



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ACP-323046-25

<b>Development</b>	Construction of a house, garage and wastewater treatment system.
<b>Location</b>	Ardogommon, Westport, Co Mayo.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Mayo County Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2560248.
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Aisling Grimes.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse Permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party vs Refusal.
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Aisling Grimes.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	17 <sup>th</sup> October 2025.
<b>Inspector</b>	C. Daly.

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The subject site, of area 0.56ha., consists of a grass field adjacent to the south of an existing detached single storey rural dwelling. The land rises modestly towards the south-east and there are some mostly modest sized trees located within the site and there are some mature trees along part of the south-east and south-west boundaries and the south-west boundary mainly consists of hedgerow. The mainly grassland site included some patches of rush type grass.
- 1.2. The site would be accessed indirectly from local road L-58521 and via the access of the adjacent dwelling accessed off the local road. The rural site is located c.3km from the centre of Westport town to the north-west.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:
  - Construction of a single storey house with main pitched roof and end projecting gable elements at either end and adjacent pitched roof garage.
  - Wastewater treatment system and ancillary site works.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

Mayo County Council decided to refuse permission for one reason as it considered that insufficient information had been supplied to establish a housing need in the area under strong urban influence per Objective RHO 1 of the Development Plan. The development was considered to constitute haphazard development in a rural area, to militate against the preservation of the rural environment, to lead to demands for the uneconomic provision of public services and communal facilities and contribute to the erosion of the visual and environmental amenity of the area and interfere with the character of the landscape at the location. It was considered to materially contravene the rural housing policies and objectives of the Development Plan.

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's Report assessment noted the applicant's family home location c.7km from the site within the same parish of Aghagower and it considered the distance from the site to be outside the general rural area per point 2 of Policy Objective RHO 1. A refusal of permission was recommended on this basis. It noted no major concerns in relation to siting or design of the dwelling.

#### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer Westport: No response received.
- Water Services: No response received.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- An Taisce: No response received.
- Uisce Éireann: No response received.
- Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage: No response received.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

## 4.0 Planning History

#### Subject Site:

**07/2083:** Permission granted by the P.A. for a dwelling house, garage and wastewater treatment system.

**06/287:** Permission granted by the P.A. for a dwelling house and integrated garage and wastewater treatment system.

#### Sites in the Vicinity

**07/885:** Permission granted at adjacent site for dwelling house, domestic garage and proprietary effluent treatment system.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028

#### Volume 1

#### Chapter 3 – Housing

Per Map 3.1, the site is located within a rural area under strong urban influence.

#### Section 3.4.8 Rural Single Housing

*Category 1 - Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence: These areas include the open rural countryside around the Tier I (Key Towns and Strategic Growth Town) and Tier II (Self-Sustaining Growth Towns) towns. They have been designated to support the sustainable growth of the urban areas, to provide for the immediate, local rural community who have a genuine housing requirement, while directing urban generated housing into designated settlements, maintaining their vitality and viability. It is recognised that new dwellings in these areas make a contribution to the vitality and viability of the local rural and urban communities.*

*Objective RHP 5 To ensure that rural housing applications employ site specific design solutions to provide for proposals that integrate into and reflect and enhance local landscape character, in terms of siting, design, materials, finishes and landscaping.*

*Objective RHO 1 To facilitate single houses in the countryside. However, in Rural Areas under Urban Influence applicants will be required to demonstrate a social or economic link to the area in which they wish to build. An economic need would include applicants having a genuine housing need and whose future or current employment is in close proximity to the primary residence they propose to build. Local rural area includes, but is not limited to Parish, District Electoral Division and Townlands. A genuine housing need includes, but is not limited to:*

- 1. Farmers, their sons and daughters, close relations or any persons taking over the running of a farm in the area in which they propose to live.*
- 2. Sons, daughters or other relations of non-farming persons who have spent a period of their lives living in the general rural area in which they propose to build a home.*

