



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-322963-25

Development	Permission for a two storey dwelling house, relocation of existing vehicular entrance, wastewater treatment system, together with all associated site works.
Location	Creggan Townland, Cornafulla, Athlone.
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560173
Applicant(s)	Niall McGinley
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Niall McGinley.
Observer(s)	None.

Date of Site Inspection

6th October 2025.

Inspector

Carol Hurley

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is located at Creggan, Cornafulla, Athlone, Co. Roscommon.
- 1.2. The site is located on the northern side of the R446 and is c. 9km to the southwest of Athlone.
- 1.3. The site has a stated area of 0.790 hectares. The main area of the site where the proposed dwelling would be located is rectangular in form and addresses the road with a southeast orientation. A long linear section of the site runs along the northeastern boundary which connects to the area where the proposed percolation area would be located.
- 1.4. Excluded from the red line of the application site, but within the blue line is the existing mobile home and shed.
- 1.5. At time of site visit the area was overgrown. The connection to the rear of the site was via a hardstanding path running alongside the shed before connecting to a field which was also in an overgrown state.
- 1.6. The fields were not in use for grazing at time of site visit.
- 1.7. The lands to the northeast and southwest predominantly consist of long narrow rectangular fields with interspersed dwellings. There is a car garage on the opposing side of the road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of a two-storey dwelling house, relocation of existing vehicular entrance, wastewater treatment system and all associated site works.
- 2.2. The dwelling is proposed to be centrally located within the main portion of the site, set back c. 30m from the roadside, c.12.9m off the northeastern boundary, c. 12.7m off the southwestern boundary and c. 38m off the rear elevation of the shed.
- 2.3. The proposed dwelling has a contemporary design idiom and sectional approach to the layout with a gable roof profile and no eaves overhang.

- 2.4. The dwelling would have a principal height of c. 7.8m with a front projecting two storey gable.
- 2.5. The proposed windows would have a vertical emphasis, and finishes are indicated to consist of white render with natural stone sections.
- 2.6. At ground floor level the proposed dwelling would consist of large open plan area with sitting, kitchen dining area with utility room, WC and bedroom. The proposed first floor level would consist of three bedrooms, one of which would have en-suite facilities, bathroom, office.
- 2.7. The proposed vehicular entrance would be predominantly located towards the southwestern side of the front boundary.
- 2.8. The proposed percolation area associated with the wastewater treatment system would be located in excess of 200m to the northwest.
- 2.9. The existing mobile home and shed are located within the blue line and are to the southwest of the proposed dwelling. The mobile home is indicated to be served by a temporary wastewater treatment system. The site layout plan indicates that the mobile home will be removed.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 11th of June 2025, Roscommon County Council issued a Notification of a Decision to Refuse Planning Permission for a two-storey dwelling house, relocation of existing vehicular entrance, wastewater treatment system together with all associated site works, the following reasons.

- 1. The proposed development is located in Rural Policy Zone A – ‘Areas under Urban Influence’ as set out in Table 3.1: Rural Area Types in the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028. It is the policy of the County Development Plan to restrict housing in this area to those who are intrinsically part of the rural community or who have an occupation predominantly based in the rural community. The Planning Authority is not satisfied, based on the

information submitted, that the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated compliance with the criteria for a rural generated housing in accordance with the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines, and Table 3.2 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development fails to satisfy the requirements of Policy Objective PPH3.13 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 which requires applicants to demonstrate a social or economic link (as per Table 3.2 of the Plan) to the rural area in which they propose to build. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the deficiency in information provided to demonstrate whether or not the proposed wastewater treatment system and percolation area are sufficient to serve the proposed development, the Planning Authority is not satisfied that it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposed wastewater treatment system can attenuate and dispose of waste water safely and in accordance with the Environmental Protection Agency (E.P.A.) Code of Practice 2021 for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10). It is therefore not considered that satisfactory proposals have been made as part of the current application to attenuate and dispose of wastewater safely and in accordance with the relevant EPA Code of Practice. The proposed development would accordingly be injurious to public health and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planning Authorities report dated 11th June 2025 sets out the site description, development proposal, planning history, Pre-planning details, Planning Policy, Consultations, Submissions/Observations, Environmental Screenings, Planning Assessment and Recommendation.

- Concern was raised in relation to the applicants housing need and the Planning Officer was not satisfied that the documents constituted satisfactory evidence of compliance with the criteria for a rural generated house in accordance with

the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines and Table 3.2 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028.

- The Planning Authority agreed with the assessment of An Bord Pleanála under ABP-317583-23 that the time spent residing at the site cannot be considered to contribute towards meeting the requirements of Table 3.2 where the structure is unauthorised.
- In respect of housing need, the Planning Authority concluded that the proposed development fails to comply with the requirements of Policy Objective PPH 3.13 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- The report raised concern regarding the proposed surface water disposal where contradictory information was provided between the site layout plan and the application form. The site layout plan indicates disposal to soakpits however the application form indicates disposal to a watercourse.
- Foul water is proposed to be disposed of via a septic tank and percolation area. The Site Assessment Report is dated September 2022.
- The test holes were closed and therefore could not be inspected.
- A site-specific percolation area layout/section including cross section and the size and details of the pumping chamber are missing.
- The Planning Authority noted that the current proposals appear irrespective to differ from the details submitted under PD/23/154. Under PD/23/154 it was proposed to replace an existing temporary treatment system with a further temporary system whilst the current proposal indicates that the existing treatment system is not part of the current application. Concern was also raised in relation to the timeline since the preparation of the site assessment report. It is submitted that it would not be appropriate that concerns expressed by the Environment Department be dismissed.
- The report of the Environment Department recommended that Further Information be sought however the report of the Planning Officer recommended refusal in this regard.

