the Third Party Appeal (Appendix A).
- The Local Authority issued a decision to Grant permission, a copy of which, together with relevant conditions is attached as Appendix B of the Response.
- The original site layout for 6 no. dwellings and copies of the Request and Responses to Further Information and Clarification of Further Information are attached as Appendix C of the First Party Appeal Response.
- An email sent by the Applicant to the Local Authority in relation to the public footpath, is attached as Appendix D.
- Appendix E of the First Party Appeal Response is a copy of an internal email sent from the Boyle MD Office to the Planning Department (North) in relation to a Special Development Contribution of €15,000 towards the cost of a

controlled pedestrian crossing which, it is recommended, the Local Authority should construct.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

- None

6.4. **Observations**

- None

6.5. **Further Responses**

- None

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 and the reports of the planning authority and having inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/ regional and national policies and guidance, I consider the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Site Selection/ Justification
- Residential Density (New Issue)
- Site Excavations
- Watercourse Management
- Other Matters
 - *Pedestrian Connectivity/ Special Development Contribution*
 - *Lack of Consultation from the Applicant*

7.2. Site Selection/ Justification

- 7.2.1. I note the concerns of the Appellant in relation to the Applicants' justification for the selection of the subject site as an optimum site for residential development within the Village. As set out further above, Frenchpark is identified as a serviced settlement in the Roscommon County Development Plan, 2022-2028. The subject appeal site is located entirely within the defined Frenchpark Village Plan boundary as per Map 19 of Section 3.19 of Volume II of the Plan. The site is within walking distance of the centre of the village at the intersection of the R361 and the N5.
- 7.2.2. As per, Section 3.3.5 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines, 2024, which relates to Rural Towns and Villages (< 1,500 population) there are 3 no. key priorities identified for compact growth in Rural Towns and Villages in order of priority. The first priority is concerned with the strengthening of the urban core and is not, in my view, of particular relevance to the subject case owing to its location at the southwestern edge of the settlement. The second priority is to 'realise opportunities for infill and backland development.' The subject appeal site, in my opinion, is an infill site positioned between 2 no. existing dwellings. The proposed residential development on the subject site would therefore, in my opinion, satisfy the second priority.
- 7.2.3. The third priority, in order of priority, is to 'provide for sequential and sustainable housing development at the edge of the settlement at suitable locations that are closest to the urban core and are integrated into, or can be integrated into the existing built up footprint of the settlement and can be serviced by necessary supporting infrastructure.' I note that for larger settlements, i.e.. Cities and Metropolitan (MASP) Areas, Regional Growth Centres, Key towns and Large Towns (5,000+ population) the final priority is to deliver sequential and sustainable urban extension at locations that are closest to the urban core. In respect of Rural Towns and Villages, such as in the subject case, there is a key difference in that the final priority is to provide for sequential and sustainable housing development 'at the edge of the settlement' at suitable locations that are closest to the urban core.
- 7.2.4. I note there are other lands located within the defined village plan boundary which are closer to the village centre/ urban core and which could similarly be developed for residential purposes but which have yet to progress to planning application stage.

I note, in particular, the existing greenfield site located within c. 157 metres to the northeast on the same side of the public road, which has an approximate site area of c. 1.2 hectares. In my opinion, this said site, further to the northeast, although located closer to the urban core of the village, is not located at the edge of the settlement as in the case of the subject appeal site.

7.2.5. The subject appeal site is, in my opinion, located in a more sequentially preferable location, relative to the urban core, than other established residential development within the defined settlement boundary. I note, in particular, the existing housing development (5 no. detached one and a half storey dwellings) located further to the south of the subject appeal site on the opposite side (southeast) of the R361. I also note there are other lands greenfield lands which are potentially viable for residential development further removed from the urban core yet still identified within the defined settlement boundary.

