



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323145-25

Development	Construction of a new entrance from the public road, a car park and a community garden with all associated development works
Location	Carnagh West, Kiltoom, Co. Roscommon
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	24/60488
Applicants	Board of Management of Glanduff National School
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	To refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellants	Board of Management of Glanduff National School
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	19 th September 2025
Inspector	Trevor Rue

Table of Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
4.0 Planning History.....	9
5.0 Policy Context.....	10
6.0 EIA Screening.....	11
7.0 The Appeal	11
8.0 Assessment	12
9.0 AA Screening.....	15
10.0 Water Framework Directive	15
11.0 Recommendation	16
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	16
Appendix A: Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening	17
Appendix B: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination.....	18

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is about 16 kilometres to the south of Roscommon, about 12 kilometres to the north of Athlone and about 3 kilometres to the south of the village of Lecarrow. With a stated area of 0.2 hectares, it comprises a generally rectangular part of a larger field on the western side of a local road, the L7610.
- 1.2. The site lies about 17 metres to the south of a pronounced bend in the L7610. There are three dwellings to the north of the site. Glanduff National School is on the opposite, eastern side of the road. A junction with another local road, the L7550, lies about 20 metres to the south west. There is an existing agricultural entrance into the field that includes the application site about 20 metres to the south of the junction.
- 1.3. The northern boundary of the site is defined by a mature hedge row. There is a natural stone wall on the road frontage. The southern and eastern boundaries are undefined.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to construct a 30-space car park in the western part of the site with a new access from the local road. Sight lines of 90 metres to the north and 30 metres to the south from the proposed access are indicated on the site layout plan. There would be an elliptical internal road in the centre of which 12 spaces would be reserved for staff parking. A footpath would be provided round the periphery of the car park. A community garden, 25 metres by 25 metres in extent, would be laid out in the eastern part of the site. It would include a walkway, a water feature and planting.

Further Information

- 2.2. Following a request from the planning authority, the applicants provided further information about the proposal, which is detailed below.
- 2.3. By way of justification for the development, the Board of Management stated that at present there is a serious health and safety risk to the pupils, parents and staff. Three buses arrive at the school in the morning and afternoon but there is only one bus parking space. Buses and cars are often double parked with excess vehicles staying on the road. With the new car parking in place, all cars could park safely in designated spaces and three buses could park safely in designated spaces outside the school

entrance. The provision of the additional bus spaces outside the school wall would drastically reduce the number of spaces for cars at that location.

- 2.4. A copy of the school's traffic and pedestrian management plan was provided. It lists a number of risks, including speed limits not being adhered to, pupils being dropped off in undesignated areas, and drivers doing U-turns outside the school. It notes that children, especially young children, have the potential to dash out on the road at any time without warning. It then makes a series of recommendations for behaviour during the morning drop off and the 2pm and 3pm pick up. Finally, it sets out guidelines or rules for drivers. These include using the new car park, not dropping children off at the roadside or in the middle of the road, not parking on or blocking the controlled crossing point, giving way to pedestrians at that location, not reversing out of car parking spaces, and slowing down where children may be crossing.
- 2.5 Reference was made in the justification letter to participation in the Green Schools Active Travel Flag. The aim of this initiative is to increase the number of pupils walking, cycling, scooting, carpooling, using public transport or using park 'n' stride instead of the private car on the school run.
- 2.6. The letter was supplemented by the following facts and arguments:
- There are currently 13 staff members and 141 pupils at the school.
 - There are currently 24 car parking spaces on the western side of the road next to the school and there are 32 cycle parking spaces at the school.
 - There is a similar car park layout in use for Ballymurray National School, which is in the same parish and similar in size to Glanduff National School. This car park has been in operation for the last two years and staff and parents have found it hugely satisfactory.
- 2.7. A letter was provided from a representative of a group of local people in Lecarrow outlining the need for a community garden.
- 2.8. A road safety audit (RSA) was presented. It noted that collision data had not been supplied and was not available on the Road Safety Authority database. It made the following recommendations:
1. The road markings at the car park entrance/exit should require drivers to pass to the left of opposing traffic.