- Sightlines were considered to be generally acceptable, save for the indication of the need to relocate road signage located to the northeast. The Planning Authority note that the relocation of this sign would be curtailed.

To note that the Planning Authority raised no concern with the design of the proposed dwelling.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

The report of the Environment Department dated 26th May 2025 can be summarised as follows;

- The site was inspected on 22nd May 2025 and the presence of the mobile home and existing DWWTS was noted. The trial hole and percolation test holes were closed and could not be inspected.
- The report noted the separation distance of c.200m between the proposed dwelling and percolation area and that it was proposed to 'level out and fill any undulations/pits with the excess material' in the area of the proposed percolation area.
- The report recommended that further information would be required in the form of the full excavation of the trial hole be undertaken to demonstrate the required minimum depth, clarification of the nature and intention of the existing DWWTS, the rationale for the location of the proposed percolation area, the nature and extent of the improvement works to be carried out, submission of a revised percolation area section to accurately reflect the measurements of the proposed percolation area and submit drawing of the pumping chambers.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann

No report received

3.4. Third Party Observations

None

4.0 Planning History

PD/19/189 – Permission refused for new dwelling and septic tank. Reasons for refusal relate to rural housing need, traffic hazard due to inadequate sightlines, inappropriate design, insufficient information to demonstrate that the treatment system would dispose of foul water safely and the proposed development facilitate the consolidation of unauthorised development.

PD/20/386 – Permission refused for proposed new dwelling, waste water treatment system and associated works and retention permission for existing mobile home and temporary waste water treatment system. Reasons for refusal relate to rural housing need, traffic hazard due to inadequate sightlines, insufficient information regarding the proposal to treat and dispose of wastewater, inappropriate design, precedent regarding the mobile home and inadequate infrastructure and safe access and consolidation of unauthorised development.

PD/21/433 – Permission refused for proposed dwelling, wastewater treatment system, relocated access and retention permission for existing mobile home on a temporary basis and existing temporary waste water treatment system which would be removed on completion of the development. Reasons for refusal relate to rural housing need, potential for traffic conflict associated with the access and resulting traffic hazard, deficiency in information regarding the proposal to treat and dispose of wastewater, precedent regarding the mobile home and inadequate infrastructure and safe access and consolidation of unauthorised development.

ABP-317583-23 (PD/23/154)– Permission refused on appeal for retention of existing mobile home for a period of 5 years, existing facilities within the agricultural shed for 5 years, permission for the installation of a new temporary wastewater treatment system, new vehicular entrance and associated site works. Reasons for refusal relate to rural housing need, traffic hazard by reason of turning movements on a heavily trafficked road and restricted sightlines, the nature of the non-permanent mobile home and additional facilities in the shed, the development seeking retention and permission would represent inappropriate ad hoc development in the rural area and set an undesirable precedent. The development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Planning Enforcement

ACP-322963-25

UDR 2325 – relates to the construction of a warehouse/non-agricultural shed and the use of the former agricultural entrance. Live (as per the Planning Authority Planning Report)

UDR 2454 – relates to the mobile home and its use for residential purposes. Live (as per the Planning Authority Planning Report)

Lands to the southwest

2460592 – Permission granted on 7th May 2025 for a new dwelling, garage and septic tank.

Lands to the northwest (Adjacent to percolation area)

01547 – Outline permission refused for a single storey dwelling house and septic tank. Reason for refusal relates to access onto a National Road.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Planning Policy

5.1.1. National Planning Framework (NPF) - Project Ireland 2040 First Revision

National Policy Objective 28 - To provide a distinction between areas under urban influence for rural housing. In rural areas under urban influence, to facilitate the provision of single 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 rural settlements.

National Policy Objective 38 - Plan for a more diverse and socially inclusive society that targets equality of opportunity and a better quality of life for all citizens, through improved integration and greater accessibility in the delivery of sustainable communities and the provision of associated services.

5.1.2. Code of Practice Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (p.e. ≤ 10) 2021

The Code of Practice (CoP) sets out guidance on the design, operation and maintenance of on-site wastewater treatment systems for single houses.

5.2. Regional Policy

5.2.1. Northern and Western Regional Assembly

RPO 3.3 seeks to deliver at least 20% of all new housing in rural areas on brownfield sites.

5.3. Section 28 Guidelines

5.3.1. Sustainable Rural Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2005)

The appeal site is located within a rural area under strong urban pressure. The Guidelines state that these areas exhibit characteristics such as proximity to the immediate environs or close commuting catchment of large cities and towns, rapidly rising population, evidence of considerable pressure for development of housing due to proximity to such urban areas, or to major transport corridors with ready access to the urban area, and pressures on infrastructure such as the local road network.

Section 4.4, Access, Non-National Roads –

‘It is vitally important that new housing in rural areas that is located along non-national routes is located in such a manner as to avoid endangering public safety by way of a traffic hazard.

5.4. **Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028**

The subject site is unzoned and unserviced and located within an area designated as being ‘Under Urban Influence’

CS 2.17 – seeks to ensure that the unserviced villages maintain existing population levels and that future growth is incremental and small scale relative to the scale, size and character.

CS 2.18 – seeks to ensure that the countryside maintains its role as a place to live and work and that development is facilitated being careful to the carrying capacity and environmental sensitivity of the rural area.