7.2.6. Having regard to the proximity of the subject appeal site relative to the centre of the settlement, the size and scale of development proposed and the wording of the third priority set out in Section 3.3.5 of the Guidelines which is to *‘(c) provide for sequential and sustainable housing development at the edge of the settlement at suitable locations that are closest to the urban core and are integrated into, or can be integrated into the existing built up footprint of the settlement and can be serviced by necessary supporting infrastructure’* I am satisfied that the choice of the subject site for residential development is appropriate in this instance and in accordance with guidance for the development of such Rural Towns and Villages, as set out in Section 3.3.5 of the aforementioned Guidelines.

7.3. Residential Density (New Issue)

7.3.1. Frenchpark is defined as a Serviced Settlement in Table 2.3 and Map 2.3 of Chapter 2 - Core Strategy and Settlement Policy of the Development Plan. I note as per Appendix 4 of Volume I of the Roscommon County Development Plan, 2022 to 2028, that Frenchpark is indicated to have a population of 454 persons and that it is stated there is *‘Adequate Capacity for anticipated growth over the Plan period. The wastewater treatment plant has a design PE (population equivalent) capacity of 1,500.’* In other words, there is sufficient spare capacity within the existing WWTP in Frenchpark to cater for an additional 1,046 PE.

- 7.3.2. I note the previous planning history on the subject appeal site, as planning reg. ref. no. 2460042 refers, sought permission for a total of 9 no. dwellings on an overall site area of 1.22 hectares which included the subject appeal site and additional lands to the rear (north) outside the defined settlement boundary of Frenchpark Village. The proposed overall residential density for planning reg. ref. no. 2460042, as presented, is therefore estimated to equate to 7 dph. When the lands to the rear (north), where no development was proposed, are excluded, the residential density is estimated to equate to 15 dph. Permission was refused in that instance for 2 no. reasons, reason no. 1 of which considered the proposal to be contrary to the Frenchpark Village Plan (Section 3.19 of Volume II of the Development Plan) and Frenchpark Development Objective DO1, by reason of the proposed residential layout and design which was considered to constitute a suburban type multi-unit residential development, see Section 4.0 above (Planning History).
- 7.3.3. The subject appeal site has a stated site area of 0.619 hectares. The initial proposal presented to the Local Authority was for 6 no. dwellings which equates to a maximum residential density of 10 dph. During the course of the subject Application, the number of dwellings was reduced from 6 no. dwellings to 4 no. dwellings, which equates to a maximum residential density of 7 no. dwellings per hectare.
- 7.3.4. I note Section 3.3.5 of the Sustainable Residential Development Compact Settlement Guidelines, 2024, relates to Rural Towns and Villages (< 1,500 population). The guidance, in accordance with the NPF, does not identify serviced settlements for significant population growth but instead recommends that such growth should be at a limited pace appropriate to the service and employment function of the settlement and the availability and capacity of infrastructure to support further development. Table 3.7 in Section 3.3.5 of the Guidelines relates to Areas and Density Ranges for Rural Towns and Villages and note it is a policy and objective of the Guidelines that development in rural towns and villages is tailored to the scale, form and character of the settlement and the capacity of services and infrastructure. It is further noted from the same said table (3.7) that lands at the edge of rural towns and villages, which are zoned for housing and can be integrated into the settlement and are connected to existing walking and cycling networks are recognised as offering an effective alternative (including serviced sites) to the provision of single houses in the countryside. It is further recommended that in such

located the density of development should respond in a positive way to the established context.

7.3.5. The subject appeal site, in my view, represents such a scenario owing to its location at the edge of the subject settlement, within the defined settlement boundary, where there are established supporting services typical for a village of its size, where there is available infrastructural capacity and where there is potential to link to established walking facilities (footpath) on the opposite side of the public road by means of a controlled pedestrian crossing, as proposed.

7.3.6. The proposed development is in my view, consistent with other similar recently permitted development in the general locality in terms of residential density.