3. *Returning immigrants who spent a period of their lives living in the rural area in which propose to build and now wish to return to reside close or convenient to family members or guardians to care for or support them or work locally or to retire.*
4. *Persons involved in farming activity including equine enterprise, or persons employed or are intending to take up employment in any other local service, enterprise or profession.*
5. *Persons whose health circumstances require them to live in a particular environment or close to family support. Applicants qualifying under this category of housing need are required to demonstrate by way of medical decentration why this is preferable.*
6. *Where permission has been granted for a rural housing proposal in an area deemed to be under urban pressure an occupancy condition may be imposed under section 47 of the Planning and Development act 2000. An occupancy clause shall not be applied to any successful application outside of areas deemed to be under urban pressure. The Residency Condition shall not affect the sale of the house or site by a mortgagee in possession or by any person deriving title from such a sale where force majeure applies, for example, death, illness, relationship break up, emigration, unemployment, relocation due to work issues which would necessitate a new primary place of residence.*

*Objective RHO 5 To advise all rural housing applicants to utilise the Design Guidelines for Rural Housing (Mayo County Council) and core principles of same.*

#### **Section 3.4.12 Layout and Design**

*In considering proposals for development, the Council will have regard to the Guidelines on 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities' (2007); 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas' and the accompanying 'Urban Design Manual: A Best Practice Guide' (2009); and 'Sustainable Rural Housing – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2005), together with the Mayo Rural Housing Design Guidelines (2008). Furthermore, regard will also be had to any specific planning policy requirements (SPPRs) set out in the 'Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities' (2018).*

Objective NEO 4 *To protect and enhance biodiversity and ecological connectivity in County Mayo, including woodlands, trees, hedgerows, semi-natural grasslands, rivers, streams, natural springs, wetlands, stonewalls, geological and geomorphological systems, other landscape features and associated wildlife, where these form part of the ecological network.*

## Chapter 10 – Natural Environment

Per Map 10.1 (Landscape Policy Areas) the site is located within Policy Area 4 where rural dwellings per Figure 10.1 are considered to have a “*low potential to create adverse impact on the existing landscape character. Such development is likely to be widely conceived as normal and appropriate unless siting and design are poor*”.

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

NEO 27 *“To ensure all development proposals are consistent with the Landscape Appraisal of County Mayo and the associated Landscape Sensitivity Matrix and future editions thereof”.*

## Volume 2

### Section 2.10 Effluent Treatment Systems

*In un-serviced rural areas where a proposed dwelling cannot connect to the public wastewater treatment plant, a site suitability assessment will be required. The assessment must be carried out in accordance with the EPA Code of Practice Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses and take into account the cumulative effects of existing and proposed developments in the area. The assessment shall be carried out and certified by a suitably qualified person (i.e. the holder of an EPA FETAC certificate or equivalent) with professional indemnity insurance.*

*In coastal/lakeside areas, any effluent disposal system or percolation area for single dwellings shall be located at least 100m from the High-Water of the sea/lake and 100m from any lands liable to flooding along the sea / lake.*

### Section 7.6 Access Visibility Requirements

Table 4 Access Visibility Requirements – on regional and local roads, this requires a visibility requirement of 70m in both directions where the speed limit is 50kph.

Section 7.6 and Table relates to access visibility requirements

Section 8.4 Effluent Treatment Systems

*The suitability of a site for the treatment of wastewater shall be determined, in accordance with the criteria set down in the EPA Wastewater Treatment Manuals i.e. the EPA Wastewater Treatment Manuals-Treatment Systems for Single Houses (2009) and the EPA Wastewater Treatment Manuals- Treatment Systems for Small Communities, Business, Leisure Centres and Hotels (including any updated or superseding document or any revision or replacement of these manuals or any guidelines issued by the EPA concerning the content of these manuals).*

Section 12.2 relates to stone walls, trees and hedgerows

## **5.2. Natural Heritage Designations**

The above guidelines seek to facilitate people from rural areas in the planning system. The Guidelines give examples including farmers (and their sons and daughters) or other persons taking over or running farms and persons who have spent substantial periods of their lives living in rural areas and are building their first homes.

## **5.3. National Planning Framework (NPF) First Revision**

National Policy Objective 28

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

- *In rural areas under urban influence, 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 town and rural settlements;*
- *In rural areas elsewhere, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory*

*guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.*

#### **5.4. Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) (2020) for the Northern and Western Regional Assembly Area**

*“The NPF confirms that there needs to be a distinction made between areas under urban influence and elsewhere. It confirms that the capacity to provide for single rural housing should be retained for those that have a demonstrable economic or social need to live in the area, subject to all other proper planning and sustainable development considerations. The management of these pressures is a matter for individual local authorities through the development plan process, having regard to the provisions of Ministerial Guidelines and other material considerations”.*