Table 3.1 Differentiates between Rural Policy Zone A ‘Area under Urban Influence’ and Rural Policy Zone B ‘Remaining Rural Areas’

Table 3.2 ‘Rural Housing Need Criteria’ differentiates between ‘Economic Need’ and ‘Social Need’.

Social Need refers to –

- persons who were born within the local rural area or who are living or have lived permanently in the local rural area for a substantial period of their life at any stage(s) prior to making the planning application. It therefore includes returning immigrants seeking a permanent home in their local rural area who meet this definition.
- Persons with a significant link to the Roscommon rural community in which they wish to reside, by reason of having lived in this community for a minimum period of five years prior to applying for planning permission or by the existence in this community of long-established ties with immediate family members.

Traveller Accommodation

Refers to the Roscommon County Councils Traveller Accommodation Programme which sets out the policy of the Council in relation to Traveller Accommodation, noting that there are a range of housing options available, including standard social housing, halt site accommodation, private home ownership and private rented accommodation.

PPH 3.12 – To implement the Roscommon County Council Traveller Accommodation Programme 2019-2024 and any subsequent programme adopted during the lifetime of the Development Plan.

PPH 3.13 – Facilitate single houses in rural areas subject to appropriate siting and design criteria. In addition, applicants for proposals for houses in areas defined as being under Urban Influence will be required to demonstrate a social or economic link to the rural area.

PPH 3.14 – Direct urban generated housing in rural areas to the towns and villages.

PPH 3.19 – Support the ongoing monitoring of new rural housing to ensure that 20% of such housing is located on brownfield sites.

PPH 3.21 – Encourage the provision of housing within designated Rural Villages as an alternative to single housing in the open countryside.

Section 12.7 – Rural House Design Considerations

Section 12.12 – Wastewater Treatment – sets out the requirement that on site septic tank and associated treatment systems shall be assessed and constructed under the

terms of the Code of Practice: Wastewater Treatment Manual Treatment Manual Treatment Systems for Single Houses or any subsequent update or standards.

Section 12.13 – Storm Water Disposal – disposal of stormwater to the foul sewer system shall be strictly prohibited.

Section 12.14 – Flood Risk Protection – Sets out the requirement for Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment where necessary.

Section 12.24 – Roads and Transportation – Sets out the requirements for accessibility and sightlines.

Planning applications shall also include third party consent letters and accompanying Land Registry Maps for sight distance triangles, if applicable. A legally binding agreement shall be signed by both parties all parties where there is a transfer of land, or where the physical movement of a boundary is necessary to achieve the required sightlines.

New rural entrances should not be located within the following distances of junctions;

- National Primary Roads 150 metres
- National Secondary Roads 100 metres
- Regional Roads 100 metres
- Local Primary Roads 40 metres

Where the above criteria in terms of sightlines or distances from junctions cannot be met, a safety audit should be submitted to justify reductions.

Roscommon County Council Traveller Accommodation Programme 2025-2029 (Adopted 23rd September 2024)

The section entitled 'Provision of Accommodation' sets out the various types of permanent accommodation available. It is stated that

'Single Instance Housing' (Once-off rural dwellings) is no longer considered as a permanent housing option under the Traveller Accommodation Programme on the basis that this option was not consistent with planning objectives.

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

The proposed development is not located within or immediately adjacent to any European Site or other Natural Heritage Site. The site is located c.1.5km to the west of the pNHA for Carrickynaghtan Bog (001623) and c. 3.3km to the southwest of the River Shannon Callows pNHA (000216).

The subject site is located c. 3.3km to the southwest of the Special Area of Conservation for River Shannon Callows (00216) and the Special Protection Area for Middle Shannon Callows (004096).

6.0 EIA Screening

7.0 The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment. 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.

See completed Form 1 and 2 on file.

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the first party appeal lodged by Peter Thomson Planning Solutions on behalf of the applicant, Niall McGinley, which relate to the two reasons for refusal can be summarised as follows;

Reason No. 1

- Sets out the applicant's connection to the area.
- Refers to the requirements of Table 3.2 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028. Contends that the relevant criterion to comply

with the requirements is the length of time in residence and not the planning status of the accommodation.

- Refers to the Roscommon Traveller Accommodation Programme 2025-2029 (RTAP) which is enshrined in the Development Plan. Contends that the plan indirectly confirms that certain members of the Traveller Community can either be automatically considered to comply with the rural housing policy or do not have to demonstrate a rural housing need to be housed in a rural area.
- Submits that the RTAP deals with unauthorised traveller encampments.
- Refers to the authorised settlements which are located outside of urban settlements. Residents are not required to comply with Table 3.2 of the Development Plan.
- Submits that it is inconsistent for the Planning Authority to expect the appellant to relocate to a designated urban settlement to have their housing need met.

Reason No.2

- The same WWTS design was considered under 23/154 and was deemed acceptable by An Bord Pleanala (ABP-317583-23).
- Nothing has changed on the site since the decision of An Bord Pleanala under ABP-317583-23). Do not consider it necessary to undertake the same tests again.
- The existing WWTS will be removed on the grant of permission for the permanent system. There will only be one treatment system on the site at any one time.
- The removal of the existing system is subject to an Enforcement Notice.

Other Matters

- The Planning Authority raised no concern regarding siting or design of the proposed dwelling.
- Letter of consent was provided from the adjoining neighbour consenting to the repositioning of the public road sign that was obstructing visibility exiting the site.

