



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323116-25

Development	Raising of ridge level of an existing dwelling to construct first floor domestic accommodation and all associated site works.
Location	No.1 Golf View, Rosstown, Co. Donegal, F94 YD51
Planning Authority	Donegal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560785
Applicant	Colin Hyde
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant	Franc Myles
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	22 nd September 2025
Inspector	Jim Egan

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision.....	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies.....	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	7
4.1. Appeal Site.....	7
4.2. Surrounding Area.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
5.1. Donegal County Development Plan 2024 – 2030	8
6.0 Natural Heritage Designations	10
7.0 The Appeal	11
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	11
7.2. Applicant Response	12
7.3. Planning Authority Response.....	13
7.4. Observations.....	13
8.0 Assessment.....	13
8.1. Visual Impact	14
8.2. Procedural Issues	17
8.3. Compliance with Building Regulations	19
8.4. Other Matters	19
9.0 EIA Screening.....	19

10.0	Appropriate Assessment Screening	19
11.0	Water Framework Directive	20
12.0	Recommendation	20
13.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	20
	Appendix 1 - Form 1	22
	Appendix 2	24
	Appendix 3 – Water Framework Directive Screening	25

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, with a stated area of 0.072ha, is located on the south side of the L7215 local road within the coastal village of Rossnowlagh, Co. Donegal.
- 1.2. The settlement of Rossnowlagh is characterised by a low-lying beach area with a backdrop of elevated land in the form of drumlin hills. The appeal site is located on the northern hillside of one such drumlin, known as Ardeelan Hill. By reason of the elevated nature of the area, the site and surrounding dwellings are visibly exposed within the local environs to the north and west.
- 1.3. The site comprises a single storey detached dwelling, located on the southern, most elevated part, of the appeal site. The site slopes downwards towards its interface with the L7215 to the north. An area for on-site car parking along with a stepped pedestrian access are located adjacent to the northern boundary with the road. Vehicular access to the site is via a shared laneway running west off the L7215 passing along the front of three adjoining cottage style dwellings.
- 1.4. To the east of the site are the abovementioned single storey corrugated holiday home cottages (1 no. detached and 2 no. semi-detached). To the west and southwest is a relatively new infill housing estate of detached dwellings on relatively large plots, all accessed from an estate road off the L7215 west of the appeal site. To the south is a detached dormer dwelling, and further south again is a row of three detached dormer dwellings. The settlement pattern in the vicinity of the site is informed by the hillside contours, noting that the dwellings to the west and east are positioned generally on the same contour as the dwelling on the appeal site, whilst dwellings to the south and southwest are positioned at intermittently higher contours on the hillside.
- 1.5. The subject site is not listed as a Protected Structure nor located within an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). The adjoining detached holiday home cottage to the east is afforded a regional rating on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) but is not a Protected Structure.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal comprises the following:

- Raising the ridge level of the existing dwelling by c. 1.613m, taking the ridge level from c. 4.387m to c. 6m in height. The eaves height would remain the same.
- Construction of a front porch.
- Construction of a minor infill section on the southeast corner of the dwelling.
- 2 no. velux style roof lights to both the front and rear roof slopes.
- Modifications to fenestration detail on front, rear and western side elevation at ground floor level.

2.2. The new first floor level would accommodate 2 no. en-suite bedrooms and storage, whilst the existing ground floor would be remodelled from kitchen/dining area, bathroom and 3 no. bedrooms to a larger open plan kitchen / dining / living area, bathroom and 2 no. bedrooms.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority granted permission subject to 3 no. conditions, including relating to materials and finishes and surface water discharge.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. *Planning Reports*

A planner's report, dated 23rd June 2025, makes the following main points:

- The refurbishment and renovation of an existing dwelling within the settlement boundary of Rossnowlagh is acceptable in principle.
- The context of the adjoining cottage, being on the NIAH register, is an important consideration in the assessment of the application.
- The proposal respects the context of the existing adjoining dwellings to the east and west and can integrate successfully at this location and does not visually detract from the character of the existing development within the vicinity of the site.

- Considering the physical separation distances between the subject site and the neighbouring dwellings no issues arise in relation to loss of privacy, overlooking or residential amenity.
- No development contribution charges apply.