2. Pencil wands (bollards) should be installed and double yellow road markings painted to both sides of the car park junction in order to deter parking in this area.
3. The roadside areas currently used for parent parking should be converted into a footpath and protected from vehicle parking by the installation of bollards.
4. A school warden should be available to assist pupils in crossing the road at busy times. Road markings and advance warning signage should be provided.
5. Buses should arrive from the south and park adjacent to the school footpath.
6. A swept path analysis should be undertaken and the layout designed to accommodate all buses outside the live traffic lanes.
7. The school boundary wall should be demolished and set back to provide full visibility for pedestrians exiting the school. Any parked vehicles that hinder visibility should be moved when the crossing is being used.
8. A swept path analysis should be undertaken to prove that all vehicles can enter and exit the car park even when adjacent spaces are occupied.
9. A safe route should be provided from the staff parking spaces to the car park footpath to the north.
10. The width of the car park entrance/exist should be reduced. If this is not possible, the footpath should continue through the junction, in order to offer pedestrians priority.
11. A suitable car park drainage system that caters for all storm intensities and durations should be provided.
12. Suitable surface falls towards the road gullies should be provided.
13. Suitable construction materials should be chosen.

2.9. The applicants said they accepted all the recommendations except Item 6. It was considered, after consulting bus companies, that there would be enough room for buses. In regard to Item 10, the preferred option was to continue the footpath through the junction. In regard to Item 12, a 1.5% fall was proposed. In response to the recommendations, a revised car park layout dated April 2025, including a cross section, was submitted.

2.10. The revised drawing shows that the final hard surface of the car park would be 80-millimetre wearing course macadam; that the final surface of the footpath would be concrete with a brushed-stroke finish; that drop kerbs would be used at the entrance to the car park; that green wire-mesh perimeter fencing 1.8 metres in height would be

erected on the southern and western site boundaries; and that an evergreen hedge would be planted along the inside of the fence.

- 2.11. The proposed surface water collection system indicated on the revised drawing consists of road gulleys installed at 15-metre intervals discharging to suitably designed soakaways. The gulleys would cater for silt collection. All surface water would be collected and disposed of on the site and no surface water would be allowed on to the public road. In the applicants' opinion hydrocarbon interception would not be required for a car park of this scale.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. On 30th June 2015, Roscommon County Council refused permission for the following reason:

The Planning Authority is not satisfied based on submissions received that it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposed car parking facilities can operate safely and efficiently and facilitate safe vehicular and active travel movement within the proposed car park and in addition safe active travel movement between the proposed car park and other school facilities on the opposite side of the public road and furthermore that the design of the car park and associated facilities as proposed sufficiently incorporates the recommendations set out in the Road Safety Audit received. It is therefore considered in view of the nature of the proposed development which will dramatically alter mobility arrangements associated with the school, that the proposed development has the potential to endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and obstruction of road users. The proposed development would, accordingly, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

Planning Reports

- 3.2.1. Planners' reports dated 6th December 2024 and 27th June 2025 provided the reasoning for the authority's decision. The main points were as follows:

- The Development Plan supports development ancillary to the school which will facilitate delivery of an educational service. The visual implications of the development when the car park is full are of a local nature and not significant.
- Thirteen staff are employed at the school and from September 150 students will be attending. The car-parking standards require 1.5 spaces per staff member, which equates to 19.5 spaces.
- Currently 24 car parking spaces and one bus bay are located perpendicular to the front boundary of the school on the public road. The applicants intend to provide two further bus bays along the road, which would necessitate removing car parking spaces, leaving 14 beside the road. It is intended to provide a total of 44 spaces for the school. However, the additional bus bays are not included in the description of development and would be outside the application site. They cannot therefore be considered as part of the current application.
- The revised layout proposes pencil bollards either side of the car park entrance/exit to prevent unauthorised parking. While their precise location is unclear, it can be assumed that a significant number (particularly those to the right of the access) would be outside the application site. It is not clear whether third-party consent would be required or with whom responsibility for installing the bollards would lie. No provision has been made for the double yellow lines referenced in the RSA, which would also be on the public road and outside the control of the applicants.
- The recommendation that the roadside areas currently used for parent parking should be converted into a footpath and protected from vehicle parking by the installation of bollards has not been incorporated into the revised design. Almost all the area concerned is outside the application site on lands which appear to be outside the applicants' control.
- While the school's traffic and pedestrian management plan does not refer to a traffic warden, it is evident from the revised layout plan that it is intended to provide one. Details of how road crossings would be managed during busy periods should be provided. There is no provision in the revised layout for road markings or advance signage. The plan lacks clear and precise safety

measures and is over-reliant on the co-operation of parents and bus drivers to abide by a set of instructions and rules.