- Notes that the Planner had concerns regarding the repositioning of the sign regard being had to its function. Applicant contends that a minor repositioning of this sign further east and set back slightly would not defeat its function and could be dealt with by condition.

8.2. **Applicant Response**

The applicant is the first party to the appeal.

8.3. **Planning Authority Response**

None

8.4. **Observations**

None

8.5. **Further Responses**

None

9.0 **Assessment**

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

- Principle of the proposed development including Rural Housing Policy
- Waste water treatment disposal
- Access and sightlines
- Water Framework Directive Screening
- Appropriate Assessment

9.2. Principle of the Proposed Development Including Rural Housing Policy

- 9.2.1. Map 3.1 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 indicates areas of the County which are subject to specific commuting patterns. The areas within the commuter catchment of a large town are considered to be Areas Under Urban Influence and therefore subject to the requirements of Rural Zone A. As per Policy Objective PPH 3.13, for proposals for single houses in defined Areas under Urban Influence, applicants will be required to demonstrate a social or economic link (as per Table 3.2) to the rural area in which they proposed to build.
- 9.2.2. In support of the application the applicant has included Part B, Supplementary Application form which sets out that the applicant has been the owner/occupier at the current address for a period of in excess of 5 years. The applicant states that he is originally from the rural area in which he proposes to build and he has immediate family members in area. It is submitted that the subject site forms part of the family landholding. The applicant is not engaged full time in a rural based activity nor is the applicants predominant occupation in farming or natural resource related activity.
- 9.2.3. Following review of the applicants Supplementary Application Form, the applicant is therefore required to demonstrate a 'Social Need' in accordance with Table 3.2 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- 9.2.4. Information to support the applicant's connection with the area includes;
- Documentation stating that at eight years old, in 1993, the applicants parents had settled in a mobile home on land they owned in Bogganfin and after that built the family home where the applicant's father still resides.
 - Letter from Cornamaddy Community National School.
 - Affidavit from the applicant's father setting out that his parents tent/wagon was pitched directly across from the subject site.
 - Affidavit from the applicants stating that they own the property at Canaan Farm and that neither of the applicants own any other property or house nor have either applicants any interest in any other property or any other house.
 - Letters from schools and sports clubs confirming the applicants children's attendance at school and involvement with local sporting clubs.
 - Letter from the local priest.

- Letter from Councillor Emer Kelly.
- Various Bank Statements and letters from Revenue setting out the applicants address as being Canaan Farm, Creggane, Cornafulla, Athlone, Co. Roscommon.

- 9.2.5. The Planning Statement submitted to the Planning Authority sets out that the applicant Niall McGinley was born and reared in Bogganfin. I also note that the appeal documents set out that the applicant was brought up in the local area and by 1993, when the applicant was eight years old, his parents settled in a mobile home on land they owned in Bogganfin, where they later built the family home, where Mr.McGinleys father still resides. It is not clear to me where the applicant had resided prior to 1993.
- 9.2.6. The same Planning Statement set out that the applicant resided at the family home until the age of 17 before moving to the UK. The appeal documents set out that the applicant moved to the UK in 2001 at the age of 16.
- 9.2.7. I note the letter received from Cornamaddy Community National School, Athlone, Co. Westmeath. This letter submits that the applicant was a pupil of the school from 3rd September 1990 until June 1998 (6th class). The letter sets out that the stated address at the time of enrolment was An Clochan Bui (Ballymahon Road, Athlone). It is further stated within the letter that the handwritten roll books were not amended with a change of address but records for members of Mr.McGinleys family show the family address as 'Roscommon Road, Bogganfinn, Athlone' from at least 2002.
- 9.2.8. From review, I note that Cornamaddy Community National School and Ballymahon Road are located on the eastern side of Athlone and within the administrative area of County Westmeath.
- 9.2.9. I acknowledge that the letter submits that the family's address was Bogganfin Road from at least 2002 however the applicant had completed his education in the school in 1998 and as noted above relocated to the UK in 2001.
- 9.2.10. The applicant refers to alternative addresses to which there is a claimed long-term connection however the applicant has not provided any site location maps to indicate the locations of these addresses as required by Question 6 of the Supplementary Application Form or a relevant Planning Reference number for the construction of the referenced family dwelling or other relevant details in this regard.

- 9.2.11. I also note that the Question 10 of the Supplementary Application Form submits that the application site forms part of the family landholding. In this regard, I note that the applicant acquired the lands in c. 2004 and has been residing at this address since 2019.
- 9.2.12. I do not consider that the records submitted robustly demonstrate the applicant was born within the local rural area or has resided for a substantial period of their life within the local rural area or sufficiently demonstrated their long-established ties with immediate family members as per the requirements of Table 3.2.
- 9.2.13. Notwithstanding the applicants submitted connections to the area as a child, as per Question 7 of the Supplementary Application Form, the applicant states that he has lived in the rural area since 2019. In this regard, the applicant has also provided consecutive documentation with a timeline demonstrating residence from 2019- 2025 both from Revenue and a Financial Institution. In my opinion these documents, specifically ones from Revenue are verifiable and accountable towards demonstrating a connection to the area.
- 9.2.14. While it is clear that the applicant has resided at Canaan Farm, Creggane for this period of time it has been however within a mobile home which is unauthorised and is subject to Enforcement Proceedings with the Planning Authority. I consider that an unauthorised use cannot establish a precedent. I would agree with the previous assessments undertaken in respect of the subject site and concur that an applicant for permission for a dwelling in a rural area cannot establish their need based on residence in an unauthorised structure. To permit a development on this basis would create an unacceptable precedent.
- 9.2.15. I acknowledge the grounds of the appeal whereby the appellant submits that meeting the requirements of table 3.2 relies on the length of time of residence and not the legal status of such residence. I would contend that the underlying premise of Policy Objective PPH 3.13 is the need to demonstrate a rural housing need which is based on the requirement of a Bonafide residence and connection to the rural area in which they proposed to build. The requirements are not solely based on the precise time living at the address rather the applicant's ability to set out comprehensive demonstration of long-established ties with immediate family members and a

significant link to the Roscommon rural community in which they wish to reside by reason of having lived in the community for a period of 5 years.