7.3.7. In summary, I am satisfied that the proposed residential density, as presented, is acceptable in this instance.

7.3.8. As this is a new issue, the Commission may wish to seek the views of the parties.

7.4. Site Excavations

7.5. I note the concerns of the Applicant in relation to the extent of cut and fill excavations proposed to take place on site and how it is proposed to handle, store and dispose of such waste as part of the site development works. I note the final site layout plan drawing received by the Local Authority on 01st May 2025, titled 'Site Layout – Boundary Treatment & Landscaping Layout', Drg. No. 01. The existing site contours and proposed finished floor levels and relevant proposed levels are shown on this drawing. In my opinion, the extent of site excavations necessary to prepare the site and construct the proposed development would be relatively normal for a development of this scale and a site of this size. Based on the existing site contours and proposed site levels, it is my opinion that the existing site levels will not be dramatically altered to such a degree to be a significant or long term cause for concern for surrounding residents. In the event of a Grant of permission being issued, I recommend that a standard Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) condition be attached. Such a condition would require the submission of a RWMP, in accordance with the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) including demonstration of proposals to adhere to best practice and protocols. I am satisfied that such a RWMP would be sufficiently robust and wide in scope to

suitably address the concerns of the Appellant in relation the control and management of surplus excavated material from the site.

7.6. Watercourse Management

- 7.7. I note the concerns of the Appellant in relation to the future management of watercourses on the subject site. The Appellant is unclear as to whether existing watercourses will be integrated into the proposed new drainage system and has requested clarity in this regard.
- 7.8. I note as per the submitted site layout plans, there are existing open drains shown to the rear of the Applicants' landholding. The said open drains are stated to measure between 1.5 m to 2.0 metres in depth. I note the generous separation distance of 14 metres proposed to be observed from the side of the southernmost dwelling to the shared side southwest site boundary. I further note the Applicant's proposals for the treatment of surface water from the proposed development which include the provision of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) in the form of a surface water attenuation area with a petrol interceptor on the inlet and a hydro brake flow-control valve on the outlet. The surface water system has been designed for an outflow discharge rate into the existing public surface water network as per greenfield site rate which is 2lt/Ha/sec. Nature based solutions for surface water management include the installation of rainwater collection butts at each dwelling.
- 7.9. It is accepted that a final surface water layout has not been presented which is reflective of the alterations to the proposed layout as presented in response to the Request for Further Information. The Applicant was not expressly requested to do so.
- 7.10. I am satisfied that the surface water arising as a result of the proposed development will be suitably attenuated on site and then discharged to the public surface water sewer at an appropriate greenfield rate. I am further satisfied that that the existing open drains will not be significantly impact upon as a result of the proposed development so as to alter their current function.
- 7.11. In the event of a Grant of Permission being issued, I recommend that a standard drainage condition be attached whereby final drainage arrangements including the disposal of surface water and the final Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS)

measures be submitted and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of construction.

7.12. Other Matters

- *Pedestrian Connectivity/ Special Development Contribution*

7.12.1. Condition no. 22 of the Notification of Decision to Grant permission issued by the Local Authority on 28th May 2025 relates to a Special Development Contribution towards the cost of a signalised/controlled pedestrian crossing on the public road/footpath of the R-361 regional road that serves this site. I am satisfied that this infrastructure is required and in this regard I recommend that a standard Special Development Contribution condition be attached in the event of a grant of permission being issued.

- *Lack of Consultation from the Applicant*

7.12.2. I note the concerns of the appellant in relation to a lack of consultation on behalf of the Applicant. In my opinion, there is no onus upon the Applicant to liaise with third parties prior to the lodgement of a planning application. Whether or not the Applicant/ Developer wishes to liaise with any third parties is a matter for said Applicant/ Developer.