- It is clearly set out in the RSA that the proposed car park would be likely to lead to an increased number of pedestrians crossing the road. The RSA highlights the stark impediment to visibility due to the school boundary wall and parked vehicles. The recommendation to demolish the wall and remove the vehicles is not referenced in the revised design and the required works could not in any case be considered as they are wholly outside the application site.
- The applicants have not submitted a swept path analysis to confirm that cars could navigate the car park safely. Serious concerns remain about the proposed parking and circulation configuration.
- The revised layout shows pedestrian crossings from the centrally located parked cars to the parallel car parking spaces to the north and south of the site. However, pedestrians would still have to access the crossings via the road and to pass between parked cars to access the footpaths to the north and south of the car park. Furthermore, the locations of the crossings do not follow pedestrian desire lines.
- The revised layout indicates that the footpath would continue through the car park junction with the road but the width of the proposed junction has not been reduced.
- The proposed surface water collection system makes no provision for hydrocarbon interception, which the planning authority had requested.
- The proposal submitted in an attempt to alleviate existing mobility problems associated with drop offs and pickups would exacerbate these problems without appropriate measures and controls. A fundamental redesign in consultation with the Council's Roads Department is required. This would necessitate a coherent approach to traffic and pedestrian management, including proposals for set-down areas and bus parking. The deficiencies in the design cannot be addressed in the context of the current application.

Other Technical Reports

- 3.2.2. When initially consulted on the application, the Council's Roads Department and Athlone Municipal District Office had serious concerns regarding the location of the entrance to the proposed car park approximately 30 metres from the junction of the L7610-0 and the L7527-0. There are significant traffic movements during school pick-up and drop-off [times] at this junction and traffic movements associated with the car park may result in conflict situations.
- 3.2.3. Following an examination of the further information received, it was the opinion of the Council's Roads Department that the applicants had failed to address significant road safety issues. It was unclear how vehicles would access and exit the proposed car parking spaces, particularly those in the centre of the car park and those on curves. Consequently the Department was unable to approve the information submitted.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Application Site

- 4.1.1. The planning report stated that no recent relevant planning history had been traced.

4.2. Glanduff National School

- 4.2.1. **11/335:** On 18th January 2012, permission was granted to construct a four-classroom building extension on land to the north west of the school.
- 4.2.2. **15/345:** On 11th February 2015, permission was granted to construct an extension consisting of two classrooms, resource rooms and toilets and renovate the existing front entrance.
- 4.2.3. **23/196:** On 15th September 2023, permission was granted for a new wastewater treatment system and tertiary polishing filter on land to the north west of the school.

4.3. Ballymurray National School

- 4.3.1. **20/281:** On 16th October 2020, permission was granted for car parking spaces, a one-direction driveway with set-down area and footpaths, and a new opening to the public road.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. Policy Objective SCCD 11.5 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 states that the expansion of existing school sites in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area will be supported.
- 5.1.2. It is stated in Section 12.24 of the Development Plan that safe unobstructed sight distances should be provided and maintained thereafter from vehicular entrances on to the road network. Figure 12.4 specifies that from a point 2.4 metres back from a local road, sight lines of 90 metres in both directions shall be provided. Section 12.24 also says that visibility splays for local roads will be determined on a site-specific basis subject to traffic safety and that in general, only the minimum interference with existing roadside boundaries and hedges will be permitted. New rural entrances should not be located within 40 metres of junctions on local primary roads. Where the criteria in terms of sight lines or distance from junctions cannot be met, a safety audit should be submitted to justify reductions.
- 5.1.3. Table 12.1 of the Plan indicates that a minimum of 1.5 car parking spaces per staff member should be provided at primary schools. Table 12.2 indicates that a minimum of one bicycle stand per 50 pupils should be provided at schools.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The application site is not in any Natura 2000 site of European nature conservation importance. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are:
- Lough Ree Special Protection Area, about 2.2 kilometres to the east, designated for various bird species;
 - Lough Ree Special Area of Conservation (SAC), about 2.2 kilometres to the east, designated for natural eutrophic lakes, semi-natural dry grasslands, active and degraded raised bogs, alkaline fens, limestone pavements, bog woodland, alluvial forests and otter; and
 - Lough Funshinagh SAC, about 3 kilometres to the west, designated for turloughs and rivers with muddy banks.