3.2.2. *Other Technical Reports*

Area Roads Engineer - No objection.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

An Taisce – No response received.

Heritage Council – No response received.

Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage in respect of Architectural Heritage and Natural Heritage – No response received.

Uisce Eireann – No response received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

4 no. third party observations were received by the planning authority. The issues raised are summarised below:

- The adjoining house is listed on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) as a building of architectural and technical special interest of regional importance.
- The proposal is of poor architectural quality and inappropriate in terms of design, character, scale and form.
- The roof is out of proportion to the building and would appear top heavy.
- The existing ridgeline is already over and above that established by the neighbouring historical structures.
- An increase in excess of 1500mm would have a detrimental and negative effect on the visual amenity of the adjoining row of holiday home cottages, which are of historical significance.

- Raised roof will block light to the adjoining cottage to the east.
- The proposed internal floor to ceiling height might not meet building regulations standards for habitable accommodation.
- A further increase in ridge height to the dwelling might result in windows on the rear elevation that cause overlooking of the garden to the dwelling to the south.
- Shared driveway not suitable for construction traffic.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

P.A. Ref. 2461798 – refers to a 2024 decision to refuse permission for development comprising the raising of the roof to provide first floor level accommodation.

The proposal was similar in principle to the current application however the ridge was to be raised by 2.59m with the inclusion of a relatively large dormer extension to the front.

The planning authority refused permission for the following reason:

1. *It is a policy of the Planning Authority (Policy AH-P-8, County Development Plan 2024-2030) to 'Ensure a high quality architectural design of all new development relating to or which may impact on NIAH structures (and their setting)...'. The proposal to raise the ridge level of the existing dwellinghouse is considered inappropriate in terms of design, character, scale and form with regard to the setting and context of the subject site to the 1 no. single storey dwelling designated as NIAH (Reg. No. 40910312) and 2 no. additional single storey dwellings located to the immediate east of the site. Accordingly, to permit the development would create an undesirable precedent for similar development within this landscape, would contravene Policy AH-P-8 of the County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030 and would thereby be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

4.2. Surrounding Area

None considered relevant.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Donegal County Development Plan 2024 – 2030

The Donegal CDP 2024 – 2030 took effect on the 26th June 2024 except for those parts of the Plan which are subject to a Draft Ministerial Direction. The Draft Ministerial Direction was issued on the 26th June 2024 and relates to land use zonings in a number of settlements and separately to text relating to accesses onto national roads. I am satisfied that the Draft Ministerial Direction has no direct implications for the appeal site.

I also note that proposed Variation No. 1 of the CDP was at pre-draft public consultation stage in February 2025, the provisions of which do not affect the site.

The appeal site is located within the settlement / development boundary of Rossnowlagh, a ‘rural settlement’, which is a level 4 settlement under the county’s settlement hierarchy, one level below Service Towns and one level above Open Countryside.

The CDP identifies ‘Settlement Frameworks’ for service towns and rural settlements, including for Rossnowlagh village. The site is not subject to a zoning objective noting that apart from amenity area, no particular zoning objectives apply within the boundary for Rossnowlagh. However CDP Policy CS-P-1 states: *That within the boundaries of settlements identified Settlement Framework boundaries, applications for development will be assessed in the light of all relevant material planning considerations including any identified land use zonings, availability of infrastructure, relevant policies of the Development Plan/Local Area Plan as applicable, other regional and national guidance/policy and relevant environmental designations.*

The following Development Plan chapters and associated policies/objectives are considered to be most relevant in respect of the subject development:

Chapter 5 – Towns and Villages

Objective TV-O-5 To ensure quality design proposals for new development within towns and villages in order to contribute to positive place-making.

Policy TV-P-3 To ensure that development proposals within towns and villages centres:

- a. Provide for distinctive buildings of a high architectural quality which contribute to a distinct sense of place and a quality public realm.
- b. Create strong street frontage by either, adhering to the established building line in the immediate area or establishing a new building line immediately adjoining the public road where a reasonable opportunity exists to do so. A greater setback will be permitted where the development would provide for the creation a high-quality urban place with sufficient landscaping/planning, street furniture etc.
- c. Respect, where appropriate, the context of the adjoining buildings, adjacent streetscape or buildings in the immediate area, in terms of design, height, scale and mass etc.
- d. Respect the architectural character (in terms of design/arrangement of fenestration, facia/soffit treatment, general finishes and materials), eaves height, roof pitch, roof line, and overall building form and height, as appropriate, in areas characterised by traditional vernacular or high-quality streetscape.
- e. Create buildings of a human scale, by providing for a fine grain of development, in terms of overall scale, fenestration, size/proportions, signage, detailing and buildings with a narrow street frontage.
- f. Promote, where appropriate, visual interest through modulation and detailing of architectural elements (e.g., detailing/treatments of eaves, windows, frontages, slight variations in roof lines, setback etc.).
- g. Utilise, where appropriate, adaptable and accessible design on the ground floor to ensure their future re-use for alternative functions (e.g., retail/commercial etc.).

- h. Avoid the use of industrial type cladding, or the glazing of extensive areas of the proposed development.

Chapter 6 – Housing

Policy UB-P-9 It is the policy of the Council both to protect the residential amenity of existing residential units and to promote design concepts for new housing that ensures the establishment of reasonable levels of urban residential amenity.

Chapter 11 – Natural, Built and Archaeological Heritage

Objective L-O-1 To protect, manage and conserve the character, quality and value of the Donegal landscape.

Policy L-P-2 To protect areas identified as ‘High Scenic Amenity’ and ‘Moderate Scenic Amenity’ on Map 11.1 ‘Scenic Amenity’. Within these areas, only development of a nature, location and scale that integrates with, and reflects the character and amenity of the landscape may be considered, subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan.

Policy L-P-7 To preserve the views and prospects of special amenity value and interest as identified on Map 11.1.

Objective AH-O-1 Conserve, manage, protect and enhance the architectural heritage of Donegal namely Protected Structures, Architectural Conservation Areas, NIAH structures, designed landscapes and historic gardens, vernacular, historic building stock industrial and maritime built heritage, character and setting of such structures.

Policy AH-P-8 Ensure high quality architectural design of all new development relating to or which may impact on NIAH structures (and their setting).

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located within or adjacent to any designated sites. The closest European Sites are as follows:

- Donegal Bay SPA (Site Code: 004151), c. 270m west of the site
- Durnesh Lough SPA (Site Code: 004145), c. 1.4km northeast of the site
- Durnesh Lough SAC (Site Code: 000138), c. 840m northeast of the site

The Durnesh Lough pNHA (Site Code 000138) is located c. 840m northeast of the site.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third-party appeal has been received from Franc Myles against the planning authority's decision to grant permission for the proposed development. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

Design

- The local authority's previous application on the site was refused on the basis of the impact on the adjoining NIAH structure and its settings, with reference to CDP Policy AH-P-8.
- In the context of the adjoining cottage, the proposal is inappropriate in terms of design, scale and form and the proposed front elevation would be seriously injurious to what survives of a sensitive architectural environment created by the linear arrangement of the adjoining cottages.
- Existing dwelling on the site already dominates the protected bargeboards, gables and finials of the adjoining cottage. A greater ridge height would injure the visual amenity of the adjoining row of cottages.

Planning Authority's Assessment

- Project designer and local authority have not delivered a suitable architectural solution to the dwelling located within an environment that enjoys a significant level of statutory protection.
- Planner's report has not given sufficient consideration to the observations received.

- Planner's report has not engaged in a serious sense with the application or its adverse impact on the historic built environment with no attempt made to quantify the impact of increasing the ridge line of the house on the protected architectural environment.
- Given the statutory protection afforded the existing built environment, a contiguous elevation of the proposal with adjoining dwellings should have been requested by the planning authority.
- Architectural Conservation Officer nor Heritage Officer were invited to comment on the application.

Building Control

- The proposed internal floor to ceiling height might not meet building regulations standards for habitable accommodation, therefore the ridge height might need to be raised notwithstanding a grant of permission.

7.2. Applicant Response

A response was received on behalf of the applicant, with the main points summarised as follows:

Design

- The dwelling is located within an area that is intensively developed with many different house types.
- The current proposal has been informed by consultation with the planning authority following the previous refusal.
- The existing dwelling is of a 1980s bungalow bliss design and is rundown.
- The proposal seeks to give a much-needed transformation to the dwelling whilst retaining its mass and scale.
- The proposed front porch seeks to mimic a similar porch roof detail on the adjacent structure and to break up the existing bland elevation.