9.2.16. As per the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines, it is considered that persons who are an intrinsic part of the rural community are people who have spent substantial periods of their lives living in rural areas as members of the established rural community and who wish to build their first home, near their family place of residence. The same consideration is given to returning emigrants who have lived for substantial periods of their lives in rural areas wishing to return to reside near their family members. I would conclude that the applicant has not adequately demonstrated that they are an intrinsic part of the rural community by virtue of their significant connection to the area and demonstration that they have resided within the rural area for a substantial period of their life.

9.2.17. I consider that the information provided with regards to the applicant's early childhood which seeks to demonstrate the significant link to the area is ambiguous and the reliance of the established need arising from 2019-2025 being based on residence in an unauthorised structure cannot be relied upon. In this regard I am not satisfied that the applicant complies with Table 3.2 and therefore has not overcome the reason for refusal.

9.2.18. The grounds of appeal refer to the Roscommon Traveller Accommodation Programme 2025-2029 being enshrined within the County Development Plan and indirectly confirms that certain members of the Traveller Community can either be automatically considered to comply with the rural housing policy or do not have to demonstrate a rural housing need to be housed in the rural area.

9.2.19. I would contend this statement and note that the Roscommon Traveller Accommodation Programme clearly sets out

Single Instance Housing (once-off rural dwelling) is no longer considered as a permanent housing option under the Traveller Accommodation Programme on the basis that this option was not consistent with planning objectives.

9.2.20. In relation to the issues raised in relation to alleged inconsistencies with the Planning Authority and the Traveller Programme with regards to the locations where people are resettled, I would submit that this is outside the scope of the appeal. The applicant has sought planning permission for a dwelling in the rural area to be assessed against

Policy Objective PPH 3.13 and Table 3.2 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028.

- 9.2.21. I recommend that the reason for refusal in respect of non-compliance with the Rural Housing Policy be upheld.

9.3. Waste Water Treatment

- 9.3.1. I note the substantial planning history which relates to the subject site. I also note that a consistent reason for refusal has been in relation to the disposal of wastewater within the site.
- 9.3.2. At present the applicant resides in the mobile home which is located to the southwest of the location of the proposed dwelling. This structure is also served by an existing wastewater treatment system. There are enforcement proceedings in relation to these elements and as such have not been located within the red line of the application site but are located within the blue line of ownership. The applicant submits that the existing OSWWTS would be removed following a grant of permission for the development which is currently the subject of this appeal. I confirm that the existing OSWWTS does not come within the scope of this application.
- 9.3.3. The submission to the Planning Authority included a Site Characterisation Form which is dated September 2022.
- 9.3.4. The Site Characterisation Form which accompanies the application sets out that the site overlies a locally important aquifer with high vulnerability.
- 9.3.5. The stated depth to groundwater is 2.7m and no bedrock was encountered.
- 9.3.6. The soil conditions found in the trial hole were medium loam topsoil with gravel, sand and small stones beneath.
- 9.3.7. As per Table E1 a Groundwater Protection Response of R1 is recommended.
- 9.3.8. Wastewater disposal was assessed by the Planning Authority's Environment Department. I note that concern was raised as to whether the proposed wastewater treatment system would provide adequate treatment for the wastewater generated on site. The report recommended that Further Information would be required. Items set out requiring further information included the full excavation of the trial hole to demonstrate the required minimum depth as required by the CoP, clarify the nature and details and intention of the existing DWWTS, clarify the rationale for the location

of the proposed percolation area, clarify the nature and location of improvement works carried out in proximity to the proposed percolation area, submit a revised percolation area section and cross section to accurately reflect the measurements of the proposed percolation area, submit drawings of the pumping chambers to demonstrate that the chamber has at least one days storage volume and be sized based on the PE and to contain an electric pump.

9.3.9. Following my review of the Site Characterisation Report, I note that the vulnerability is moderate rather than high as set out by the applicant.

9.3.10. I also note that there are instances of ambiguous information within the submitted information.

- The results of the T Test from the Site Characterisation Form from Step 4 is stated to be 10.28 however the concluding result is 22.81.
- The results of the P Test from the Site Characterisation Form from Step 4 is stated to be 21.97 however the concluding result is 19.14.
- The T and P Test results in the Conclusion of the Site Characterisation Form are not consistent with those indicated at Step 4 of the T and P Test.
- Section 6 of the Site Characterisation Form as submitted to the Planning Authority is blank.
- As per the Site Characterisation Form, the trial holes were excavated on the 3rd September 2022 and were examined on the 5th September 2022 at 16.30. The Site Characterisation Form does not set out the time of excavation on the 3rd September and therefore I am unable to determine if the trial hole was left open for 48 hours prior to examination.