- 5.2.2. River Suck Callows Natural Heritage Area (NHA), about 16 kilometres to the south west of the site is designated for peatlands and birds. Section 10.5 of the Development Plan states that there are also many proposed NHAs in Co. Roscommon which will be designated on a phased basis.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment Screening

- 6.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment; please refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendix 1 to this report. Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, I am satisfied that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development does not trigger a requirement for EIA screening and that an EIA report is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 7.1.1. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- Glanduff National School is located in a rural setting and has been in existence since 1961. The school has identified the following risks during drop-off and collection times: (i) insufficient car parking spaces for staff; (ii) insufficient drop-off points; (iii) insufficient bus parking; (iv) uncontrolled parking outside the school and houses on the opposite side of the road; (v) uncontrolled crossing of pedestrians; (vi) uncontrolled parking outside gates; (vii) cars parking in the bus parking area and the disabled parking area; (viii) drivers doing U-turns in the middle of the road outside the school; and (ix) dangerous road congestion.
- The school does not have any space in its existing grounds to use as a car park. The Board of Management has spent a substantial amount of time sourcing a site for a car park and community garden. The application site is the only site available to the school within easy access of the school.

- The Council's decision to refuse permission on safety grounds is baffling. The proposed car park would provide adequate staff parking, would allow safe dropping off and collection, would facilitate controlled pedestrian crossings, would free up space for necessary additional bus parking and would eliminate parking outside residents' houses. It would also facilitate access for school users and others to the proposed community garden, which would enhance wellbeing and allow participation in community activities.
- The appellants have made several improvements to their proposals following the recommendations of the RSA. A copy of the revised layout drawing with these improvements highlighted in orange was attached to the appeal statement. The appellants are concerned that without the proposed car park an accidents resulting in serious injury or potential fatality is imminent.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

7.2.1. None

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Issues

- 8.1.1. Having inspected the site and considered in detail the documentation on file for this First Party appeal, it seems to me that the main planning issues are:
- whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle; and
 - the safety and convenience of road users, including school children.

8.2. Acceptability in Principle

- 8.2.1. The Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 specifies that a minimum of 1.5 car parking spaces per staff member should be provided at primary schools, as well as a minimum of one bicycle stand per 50 pupils. From the information provided, Glanduff National School already more than meets both these minimum standards. While the grounds of appeal refer to insufficient car parking spaces for staff, the justification letter focuses on the need to relocate roadside car parking spaces to ease congestion and free up room for two additional bus parking spaces.

8.2.2. The Development Plan does not require a justification for the proposed development to be shown. It supports the expansion of existing school sites in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The Plan does not place an upper limit on the number of parking spaces at schools. It seems to me, therefore, that the proposed development is acceptable in principle. However, the highly important issue of road safety must be carefully examined.

8.3. Safety and Convenience of Road Users

8.3.1. The proposed car park access would be only 20 metres from the junction of the L7610 and the L7550. This is a matter of concern due to the convergence of traffic on the school at certain times of the day. While a 2.4- by 90-metre sight line is shown on the site layout plan in the northerly direction from the proposed access, it would be impossible to provide an adequate sight line in the south-westerly direction.

8.3.2. I find it noteworthy that in providing further information to the planning authority, the applicants did not address the Roads Department's concerns about the location of the proposed access. Its close proximity to the junction is not mentioned in the RSA. The RSA made eight recommendations relating to the layout of the proposed car park and its entrance and five about matters relating to land outside the application site.

8.3.3. I am of the opinion that in the absence of a swept path analysis, it cannot be concluded with certainty that the proposed car park layout is safe and that all the proposed spaces would be useable. Such an analysis, if produced, might have shown a need to reduce the number of spaces being proposed. There is a risk that implementation of the proposed layout might cause traffic congestion within the site and at the entrance and lead to increased danger on the public road.

8.3.4. I am not sure that it is possible to devise a solution that would eliminate the necessity for staff members to walk along the internal circulation road. However, I am not convinced that the layout would be any more hazardous in this respect than that of many car parks which are open to the public. School children and their parents would be able to use the peripheral footpath.

8.3.5. As a high proportion of the vehicles using the car park are likely, for some time to come, to have petrol engines, I agree with the planning authority that the proposed surface water collection system should make provision for hydrocarbon interception. In the event of permission being granted, this could be secured by a condition.