Planning Authority's Assessment

- Planning authority has given due consideration to the application, evident by the previous refusal and engagement with the applicant in the form of pre-planning prior to lodgement of the current application.
- The planning authority referred the application to the department, An Taisce and the Heritage Council.

Building Control

- The design approved will ensure that all building control regulations will be complied with by means of the introduction of a site-specific mechanical ventilation heat recovery system to ensure adequate levels of ventilation are achieved.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

A response has been received from the Planning Authority which states that while the contents of the appeal have been noted, the planning authority wishes to rely on the content of the planner's report and therefore has no further comment to make.

7.4. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

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

- Visual Impact
- Procedural Issues
- Compliance with Building Regulations
- Other Matters

The issues of EIA, Appropriate Assessment and Water Framework Directive screening also need to be addressed.

8.1. Visual Impact

- 8.1.1. The main ground of appeal is that by reason of design, and specifically raising the roof of the existing dwelling, the proposal would adversely impact the visual and architectural significance of the adjoining cottage. In this regard, the appellant refers to the 'protected architectural environment', the 'statutory protection' afforded to the area and to the 'protected' elements of the adjoining cottage.
- 8.1.2. The existing dwelling on the appeal site is not a protected structure nor is the adjoining cottage and there are no Architectural Conservation Area designations within the settlement. The adjoining cottage is listed on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH). Planning Leaflet 12, published by the Department of Housing, Heritage and Local Government in conjunction with the Officer of the Planning Regulator, outlines that the function of the NIAH is to act as a central survey database for post 1700 architectural heritage but also notes that the structures listed in the NIAH do not have statutory protection. I have also reviewed the Record of Monuments and Places, maintained by the National Monuments Service, and note that the site nor immediate environs intersect with a zone of notification for a known or potential recorded monument.
- 8.1.3. On the basis of the above, from an architectural or archaeological perspective, there is no statutory protection afforded to the existing built environment in the vicinity of the appeal site, including the adjoining cottage.
- 8.1.4. However, I do note that the NIAH survey attributes a rating value of regional importance to the adjoining cottage, concluding that the structure is an interesting feature in the scenic landscape and is an integral element of the built heritage of Donegal. The *Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2011* outlines that where the NIAH survey attributes a rating value of international, national or regional importance to a structure, that structure will be recommended by the Minister to the planning authority for inclusion on the record of protected structures. As such, while the structure is not included on the record of protected structures, it

does have architectural merit by reason of the NIAH survey and is therefore, in my view, a key consideration in the assessment of the application.

- 8.1.5. For development in towns and villages, Objective TV-O-5 seeks to ensure quality design proposals for new development within towns and villages in order to contribute to positive place-making; whilst CDP Policy TV-P-3 seeks adherence to a broad array of design standards including that the proposal provides for distinctive buildings of a high architectural quality which contribute to a distinct sense of place and a quality public realm; respects, where appropriate, the context of adjoining buildings, adjacent streetscape or buildings in the immediate area, in terms of design, height, scale and mass etc.; and also seeks to promote, where appropriate, visual interest through modulation and detailing of architectural elements.
- 8.1.6. Also of relevance is CDP Policy AH-P-8 which seeks to ensure high quality architectural design of all new development relating to or which may impact on NIAH structures and their setting.
- 8.1.7. The proposal is for the renovation and extension of a 1980s bungalow, including, from a street view perspective, the construction of a new roof with a ridge level c. 1.613m higher than the existing roof, installation of two velux style rooflights on the front roof slope and the construction of a front porch. The proposed front porch has a depth of c. 750mm and length of c. 4.01m to the front elevation, with a front gabled pitch roof extending above the eaves of the main roof. The porch is of a somewhat contemporary design with a large section of glazing on the front elevation, matched in style by further sections of glazing to the east and west sides of the same front house elevation.
- 8.1.8. The proposal would broadly retain the scale and massing of the existing house, and apart from the proposed front porch extending out by c. 750mm and a minor infilling on the southeast corner, the footprint of the house would more or less remain the same. Whilst the ridge line would be higher, I note that the existing roof is relatively shallow. With reference to the submitted side elevation drawings, it is my view that the new roof would remain in proportion to the main structure. As such, I consider that the proposal promotes visual interest and high architectural quality by providing for a renovated and modernised house, consistent with CDP Objective TV-O-5 and Policy TV-P-3.