8.0 AA Screening

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

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the Cloonshanville Bog SAC, Bellanagare Bog SAC and Bellanagare Bog SPA or any other European site, in view of the Conservation Objectives of these sites and is

therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The nature and scale of the proposed development and lack of mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site.
- The location/ distance from the nearest European Site and the lack of any connections to same.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

- 9.1. The subject appeal site is located within the settlement boundary for Frenchpark Village. The proposed development comprises the construction of 4 no. single storey detached dwellings and all associated site works.
- 9.2. The Carricknabraher River (CARRICKNABRAHER_010) is located c.497 metres to the south of the appeal site. The appeal site is also located within the Cloonshanville Bog Groundwater Body (GWDTE-Cloonshanville Bog (SAC000614)) which underlies the site.
- 9.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.4. I have assessed the proposed residential 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.
- 9.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The relatively small-scale nature of the proposed development.
 - The location of the subject appeal site, distance to the nearest water body and lack of direct hydrological connections.

- 9.6. 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. I recommend that permission be granted for the reasons and considerations set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 11.1. Having regard to the existing pattern of development in the area, the location and setting of the site within the designated settlement boundary for Frenchpark, which is identified as a 'serviced village' according to the Core Strategy and Settlement Policy under the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028, and as a settlement that is serviced by public sewerage with the capacity to facilitate a degree of residential demand, and to the relevant policies, objectives and development standards, in particular Policy Objectives Frenchpark DO 1, TV 4.1 and TV 4.2, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, is appropriate in terms of design, scale and layout and consistent with the established built character of the vicinity, and that it would provide an acceptable standard of amenity for future residents. The proposed development would, therefore, be 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 7th January 2025 and 1st May 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. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit a revised site layout plan for the written agreement of the planning authority, which correctly corresponds with the submitted floor plans and elevations for House Types A and B as received by the planning authority on the 7th January 2025.

Reason: In the interest of the clarity.

3. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes of the proposed development shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

4. 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.

5. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer or any agent acting on its behalf, shall prepare a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) including demonstration of proposals to adhere to best practice and protocols. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness; these details shall be placed on the file and retained as part of the public record. The RWMP must be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement prior to the commencement of development. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times.

Reason: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development.

6. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall agree in writing all vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of pedestrian and traffic safety.

7. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a connection agreement with Uisce Éireann to provide for a service connection (s) to the water supply network.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure access to a potable water supply.

8. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a connection agreement with Uisce Éireann to provide for a service connection(s) to the wastewater collection network.

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

9. Drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Details of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) measures shall be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement prior to the commencement of construction.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable drainage and public health.

10. 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 lighting along pedestrian routes and open spaces and shall take account of trees. Such lighting shall be provided prior to the making available for occupation of any residential unit.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and public safety.

11. All of the in-curtilage car parking spaces serving residential units shall be provided with electric connections to the exterior of the houses to allow for the provision of future electric vehicle charging points. Details of how it is proposed to comply with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable transportation.

12. The boundary treatment and landscaping scheme shown on drawing number boundary treatment layout plan, DRG. no. 01, , as submitted to the planning authority on 01st day of May, 2025 shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works. In addition to the proposals in the submitted scheme, the following shall be carried out:

- i) All rear gardens shall be bounded by block walls between 1.2 and 2 metres in height, capped and rendered on both sides. Alternative boundary treatments shall otherwise be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

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

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

13. Proposals for an estate name, house numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all estate and street signs, and house/apartment numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. The proposed name(s) shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority. No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name(s) of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name(s).

Reason: In the interest of urban legibility and to ensure the use of locally appropriate placenames for new residential areas.

14. The management and maintenance of the proposed development following its completion shall be the responsibility of a legally constituted management company, or by the local authority in the event of the development being taken in charge. Detailed proposals in this regard shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of this development.

15. 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. Details of the ducting shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. Any existing overground cables shall be relocated underground as part of the site development works.

Reason: In the interest of visual and residential amenity.

16. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays 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.