#### **5.5. Natural Heritage Designations**

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

- c.0.24km north-east of Ardgommon Wood Proposed Natural Heritage Area (PNHA) (site code 001470).
- c.1.6kkm north-west of Kinlooe Lough PNHA (site code 001518).
- c.4.5km south-east of Clew Bay Complex Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and PNHA (site code 001482).
- c.5.3km south-east of Coolbarreen PNHA (site code 000481).
- c.6km north-east of Knappagh Woods PNHA (site code 001520).
- c.6.1km north-east of Brackloon Woods SAC and PNHA (site code 000471).
- c.7.3km north-east of Lough Greney Bog NHA (site code 002455).
- c.8.3km north-east of Croagh Patrick PNHA (site code 000483).

### **6.0 The Appeal**

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

The grounds of appeal on behalf of the applicant Aisling Grimes can be summarised as follows:

- The applicant’s family home is located such that she is not relocating from another planning zone with her case lying fully within the policy’s intent.



- As agreed at a pre-planning meeting, the family home and site are within the same parish of Aghagower meeting Objective RHO 1 of the Development Plan.
- Supporting documentation has been submitted including land registry folios showing family ownership since 1978, ownership by the applicant's sister since 2017, that the applicant resides long-term in the area and is employed locally which confirm the housing need.
- There are no concerns in relation to design and siting and the proposal reflects orderly rural development and previous permissions were granted on the site.
- The proposal meets the spirit and letter of the law and the refusal should be overturned.

## 6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

None received.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

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

- Rural Housing Policy.
- Visual and Landscape Impact.
- Access.
- Wastewater Treatment.
- Other Issues.

## 7.2. **Rural Housing Policy**

7.2.1. In relation to the CDP rural housing policy per Objective RHO 1 the applicant has asserted an entitlement under part 2 of same which states "*sons, daughters or other*

*relations of non-farming persons who have spent a period of their lives living in the general rural area in which they propose to build a home*". The family home at Lanmore is c.7km to the south-west of the subject site within the same parish. Per Map 3.1 of the CDP, the site is located within a rural area under strong urban influence.

- 7.2.2. The P.A. took the view that the subject site is not within the "general rural area" where the applicant is from. The application cover letter states that the applicant has resided at the family home which is located in the same parish as the subject site, at Lanmore. I note that the folio for the home at Lanmore refers to a family member. However, no supporting documentation has been submitted in relation to the applicant's upbringing at this location, for example a school letter of attendance, or in relation to her location of employment.
- 7.2.3. I also note the family connection cited in relation to the adjacent dwelling and the folio details indicate that it has been owned by the applicant's sister since 2017. However, I note this dwelling was originally granted permission under reg. ref. 07/885 relatively recently and in that context I do not consider a connection to the local area can be established in such a manner. I consider such an approach would not be consistent with Objective RHO 1 in relation to relations of non-farming persons who have spent a period of their lives living in the general rural area.
- 7.2.4. While Aghagower is c.2.9km south of the subject site, I note the parish covers an extensive area (c.23km as the crow flies) from an area to the east of Westport south of this and south-west towards Aasleagh and Glenummera. I note the family home at Lanmore is within the same parish as the subject site. I note the extensive area of the parish and its almost random layout from a planning perspective, for example Westport is c.2.5km away. I do not regard references to the parish under Objective RHO 1 to be a definitive test of a connection to a rural area. In this case in my opinion the location within the parish fails to justify a connection to the general rural area. I note that while Lanmore is c.7km from the site, this is as the crow flies and the actual required distance to travel would be significantly greater. I consider 7km to be a significant distance from the site in this regard. I consider such an approach would not be consistent with Objective RHO 1 in relation to relations of non-farming persons who have spent a period of their lives living in the *general rural area*.

- 7.2.5. The failure to demonstrate compliance with the rural housing policy in my view would contravene Objective RHO 1 of the CDP in relation to social or economic need provisions and in relation to demonstrating having spent a significant portion of an applicant's life in the general rural area.
- 7.2.6. I therefore recommend that the refusal reason of the P.A. insofar as it relates to this issue be upheld as I consider the appeal and other documentation have not demonstrated compliance with Objective RHO 1. Therefore, the proposed development would, in my opinion, lead to demands for the uneconomic and provision of public services and communal facilities in the area and would constitute an unsustainable form of rural development contrary to policy.