- 8.1.9. With regards the adjoining cottage, the planning authority considered that the proposal respects the context of the existing adjoining dwellings to the east and west and can integrate successfully at this location and does not visually detract from the character of the existing development within the vicinity of the site, complaint with CDP Policy AH-P-8.
- 8.1.10. In my view, by reason of the established and emerging settlement pattern of the surrounding hillside, particularly noting the dwellings on the upper contours forming an immediate backdrop to the appeal site and adjoining cottages, the architectural significance of the adjoining cottage is contained within the parameters of the cottage site itself and adjoining cottages to the east. The proposal seeks to renovate a 1980s dwelling, a proposal, in view, by reason of the scale and design, does not adversely impact on the adjoining cottage or its setting in the context of the aforementioned hillside settlement pattern. As such, in my view, the proposal is consistent with CDP Policy AH-P-8.
- 8.1.11. The site is located within an Area of High Scenic Amenity. For such areas, CDP Policy L-P-2 states that only development of a nature, location and scale that integrates with, and reflects the character and amenity of the landscape may be considered.
- 8.1.12. Whilst noting the adjoining cottage and significance of same with respect to the NIAH, the wider area is characterised by the pattern of residential development across the hillside. In this regard, the existing built form on the upper slopes of the hill forms the backdrop to the views of the appeal site and adjoining cottage from the public realm to the north. I consider that by reason of this settlement pattern across the exposed hillside, the proposal to renovate the house including raising the ridge line will result in a structure that will continue to integrate within the existing landscape, consistent with CDP Policy L-P-2.
- 8.1.13. In addition to the wider classification of 'Areas of High Scenic Amenity', the County Development Plan identifies views and prospects of special amenity value (Map 11.1). Policy L-P-7 seeks to preserve the views and prospects of special amenity value. The closest protected views and prospects of special amenity value and interest are those views from the southern end of Rossnowlagh Beach and adjoining headland in a north and northeast direction across the settlement. Whilst the view lines generally cover the area in which the appeal site is located, by reason of the local topography,

specifically in this case that the appeal site is located on the northern side of a hill and therefore not visible from the standpoint of the views to be preserved, I am satisfied that the development will not result in an adverse impact on any identified views and prospects of special amenity value and interest and is therefore consistent with Policy L-P-7 and Policy L-P-8 of the County Development Plan.

- 8.1.14. Condition 2 on the planning authority's decision requires that all external finishes shall match those of the existing dwelling in terms of colour, texture and materials. External material finishes on the existing house comprise dashed plaster to the walls, wood effect upvc windows and concrete roof tiles. The proposed finishes, as per the submitted drawings, include white smooth plaster to the walls, slate grey windows and natural roof slates. The planner's report does not contain any discussion on material finishes. Notwithstanding, in the context of the modernised and somewhat contemporary approach to the proposed renovation, I consider that to require the material finishes to match those of the existing house would be misplaced. As such, if An Coimisiún is minded to grant permission, I recommend that a condition is included that requires external material finishes to be agree with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.
- 8.1.15. On balance, I consider that the proposal integrates sufficiently within the site and surrounding landscape and will not adversely impact on the visual amenity or character of Rossnowlagh nor the character or visual amenity of the adjoining cottage.

8.2. Procedural Issues

- 8.2.1. Grounds of appeal include that, with reference to the planner's report, the planning authority did not address concerns raised in the 4 no. observations received.
- 8.2.2. Section 34(3) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) states that a planning authority shall, when considering an application for permission, have regard to any written submissions or observations concerning the proposed development made to it in accordance with the permission regulations by persons or bodies.
- 8.2.3. The planner's report lists the observations received and summaries the concerns raised, stating that the issues are addressed in the assessment section. In my view, the planning authority has shown reasonable intent to engage with and consider observations received, consistent with Section 34(3) of the Act.