17. The developer shall pay a financial contribution to the planning authority as a special contribution under Section 48(2)(c) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, in respect of the provision of a signalised/controlled pedestrian crossing on the public road/footpath of the R-361 regional road that serves this site which benefits the proposed development. The precise siting of said controlled pedestrian crossing shall be determined by the planning authority. Roscommon County Council. The amount of the contribution 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 for determination. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as may be agreed prior to the commencement of the development, and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the terms of payment of this financial contribution shall be agreed in writing between the planning authority and the developer.

Reason: It is considered reasonable that the developer should contribute towards the specific exceptional costs which are incurred by the planning

authority in respect of public services, which are not covered in the Development Contribution Scheme or the Supplementary Development Contribution Scheme and which will benefit the proposed development.

18. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefitting 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 the 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 developers 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.

19. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion and maintenance until taken in charge by the local authority of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, public open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion or maintenance of any part of the development. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of the development until taken in charge.

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.

Frank O'Donnell
Planning Inspector

26th September 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	322849-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 6 houses and all associated site works.
Development Address	Corskeagh, Frenchpark, Co. Roscommon.
	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.	
☒ 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) (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units. 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. (In this paragraph, “business district” means a district within a city or town in which the predominant land use is retail or commercial use.)

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-322849-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 6 houses and all associated site works.
Development Address	Corskeagh, Frenchpark, Co. Roscommon.
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 subject appeal site measures has a stated site area of 0.619 hectares. The proposed development, as initially presented to the Local Authority, was for 6 no. single storey detached houses and associated site works including access road, services and open space. The site is a greenfield infill site and is adjacent to established residential development to the immediate northeast and southwest. It is anticipated that the proposed development will not result in any significant use of natural resources, will not result in any significant production of waste, will not give rise to significant pollution or nuisance impacts, will not give rise to any significant risk of accident/ disaster or impacts upon human health.
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 development is a greenfield site situated in an urban area. There are no Protected Structures on the subject site or within the general vicinity and the site is not located within an Architectural Conservation Area. Zone nor are there any Protected Structures present. The site is not located within or adjacent to sensitive sites or European Sites including any Natura 2000 sites. The site is not located in what can be considered a densely populated area. Although the site is located within an area of archaeological significance/ potential, a site specific archaeological test trenching report prepared by the Applicant in Response to item 7 of the Request for Further Information did not find any archaeological remains at the site. No archaeological finds, features or artifacts were identified. The site was therefore found to be of low archaeological potential.

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 relatively small scale nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, the likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and the 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.	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Template 2:

Standard AA Screening Determination Template Test for likely significant effects

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	Construction of 6 houses and all associated site works.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	The subject appeal site measures has a stated site area of 0.619 hectares. The proposed development, as initially presented to the Local Authority, was for 6 no. single storey detached houses and associated site works including access road, services and open space. The proposed Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) is proposed to be provided in the form of a surface water attenuation area with a petrol interceptor on the inlet and a hydro brake flow-control valve on the outlet. The surface water system has been designed for an outflow discharge rate into the existing surface water network as per greenfield site which is 2lt/Ha/sec. Nature based solutions for surface water management include the installation of rainwater collection butts at each dwelling. There are no watercourses or other ecological features of note on the site that would connect it directly to European Sites in the wider area.
Screening report	Yes – Local Authority
Natura Impact Statement	No
Relevant submissions	None

Step 2: Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model.