9.3.11. In addition to the foregoing, I note that the location of the trial holes indicated on the site layout plan submitted with the current application differ to the location of the trial holes indicated on the site layout plan submitted under ABP-317583-25 (23/154). The documents submitted with the current appeal submit that the Site Characterisation Assessment was carried out in September 2022 for a previous application and resubmitted with this application in 2025. The documents infer that no further trial holes have been excavated since 2022, therefore the contradictory information in relation to the trial hole locations and inconsistent test results reduces confidence in the results.

- 9.3.12. The quality of the photographs included within the Site Characterisation Form do not make it possible to clearly assess the nature or quality of subsoils. The photographs present images of grey soils which would be indicative of poor drainage.
- 9.3.13. At time of site visit I observed rushes within the main portion of the site (fronting the road) in addition to being within the gravel path in proximity to the entrance to the field where the proposed percolation area would be. I also noted that the field to the immediate north (outside of the applicants ownership) had instances of ponding and substantial presence of rushes.
- 9.3.14. In accordance with the CoP, Table 6.4 the percolation value would be suggestive that the site would be appropriate for the installation of a septic tank and percolation area. However, given the inconsistency in the Site Characterisation Form with the value given between the conclusion and Step 4 of the process, further clarification in this regard may be appropriate.
- 9.3.15. As per the Site Layout Plan and having regard to the location of the proposed percolation area, I am satisfied that the development would accord with Table 6.2 of the CoP.
- 9.3.16. From review of the interactive planning maps, I note that including the existing OSWWTS (unauthorised) within the blue line, in addition to the existing and permitted dwellings along this stretch of the road would equate to five systems. In the event of a grant of permission for the proposed development, the number of systems would remain at five, noting the applicant's intention that the existing system would be removed, should permission be granted for the proposed development.
- 9.3.17. I note that the documents prepared by ABBD accompanying the appeal seek to address the issues raised by the Environment Department.
- 9.3.18. The applicant submits that they are willing to undertake another full excavation of the trial holes as part of the appeal process.
- 9.3.19. The rationale for the chosen location of the percolation area is due to more appropriate sub-soils.
- 9.3.20. It is submitted within the documents that no works of any kind were carried out at the proposed location of the percolation area. It is submitted that there are some hills and undulations that will be levelled and filled with the excess materials. The appeal

documents include a report from Molloy Environmental Systems and a completed Section 6 of the SCF. This indicates a tank capacity of 6000 litres with an invert level of -0.85.

- 9.3.21. The applicant has included a site-specific section through the proposed percolation area including pump details which are designed by a suitably qualified professional.
- 9.3.22. The Planning Authority requested a section through the percolation area in addition to a cross section through the site to demonstrate the accurate measurements of proposed percolation area and all other significant site features. The generic system section provided by Molly Environmental appears to be more informative in detail (although not fully legible). In this regard, I am not satisfied that the section through the proposed percolation area is sufficient.
- 9.3.23. I acknowledge the submission of the documents which seek to address the issues raised by the Planning Authority however I would submit that given the substantial planning history of the site and the consistent issues raised with regard to the disposal of foul water, given the inconsistent information in the Site Characterisation Form and the accompanying photographs to determine colouration of the soil in addition to the sections through the percolation area, it would be prudent to commence the process again (in the instance that the applicant could overcome the contended rural housing need). While I note the applicant's willingness to reopen the trial holes during the appeal process, I consider this to be outside the scope of the appeal.
- 9.3.24. In this regard, in the absence of a comprehensive proposal for the provision of a septic tank, I cannot conclude that the design would be acceptable.
- 9.3.25. I would consider that in principle the site would generally appear to be suitable and submit that there are design issues which may require clarification but, in this instance, fundamentally not a reason for refusal.

9.4. Access

- 9.4.1. I note that traffic hazard was not included in the reasons for refusal by the Planning Authority for the current application. That said, traffic hazard has formed part of the previous reasons for refusal associated with the planning histories.
- 9.4.2. The applicant has indicated that sightlines of 160m in each direction at a setback of 3m is required and can be achieved. Having regard to the information submitted in

addition to the curvature of the road to the southwest, I consider that sightlines are generally achievable in this direction. The applicant has included a signed letter of consent from the adjoining landowner to the northeast consenting to the alteration, amendment and/or augmentation of the roadside boundary in order to achieve adequate sightlines. This letter is not cosigned by the applicant nor are the stated attached maps evident.

- 9.4.3. The Planning Officers report sets out that discussion was undertaken with Roscommon County Council's Road Design Department in relation to the proposed development and it was considered that the updated proposals constitute sufficient progress on the concerns set out in ABP-317583-23. Concern was however raised in relation to the relocation of the road sign.
- 9.4.4. The appeal documentation submits that the adjoining neighbour had consented to the repositioning of the public road sign onto his property that was currently obstructing visibility when exiting the site.
- 9.4.5. I would consider that the sign is within the control of the Local Authority and not for the applicant to propose its relocation onto 3rd party lands. As the applicant was aware of the need to reposition this sign, I would submit that in preparation of the application, the applicant should have ensured that this detail had been comprehensively addressed. Given the directional nature of this sign, its measurements (provided by the applicant), in the absence of a definitive safe position for its relocation consideration of the impact of the sign to the sightlines cannot be taken in isolation.
- 9.4.6. It is submitted by the Planning Authority that the issue of the sign would have been dealt with as part of a request for further information.
- 9.4.7. From comparison of the plans submitted as part of the application and the appeal documents, it is not clear as to the extent of works that would be required to be undertaken to the 3rd party boundary to facilitate the sightlines to the northeast.
- 9.4.8. The information provided on Drawing No. PL2100NMG 'Proposed Sightlines' solely states that 'Location of Road Sign To Be Removed'. Documents submitted with the appeal, specifically the report prepared by ABBD, Section 3 'Mobility and Traffic Safety – Obstruction from Road Sign' refers to the relocation of the road sign. In addition, an accompanying aerial view photograph is included and refers to 'Proposed New Fenceline' which is indicated on the lands to the northeast, being 3rd party lands.