- 8.2.4. The appellant also contends that given the statutory protection afforded to the existing built environment, a contiguous elevation of the proposal with adjoining dwellings should have been requested by the planning authority.
- 8.2.5. As noted earlier in my report, the existing dwelling on the appeal site is not a protected structure nor is the adjoining cottage and there are no Architectural Conservation Area designations in the village. As such, there is no statutory protection afforded to the existing built environment in the vicinity of the appeal site.
- 8.2.6. I note that there was no contiguous elevation was submitted with the application. Article 23(1)(d) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) requires planning applications for a 'proposed structure' to include contiguous elevations showing the main features of any adjoining buildings. The planning authority's Validation Checklist, a copy of which is on the file, shows that the requirement for a contiguous elevation was not applicable to the application. I note that the words 'proposed structure' are highlighted within the checklist, which suggests that, in practice, contiguous elevations are only requested in the situations where a new structure is proposed.
- 8.2.7. Whilst, in my view, a drawing of this nature would be beneficial to the assessment from a streetscape perspective, I am satisfied that the submitted drawings are sufficient to assess the proposal.
- 8.2.8. The appellant also raises a concern that the local authority's Architectural Conservation Officer or Heritage Officer were not invited to comment on the application. Having regard to the content of the planner's report and with reference to the reason for refusal of previous application, I am satisfied that the planning authority had due regard to the architectural context of the adjoining cottage, again noting that the cottage, whilst included on the NIAH survey register, has no statutory protection from an architectural perspective. I also note that the planning authority referred the application to the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (with regards architectural heritage), An Taisce and the Heritage Council, pursuant to Article 28 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), with no response received.
- 8.2.9. The issues outlined above, as raised by the appellant, are of a procedural nature, having no implications on my assessment of the proposed development.

8.3. Compliance with Building Regulations

- 8.3.1. Grounds of appeal include that by reason of the internal floor to ceiling heights, the proposed first floor level rooms might not meet building regulation standards for habitable accommodation, and as a result the ridge height might need to be raised notwithstanding the plans submitted with the application. In the response to the appeal, the applicant outlines that all building control regulations will be complied with.
- 8.3.2. The issue of compliance with Building Regulations will be evaluated under a separate legal code and thus need not concern An Coimisiún for the purposes of this appeal.

8.4. Other Matters

Development Contributions

- 8.4.1. Table 2 of the current Donegal Development Contributions Scheme (2016-2021) provides for a 100% exemption from the payment of a development contribution in respect of applications for domestic extensions. On this basis, I am satisfied that the proposal is exempt from the requirement for the payment of a development contribution.

9.0 EIA Screening

Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination.

10.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

Refer to Appendix 2. Having regard to nature, scale and location of the proposed development and proximity to the nearest European site, it is concluded that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise as the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

11.0 Water Framework Directive

Refer to Appendix 3. On the basis of objective information, I consider 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.

12.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be granted for the reasons and considerations outlined below.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of Donegal County Development Plan 2024-2030, the nature, scale and design of the proposed development and to the pattern of existing development in the area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would respect the existing visual character of the area and would not adversely impact on the adjoining cottage in the context of its inclusion on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage. The development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Conditions:

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on the 15 th May 2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the
----	--

	<p>development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.</p>
3.	<p>Drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public health and waste management</p>

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.

Jim Egan
Planning Inspector

28th October 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323116-25
Proposed Development Summary	Raising of ridge level of an existing dwelling to construct first floor domestic accommodation and all associated site works.
Development Address	No.1 Golf View, Rossnowlagh, Co. Donegal, F94 YD51
	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed	

<p>road 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>	

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2

AA Screening

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

The site is not located within or immediately adjacent to any European Sites. The closest European Site, part of the Natura 2000 Network, is the Donegal Bay SPA (Site Code: 004151), c. 270m west of the site.

The proposed development is located within an urban settlement and comprises renovation and extension of an existing dwelling. The development would be connected to public services including water and sewerage.

The Planning Authority concluded that AA is not required.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, and having regard to the AA Screening carried out by the Planning Authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site.

The reasons for this conclusion are as follows:

- Nature and scale of the proposed development,
- Urban location with access to all public services and utilities,
- The distance from European Sites.

I consider that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site and appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

Appendix 3 – Water Framework Directive Screening

Screening the need for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination.

The proposed development is located within an urban settlement and comprises the renovation and extension of an existing dwelling.

I have assessed the application and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of the development
- Connection to all urban water services.
- Urban location and location in the context of the nearest water bodies

Conclusion

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.