- 8.3.6. The proposed entrance, which would be over a drop kerb, measures about 8.5 metres in width. Pedestrians crossing there would be exposed to motor vehicles for the full width of the entrance. It seems to me that if permission is granted, a condition could be imposed requiring the width of the entrance to be reduced to, say, 6 metres. However, regardless of the geometry of the entrance, the proposed layout would lead to pedestrian/vehicular conflict at this location. Creating a car park on the opposite side of the road from the school and obliging children to cross the road close to a road junction would introduce a traffic hazard which does not exist at present.
- 8.3.7. Recommendations 3 to 7 of the RSA relate to off-site matters. They cover the safety of the increased number of pedestrians likely to cross the road as a result of the development, visibility to the left when walking out of the school, the adequacy of bus parking arrangements and the safety of children alighting from the buses. These matters are intimately linked with the proposed development and essential to its safety.
- 8.3.8. The reorganisation of roadside parking and provision of additional bus bays are not included in the description of development. The school grounds are not part of the application site as depicted on the location map and, surprisingly, are not identified as land under the control of the applicants. Matters such as the installation of bollards, road markings, advance warning signs, the routing of buses, and the prohibition of roadside parking likely to impede visibility, are not within the control of the school and require the co-operation of the Council as traffic management authority.
- 8.3.9. I agree with the planning authority that the proposed development could exacerbate existing mobility problems associated with drop offs and pickups. The school's traffic and management plan relies on exhortations to drivers which it is far from clear that the school would be able to enforce. It is not difficult to imagine the proposed layout leading to increased chaos and danger. A comprehensive redesign, in consultation with the roads authority, is required in order to identify a satisfactory solution. I conclude that the development as proposed would be likely to prejudice the safety and convenience of road users, including school children.
- 8.3.10. Having studied the permission granted for car parking at Ballymurray National School, I note that the additional spaces are on the same side of the road as the school. Consequently, they do not give rise to the problems associated with traffic and pedestrian movement that this application presents. The land immediately to the north

of Glanduff National School, on the same side of the road and in the same 1.19-hectare field, was identified as being within the ownership of the school in previous planning applications relating to the school, the most recent of which was dated 2023. It seems that, for some reason, this land is not available for a new car park.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

9.1. Having considered the nature, location and modest scale of the proposed development, the nature of the foreseeable emissions therefrom, the distance from the nearest European site and the absence of any known hydrological link between the application site and any European site, I am content on the basis of objective information that the development is not likely to have a significant effect on any European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. I therefore conclude that the carrying out of an appropriate assessment under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The application site is located about 180 metres from the nearest water body, Carrowphadeen. The proposed development comprises a car park and a community garden. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.2. I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and 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.
- 10.3. The reasons for this conclusion are the nature and modest scale of the works, the distance from nearest water body and the absence of any known hydrological connections.

10.4. 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 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend to the Commission that planning permission be refused.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. Having regard to the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028, and in particular to Section 12.24 and Figure 12.4 thereof, to the absence of a swept path analysis of the proposed car park layout, to the inevitability of pedestrian/vehicular conflict at the proposed car park entrance and road crossing, and to the reliance on traffic management measures and driver behaviours which are outside the control of the school authorities, it is considered that the proposed development would be likely to prejudice the safety and convenience of road users, including school children, and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. A comprehensive redesign, in consultation with the roads authority, is required in order to identify a satisfactory solution.

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.



TREVOR A RUE

Planning Inspector

29th September 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323145-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a car park and a community garden
Development Address	Carnagh West, Kiltoom, Co. Roscommon
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<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"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required (Form 2)	Class 10(b)(ii) Threshold: 400 spaces
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)?	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: Trevor A Rue

Date: 29th September 2025

TREVOR A RUE

Appendix B: Form 2 – EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ACP-323145-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a new entrance from a road, a car park and a community garden
Development Address	Carnagh West, Kiltoom, Co. Roscommon
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of the Proposed Development (in particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health)	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. <i>The development has a modest footprint, does not require demolition works or the use of substantial natural resources. It does not give rise to a significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster and is not vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.</i>
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)	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed <i>The application site is in a rural area on improved agricultural land which is abundant in the area. The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, centres of population and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan.</i>
Types and Characteristics of Potential Impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation)	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects. <i>Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, the likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects and absence of in-combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in Section 171A of the Planning and Development Act 2000.</i>

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

Inspector: Trevor A Rue

Date: 29th September 2025

TREVOR A RUE