- 9.4.9. This information introduces ambiguity as to the nature of the proposed development. No details have been provided as to what the new fence would be. It is my opinion that where a new setback boundary/fence is required on 3rd party lands this should be included within the redline of the application site in addition to being accompanied by the necessary requirements as per the requirements of Section 12.24 'Accessibility and Sightlines' Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028. Without such inclusion, the applicant or indeed the Planning Authority in the event of unauthorised development occurring has no control on these works being undertaken as part of the development.
- 9.4.10. The information submitted does not demonstrate certainty as to what works are required and I therefore consider that the achievement of the sightlines to the northeast is unclear. I would refer back to the assessment of ABP-317583-23 and reiterate that notwithstanding the provision of a letter of consent as part of the current application, the area is not included within the red or blue line of the application site and therefore should the Commission be minded to grant permission, a condition requiring this area to be kept free from obstruction could not be attached.
- 9.4.11. While I acknowledge the letter of consent provided, I refer to Section 12.24 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 which requires such letters to be accompanied with Land Registry Maps for sight triangles and a legally binding agreement to be signed by both parties where there is a transfer of land or where the physical movement of a boundary is necessary to achieve the required sightlines. I do not see any such documents enclosed.
- 9.4.12. In addition to the above, from review of the planning history and specifically planning reference 21433, I note that an assessment was undertaken by the Municipal District Coordinator of the Planning Authority. The report noted that at the location of the site there is a junction between the Regional Road and Local Road LS7612 which includes a right turning lane. The report noted a strong potential for conflict with traffic using the existing road network and with vehicles ingressing and egressing the proposed development. The report recommended that planning permission should be refused on the grounds of road safety.

I note that under PD 23154, an engineered design approach was proposed which indicated a left in left out design for the entrance. Documents dated 25th April 2022

from ORS Engineers set out this approach and are included in the current appeal enclosures. Appendix A of the document refers to the Visibility Splay Parameters and Appendix B refers to the design of the Direct Access (Left in left out) and Appendix C Site Layout is not included. I refer to the report of the Planning Authority under the current appeal which submits that a more conventional approach is proposed as part of the development under appeal. This is reflected in the site layout plan, Drawing No. PL2000NMG.

It is not clear to me how the concerns regarding the potential conflict with the 'ghost island' have been addressed. At time of site visit, I observed that the R446 is heavily trafficked and operates at or above the posted 80km speed limit given the wide and sweeping nature of the road. Given the nature of the road, I would submit that the right turn lane provides shelter for cars traversing the road at this location. It is my opinion that the access to the proposed development would create a direct conflict with this right turning lane and would as a result create a traffic hazard.

I do not consider where such issues regarding sightlines could be resolved how this would overcome the issue in relation to the traffic conflict which arises by virtue of the roads layout.

I refer again to Section 12.24 of the Roscommon County Development Plan which requires that new rural entrances should not be located within 100 metres of a junction and where such distances cannot be met, the application should be accompanied by a safety audit. I do not see a complete safety audit undertaken by suitably qualified professionals, explicitly addressing the direct conflict between the proposed vehicular entrance and the right turning lane as part of the appeal documents.

To permit the development as proposed would be contrary to Section 12.24 of the Development Plan and Section 4.4 of the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines which sets out that a proposed development should avoid endangering public safety by way of traffic hazard.

10.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

10.1. The application site is located at Creggan, Cornafulla, Athlone.

- 10.2. The proposed development consists of permission for a two-storey dwelling house, relocation of existing vehicular entrance, wastewater treatment system together with all associated site works.
- 10.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised however I do note that one of the reasons for refusal related to the deficiency information available to demonstrate whether or not the proposed wastewater treatment system and percolation area would be sufficient to serve the proposed development.
- 10.4. The site is located c. 350m to the southwest of the Cross (Roscommon)_40 IE_SH_260100400 which is located within the Cross (Roscommon)_40 Sub Basin.
- 10.5. The site is located c. 394m to the northeast of the Shannon (Upper)_120 IE_SH_265021800 which is located within the Shannon (Upper)_120 Sub Basin.
- 10.6. The groundwater body is Athlone West IE_SH_G_014 which is poorly productive bedrock.
- 10.7. The site overlies a locally important aquifer which is moderately productive in local zones and has moderate vulnerability.
- 10.8. As per Table E1 of the EPA Code of Practice: Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Populations Equivalent ≤ 10), R1 would apply.

'Acceptable subject to normal good practice (i.e. system selection, construction, operation and maintenance in accordance with this CoP)
- 10.9. Foul water is proposed to be disposed of via an onsite wastewater treatment system. The Site Characterisation Form concluded that the site is suitable for the installation of a septic tank system (septic tank and percolation area). I note that the Planning Authority refused permission in this regard.
- 10.10. The Planning Authority noted that question 20 of the application form states that surface water would be disposed of to a water course. The report of the Planning Authority submits that site layout plan indicates surface water disposal to three soakpits. The report prepared by ABBD as part of the appeal submission notes that the indication to discharge to a watercourse was a typographical error. The proposed surface water drainage would be for the roof and paved areas to be drained to soakpits of adequate capacity, to be based on a design regime in compliance with BRE Digest 365.