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³ Y/N
Cloonshanville Bog SAC (Site Code 000614)	Active raised bogs [7110] Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration [7120] Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion [7150] Bog woodland [91D0] https://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/sac/000614	1.5 km to the east.	No direct connection Possible weak indirect connection via surface water	Y
Bellanagare Bog SAC (Site Code 000592)	Active raised bogs [7110] Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration [7120] Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion [7150] https://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/sac/000592	1.5 km to the south.	No direct connection Possible weak indirect connection via surface water	Y
Bellanagare Bog SPA (Site Code 004105)	Greenland White-fronted Goose (Anser albifrons flavirostris) [A395]	1.8 km to the southwest	No direct connection Possible weak	Y

	https://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/spa/004105		indirect connection via surface water	
Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone <u>or</u> in combination) on European Sites				
Site name Qualifying interests		Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*		
		Impacts	Effects	
Site 1: Cloonshanville Bog SAC (Site Code 000614) <u>Qualifying Interests</u> Active raised bogs [7110] Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration [7120] Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion [7150] Bog woodland [91D0]		Direct: None Indirect: Possible localised, temporary, low magnitude impacts from construction related emissions to surface water during construction.	The contained nature of the site (no direct ecological connections or pathways) and distance from receiving features connected to the SAC and SPA make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SAC or SPA for the QIs listed. Conservation objectives would not be undermined.	
		Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No		
		If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No		
		Impacts	Effects	
Site 2: Bellanagare Bog SAC (Site Code 000592) <u>Qualifying Interests</u>		As Above	As above	

Active raised bogs [7110]		
Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration [7120]		
Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion [7150]		
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 3: Bellanagare Bog SPA (Site Code 004105) <u>Qualifying Interests</u> Greenland White-fronted Goose (Anser albifrons flavirostris) [A395]	As Above	As above
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site.		
I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on Cloonshanville Bog SAC, Bellanagare Bog SAC or Bellanagare Bog 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

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 the Cloonshanville Bog SAC, Bellanagare Bog SAC and Bellanagare Bog SPA or any other European site, in view of the Conservation Objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The nature and scale of the proposed development and lack of mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site.
- The location/ distance from the nearest European Site and the lack of any connections to same.

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

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

An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	ACP-322849-25	Townland, address	Corskeagh, Frenchpark, County Roscommon
Description of project	Construction of 6 houses and all associated site works.		
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,	The subject appeal site comprises an existing greenfield which is understood to be in agricultural use. The site includes an extensive coverage of reeds and the subsoil is of 'till type' both indicative of impeded/ slow drainage characteristics.		
Proposed surface water details	It is proposed to manage surface water on site via a proposed surface water management SUDS type system with onsite attenuation area discharging to the existing surface water network on the public road. The proposed Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) is proposed to be provided in the form of a surface water attenuation area with a petrol interceptor on the inlet and a hydro brake flow-control valve on the outlet. The surface water system has been designed for an outflow discharge rate into the existing surface water network as per greenfield site which is 2lt/Ha/sec. Nature based solutions for surface water management include the installation of rainwater collection butts at each dwelling.		
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	It is proposed to serve the development with water from the public mains shown to be located on the opposite side (southeast) of the public road. A connection has been confirmed by Uisce Eireann to be feasible. No water supply capacity constraints have been identified.		

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues			It is proposed to connect the development to the existing wastewater network. A connection has been confirmed by Uisce Eireann to be feasible. No wastewater capacity constraints have been identified.			
Others?			Not applicable			
Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)
River Waterbody	454m	Carricknabraher_010 (IE_SH_26C020100)	Good	Not at risk	None identified	Not hydrologically connected to surface watercourse.

Groundwater waterbody		Underlying site	Carrick on Shannon (IE_SH_G_048)	Good	Not At risk	None identified	Poor slow draining soil conditions
Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.							
CONSTRUCTION PHASE							
No.	Component	Water body receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Surface	Carricknabraher_010 (IE_SH_26C020100)	None	None	None	No	Screened out
2.	Ground	Carrick on Shannon (IE_SH_G_048)	Drainage to Groundwater	Hydrocarbon Spillages	Standard Construction Measures / Conditions	No	Screened out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
1.	Surface	Carricknabraher_010 (IE_SH_26C020100)	None	None	None	No	Screened out

2.	Ground	Carrick on Shannon (IE_SH_G_048)	None	None	None	No	Screened out
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	N/A						