### **7.3. Visual and Landscape Impact**

- 7.3.1. In relation to visual and landscape impact, I note that the refusal reason cites that the proposal would constitute haphazard development in a rural area that would militate against the preservation of the rural environment. I accept that the modest design of the bungalow and garage is suitable in a rural context, noting the pitch roof forms, vertical emphasis to windows and sufficient break-up of the facades. I note the position on what is a cul de sac rural road where there would be limited visibility of the site and where the existing hedgerow on the south-east boundary and the proposed trees along the south-west boundary would provide additional screening.
- 7.3.2. Accordingly, I consider that in relation to visual and landscape impact, the dwelling would integrate with its setting to an acceptable degree and I do not agree that the form of development would result in a haphazard development form that would excessively militate against the preservation of the rural environment. Accordingly, I do not consider this part of the refusal reason to be justified and in this regard I do not consider it contrary to Objective RHO 1 of the Development Plan. Nevertheless, I recommend the refusal reason be upheld in relation to rural housing need.

### **7.4. Access**

- 7.4.1. In relation to vehicular access, the site access would be from a laneway which leads to the adjacent house to the north and I note no issues with sightlines at this entrance. I do not consider that one additional dwelling for the laneway, which would then serve two dwellings, would cause a significant increase of intensification of use at the existing permitted entrance to the local laneway/ road a short distance to the

south-east of the proposed vehicular access. I am satisfied that no significant road safety issues would arise.

#### **7.5. Wastewater Treatment – New Issue**

- 7.5.1. The applicant has submitted a Proposed Site Treatment System report prepared by RM Consulting Engineers. The report notes the aquifer type to be poor with a high vulnerability and the bedrock (SMV – Silurian Metasediments and Volcanics) to be generally unproductive. It notes there to be till derived from Devonian sandstones. The subsoil is noted to be sandstone till.
- 7.5.2. The depth of the trial hole is noted at 2.1m with water ingress at 1.2m. The depth from ground surface to the water table is noted at 0.9m. A subsurface percolation value of 67 was noted. The surface percolation value noted was 67. As I noted the trial hole to be partially water logged on my site visit I am not satisfied that these results are reflective of the site conditions. Groundwater protection response is noted to be R2(1). The dwelling gives rise to a population equivalent of 6. Based on this the report recommends a tertiary treatment system and infiltration area with an invert level of 59.96. While this would be consistent with Table 6.4 of the EPA Code for percolation values between 3 and 75, my observations on site suggest poor percolation conditions.
- 7.5.3. While the report suggests that, per Table 6.3 of the EPA Code, the required depth of 0.9m can be achieved for polishing filters following secondary systems and infiltration areas following tertiary treatment systems, grass and rushes were noted in the immediate area of the percolation area consistent with my observations on site and I am not satisfied that the percolation results are consistent with my on-site observations. Per Table 6.2 of the EPA Code in relation to separation distances I am satisfied that minimum separation distances would be exceeded. I note that water supply is to be taken from the mains located at the roadside.
- 7.5.4. Given the above and the observed ground conditions I am not satisfied that the proposed wastewater treatment system would accord with the EPA Code and be consistent with the requirements Section 2.10 and 8.4 of Appendix 2 of the CDP. I consider that a risk to public health cannot be ruled out in this circumstance. While the P.A. did not raise any issues in relation to the WWTS, I note no expert internal reports on file in relation to same. Accordingly, this would be a new issue and the

Commission, if it agrees with my assessment, may wish to consider if this merits an additional refusal reason in this context.

## **7.6. Other Issues**

- 7.6.1. I note that while the P.A. have cited material contravention of Objective RHO 1 of the CDP based on the facts of the case. While I consider this objective to be contravened, in my opinion the failure to supply information in relation to compliance with same in this case is not at the high threshold required to cite a material contravention of the CDP. I do not consider Objective RHO 1 to be sufficiently specific to justify the use of the term “*materially contravene*” in terms of normal planning practice. The Commission should not, therefore, consider itself constrained by Section 37(2)(b) of the 2000 Act as amended in my view.
- 7.6.2. I note appellant asserts that based on a pre-planning meeting undertaken prior to the lodgement of the application they expected to comply with rural housing policy. Whether such a commitment was given or not, I note that legally the planning application and appeal must be considered “*de novo*” and on its merits. I confirm that I have assessed this matter without reference to the pre-planning meeting assertions referenced in the appeal.
- 7.6.3. I note that water supply provision would be from the public mains and no pre-connection agreement letter from Uisce Éireann has been submitted. Should the Commission be minded to grant permission they may wish to consider how to address this matter. In relation to drainage matters, I note that standard SUDS drainage measures can be conditioned, given the size of the site and the layout plan, to ensure surface water drainage is catered for exclusively on the site.