10.11. I have assessed the development seeking permission and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.

10.12. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

10.13. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development
- Ground Water Protection Response R1.
- Location-distance from nearest surface Water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.
- The development subject to compliance with the EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)
- The development subject to adequate design of soakpits to industry best practice.

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

11.0 AA Screening

11.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located within an established rural area located c. 3.3km to the southwest of the Special Area of Conservation for River Shannon Callows (00216) and the Special Protection Area for Middle Shannon Callows (004096).

The proposed development comprises permission for a two-storey dwelling house, relocation of existing vehicular entrance, wastewater treatment system together with all associated site works.

11.2. No further nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

11.3. 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.

11.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows

- The nature of the works
- The distance from the nearest European site and the lack of connections.

11.5. 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.

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

12.0 Recommendation

12.1. Having considered the contents of the application, the decision of the planning authority, the provisions of the Development Plan, the grounds of the appeal and the responses thereto, my site inspection and my assessment of the planning issues, I recommend that permission be refused for the reasons set out hereunder.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

4. Having regard to the location of the site within an area Under Urban Influence as identified in Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in April 2005 and in an area where housing is restricted to persons demonstrating local need in accordance with the current Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 - 2028, it is considered that the applicants do not come within the scope of the housing need criteria as set out in the Guidelines or the Development Plan for a house at this location. The proposed development, in the absence of any identified locally based need for the house, would contribute to the encroachment of random rural development in the area and would militate against the preservation of the rural environment and the efficient provision of public services and infrastructure. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to Policy Objective PPH3.13 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028. The development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The appeal site is located along a heavily trafficked regional road (R446), at a point where sightlines in a northeasterly direction are restricted and where there is an existing right turning lane for traffic travelling in a north easterly direction thereon. The Commission is not satisfied that the measures set out in the application would adequately address these sightline deficiencies and, furthermore, conclude that turning movements associated with the proposed development would result in direct conflicts with traffic movements on the R446. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Section 12.24 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 and Section 4.4 of the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines and would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard or obstruction of road users or otherwise.

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.

Carol Hurley
Planning Inspector

4th November 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

No EIAR Submitted

Case Reference	ACP-322963-25
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for two storey dwelling house, relocation of existing vehicular entrance, wastewater treatment system together with all associated site works.
Development Address	Creggan Townland, Cornafulla, Athlone.
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>S. 5 P.2 10(b)(i) construction of more than 500 dwelling units.</p>

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ACP-322963-25
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for two storey dwelling house, relocation of existing vehicular entrance, wastewater treatment system together with all associated site works.
Development Address	Creggan Townland, Cornafulla, Athlone
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).	Permission sought for construction of one house. The proposed house would be served by an OSWWTP. The scale of the development would be consistent with the surrounding pattern of development.
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 application site is not proximate to any protected sites. There are no water courses traversing the site. There are indicative features of poor drainage on the subject site and in the vicinity. The applicant submits that the site of the percolation area was chosen due to better absorption rates.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	The development would not have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location. There is no direct hydrological connection present which would give rise to significant impact on nearby water courses (whether linked to any European site or other sensitive receptors) or any drinking water source. Foul water drainage is proposed by way of an OSWWTP which the applicant proposes will be designed in accordance with the EPA Code of

	<p>Practice for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10).</p> <p>The Site Characterisation Report concludes that the site is suitable for an OSWWTP. The overall assessment above concludes that insufficient information has been submitted to conclude that the site is suitable.</p>
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	ACP-322963-25	Townland, address	Creggan Townland, Cornafulla, Athlone
Description of project		Permission for a two-storey dwelling house, relocation of existing vehicular entrance, wastewater treatment system, together with all associated site works.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		<p>The site is located to the southwest of the Cross (Roscommon)_40 and to the northeast of the Shannon (Upper)_120.</p> <p>The site overlies a locally important aquifer which is moderately productive in local zones and has moderate vulnerability.</p> <p>The groundwater body is Athlone West.</p> <p>The subsoil is Limestone Till Type.</p>	
Proposed surface water details		Surface waters can drain to soakpits.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Proposed connection to mains water supply.	

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues			Septic tank and percolation area.			
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	350	IE_SH_260100400 Cross (Roscommon)_40	Poor	At Risk	Hydromorphology Extractive Industry	Drainage
	394	IE_SH_2650021800 Shannon (Upper)_120	Poor		Hydromorphology	Drainage

Groundwater waterbody			IE_SH_G_014 Athlone West	Good	Not at risk		Drainage
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.	Site clearance and construction	IE_SH_260100400 Cross (Roscommon)_40	None	None	None	No	Screened Out
2.	Site Clearance	IE_SH_2650021800 Shannon (Upper)_120	None	None	None	No	Screened Out

	and construction						
3.	Site Clearance and Construction	IE_SH_G_014 Athlone (west)	Drainage	Seepage to ground water	Standard Construction Measures / Conditions	No	Screened Out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
4.	surface			None	Subject to detailed design of soakpits in accordance with industry best practice.	No	Screened out
5.	ground			Seepage to ground water. Foul water to be disposed of by means of a Septic Tank and	Noting the Ground water Response of R1, the proposed Septic Tank subject to design in	No	Screened out

				percolation area	accordance with EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤10)		
--	--	--	--	---------------------	--	--	--