## **8.0 EIA Screening**

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

## 9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located c.4.5km south-east of Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482), the closest European site. The proposed development comprises a dwelling and on-site wastewater treatment system. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.2. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The relatively small-scale nature of the development.
  - The distance from the nearest European site and lack of ecological connections thereto.
  - Taking into account the screening determination by the P.A..
- 9.3. 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.
- 9.4. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive – New Issue

- 10.1. I note designated waterbodies must be improved to at least good ecological status per the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. I have carried out a screening assessment in Appendix 3 in relation to impacts related to the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. Noting that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed on site wastewater treatment system and soil polishing filter complies with the EPA Code, I have concluded that it cannot be ruled out that the proposed development will not pose a risk to surface and ground water bodies.

10.2. Given the proximity of the Clifden Castlebar (IE\_WE\_G\_0017) ground waterbody (status “good”), the proposed development may prevent the future maintenance or attainment of a ‘Good’ water status and may result in the deterioration of existing water quality of the groundwater body which would not be consistent with the Water Framework Directive. Accordingly, I recommend that permission be refused in relation to this issue. This would be a new issue and the Commission, if it agrees with my assessment, may wish to consider if this merits refusal of permission in this context.

## **11.0 Recommendation**

I recommend that permission be refused for two reasons.

## **12.0 Reasons and Considerations**

1. The proposed development is located in an area identified in the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 as being under strong urban influence for development. Per Objective RHO 1 of the Development Plan, applicants are required to establish a rural housing need in such areas. As insufficient information has been provided to substantiate that the applicant has a rural housing need at this location, it is considered that the proposed development would, if granted permission, would lead to demands for the uneconomic and provision of public services and communal facilities in the area and would constitute an unsustainable form of rural development contrary to policy. The proposed development would, therefore, contravene Objective RHO 1 of the Development Plan and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the observed ground conditions at this location, the Commission is not satisfied that the site is suitable for the treatment and disposal of wastewater in accordance with the requirements of the EPA Code of Practice 2021: ‘Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent  $\leq 10$ )’. The proposed development would,

therefore, be contrary to Sections 2.10 and 8.4 of Volume 2 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be prejudicial to public health. Given the site location above the Clifden Castlebar (IE\_WE\_G\_0017) ground waterbody (status “good”), the proposed development may prevent the future maintenance or attainment of a ‘Good’ water status and may result in the deterioration of existing water quality of the groundwater body which would not be consistent with the Water Framework Directive. Therefore the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

---

Ciarán Daly  
Planning Inspector

31<sup>st</sup> October 2025



## Appendix 1

### Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	ACP-323046-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of a house, garage and wastewater treatment system.
<b>Development Address</b>	Ardogommon, Westport, Co Mayo.
	<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,  - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.  <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

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

<p><b>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</b></p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b></p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b></p>

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

## Appendix 2

### Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	ACP-323046-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of a house, garage and wastewater treatment system.
<b>Development Address</b>	Ardogommon, Westport, Co Mayo.
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<b>Characteristics of proposed development</b>  (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	<b>Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed.</b>  New dwelling (346sqm.), connection to public water supply and on site wastewater treatment system. Site area 0.56ha.
<b>Location of development</b>  (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	<b>Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed</b>  The rural site is not located close to any environmentally sensitive sites or surface water bodies.  There are no sites of social or cultural interest in the vicinity.
<b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b>  (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	<b>Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.</b>  Modest scale and domestic nature of the development with no significant pollution at construction or operational stages, such that no likely significant effects on the environment arise. Wastewater treatment system to EPA Code.
<b>Conclusion</b>	

Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

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

DP/ADP: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

### Appendix 3

#### Water Framework Directive Screening and Assessment

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
<p><b>Step 1:</b> The proposed development is for the construction of a house, garage and wastewater treatment system.</p> <p>Site Area 0.56ha</p> <p>Total floor area 346sqm. The site is within a serviced urban area for water provision but not for wastewater treatment services.</p> <p>There are no surface water bodies running through the site. The subject site is located c.275m south-west of the Carrowbeg (Westport_020) river waterbody (IE_WE_32C050100) (status “good”) and is above the Clifden Castlebar (IE_WE_G_0017) ground waterbody (status “good”).</p>			
<b>An Bord Pleanála ref. no.</b>	ACP-323046-25	<b>Townland, address</b>	Ardogommon, Westport, Co Mayo.
<b>Description of project</b>	The proposed development consists of the construction of a house, garage and wastewater treatment system.		
<b>Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,</b>	<p>The site slopes somewhat uphill towards the south-east and while mainly in grass there are some areas of rushes. There is an adjacent rural dwelling to the north-east and the site is otherwise surrounded by grassland fields being in a rural area.</p> <p>The proposed urban development would be located at a remove surface water bodies but would be above a ground water body as noted above.</p>		

<b>Proposed surface water details</b>		The site is not located close to any flood risk zones and a stormwater soakaway is proposed towards the north-west corner of the site.				
<b>Proposed water supply source &amp; available capacity</b>		Public network with no pre-connection agreement supplied.				
<b>Proposed wastewater treatment system &amp; available capacity, other issues</b>		On-site wastewater treatment system proposed with soil polishing filter.				
<b>Others?</b>						
<b>Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection</b>						
<b>Identified water body</b>	<b>Distance to (m)</b>	<b>Water body name(s) (code)</b>	<b>WFD Status</b>	<b>Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk</b>	<b>Identified pressures on that water body</b>	<b>Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)</b>
River Waterbody	c.275m to the south-	Carrowbeg (Westport_020)	Good.			Potentially via surface run-off and groundwater.

	west, with intervening urban development between it and the site.	river waterbody (IE_WE_32C050 100) (status “good”)		Not at risk.	No pressures.	
Groundwater Waterbody	Underlying site	Clifden Castlebar (IE_WE_G_0017 ) ground waterbody (status “good”)	Good	Not at risk.	No pressures.	Surface run-off and wastewater treatment output to groundwater.

**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	Waterbody 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	Carrowbeg (Westport_020) river waterbody (IE_WE_32C050100)	No direct link with intervening rural lands.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages	Standard construction practice measures can be conditioned.	No, best practice construction measures, significant distance and intervening lands between site and surface waterbody	<b>Screened out</b>
2.	Ground	Clifden Castlebar (IE_WE_G_0017) ground waterbody	Pathway exists	Spillages.	As above	No, best practice construction measures.	<b>Screened out</b>
<b>OPERATIONAL PHASE</b>							



3.	Surface	Carrowbeg (Westport_0 20) river waterbody (IE_WE_32C0 50100)	No direct link with intervening lands and significant separation distance.	No link to water body given separation distance and design measures for surface water drainage.	Use of SUDS measures can also be conditioned.	No, soakaway provided for and SUDS can be conditioned.	<b>Screened out</b>
4.	Ground	Clifden Castlebar (IE_WE_G_0 017) ground waterbody	Pathway exists	Potential link to water body via surface water and wastewater output draining to ground.	Potential link could give rise to risk.	Yes	<b>Screened in</b>
<b>DECOMMISSIONING PHASE</b>							
5.	N/A						
<b>STAGE 2: ASSESSMENT</b>							
<b>Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives</b>							

Groundwater				
Development/Activity e.g. abstraction, outfall, etc.	<u>Objective 1: Groundwater</u>  Prevent or limit the input of pollutants into groundwater and to prevent the deterioration of the status of all bodies of groundwater	<u>Objective 2 :</u> <u>Groundwater</u>  Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of groundwater, ensure a balance between abstraction and recharge, with the aim of achieving good status*	<u>Objective 3:Groundwater</u>  Reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in the concentration of any pollutant resulting from the impact of human activity	Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)
	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:	

<b>Development Activity</b> <b>4:</b> Operation phase, groundwater	Use of SUDS measures sufficient for surface water drainage however on-site wastewater	On-site wastewater treatment system to EPA Code. However, this has not been	On-site wastewater treatment system to EPA Code. However, this has not been demonstrated given on site observations, see Section 7.5 of above report.	No.
---	---	---	---	-----

	treatment system not demonstrated to comply with EPA Code.	demonstrated given on site observations, see Section 7.5 of above report.		
--	--	---	--	--